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Abstract

On December 26, 2004, the world witnessed one of the most destructive natural disasters in modern history, the Indian Ocean tsunami or the Asian tsunami. The gigantic waves were the result of an undersea quake that originated north west of Sumatra Island in Indonesia. The countries most affected by the tsunami were India, the Maldives, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, and Thailand and the governments of each were forced to implement disaster response and recovery efforts. The purpose of the study was to ensure meaningful public participation in the disaster response and recovery context of a natural disaster. The objectives were to: 1) broadly identify and describe the response and recovery projects undertaken in post-tsunami Thailand; 2) examine the participation of affected communities in the decision making during disaster response and recovery; 3) examine obstacles to successful participation in disaster response and recovery projects.

A case study approach was used to accomplish the objectives of the study. Two affected communities in Thailand, namely Ban Namkem and Ban Tungwa, were selected for this research. Experiences of the two communities were presented and analyzed through document review, participant observation, and semi-structured interviews. Interviews were also carried out with key informants from the Thai government and international and national non-government organizations that assisted in the tsunami response and recovery efforts.

Results show that there was no consensus on the success of the tsunami disaster response in Thailand. The rapid response of the Thai government was effective for the search and rescue operations, but in terms of aid distribution and relief operations, errors were made that should be examined. The Thai government immediately formed a chain-of-command and distribution of responsibilities to different Ministries. The response phase focused mainly on assisting the victims with search and rescue teams and basic necessities. Donations and volunteers came from aid organizations as well as the Thai citizens residing within and out of Thailand. Community participation during this phase was shown in the establishment of temporary relief camps for the victims of Ban Namkem
and Ban Tungwa communities provided by local NGOs. Overall, there was, however little involvement of the impacted public in the response despite the fact that those affected were in fact the first responders.

The tight timeframe and overwhelming number of tasks carried out by field staff, as well as the strict criteria for aid, prevented the government from reaching out to all victims. These factors discouraged field staff from implementing programs that would enable the community to participate and voice their concerns during the recovery effort. Failure to involve the affected communities or lack of meaningful public participation led to time consuming and costly delays and development projects which were not popular with the affected community. In fact, a housing project implemented without community input was abandoned due to its low quality and failure to meet the affected community’s lifestyle.

Findings show that the two communities studied were capable of making their own decisions and organizing themselves to assist each other as early as right after the disaster struck. It was also clear that community participation in the decision-making process could empower and promote the solidarity of the community, which in turn enables community members to protect themselves from outsiders’ exploitation, as shown in the fight for land rights that ensued in Ban Namkem and Ban Tungwa communities.

Obstacles that either prevented or decreased the capacity of community members to participate arranged from a general lack of opportunity to participate in any of the response or recovery decisions to low expectations within the affected communities regarding government assistance and/or any call for their involvement in the decision-making process. The overwhelming number of responsibilities placed on field staff also impacted their ability to involve people in a timely way.

Recommendations for meaningful community participation in disaster response and recovery include: extending planning timeframes to allow community input in the planning and implementation of response and recovery projects. Community members
should be involved very early in disaster response and recovery in order since they will best know community's needs and built trust and partnership between the community and the relief providers. Relief organizations and/or government need to step back and enable the affected communities to drive their own disaster recovery project. Lastly, regular meetings and discussion among the victims as well as with the aid providers is a therapeutic way of dealing with grief and sorrow. The meetings and discussions are also an opportunity to rebuild community ties and networks which may have been lost due to the disaster.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCOP</td>
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<tr>
<td>CODI</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORDIO</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIDA</td>
<td>Danish International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasta</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDPM</td>
<td>Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>Humanitarian Aid Department of the European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECNEQA</td>
<td>Enhancement and Conservation of National Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Global Environment Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>Government Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>German Technical Cooperation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ICNEQA: Improvement and Conservation of National Environmental Quality Act

ILO: International Labour Organization

INGO: International Non Governmental Organization

IUCN: World Conservation Union

JICA: Japan International Cooperation Agency

KIA: Kenan Institute Asia

NACA: Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia—Pacific

NCDC: Natural Civil Defence Committee

NGO: Non Governmental Organization

NOAA: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

ONEP: Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning

PAP: Phuket Action Plan

PAPN: People Against Poverty Network

PRA: Participatory Rural Appraisal

PTA: Phuket Tourist Association

REA: Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment

RRA: Rapid Rural Appraisal

RTA: Royal Thai Army

SEAFDEC: Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center

SIDA: Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRDP:</td>
<td>Sub-regional Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREAM:</td>
<td>Support to Regional Aquatic Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAO:</td>
<td>Tambon Administrative Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCS:</td>
<td>Thai Red Cross Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDO:</td>
<td>Urban Community Development Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN—HABITAT</td>
<td>United Nations Human Settlements Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP:</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP:</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS:</td>
<td>United Nations Office for Project Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID:</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB:</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFT:</td>
<td>Wildlife Fund Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO:</td>
<td>World Tourism Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 BACKGROUND
Large natural disasters always bring widespread destruction and sorrow wherever they occur. On December 26, 2004, the world witnessed one of the most destructive natural disasters in modern history, the Indian Ocean tsunami or the Asian tsunami. The gigantic tidal waves were the result of an undersea quake that originated north west of Sumatra Island in Indonesia (ONEP 2006, p.12). It was the fifth largest quake of the century with a magnitude of 9.15 on the Richter scale. The resulting tsunami struck eleven countries along thousands of miles of exposed coastline, killing some 350,000 people and leaving another 2.5 million homeless (Ghosh et al. 2005, p.1; ACHR, 2006). The countries most affected by the tsunami were India, the Maldives, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, and Thailand, however, the loss was magnified and extended to countries around the world, as the tsunami occurred during peak tourist season (Telford et al., 2006; also see Plate 1).

Plate 1: Affected Population (UN Thailand, 2006)
In response to the disaster, Thailand declined any outside financial assistance, but requested technical and material assistance for damage assessment, recovery, and reconstruction, as well as identification and repatriation of the deceased. The requested assistance also included technical support in the area of environmental rehabilitation and community livelihood recovery through the implementation of Environmental Assessment (EA). The measures ensured sustainable rebuilding, as well as tsunami early warning systems, so that in the future, there is sufficient time to evacuate residents, thereby decreasing vulnerability to future tsunamis (UNEP, 2005).

Many countries dispatched forensic experts, search and rescue teams, and transportation units to strengthen Thai relief operations. The International organizations that provided assistance can be seen in Appendix A. Thailand was praised by many organizations for its ability to effectively respond to the disaster within a short period of time (Scheper, 2006). During the emergency phase, the government used a centralized approach to authorize a chain of command in order to coordinate and increase the capacity of emergency response and repatriation of tsunami victims. The centralized approach, however, is only effective for immediate response and not for the long-term recovery process, since it tends to overlook the interests of poor communities (Scheper, 2006). Moreover, the victims are perceived as receivers instead of stakeholders when it comes to planning for relief projects.

1.2 RESEARCH PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this study is to consider the extent of community participation in the disaster response and recovery context during the 2004 tsunami in Thailand. In order to achieve the above purpose, the following objectives were:

- To broadly identify and describe the response and recovery projects undertaken in post-tsunami Thailand.
- To examine the participation of affected communities in decision making during disaster response and recovery.
- To examine obstacles to successful participation in disaster response and recovery projects.
1.3 RESEARCH APPROACH
This research was conducted using a qualitative paradigm, following a case study strategy. Primary data sources were collected by the researcher over the course of six months in Thailand. Two communities were selected from Phang Nga province as case study communities. The first community was Ban Namkem, which was considered to be the worst hit community in the tsunami disaster. The other community was Ban Tungwa, which was a sea gypsy community that was decimated by the tsunami. Both communities had a similar level of destruction and their members were involved in many disaster response and recovery activities. Chapter Three provides more information on the two communities and the criteria used to select them as case studies.

The data collection techniques were selected from the participatory rural appraisal (PRA) tool box. As such, the primary means of data collection were semi-structured interviews with government officials, local and international NGOs, and the affected communities. Since my family’s origin is the Southern part of Thailand, I was able to participate in the conversations and interviews without the need of a translator. My Thai nationality and language skills also made for more comfortable interviews with older participants, many of whom can only express themselves freely using a Southern dialect. Participant observation was also employed to help identify and understand the status of recovery projects and the recovery priorities of the communities. Often times, community members were more than happy for me to sit and listen to their conversations and interactions. I believe that my fluency in the Southern dialect enabled me to blend in and participate more freely.

1.4 ORGANIZATION
My thesis consists of six chapters. Chapter 1 provides information on the research process and rationale. Chapter 2 reviews literature related to disaster recovery, public participation, and case studies in Thailand. Chapter 3 presents the selected methods for data collection in the field. Chapter 4 discusses the local and national disaster responses in Thailand during the emergency and recovery phases. Chapter 5 takes the study to the
local level and demonstrates the disaster responses in the two selected communities, Ban Namkem and Ban Tungwa. Here, the communities’ participation is presented with respect to the planning and implementation of relief projects in the emergency and recovery phases. Finally, Chapter 6 summarizes the research, draws conclusions, and provides recommendations for public participation in disaster response and recovery.
Chapter 2: The Indian Ocean Tsunami and Disaster Response and Recovery in Thailand

2.1 INTRODUCTION
The Indian Ocean Tsunami was one of the world’s most destructive natural disasters. Eleven countries were hit by the waves and many citizens from different countries in all parts of the world were victimized by the catastrophe. Many tourists lost their lives while holidaying in Thailand. Relief organizations from around the world traveled to Thailand to offer assistance. The number of organizations and individuals involved in the relief operation and disaster management was extensive, which lead to difficulties in communication and cooperation. During the relief operation, all involved parties worked towards the same goal, which was to answer to the victims’ needs and to help them recover from the tragedy as soon as possible. “Only by actively engaging the residents and other stakeholders can recovery from disaster lead to integrating a community’s social, economic, and environmental goals and ideals” (Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center, 2001, p.3-12). This chapter offers background information on the tsunami and its impact on Thailand, disaster management, and the importance of public participation in the disaster response decision-making process.

2.2 COUNTRY BACKGROUND
Thailand is located in Southeast Asia. In 2003, the population was 62 million with an annual growth of 0.6 percent (World Bank, 2005). It has 76 provinces with Bangkok as the capital city. One of Thailand’s unique qualities is the citizens’ love for the Royal Family. Although the country is now democratic, its strong tradition of respect for the monarchy system still blossoms. King Bhumibol Adulyadej is recognized by his citizens as the father of the nation. His dedication to improving the standard of living of all his citizens through sustainable development and self-sufficiency is demonstrated by many rural development projects. The idea of “sufficiency economy” is promoted by the King to encourage Thai citizens to live a more sufficient lifestyle and become resilient to the changing world of globalization. “Sufficiency has three key principles: moderation;
wisdom or insight; and the need for built-in resilience against the risks which arise from internal or external change” (UNDP, 2007). Thai citizens honour generosity, kindness, seniority, respect, politeness, and hospitality. These characteristics are the foundation of Thai culture. Therefore, in an emergency, it is not a big surprise to the nation that everyone pulls together and helps as much as possible by volunteering and donating (UNDP, 2007).

According to the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, the economy in Thailand is recognized as one of the fastest growing in the world (World Bank, 2005). The Gross Domestic Product (GDP) for the year 2003 was 143 billion US dollars, which places Thailand among newly industrialized countries (World Bank, 2005). Tourism is a very important factor that has contributed to the country’s high economic performance. Thailand is a country with beautiful scenery. The northern part of the country consists of mountains and forests, while the southern region has many islands and beaches. Tourists from all over the world visit Thailand for on vacation, which resulted in the development of many resorts, hotels and restaurants. New communities are established in popular tourist areas, however these tourism-related developments are often unplanned and uncontrolled, causing varying degrees of damage to the environment.

2.3 IMPACTS OF THE INDIAN OCEAN TSUNAMI IN THAILAND

On December 26, 2004, the tsunami waves started from the undersea quake near Sri Lanka. They hit Thailand around the Phuket and Phang Nga coastlines at 9:38 hours (ONEP, 2006). Thailand had never encountered this type of disaster before, so there was no knowledge or preparation available for the country to minimize the impact of such a catastrophe. The wave traveled to the neighbouring countries of Indonesia and Thailand. The undersea quake caused a massive wave called “tsunami”. There are five types of possible movements of the earth’s layers that lead to undersea earthquakes, namely lateral fault, normal fault, reverse fault, lateral normal fault, and lateral reverse fault. The Asian Tsunami was caused by a reverse fault, more specifically: “the Indian plate, formerly overlapping the severed Burmese layer, dipped down and lifted the latter plate up several meters, and caused a fault that was over 1,200 kilometres long from Sumatra.
Island to the north, and resulting in a devastating earthquake” ONEP; (2006, p. 14).

Figure 1: Formation of tsunami (BBC news, 2005)
The tsunami hit six coastal provinces in Thailand, namely Phuket, Ranong, Phang Nga, Krabi, Trang, and Satun (See Plate 2). Approximately 6,791 houses were damaged and 3,619 houses were destroyed (UNEP, 2005). As of June 10, 2005, there were 8,221 deaths, among which 3,896 were Thais, 3,146 were foreigners, and 1,179 were unknown. Out of these casualties, Phang Nga accounted for 5,880 deaths where 2,654 were Thais, 2,229 were foreigners, and 997 were unknown (Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation, 2007). The UNEP report estimated that damage cost of Thailand’s tourism industry alone was around 321 million US dollars. In addition, the damage to the fisheries sector was estimated to be 43 million US dollars and 0.65 million US dollars for the agriculture sector (UNEP, 2005).

Plate 2: Six Affected Provinces in Thailand (Choowong, 2006)
Among the victims was His Majesty, the King’s grandson. Khun Poom was the son of Princess Ubolratana, the King’s oldest daughter. The Princess and two of her three children went to a beach-front hotel in the Khao Lak area, as honourable guests for the hotel’s grand opening (The Nation, 2004). The Royal Thai Government responded to the disaster immediately after the tsunami hit. The Princess and her daughter, Khun Mai, were saved. The Thai Royal Family provided assistance to all victims through the Royal Rajaprachanugroh Foundation under the Royal Patronage. Personal funds of 30 million Baht were used to purchase food, water, medicine, and basic necessities for people affected by the disaster. The foundation also funded the reconstruction of schools in the affected areas, worked with the Thai Red Cross and World Vision Foundation of Thailand on permanent housing projects, and provided local fishermen with 500 small fishing boats (ONEP, 2005).

Many relief operations were carried out to assist people in need. The international organizations that provided assistance included the ADB (Asian Development Bank), AIT (Asian Institute of Technology), CCOP (Coordinating Committee for Geoscience Programmes in East and Southeast Asia), CORDIO (Coral Reef Degradation in the Indian Ocean), EU (European Union), CCC (Coral Cay Conservation), FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization), GTZ (German Technical Cooperation), KIA (Kenan Institute Asia), ILO (International Labour Organization), IUCN (World Conservation Union), JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency), SEAFDEC (Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center), SIDA (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency), UNDP (United Nations Development Programme), USAID (United States Agency for International Development), UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme), UNESCO (United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization), UNOPS (United Nations Office for Project Services), UN—HABITAT (United Nations Human Settlements Programme), WB (World Bank), GEF (Global Environment Facility), CODI (Community Organization Development Institute), DANIDA (Danish International Development Agency), Stockholm Environment Institute, NACA (Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia—Pacific), STREAM (Support to Regional Aquatic Resources Management), ECHO (Humanitarian Aid Department of the European
Commission), WFT (Wildlife Fund Thailand), and NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) (ONEP, 2006). Although many organizations rushed into the affected areas hoping to lend a helping hand to the victims, not every organization was familiar with emergency or disaster management. It is important to understand the concept of disaster management and the role of relief organizations during disaster response and recovery.

2.4 DISASTER RECOVERY AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
According to Carter (1991, p.xxiii), disaster is “an event, natural or man-made, sudden or progressive, which impacts with such severity that the affected community has to respond by taking exceptional measures” (Faulkner, 2001). It is a product of social, political, as well as economic environments, which is different from natural environments (Wisner et al., 2004). The concept of disaster management was first introduced after the Cold War in the mid-1950s. Plans and decisions were made around preparation for nuclear war and the construction of bomb shelters. The idea of disaster management was later used to reduce the impact of natural disasters (Pearce, 2003). Disaster recovery is a process of loosely related activities that takes place before, during, or after a disastrous event to restore order in communities affected or that could be affected by a disaster (Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center, 2001). The activities vary and range from warning and ongoing public information, evacuation and sheltering, search and rescue, redevelopment planning, and preparation for the next disaster, to damage assessments and environmental assessment, just to name a few. Usually these activities are delivered under an emotional, reactionary, time-sensitive, expensive, and politically charged atmosphere and are based upon incomplete information, disproportionate needs, and poor working conditions (Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center, 2001).

There are four phases of disaster management, namely preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation (Warfield, 2002; also see Figure 2). Preparedness refers to activities that take place prior to the disaster in order to prevent or minimize negative impacts caused by disaster. These are short-term preparation activities such as evacuation plans or a
warning system. Response is the phase where affected parties react to the initial impact of a disaster. It includes all activities that take place as soon as disaster strikes, such as emergency aid and assistance, search and rescue, as well as site clean up. Once the immediate response took place, the next phase is called recovery. It includes any activities that bring the community back to normal, for example temporary housing, grants, or medical care.

Figure 2: Four phases of disaster management

The immediateness of disaster makes it very difficult for response activities to be effectively coordinated. “The emergency phase is characterized by actions that are necessary to save lives. They include search and rescue, first aid, emergency medical assistance, restoration of emergency communication and transportation networks, and in some cases, evacuation from areas still vulnerable to further disaster” (Cuny, 1983). Since the first people at the scene are the victims, the management responsibility of relief operations is carried out by those who are unfamiliar with such processes. Decisions are made under intense pressure and in short periods of time in order to keep up with the situation. “In the case of natural disasters and social conflict, the resulting resettlement decisions must be taken relatively quickly: the disaster context typically requires reactive (emergency) decision-making—there is insufficient time for proactive planning and
stakeholder consultation.” (Badri et al., 2006). Therefore, it is very difficult for the activities to be coordinated accordingly.

According to Hewitt (1983), comprehension of the condition of population, economy, and infrastructure of the affected country are as important as its geophysical and biological processes and outcomes (Haque, 2003). The World Bank recognized that many developing countries had gone through a rapid transition of economies from self-reliance to liberalized market systems (The World Bank, 1996). Such changes place a new value on higher economic performance and development, while jeopardizing the livelihood and state of the environment of such countries. Amartya Sen explained that poverty and the socio-economic marginalization processes are key factors that increase the level of human vulnerability to natural disasters (Haque, 2003). However, there is also another important factor that contributes to higher risk to natural disaster. According to Manuta et al. (2005) poor coordination across administrative bodies and line agencies, plus the absence of monitoring and evaluation of state agency has undermined the provision of effective disaster management.

Decisions related to a disaster management approach used to rest solely on the government. However, according to Rubin (1991), affected communities become frustrated with closed decision making process on disaster management planning that directly affects their lives (Pearce, 2003). Over time, public participation became an accepted part of disaster management process. Australia and New Zealand Standards Associations (1995) reported that “…while a top-down policy is needed, it is really the local-level bottom-up policy that provides the impetus for the implementation of mitigation strategies and a successful disaster management process” (Pearce, 2003). It was up to affected communities to initiate and implement the policies.

The disaster situation may be a very intense and terrifying moment for the victims, but it does not mean that they lose their rationality and become helpless victims like many would assume. “In the conventional relief formula, all kinds of agencies descend upon the disaster scene, all with their separate objectives, styles of working and time frames,
with very little coordination…In this formula, the victims of calamities are considered to be helpless “target populations”, and rehabilitation is something that is to be done for them, not by them” ACHR (2006, p. 1). Aptekar (1994) pointed out that myths about disaster victims can include irrational behaviour under stress, looting during a disaster, epidemics, refusal to stay in the affected area, and helplessness. However, “[c]ross-cultural evidence suggests that immediately after a disaster the desire to help other people is very strong” Aptekar (1994, p. 6). The victims are able to take control over their lives soon after the disaster strikes. However, the nature of disaster relief sometimes makes it very hard for the victims to reclaim their lives. To ensure the success and sustainability of disaster recovery projects, it is beneficial to include the victims in the decision-making process.

An example of the Guatemalan government’s response to the 1976 earthquake proves the importance of including affected community members in the decision making process. The Guatemalan government invited the victims to participate in the reconstruction by forming an ad hoc committee to work on coupling earthquake reconstruction with development issues. “Because of the responsibilities lodged in the local communities, victims became more adept at making decisions. They felt more empowered. Local leadership developed” Aptekar (1994, p. 64).

In order to implement a successful disaster recovery process, the concept of holistic disaster recovery was developed by the Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center (2001) to deal with uncoordinated disaster recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster. “Holistic disaster recovery is really “sustainable redevelopment”, which is a subset of a larger issue, sustainable development” Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center (2001, p. 2-13). Holistic disaster recovery incorporates the principles of sustainability in every decision and considers the community’s best interest overall, which require thorough public participation processes (see Figure 3). An ideal disaster recovery process requires a meaningful participation program for the affected community. The community should proactively take part in decision-making related to recovery and redevelopment after the disaster to make sure
that people’s interests are being considered and put together toward long-term and sustainable community benefits rather than short-term gains. The availability of financial resources is also important for successful disaster recovery. The community needs to have money to invest into recovery activities. There needs to be opportunities for the affected community to enhance its economic and community vitality as well as environmental and natural resources. Last but not least, the community should work together to decrease the risk of future disasters (Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center, 2001).

The literature of resource and environmental decision making, participatory project development agree that local involvement in the decision-making process is the path toward ‘sustainable development’ (Leach et al., 1999). It has been proven that by including the affected community’s input, more effective solutions for a sustainable environment are achievable (Leach et al., 1999). The reasons for the success are further explained by Webler et al. (1995). First, the competence of the decision is enhanced when all available information related to the project is presented, including local knowledge. Secondly, by providing all parties with an opportunity to offer their input to the project, the legitimacy of final outcomes is increased. Thirdly, public participation
promotes democratic activity through decision-making processes. Lastly, by being involved in the planning and decision-making process, the parties are empowered and more likely to become involved in future projects. This increases the level of civic participation through the ‘social learning’ process. The knowledge gained from the public participation process creates legal rights awareness, enabling the public to effectively exercise their rights. Alderson (1992) describes the importance of public learning in terms of legal education (Sinclair and Diduck, 1995). Legal education enables the public to recognize the inadequacy and inaccessibility of information about the legal and justice system (Sinclair and Diduck, 1995).

According to Sinclair and Diduck (1995) there are at least six advantages of public involvement in decision-making process.

- It helps avoid any favours and maintain balanced decisions.
- It allows traditionally unrepresented interests of the public to be expressed.
- It increases public confidence in the process.
- It encourages efficiency and modifies policies towards public needs.
- It promotes accountability.
- It allows the public to intervene and challenge improper decisions or actions before they come into force.

Although public participation has many advantages, it is still important to recognize that not all public participation process provide the same outcomes. There are many different types of public participation thus it is important to first identify the level of public participation in the project. The ladder of public power by Arnstein (1969) is a well known model used to measure the degree of public participation (see figure 1). The first two rungs of the participation ladder are considered a non-participation approach, where the public is educated about the process, but not enabled to provide or integrate any input in the project decisions. The third to fifth rungs provide the public with the opportunity to share their opinion and information in regards to the project. However, there is no guarantee that their input will impact the final decision. The three top rungs are levels of citizen power with increasing degrees of influence in decision-making. According to
Arnstein (1969), the top rung of citizen control is where “…have-not citizens obtain the majority of decision-making seats, or full managerial power.”

Figure 4: Ladder of public power over the decision in participatory processes (Arnstein, 1969)

Although Arnstein’s ladder of public power is recognized by Sinclair and Diduck (1995) as one of the models available to evaluate the public participation process, they also suggest that the model leaves out the important learning component of participation processes. According to Sinclair and Diduck (1995), “…citizens must have a firm understanding of the decision-making process which they are part of [in order to achieve higher degrees of citizen power]” Sinclair and Diduck (1995, p. 228). The importance of learning is expanded further by Webler et al. (1995) as they use the term ‘social learning’ to describe a process that results in changes in the way that individuals perceive their private interests by linking their interests to others interests. It can be explained through two main components, cognitive enhancement and moral development (Webler et al., 1995). Cognitive enhancement describes learning processes relating to the state of the problem; the solutions and its consequences; others as well as personal interests and values; methods, tools, and strategies contributing to good communication and consensus; and holistic and integrative thinking.
Kurtines and Gewirtz (1987) suggest that moral development refers to the process where individuals develop the ability to make right and wrong judgments (Webler, et al., 1995). Collective good is a highlight in moral judgment. “The crystallization point of participation is when the group transforms from a collection of individuals pursuing their private interests to a collectivity which defines and is oriented toward shared interests” (Webler et al., 1995). Moral development in public participation includes building respect and responsibilities of oneself and others without imposing personal interests or values and abiding by it; being open-minded; acquiring moral reasoning and problem solving skills to solve conflicts; developing unity within the group; learning how to incorporate new cognitive knowledge; and learning how to work with others to solve collective problems (Webler et al., 1995).

Given the interest in public participation in disaster management some authors have established conditions that need to be met for it to be efficient and meaningful. There are many conditions and factors that must be followed to achieve efficient public participation. One of the most popular environmental related activities that public participation plays a crucial role in its success is the Environmental Assessment (EA) process. It can be applied to any other type of public participation in decision-making processes. By looking at the work done by Johnson and Dagg (2003) and Bond et al. (2004), a checklist for meaningful public participation is as follows:

- It should take place early in the decision-making process.
- It should be an interactive consultation (two-way communication).
- It should provide access to information and key information.
- The consultation should be continuous throughout the process.
- There should be opportunities for feedback.
- It should be an inclusive and transparent process, where the decisions are accountable.
- It should empower stakeholders through the integration of their input into the final decision.
- It should take into account the values of stakeholders.
There are many ways of involving community members. Techniques used to include affected community members in the decision-making process are also very important. However, it is not easy to include all affected parties in the decision making process. The higher the number of affected parties, the more difficult it is to make a decision mutually. One of the most popular techniques to accomplish successful consensus-based multi-stakeholder approaches to disaster management is to form an advisory committee consisting of representatives from different interested groups (Pearce, 2003). Thomas (1995) provided at least three advantages of using an advisory committee. Mainly because it is less difficult to reach consensus through an advisory committee than with the public as a whole. Secondly, the honour of membership makes it more difficult for the participants to base their decision solely on their personal interests. Last but not least, is increases the chance that the decision is accepted by the community (Pearce, 2003). Of course an advisory committee approach also demands that mechanisms be established for the public to provide input to their representatives.

However, it is also important to recognize that the obstacles that prevent people from participating may stem from the individual’s attitude toward the participation process. According to Webler et al. (1995), the obstacles to effective and efficient public participation are disbelief and distrust, which prevent people from becoming fully involved in the process. The lack of confidence that their input will be valuable is also an obstacle to meaningful public participation. The study of why some members of the public do not participate in public participation processes by Diduck and Sinclair (2002) show that there are five key barriers to public involvement, namely:

1. Information deficiencies: inaccessible information, overly technical discourses, or incomplete information.
2. Lack of resources: e.g. lack of resources to create knowledge to challenge proponent position.
3. Opportunities to participate: unequal or lack of opportunity to participate.
4. Lack of impact on ultimate decisions: lack of opportunity for input to influence the final decision, lack of transparency to alternative perspectives on the part of
the dominant parties in the proceedings, and thinking the results are a foregone conclusion, which is a serious obstacle to participation.

5. Lack of motivation, interest, or time: the potential effects of the project are not perceived as a threat to their everyday life. Some people are consumed by their daily chores, or believe that others are already representing their interests.

Therefore, assurance that they could learn about new technical knowledge and that their knowledge and experience are valuable and can contribute tremendously to the process must be provided all through the process. Opportunity and resources necessary for the community to effectively be involved in the decision-making process are also important.

2.5 ENVIRONMENTAL AND DISASTER MANAGEMENT IN THAILAND

Environmental degradation and overexploitation of natural resources are the unwelcome fruits of development and growth. The environmental impacts of socio-economic change due to rapid increases in development activities have led to an international debate on development. Many countries implemented legal requirements to promote sustainable development. In the 1970s, the United Nations held many conferences inviting scholars and experts from all over the world to address and discuss problems related to the environment (1972), population (1974), and human settlements (1976) (Modak and Biswas, 1999). The awareness of the impacts from resource depletion and environmental degradation as a result of rapid development around the world and humanity’s increased ability to extract and exploit nature at a faster pace became a topic that was widely discussed. The United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) was set up to assist countries around the world deal with environmental problems.

The Brundtland Commission’s report on the environmental debate was released in 1987 and the term ‘sustainable development’ emerged as a new environmentally related definition of development. According to Martinussen (1997), sustainable development is “…a process that fulfills present human needs without endangering the opportunities of future generations to fulfill their needs” (1997, p.43). The report focused on problems of poverty. The goal was to eliminate poverty or at least enable people to meet their basic
human needs. In order for sustainable development to be achieved, standards of consumption must be ecologically feasible, and attainable by people all over the world (Martinussen, 1997).

Rapid economic growth, increased population, and expansion of needs for residential areas are a few of the factors that pushed the Thai government to establish plans and policies that would ensure the country’s environmental sustainability. In 1961, the Thai government introduced the first National Economic and Social Development Plan. It was a five-year development plan that focused on promoting the country’s economic growth. However, concerns about environmental degradation and the impacts of over exploitation of natural resources did not receive much attention until the Fourth National Economic and Social Development plan (1976-1981), through projects like reforestation programs or the compilation of data on natural resource utilization problems. (Manopimoke, 1999; as appeared in Itakura et al., 1999). Environmental law in Thailand is considered to be a top-down policy implemented by government as a fashionable response to Western donors rather than necessity (Roque, 1986; as cited by Boyle, 1998). The international environmental conferences at Stockholm and Rio de Janeiro in 1972 and 1992, respectively, were offered major international peer pressures for Thailand (Tongcumpou and Harvey, 1994). The Thai government declared the Improvement and Conservation of National Environmental Quality Act (ICNEQA) or Enhancement and Conservation of National Environmental Quality Act (ECNEQA) in 1975 and revised it in 1992 in response to these international conferences. The Act deals with development projects with potential environmental impacts.

As such, disaster management system in Thailand is based on the Civil Defence Act of 1979 and the Civil Defence Plan 2002. Disasters are divided into three categories in the Civil Defence Act of 1997, namely i) man-made and natural disasters; ii) disaster as a result of war; and iii) disaster as a result of sabotage or terrorist attack (ADRC, 2006). Policy making on disaster management falls onto the Natural Civil Defence Committee (NCDC)’s responsibilities. On October 2, 2002, the Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation (DDPM) was established under the Ministry of Interior authority and has
been designated to shoulder responsibility for the disaster management of the country. Despite these actions, Thailand does not have a national disaster preparedness plan in place. “Natural disaster management in Asia and the Pacific Islands has traditionally been either sector-based development schemes or response-oriented programs. As a result, the responsibilities for disaster relief, resettlement and rehabilitation in many countries still lie with the ministry of Home Affairs or Interior since these functions are viewed in terms of civil defence” (Haque, 2003, p. 479). Thailand relies a great deal on its military personnel when it comes to keeping the country’s orderly. When the disaster strikes, the military gets involved. How the government responded to the tsunami is discussed in chapter 4.

2.6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN THAILAND

The importance and advantages of public participation were recognized by the Thai government through several implications for involvement of local communities and public interest groups, for example, under section 6 of the ICNEQA, the public is granted the right to participate in the enhancement and conservation of national environmental quality. This includes: 1.) the right to be informed and obtain information related to the enhancement and conservation of national environmental quality, unless the information is officially classified or violating privacy and/or property rights of others; 2.) the right to be remedied and compensated for illness or damage from pollution; 3.) the right to file complaint against polluters with sufficient information; and 4.) the right to work with government officials in activities related to the enhancement and conservation of environmental quality (Yap, 1994).

It is important to understand the impacts of political, social, and cultural factors in order to create an effective framework for public participation in Thailand (Daniere and Takahashi, 2002). Low civic participation and lack of political will contribute to the failure of the country to properly create a good environment for meaningful public participation. Boyle (1998) provides cultural explanations for ineffective public participation process, claiming that social status, personal relationship and interaction, and the passive characteristics of Thai culture, along with technical factors related to
discussions contribute greatly to low performance of public participation in Thailand. According to Boyle (1998), cultural characteristics of Thai people that impact public participation can be divided into three major categories of related traits:

1. Status, hierarchy, and power: Thailand’s history of absolute monarchy until the transition to a constitutional monarchy in 1932 influences how the society deals with status, hierarchy, and power. Pye (1985) recognizes that, Asian culture, collectivity places a higher value over individual interests (Boyle, 1998). According to Nakata and Dhiravegin (1989), “…Thais are prone to exercise absolute power if they can; to defer, obey, and submit to those in power; and to seek to belong to groups forming around a leader or patron with greater power or wealth (Boyle, 1998).

2. Personalism, patrons, and clients: Thai culture favours feelings of obligation and indebtedness in personal relationships. This characteristic is explained by Pye (1985) as a reflection of the urge for paternalistic authority, dependency, and loyalty to a collectivity (Boyle, 1998).

3. Self-control, avoidance of conflict, and face: Suppression of feelings to avoid conflict, criticism, disagreement and controversy is largely practiced in Thai culture. Personal emotion is expected to be hidden in graceful manners when dealing with problems and conflicts. Nakata and Dhiravegin (1989) perceive “…Thais are generally keen to avoid conflict, not prone to violence, patient and tolerant toward injustices, and modest, considerate and averse to criticizing others in their presence” (Boyle, 1998). Religion also plays an important role in how Thais deal with conflict. Buddhism is the major religion in Thailand and its teachings of ‘middle path’ suggest that a person should balance between being considerate and being sincere. Conflict is also avoided because of concerns for gaining, losing, and saving face to maintain self-respect, prestige and honour (Boyle, 1998).

It is very difficult for a local community to effectively participate in a decision-making process if they do not feel that they are capable of making informed decisions on national level issues. “Leaders expect to make decisions on behalf of their people without being
questioned, and they expect people to defer to their authority, to avoid confrontation and conflict, and to avoid causing them to lose face” (Boyle, 1998). This practice contradicts the purpose of public participation more broadly. However, human behaviour can change in disastrous time where fast action and personal involvement are required in order to move forward and recover.

2.7 SUMMARY

The devastating tsunami hit six coastal provinces in Thailand on December 26, 2004. After the disaster took place, aid was sent from all over the world for the victims in all of Southeast Asia. The United Nations along with other international organizations and governments have offered financial assistance to Thailand, but it was declined. Instead, the Thai government has requested for technical assistance. Many relief organizations worked with Thai government to support the recovery of affected communities. Public participation in decision-making is crucial for the success of disaster recovery. However, the level of affected parties’ involvement in the decision-making process is low because they were perceived as victims rather than stakeholders in the relief operation. If the aid providers and policy makers can change their perception of the affected parties as victims to stakeholders, the disaster recovery plans and projects would have more success than failure.


Chapter 3: Methods

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I explain the process of and the approach to select the topic, case study sites, and interviewees. The purpose of this research was to broadly identify and describe post-tsunami recovery projects underway in Thailand, and to obtain from the public, NGOs, INGOs, and government agencies, their approach and strategy related to public participation in post-tsunami response and recovery projects. The research consists of two methods including a review of related literatures and empirical field work. The empirical data collection is conducted in qualitative paradigm, using a case study approach. This approach enables an understanding of the experiences, perspectives and histories of people within the context of their own setting (Spencer et al., 2003). The data collection techniques are selected from the participatory rural appraisal (PRA) literatures, which include participant observation and key informant interviews. Data collected from literature reviews and field work was synthesized by grouping similar findings into different themes for summary and discussion of community involvement in disaster response and recovery.

My empirical field work occurred in the late summer of 2005, more than half a year after the disaster took place. The response and recovery projects were already established and many affected areas were almost fully recovered by the time I visited the areas in January of 2006. However, despite my late arrival, many community members always referred back to their experiences prior to the recovery phase during my interviews. Therefore, I found that it is necessary for me to also include projects took place at the response phase in order to provide background on the projects during the recovery phase.

3.2 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

My original goal was to do research in my home country of Thailand. The tsunami struck Thailand at the end of 2004 soon after I began my search for a topic. My interest was in public participation in redevelopment projects with a special focus on Environmental Assessment (EA). According to the Natural Hazards Research and Applications
Information Center (2001), disaster recovery is a process of loosely related activities that takes place before, during, or after a disastrous event to restore order in communities that are affected or will be affected by the disaster. The activities vary from warning and ongoing public information, evacuation and sheltering, search and rescue, redevelopment planning, the preparation for the next disaster, to damage assessments, and EA. Thus I examined many articles related to disaster recovery, EA, and public participation in Thailand.

I came across a process similar to EA but used mainly in a post-disaster situation. According to Kelly (2005), the Guidelines for Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment (REA), developed by Benfield Hazard Centre and CARE International, is introduced to generate input on environmental conditions and sustainable recovery in a short period of time. During the development period of my thesis proposal, I identified the REA report by the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) as a main project to study and hoped to learn more about the report process. However, after interviewing the UNEP staff in Bangkok by phone, I realized that the report was based purely on secondary data from other organizations that went into the affected areas. The REA report by the UNEP was prepared without direct contact with the communities. The report leaned more towards a damage assessment of the tsunami-affected areas. So I decided to visit the two affected provinces, namely Phuket and Phang Nga, to identify the study areas as well as to look at available projects in the area. My objectives were revised to focus on the participation process of the two communities in Phang Nga province. My research was based on the belief that the affected community’s participation in disaster response and recovery would improve the success of the post-disaster projects.

The secondary data was collected by reviewing documents related to post-tsunami recovery situations in Thailand, disaster management, and the concept of meaningful public participation. I began by looking at many news websites and newspapers in English and Thai with information on the recovery projects in Thailand. I also reviewed the progress reports, in both languages, from INGOs, NGOs, and government agencies. Many articles on disaster management and community participation were reviewed and
used as a theoretical guideline for data analysis. I used all the information I collected to identify key organizations and individuals who became my key informants and who guided me to the two communities discussed in this research.

3.3 SELECTION OF CASE STUDIES
Case studies refer to the investigation of contemporary events within the real-life context in which multiple sources of data are used, and in which the boundaries of the research and the context are not clearly defined (Yin, 1989). Due to the ongoing status of post-tsunami events and my research focus on the public participation process, the case study is the most suitable approach because it “allows an investigation to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events” (Yin, 1989, p.14). This approach enables the researcher to have better understanding of complex social phenomena.

In order to implement the case study design, consideration of the tsunami’s impact and the resulting development activities focused on southern Thailand because i.) Thailand was badly affected by the Indian Ocean Tsunami; ii.) governmental and non-governmental organizations from all over the world are undertaking a significant number of disaster recovery projects as a result; iii.) Thailand is the researcher’s home country making it easier to detect culturally related issues and prevent any miscommunication problems caused by translation.

The sites within Thailand were selected based on 1) the scale of destruction, 2) the evidence of community participation in decision-making in the recovery process, 3) the accessibility of the communities, and 4) the willingness of the communities to participate in the research. After reading several newspapers, two distinct communities in Phang Nga province came to light. Ban Namkem was the worse hit community with almost one third of its population missing or dead. Baan Tungwa is a small sea gypsy community that lost half of its community members and its houses were completely destroyed. These communities were located not too far from each other, and both faced similar land rights problems. The two communities were also involved in the planning of a few development projects in their own communities. Based on these criteria, two small fishing
communities, namely Ban Namkem and Ban Tungwa, in Phang Nga province were selected as case study sites (See Map 3).

Plate 3: Tsunami affected areas in Thailand with highlight on case studies area (SDF, 2006)

Similar to the Lampom neighbourhood in Ban Namkem, Ban Tungwa community was also faced with land disputes. The level of participation in both communities was very strong, largely because of the fight for land. The immediate shock of loss due to natural disaster may have been the main force that pushed community members to work together toward the greater good of the community, but the fight for their right to ownership of ancestral lands created opportunities for many members to become more involved in long-term community projects.

3.4 IDENTIFICATION OF KEY INFORMANTS

Many organizations from all over the world with different expertise and backgrounds came to Thailand to assist with the disaster response and recovery. I searched for different approaches used by the relief organizations to involve the tsunami-affected communities in Thailand during the emergency as well as during the recovery period. The key informants for this research included government officials (both national and local level), academics, staff from NGOs and INGOs, as well as affected community
members (table 1). I tried to contact the Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP) department, which is responsible for all EA projects, for information on redevelopment projects which took place in the affected areas. I was able to get a phone interview with one of the staff after searching for the ONEP department phone number from its official website. I discovered that there were no suitable development projects in the tsunami areas that required the submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report because submissions were waived for reconstruction of hotels and/or resorts which were destroyed by the tsunami. Owners had already submitted reports and received approval prior to the disaster. It was the government’s way of speeding up the recovery process and returning tourism to its former state.

**Table 1: Breakdown of Interviews Conducted**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Officials</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff from NGOs and INGOs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Community Members</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Much tsunami-related research was done by academia in Thailand. After reviewing several articles in the newspapers, I contacted and set up interviews with professors from two prestigious universities in Bangkok. The Mahidol University had completed its report on “Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment” (REA) while the Chulalongkorn University was working on its report. I set up an interview with the professor from Mahidol University to find out more about the report. Although the title of the report is REA, the findings in the report were based more on damage assessment. However, the professor was kind enough to suggest a few places that I should visit. Two of them became my case studies.

I also contacted a professor in the political science department in Chulalongkorn University who was working on post-tsunami projects with a special focus on evaluation and recommendations of the government’s performance and tsunami relief operation in
Thailand. He was kind enough to invite the researcher to join the roundtable talk organized for his project. One of his research team members also contacted the researcher and provided an electronic file of the progress report on the project. The roundtable talk was a very resourceful event for the researcher. Many key spokespersons from different organizations were present, including the community members from Baan Namkem and Morklens. The meeting took place at the political science department in Chulalongkorn University in Bangkok. The professor also suggested that I visit Ban Namkem and Ban Tungwa to find out more about their participation process.

Prior to my first visit to Ban Namkem and Ban Tungwa communities, I also contacted the local authorities in Takuapa and Takuatung districts in Phang Nga province for interviews. I also contacted the Phuket Tourism Association in Phuket province to set up an interview to learn more about the recovery of hotels and tourism related businesses in the province. I was also fortunate to obtain an interview with the owner of the hotel located on the street by Patong Beach, the most famous street in Phuket. Information gained from my interviews and my interest in community participation enabled me to narrow down my study to focus mainly on Phang Nga province.

In the case of Ban Namkem, since my first visit to the community, I noticed two organizations that were well established within the community, namely World Vision and Ban Namkem Community Coordinating Centre. Ban Namkem Community Coordinating Centre was located opposite the Ban Namkem School, while World Vision had its office building painted a bright orange colour and was located just a little further inside the community. I began to search online for phone numbers of World Vision staff working on tsunami related projects in the affected areas. According to World Vision’s official website in Thailand, the main headquarters for tsunami related projects is located in Phuket. I contacted the number available on the website and talked to one of the staff, who happened to be a Canadian woman. She was very helpful and offered to set up an interview with the project coordinator in Phuket a few weeks later.

After the first visit to Phuket and Phang Nga provinces, I returned to Bangkok to analyze
the information obtained from the field and decided to research Ban Namkem and Ban Tungwa communities based on their willingness to participate in the study as well as the public participation characteristic that both communities have. I also looked for articles and news items related to both communities in order to learn more about their situations and tried to identify the key organizations that worked with both communities during the recovery period. I went back to the communities twice after that to interview community members based on their availability and referral by community leaders.

### 3.5 DATA COLLECTION APPROACH

One of the most well-known and widely applied qualitative methods in development and resource management fields is Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), developed by Robert Chambers. Its informality and flexibility enables the data collection at the community level to be done more effectively. PRA is a qualitative research method that was developed from Chambers’ Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA). I chose to use PRA as a guideline because it puts the community in the driver’s seat and the researcher learns with the community throughout the process. Good rapport is achievable with the researcher’s relaxation and reorientation as well as critical self-awareness. I used semi-structured interviews and participant observation as my main tools to collect data. The interviews were conducted with a set of questions that I used as a guideline to obtain information while keeping the process very informal and conversational. I also attended many workshops, meetings, and roundtable talks to gain information as well as to observe the interaction of the interviewees. All of my interviews were recorded using a voice recorder, which enabled me to revisit my conversations for future clarification.

### 3.6 DATA ANALYSIS

Once I collected my data, both primary and secondary, I began the task of transcribing my interviews. Most of them were in the Thai language so I also had to translate them into English. I began to find the key issues and main themes from my data and drew my conclusion from there. I constantly revisited my objectives and looked at my data to find the answers to my questions. My conclusion was drawn using comparisons to the literature reviews I had prepared prior to the field work.
Chapter 4: Tsunami Disaster Response and Recovery in Thailand

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter offers background information on the response and recovery to the tsunami disaster in Thailand. The main players included the Thai government, governments of various countries, international relief organizations, international NGOs, local authorities, local NGOs and GOs, as well as private donors in Thailand and around the world. The chapter is divided into two main disaster phases: emergency response and recovery, with information on responses at the national and local levels accompanying each phase. The conclusion summarizes and evaluates key findings.

Photo 1: Destructions (Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation, 2007)

4.2 DISASTER RESPONSE PHASE

4.2.1 National Level Response

ESTABLISHING THE RESPONSIBILITIES

Despite the fact that there was no national disaster preparedness plan in place, the Thai government, with the Prime Minister in charge of directing various bodies of administration through the Minister of Interior and the National Civil Defence Council, was able to establish a centralized national disaster management response during the emergency phase. “This structure, replicated at provincial and district levels, under the
authority of the Governor and of the District Civil Defence Director, coordinated the implementation of the national response” UNCT (2006, p. 33). Immediately after the news of the tsunami’s assault on Thailand’s coastal provinces, Prime Minister Thaksin Shinnawatra, along with many concerned Ministers and high ranking officials, rushed to Phuket province to aid in the disaster response.

On December 26, 2004 the Prime Minister established the Southern Disaster Victim Relief Collaboration Center in Phuket. The Center’s tasks were to coordinate the relief operation in six affected provinces (UN Thailand, 2005a). “The Center was chaired by [the] Minister of Interior [at that time, Mr. Kongsak Wattana] and the committees comprised the Permanent Secretaries for all concerned ministries, and Director General of [the] Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation was the committee and secretary” (UN Thailand, 2005b). The relief activities included search and rescue; retrieving corpses, forensic autopsy and body identification; assisting and facilitating tourists’ repatriation; repairing roads, communication systems, and electricity; managing and distributing donations; and containing the potential epidemics (UN Thailand, 2005b).

On that same day, the Earthquake/Tsunami Victims Relief Center was set up in Bangkok at the Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation. This center provided information for relatives of disaster victims via the International and Domestic Call Center, received and transported donations to the affected areas through the Donation Center, and mobilized personnel and equipment necessary for search and rescue and relief operations in the affected areas (UN Thailand, 2005b). The Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation was established in 2002. Most of their work lies in promoting public awareness of prevention of disasters and accidents through disaster mitigation policies and civil defence activities (Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation, 2006). There are only a few officers in each province and most of them are technicians who look after road conditions or implementation of disaster mitigation programs. When the tsunami struck, most of the officers became coordinators for relief operations in the affected areas. “The department acted as technical assistant for local authorities in dealing with the disaster relief operation, but did not work directly with the victims in the
affected areas” (Respondent # 24).

The waves hit six provinces in Thailand. The impact was severe in four provinces, namely Phuket, Phang Nga, Ranong, and Krabi, while the impact on Trang and Satun was moderate (see Table 1). The Prime Minister assigned four Ministers to each look after a severely impacted province. Phuket was the Minister of Interior’s responsibility. The Minister of Natural Resource and Environment was responsible for relief operations in Phang Nga. The Deputy Minister of Interior was assigned to take charge in Krabi, while the Deputy Prime Minister took care of Ranong (UN Thailand, 2005b). In Phang Nga province, for example, the Tsunami Victims Relief Center was established on December 27, 2004, under the direct authority of the Minister of Natural Resources and Environment (at that time, Mr. Suvit Khunkitti). Their tasks were to search for and collect dead bodies, to coordinate the treatment of injured victims, to prevent the spread of disease, and to assist tourists and facilitate their return to their countries (ONEP, 2005).

Table 2: Casualties in six affected provinces as of March 21, 2005 (UN Thailand, 2005b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Death (person)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Injured (person)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Missing (person)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Foreigner</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Foreigner</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Phang Nga</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>4,224</td>
<td>4,344</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Krabi</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phuket</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ranong</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Trang</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Satun</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>5,395</td>
<td>6,065</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEARCH AND RESCUE OPERATION

Military personnel were immediately mobilized to help in the search and rescue operation. “[A]lthough 30 public agencies from 12 ministries were involved with disaster management responsibilities, the main agency for implementing policies and programs was the Department of Local Administration under the Ministry of Interior” (Haque,
The navy, air force, army, and police organized their own troops and equipment to assist survivors who were stranded on islands and in destroyed areas. There were approximately 7,000 soldiers sent to aid the affected areas in the first few months of the disaster (The Nation, 2005a). The tasks during the emergency period included searching for, rescuing, and transporting survivors to safe areas with Medicare. Army doctors and hospital teams were sent from army hospitals around the country to help in the affected areas. They were also in charge of distributing food and water, clearing out the paths and setting up tents in the affected areas (Directorate of Civil Affair-Royal Thai Army, 2005, p. 46).

The Thai government declined all financial assistance, but requested technical assistance from other governments. Many international relief organizations sent teams to Thailand to help the local authorities with operational assistance. As a result, the search and rescue operation in Thailand became an international operation. According to United Nations Thailand (2005c), military personnel from many countries flew to the affected areas to provide assistance in the relief operation. Two major troop regiments came from the United States and Japan. The Australian government also sent in the Australian Federal Police team to provide technical assistance in the Disaster Victims Identification operation (UN Thailand, 2005c). Additionally, the Taiwan government sent in a search and rescue team, while the Israeli government sent in 15 doctors to help treat the victims, and the Belgium government sent in a medical team and four specialists from the Belgian Federal Police’s Disaster Victim Identification Unit along with 18 police officers for search and rescue operations (The Nation, December 29 and 31, 2004).

In order to assist the international relief teams, the Thai government opened up “…[the] Utapao Airbase as a regional staging center for the distribution of [the international community’s] humanitarian assistance to affected areas throughout the region” (The Nation. December 26, 2005; p.6A). The US Airforce flew six C-130 cargo planes to the Utapao Airbase to deliver basic foods and medical supplies (The Nation, December 29, 2004). The airbase is located in the province of Rayong, which is 190 kilometres from Bangkok. It operates under the direction of the Royal Thai Navy (also see Map 2 in
Chapter 1 for location)

**KINDNESS IN TIME OF NEED**

The government requested that the Thai Red Cross Society (TRCS) become the lead agency for food distribution to the affected areas during the emergency phase. TRCS National Blood Centre also sent 13,208 units of blood supplies to the hospitals in affected provinces. Volunteers from TRCS worked with other organizations to help affected communities settle into the temporary shelters (UN Thailand, 2005c). People from within the country also moved into the six affected provinces and volunteered to assist the victims. It was Thailand’s biggest relief operation and people from different backgrounds and expertise volunteered and worked together. Many doctors volunteered to fly to the affected areas to help. The most famous forensic pathologist in Thailand, Khunying Dr. Porntip Rojanasunan, flew to the affected areas to offer her expertise in body identification using DNA testing along with her students, who volunteered to work on the project. Forensic experts from 40 countries also joined the team making it the largest forensic operation in history (Schepers, 2006). Tasks performed by volunteers included search and rescue, collection and identification of corpses, debris clearing and cleaning up the affected areas, and setting up relief camps for the victims.

Many people were generous and sent food, medicine, clothing, and money into the affected areas. The Thai public was praised by many nations for its generosity and humanity for those in crisis. Many commercial airlines also offered support to the relief operation via free flights to bring volunteers and officials into the affected areas. The participating airlines included Nok Air, Thai Airways International, Bangkok Airways, Air Asia, Orient Air, and Phuket Air. These airlines transferred thousands of affected visitors to Bangkok so they could catch flights back to their countries. Many injured victims were air lifted to hospitals in nearby provinces. Nok Air offered free flights for all doctors traveling to affected areas (East West Siam Ltd., 2004). Cathay Pacific Airways carried out supplies and aid personnel to the affected areas, as well as donated money (The Nation, December 30, 2004).
Many tourists were helped and received compensation from the government. “Within 10 days of the disaster, the Immigration Bureau had assisted almost 5,000 victims, mostly foreigners, to return home, helping thousands of tourists who had lost all their belongings, including passports” (UNCT 2006, p.24). The help also extended to families and friends of victims, who came to receive the injured and/or the bodies or search for their loved ones, at the centres that were set up at airport arrival halls. Moreover, the Ministry of Tourism offered to pay the living expenses as well as funeral expenses for the victims’ families while they searched for survivors and bodies of their loved ones. Financial assistance on medical expenses was provided to the injured by the Ministry of Public Health (UNCT 2006, p.25).

Thai media crews were sent into the affected areas not long after the first few tidal waves hit the coastline and news stories were reported to the rest of the nation. At the time of the incident, I was in Chicago, where the news was also reported through the Thai satellite channel which is widely viewed by Thai communities in North America and Europe. Many personal stories were broadcast by local news stations. Numerous news features focused on the sorrow and grief of the victims’ families as well as ongoing relief operations. Advertisements of various organizations and aid agencies that were accepting donations provided information to donors on what was needed and where they could pledge their donation. The donations from Thai people outside of the country poured into the affected areas. Thai students in Winnipeg, for example, sent money to family members in Thailand via MoneyGram, a money transfer service offered by Canada Post. MoneyGram also waived the transaction fee for money transfer to tsunami affected countries. Many relief organizations as well as local businesses, such as Thai restaurants, accepted donations for the tsunami victims. Volunteers from in and out of the country flooded into the areas.

4.2.2 Local level response

VICTIMS HELPED EACH OTHER

The disaster happened suddenly and without prior warning. Immediate help came from those who survived. Help from outsiders arrived many hours after the disaster took place. The emergency situation was the same for everyone at the scene; people were assisting
those who were in need. Local people were the first responders in the disastrous situation. For example, Phi Phi Island, located off the shore of Krabi province, was badly hit as the waves slammed through the entire island. Most of the victims on the island were foreigners. Since the island was so far away from the mainland, the immediate need was to get the victims to hospitals. Assistance was provided by fishermen. Many boats went to the island to transport the victims back to the mainland, while the merchants and local people provided tsunami victims with clothes, shoes, blankets, food, drinks and other amenities (The Nation, Dec 31, 2004).

In Phuket, many businesses and hotels along the beaches were flooded. Due to the crowded layout of the stores and hotels in the beachfront areas, the casualties in Phuket were the second highest of all six affected provinces (see Table 1). Along the Patong beach, Phuket’s busiest and most crowded street, the destruction was massive. Cars and debris were everywhere, along with the bodies of many unfortunate people. Numerous survivors ran up the nearby hills to save their lives. One of the Swedish tourists said she was walking along the beach and a man took her into his truck and headed for the hills. Many people did the same and stayed up on the hill overnight to make sure that the waves would not hit again (Thapanachai and Maneerungsee, Dec 26, 2005).

According to one of the beach-front hotel owners in Phuket, many survivors walked along the street in front of the hotel after the water receded (Respondent #1). Most of them looked lost, terrified, and injured. He was not at the hotel at the time but heard about the disaster from the local radio and was rushed to his hotel. Many cars were flooded inside the hotel along with tourists. Some hotel rooftops had cars resting on them. Immediate help came from hotel workers who survived the event. According to Respondent #1, his workers who survived helped him to clear the debris and search for survivors who were perhaps trapped inside the hotels. This search and rescue operation was based purely on kindness during a disastrous time.

COMMUNICATION, COORDINATION, AND CHAOS
Due to the disaster, the communication system was not working in many of the affected
areas. The key players that informed locals about what had happened, what should be done, and where to get help were the local radio stations. “Landlines and radio networks were still operating and provided adequate communication support for the relief effort. Also telecommunication companies set up their mobile systems around the province and offered free service for the public” (ADPC 2005, p.16). Many immediate donations in response to the survivors’ needs were requested and delivered by announcement on the local radio stations. In Phuket province, the local radio station reported the news to local residents and advised them to move up into the highland. However, due to lack of experience in disaster management and knowledge of this type of disaster, the announcement was made with very limited information, which created panic among local residents who lived further inland away from the beach front. The observation point on top of the mountain, located in the middle of Phuket city, was crowded with cars and people from all parts of the city, including those who lived close to the beach front and were fleeing the tsunami waves (Kaewnoo, 2004). Despite the inability to provide effective advice, the radio station provided immediate assistance to many survivors by linking victims to donors.

The Southern Disaster Victim Relief Collaboration Center operated for four to five months after the disaster. It was set up merely to respond to the emergency situation. According to Respondent #2, the victims had to go to the center to request help and assistance. “The government did not approach the victims. If the victims needed help, then they would have to go there. By not requesting help, the government assumed that they did not need help. But there were people who were injured or sick and they couldn’t go. The request had to be submitted within 30 days, otherwise they would not receive help” (Respondent #2). Strict criteria and short time frames for the relief operation created great difficulty for locals in coping with the disaster. In Phuket, high ranking officials demanded that one of the local tourist organizations submit a list of all the missing tourists at the end of the day, which was impossible to do. Respondent #2 was not impressed and felt that the Prime Minister was doing the right thing by dividing up the tasks, but the people in charge were sometimes unable to effectively deliver it.
Local government agencies or the Tambon Administrative Organizations (TAO) also played a crucial role in the distribution of aid and relief supplies to affected people. TAO belongs to sub-district authorities, the primary local government agency in the Thai system (Lebel et al., 2006). The TAO officials are representatives elected from within the community. In Phang Nga, Takuapa District Office (Takuapa TAO) coordinated with higher officials in the search and rescue operation. However, in most cases, the local officials were also victimized by the disaster themselves. In Bangmuang sub-district, a TAO officer tried to help his family members and neighbours as well as coordinate with relief organizations to set up a relief camp for the victims. “I am a victim myself. I lost my father in the event…I was approached by CODI staff and asked what they should do to assist the victims so I suggested that we should set up a place with toilets so people can gather there. It would be easier to deliver help that way” (Respondent #6). The local health office was informed by the police radio announcement of the disaster and the TAO staff started their help and rescue within two hours of the news. In the afternoon, the military personnel in the area began to search for victims and bodies (Scheper, 2006). Soldiers transported bodies to different assigned spots for forensic body identification (Directorate of Civil Affair-Royal Thai Army, 2005). Helicopters and an aircraft carrier from the Royal Navy were rushed into the search and rescue operation as well as distribution of essential supplies to affected areas (UN Thailand, 2005c).

During the first 24 hours, there were more than 1,000 patients in Takuapa Hospital which is a general hospital with 180 beds. The hospital only has 10 physicians, five are general practitioners, two are orthopaedists, two are paediatricians, and one is a surgeon. Everyone was called to the emergency room to assist as many patients as they could during the first 24 hours (Watcharong et al., 2005). “On 27 December, national assistance began to arrive, including doctors, nurses, mental health specialists, 200 ambulances and 10 army helicopters to transport the wounded to hospitals around the country” (Scheper 2006, p. 26). Volunteers were also important players in assisting medical staff with translation. Doctors from all over the country worked side by side in the affected areas, with help from multilingual Thai and foreign victims who translated to make the process smoother.
VOLUNTEERISM AND DONATIONS

Media coverage of the disaster brought the nation together. Volunteers flew in from every province in Thailand to lend a hand. Many people offered their expertise, while others were there just to offer their labour and do whatever needed to be done. However, the large number of organizations and volunteers that simultaneously went into the affected areas during the emergency phase also created chaos in some areas. “The biggest problem in the emergency phase was the lack of information sharing. Every organization went in and collected information without sharing it with others. So much time, money, and energy was wasted in managing information” (Respondent #16). This issue was also confirmed by many villagers whom I interviewed. They said that it was very confusing and frustrating at the beginning because there were so many organizations that came in and asked questions. Most villagers did not remember the names of the organizations, the people they talked to, what would be done with the information they gave or what they could expect in terms of action.

Those who could not go into the areas organized fundraising activities and collected donations. The donations were dropped off in front of district offices, but there were not enough people to sort and distribute them. In one case, the local official was contacted and requested to pick up a donation package at the airport in the next province as it was coming in from Hawaii. The donor requested that photos be taken, so the official had to send out a group of officers to pick up the package. “The package turned out to be a bag full of sandals. I think there were around 200 pairs” (Respondent #3). The officers spent a lot of time doing little tasks such as the one mentioned, answering the demands of high ranking officers, as well as managing the relief operation in the area. The local authorities found themselves multi-tasking. The officials from different departments were on standby to perform whatever tasks they could at the time of the disaster. There were volunteers who came into the area later on, but the immediate response and help came from the survivors themselves.
4.3 DISASTER RECOVERY PHASE

4.3.1 National level response

RECOVERY ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY GOVERNMENT

The magnitude of the disaster made it impossible to document everything that occurred nationally during the response phase of the tsunami disaster. However, it is clear that the transition from emergency phase to recovery phase happened soon after the waves receded. In order to assist the survivors of the tsunami in the six affected areas, various departments were assigned sets of responsibilities. The Ministries involved in the disaster recovery operation included:

1. Ministry of Tourism and Sport (assisted affected foreign tourists);
2. Permanent Secretary for the Office of the Prime Minister (assisted affected persons);
3. Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperative under the Department of Fishery (assisted affected persons in the fishery business);
4. Ministry of Labour (assisted the affected persons unemployed by the disaster);
5. Ministry of Interior (assisted small-scale business entrepreneurs);
6. Ministry of Finance (assisted large-scale business entrepreneurs);
7. Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (provided shelters for the affected persons);
8. Ministry of Education (assisted affected students);
9. Ministry of Public Health and provincial health offices (provided medicare and controlling the spread of infectious diseases for the survivors);
10. Ministry of Fisheries (provided compensation and livelihood support for fishing villages) (UN Thailand, 2005b).

All programs were expected to be delivered in a short period of time, in order to bring the economy back to the way it was before the tsunami. However, the most important task for the government was the provision of shelters for those who lost their houses in the disaster.
Not long after the emergency phase, the Prime Minister assigned the Interior Ministry to carry out the housing projects in cooperation with the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security and the Military. Initially, the Royal Thai Army (RTA) had been given 15 days to build temporary shelters for the victims with a budget of 10 million bahts from the Government Lottery Office (Directorate of Civil Affair-Royal Thai Army, 2005). The RTA also provided labour and equipment to remove debris and clear the affected areas for reconstruction projects, to manage and store the bodies for further identification, as well as to transport bodies for burial. In addition, due to the massive flood of donations from all over the world, soldiers assisted with managing, organizing, storing, and distributing the funds (Directorate of Civil Affair-Royal Thai Army, 2005).

**ASSISTANCE FROM THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY**

As mentioned, although the Thai government declined all financial assistance, it accepted technical assistance from other governments. Many international relief organizations sent teams to Thailand to assist local authorities with operational assistance. The United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) and Asian Development Bank (ADB) were two of the many organizations that offered their expertise to assist Thailand during its disaster recovery process. On February 2005, the UNEP released a report called “After the Tsunami: Rapid Environmental Assessment” to provide Thailand with an assessment of the environmental impact of the tsunami and to identify long-term needs for disaster recovery (UNEP, 2005). The report was based on desk-research methods; therefore, the collection of data did not include direct contact with affected communities or field visits (Respondent #5). The findings were divided into three main sections, namely impact on the natural environment, impact on the human environment, and environmental management capacity. The recommendations from the findings included the application of EIA for long-term rehabilitation work with systematic monitoring, support for livelihood recovery with integrated coastal zone management plans to ensure that the future vulnerability of the coastal communities is minimized, and the establishment of an early warning system in the affected areas to provide increased security for locals as well as tourists.
The Asian Development Bank assisted Thailand by preparing the Sub-regional Development Plan (SRDP) for the Tsunami Affected Andaman Region of Thailand, partially funded by the ADB’s Technical Assistance programme and the Fiscal Policy Office of the Thai Ministry of Finance (executive agency). The research team of Thai and international consultants under Wilbur Smith Associates and Tesco Ltd. were hired by ADB to produce the report (Wilmer Smith Associates, 2006). The report provided recommendations based on various workshops done by the research team in three affected provinces, namely Krabi, Phang Nga, and Phuket. People involved in the workshops were selected by the local Thai consultant. The invitations were sent out to local authorities, NGOs, and people in the business sector, particularly those in tourism (Respondent #4).

In the last workshop, the findings, along with feedback from previous workshops, were presented to audiences for further suggestions. Recommendations on what could be done to assist the recovery of the affected communities were presented and discussed. I was fortunate to be able to attend the workshop which took place in Phuket province. It took place in one of the province’s well known hotels, and was done in a formal manner in a large conference room. Participants were requested to sign in at a desk at the front of the room, providing their name and indicating which organization or group they represented, if any. The room was set up with a panel table on the stage for project team members and rows of tables and chairs on the floor for the audience. Microphones and PowerPoint presentations were used. The presentation of the plan lasted approximately 3 hours, including question period and a coffee break. Coffee and tea along with a variety of baked goods were provided at the break. Since most of the researchers in the project were foreigners, the results were presented in English and then translated into Thai by one of the Thai staff on the project team. Before the workshop ended, there was mention of another presentation for the final version of the plan in the following month.

Since Phuket is a very tourist-based province, most of the participants in the workshop were business owners and provincial representatives. Most recommendations and discussions revolved around what could be done to assist the province with bringing the
tourists back. However, one of the project team members in charge of tourism revitalization mentioned in his presentation that Thailand relied too much on the tourism industry and that changes should be made to ensure there would not be a collapse of the economy in the tourist based areas if disaster strikes again. Having said that, his main recommendation was to expand the tourism industry to different areas of Phuket province and making it more local, i.e. community-based tourism. The meeting focussed on the presentation of findings and recommendations produced by the research team members. There was a question period for the attendants but no question was asked. After the workshop was over, the team members met for a discussion. No observers were allowed.

The final report was presented to the steering committee, the cabinet, and the Prime Minister for approval. The report was then presented back to the participants. However, there was no guarantee as to whether the plan would be implemented. The Wilmer Smith Associates team was simply responsible for the planning of the SRDP. An operations team responsible for the implementation was to be created. One of the researchers expressed concerns over the implementation of the plan as the workshops had already generated excitement about the possibilities for future development. “They will think that it’s all talk, no action. There should be a structure that makes sure that the plan is implemented” (Respondent #4).

The recommendations stated in the SRDP included the development of six key sectors in the sub-region, namely resort-based and commercial tourism, community-based tourism, leisure and knowledge-based activities, plantation agriculture (oil palm and rubber), fisheries, and local products (Wilmer Smith Associates, 2006). Local people were encouraged through the plan, to develop their own tourism and activities.

In addition to the work of large international organizations and consultants, technical assistance also came from experts within the country. Many academic institutions worked on research projects in order to provide recommendations for the recovery operation. For example, one of the Chulalongkorn University’s tsunami-related projects considered the evaluation and recommendations of the government’s performance and tsunami relief
operation in Thailand. Several roundtable talks were organized in order to bring together representatives from governmental departments, NGOs and the private sector, such as Cement Thai Corporation; as well as affected communities involved in the disaster. The talks enabled different groups to bring together their ideas and concerns related to the disaster recovery process.

One of the roundtable talks I attended was set up in a conference room in the Department of Political Science in Chulalongkorn University. Tables were set up in a circle and equipped with a microphone for each speaker. Agendas were provided to all participants along with a list of speakers and the organizations they represented. The roundtable talk was set up to obtain feedback from key players involved in the relief operation, such as representatives from the affected communities of Ban Namkem or Moklen community as well as a representative from the Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation, just to name a few. The research team gathered all the information and feedback necessary to develop a set of recommendations for the government. The analysis included strengths and weaknesses of the response at the local, national, and international levels; the importance of a self-organizing system and flexibility when dealing with disaster response and recovery; policy gaps in disaster management; centralization of disaster response commands that were only effective for short-term response but decrease the success of long-term recovery; the importance of an integrated communication approach for informed decision-making; and recognition of social capital as a way to achieve successful cooperation and coordination of different players involved in the disaster recovery process.

The recommendations were to encourage self-organization and cooperation, to improve the communication system, and to develop a more problem-oriented relief operation with better volunteer management in the emergency phase. One of the recommendations to increase the effectiveness of disaster management in Thailand was to break the centralized chain of command and provide opportunity for information to be shared with all levels, so that people in charge could quickly react to the situation instead of waiting for the command to be sent from the top.
There were a lot of orders from the top to the local authorities. Especially during the emergency situation, local authority has to deal with the orders that poured down from the top as well as with the disaster situation that they are facing with. The pressure and tension of emergency situation cause the system at the local level to break if the system is not flexible enough. Power of authority needs to be scattered evenly at the local level with information sharing system in place so time is not wasted in information gathering. One way is to establish a community radio station or community center as soon as the disaster strikes in order to provide information for the victims in the affected areas so they would know where they should be and what they should do. By providing them updates of the situation, people would be able to determine their roles. Officers would know what they should do without having to wait for the orders to come down (Respondent #8).

At the emergency phase, the time frame seems to be shorter and a centralization approach is normally used during this period to speed up the process. However, the authors of the report suggested that direct command from higher levels should be avoided if the strict time frame is set and decisions are made without input from the victims. The team also suggested that self-organization of the affected people and cooperation can be done through open mindset and flexibility of the involved parties. Many players have different expertise to offer as well as different needs. Therefore, it is important that everybody involved in the process, including the victims, receives the same level of respect and opportunity to offer their input.

In the recovery and rehabilitation phase, the team proposed the establishment of the inter-sectoral taskforce with different key players instead of one department with centralized authority. They suggested that the affected communities be informed about and participate in the projects that would be implemented in the area to ensure the equality and appropriateness of aid. There should also be the inter-community communication and a community database developed to enable different affected communities to share their problems and solutions with one another in order to create a social network. Furthermore, the team indicated a need to improve the communication and healthcare systems in the recovery and rehabilitation phase. The recommendations for the preparedness phase
include addressing the land dispute issues, developing disaster awareness workshops for
the local authorities in potential affected areas, improving the communication strategy on
how to effectively deliver the disastrous news, and to better manage volunteers so that
they can apply their abilities more effectively in the relief operation. However, like many
other research projects, there is no guarantee that the recommendations would be
considered or used by government.

As a response to the recovery of affected areas, the Thai government also came up with a
few development plans focusing mainly on tourism recovery. The most controversial plan
was one where “…the government assigned Dasta [Designated Area Sustainable Tourism
Administration] to take over the drafting of Koh Phi Phi’s town plan, which was
previously the responsibility of the Public Works Department” (Charoenpo, 2005). The
task for Dasta was to develop and derive revenue from natural resources and culture by
improving the landscape, developing tourist attractions and improving the transport links
of the country to attract more tourists and foreign investors. Although Dasta is registered
as a public organization, which legally must be non-profit, the plan enables Dasta to
become a shareholder of the tourism businesses in the designated area and collect
revenue from it. There were complaints from many villagers who wanted to rebuild their
houses on the land but could not do so because the town planning was not completed.
Many of them had been approached by businessmen who were looking to buy their lands
(Charoenpo, 2005).

The Phuket Action Plan (PAP) is another tourism oriented plan that the government
developed. It was the result of a meeting organized by the World Tourism Organization
(WTO) in February 2005. The meeting consisted of tourism experts from 42 countries.
The plan, in collaboration with the United Nations organizations, focuses on a recovery
action plan to promote the tourism industry in tsunami affected countries such as
action areas: marketing and communications, community relief, professional training,
sustainable redevelopment and risk management” (Rice, 2005). The main goal of PAP in
Thailand is to restore traveler confidence and increase the flow of visitors as quickly as
possible by focusing on the fast recovery of tourism.

Although the Master Plan for rebuilding infrastructures was developed by the government, nothing changed once businesses began to rebuild. There is a buffer zone and coastal management that require all infrastructures along the beachfront to move 100 meters away from the shore. However, at the Patong beach in Phuket province, some hotels along the beachfront are built on the exact same locations. The hotel owners did not submit any EIA report to the authorities. The reason for the lack of reporting is that the department waived submissions of new EIA reports so long as the hotels are built back according to the previous submitted EIA reports in order that development could proceed (Respondent #9). The official who provided this information expressed that it is to help business owners build back their livelihoods and bring back the local economy.

The tourism industry is such a major source of livelihood for the affected areas that most of the government recovery programs were focused on bringing the local economy back to where it used to be. On the December 26, 2005, the Thai Government invited the world to join the “One Year in Memory of Tsunami” ceremony held at seven areas of the affected provinces (Bangkok Post Reporters, Dec 27, 2005). Ninety-six page booklets were handed out to tourists to promote the event. Inside the booklets were lists of shopping places and an “Andaman Grand Sale discount card”, but nothing about remembrance (Phataranawik and Rojanaphruk, Dec 27, 2005). The day included a ceremony to lay the foundation stone of the Tsunami Memorial in the Khao Lak Lamru National Park and an interfaith memorial service. At night, a “Light Up Phuket” event was held along Patong beach with 100,000 lit candles to remember those who passed away. The government also sent out invitations to the affected communities and promised the payment of 2,000 baht per person if they showed up. However, problems arose as not everyone received the invitations (Respondent #6). In total, the government spent around 300 million baht for the single day’s events.

There is also to be a tsunami museum locates alongside the memorial. The design of the memorial museum was selected from several design teams from different countries and
the selection process alone lasted a year with a cost of 50 million baht (Phataranawik, 2006). The Natural Resources and Environment Ministry gave permission to construct the museum using the national park, although the project still needs to submit the Environmental Impact Assessment report to the department. The laying of foundation stone made the EIA development almost unnecessary since everything was already finalized including the location of the memorial. According to the Prime Minister Thaksin Shinawatra, the construction was “…part of [Thailand’s] endeavour to compile knowledge from the tsunami and learn from it” (Wongruang, 2005). The project is to cost 1.5 billion baht.

However, the livelihood of the local communities was not left untouched. The government also attempted to tackle the livelihood rehabilitation of the affected communities. For example, the Poverty Alleviation Caravan project became one of the projects that the government used to address the problems of the tsunami-affected communities. The main objective of the project was for the local authorities to work closely with the citizens in their district to solve or address poverty related problems in each household. The officers from each sub-district office were assigned to collect information on problems and concerns from every household in their district. Meetings are called by the District Deputy Officer for presentation on the information collected and to discuss potential solutions for citizens with officials.

4.3.2 Local level response

At the local level, the recovery was done through the local authorities according to the orders and commands of the Ministries assigned to the areas by the Prime Minister, as outlined in the previous section. For example, Tsunami Victims Relief Center, under direct command of the Minister of Natural Resources and Environment, focused on the recovery operation in Phang Nga province. The center’s tasks included restoration of electrical and potable water systems and road repair, facilitating the location of temporary shelters, and coordinating the survey and assessment of damages to natural resources and the environment (ONEP, 2005). According to the Provincial Social Development and
Human Security Office, approximately 2,634 housing units were built by different donors for the affected communities in Phang Nga province alone (Assavanonda, 2005).

There were two types of assistance in the housing project provided by the government (Respondent #10). First, for those who had legal documents to prove their land ownership, the government built new houses for them. Second, for those who had legal documents, but felt uncomfortable living on the same land, the government provided them with houses built in a new settlement. Villagers who qualified had to choose from three house designs that the government came up with. In the case of houses built by donors, house designs had to be approved by the government prior to construction. Where private donors wanted to build houses for the victims, they also submitted the designs to local authorities for approval (Respondent #10). Similar criteria were set for victims who qualified to receive compensation from the government. A death certificate had to be presented to local officers in order to receive compensation. However, due to the difficulties with body identification process, some victims could not be identified for over a year. “I took the death certificate to [my daughter’s school principal] for compensation that was given out by the Department of Education, but the officer told me that there is no compensation left. The budget is gone” (Respondent #12). It was a very difficult situation for the victims as well as people involved in the compensation process.

RTA also built permanent houses for the victims who had legal rights to their land. In Ban Namkem, for example, 722 houses were built by the soldiers (Directorate of Civil Affair-Royal Thai Army, 2005). District officers worked with the army in choosing who among the victims were entitled to receive free houses. The victims would then be presented with three designs for their homes and be asked to pick one so that the army could build it for them. For example, two of the three the housing designs from the army are 4x9 and 6x6 square meters with one room and the toilet outside the house (Assavanonda, Dec 26, 2005). The location and designs of the houses were determined by the project providers. “The problem is the designs and materials used to build these houses were so poor and uninviting for the people to move into, causing many houses left unoccupied. They were built quickly and cheaply and will not last very long. They are
not even big enough for most family” (Respondent #11).

There are also many donors that worked with the district officers in building houses for the victims in affected areas. “Many private donors also offered to build houses. They showed us the designs and we [district official] approved it” (Respondent #10). Many of the houses funded by private donors were built outside of the original community, approximately 4-5 kilometres inland. This created difficulty for many victims who are fishermen because of the distance away from the sea. Rotary International, the iTV television station, and private donors like the former Miss Universe Porntip Narkhirunkanok are among many donors responsible for houses scattered around the Phang Nga province. Many of these houses are poorly built with rather small living spaces. The Rotary International projects are houses with two small rooms of 2x2 and 3x2 square meters on the upper floor, with open-air space on the lower floor. The bathroom is located on the lower level with a small sink outside, marking the kitchen area. These houses were built for the victims according to the donors’ budgets and designs. The result is that many houses were not popular among the victims due to their unpractical designs and resettlement location. This created great difficulty for many of the residences who remained in the community, as well as for those living in the new housing projects.

There were also some complaints from the residents inside the original community, which due to the new housing projects outside the community, the number of residents has drastically declined, destroying once fruitful livelihoods. Restaurants and grocery stores found themselves without customers. The situation in the new housing projects is not much different. Many of the fishermen residents who live further away from the sea have to invest in transportation in order to continue on with their livelihoods. The break-up of the community dynamic is an important consequence of unplanned or ill-suited resettlement projects.

There are, however, some people who prefer to live in the new housing units located away from the original community because of the fear that tsunami will strike again. By
choosing to live in the new housing unit, many victims were faced with another problem of poor housing. Many of the housing units were poorly designed and unsuitable for large families. Some families have four members, but the houses provided to them can only accommodate two members. Cheap materials were used in order to cut the cost and increase the number of houses that could be built. Many villagers who moved into these houses voiced their concerns over the tight space and the strength of the house: “The house is very hot in daytime and very cold at night” (Respondent #13). “When it rains everything gets wet [because of the open space at the lower level of the house]” (Respondent #15). Many houses were left empty because the villagers refused to move into them.

As mentioned in section 4.1, lack of information sharing among organizations that went into the affected areas resulted in time, money, and energy wasted that could have been used toward assisting the victims. World Vision was one of the major INGOs that provided aid to the victims in Thailand. It worked mainly by itself without much coordination with other aid providers. The reason for the lack of coordination is because the organization has enough personal to carry out projects without help from other organizations.

World Vision is by far the largest agency working in the tsunami area in terms of scale of our work and the size of our budget. We have 170 staff working on the tsunami projects with budget of over 25 million dollars. Not saying that one is better than the other [organizations] but we just have a much bigger scope. So sometimes we collaborate in our own organization…but we’re engaged with a number of other organizations where we are overlapping or work in the same area (Respondent #19).

Due to lack of coordination with other organizations in the affected areas and World Vision’s capacity to carry out their own projects, many local organizations viewed World Vision activity as a “monopoly of aid” (Respondent #4).

World Vision tried to incorporate community inputs into their work by encouraging locals to be part of the design stage of the projects they implemented. However,
community participation proved to be more difficult in disaster response. The decisions made during disaster response were mostly made by the staff.

The vast majority of [World Vision] work, not just in Thailand but all over the world, is long term work with community to establish and identify what their needs and requirements for development are through participatory processes…We tried to do the same in response to the disaster, but quite often relief seems to be a little bit more top-down because it has to meet the immediate needs (Respondent #19).

Rapid assessment teams go into the affected areas and collect information on the damage and needs of people in the areas at the macro level in a short time frame, and then the team will determine the plan for delivering aid.

There were also a lot of problems working with the Thai government, especially with the house building projects.

There are a lot of land dispute problems in Phang Nga and Phi Phi Island. It has been the big factor of what has delayed the speed we could get this building project started. The housing design in Thailand does not have any specification for other organizations that wish to assist the affected communities in building houses. Other tsunami affected countries like Sri Lanka or India have their standard housing designs in place. Both governments have designs for reconstruction package and what it should look like with specification and not much room for any alternatives. Thailand has a very ad hoc process, although the government has their own specification when they build houses. They are very small…so we’re working on expanding those houses that the government built in order to fit all the people in…but it shouldn’t happen like that (Respondent #19).

World Vision proposed that they would expand houses built by the government for the victims who live on their own land in order to create a good living space for affected families.

In Phuket, the local business owners got together to bring the province back to life. The Phuket Tourist Association (PTA) is one of many local organizations that helped small business owners who did not get help from the government to recover their businesses.
The association was established in 1978 by a group of tourism business owners in the province. It is a non-profit organization with 250 members. All of the big hotel owners in the province have memberships. The association enables the business owners to help each other, especially during disasters like the tsunami. There are four key aspects that the PTA worked on locally during the recovery period. First was assisting the affected business owners with loans to rebuild their business. Second was coordinating with government departments to provide help for the victims. Third was focusing on finding jobs for labourers. The final aspect was developing public relations to bring back the tourists (Respondent #18). The PTA acts as a voice for many business owners in Phuket at meetings with local authorities, in addition to helping find loans for business owners.

While the government organized the national ceremony, the affected community in Phang Nga decided to organize one ceremony of their own with help from local NGOs like CODI and Chumchonthai Foundation. The remembrance ceremony in the Ban Namkem community brought the affected community members together to pay respects to their love ones and to discuss their situations. The sea gypsies also held their own commemoration ceremony on a beach near Ban Tungwa community. Sea gypsies from all over the southern part of Thailand came to Takuapa district, Phang Nga, to attend the ceremony (The Nation, December 25, 2005). Many of the local community members in Phang Nga province refused to attend the official government ceremony because it was perceived as the government’s way of announcing to the world that the recovery process was a success, when in fact many of the victims had still not fully recovered.

Many coastal communities with fishermen or people who worked in fishing-related activities like buying or selling seafood required a large number of labourers to assist with ongoing fishing activities. People from other parts of the country would migrate there and rent houses built by a handful of landowners in the community. When the disaster struck, these renters lost their belongings as well as a place to live. Since the government only built houses for victims with legal land entitlement documents, the renters found themselves frustrated and in fear of not having a place to stay. Many private donors and NGOs like iTV or Rotary International Foundation assisted this group of
victims by building houses for them outside the original location of the community. Later, the government provided people without land documents with eligibility to apply for free houses due to the large number of houses left unoccupied.

There were a few affected groups that fell through the cracks and did not receive any help from the government because they were not qualified according to the criteria set by the government. These groups are people without citizenship, such as Burmese migrants; people living on public land; and people without legal land title, including sea gypsies, small fishermen who did not register their boats, local residents who rent houses, street vendors without registration, and victims who migrated from other provinces to work in the affected areas but did not have their name registered as local residents at the district office.

There were approximately 5,800 fishing boats destroyed by the tsunami waves. This includes small fishing boats as well as trawlers. The government offered some compensation for the fishermen, but this only applied to those who registered their boats prior to the disaster. However, most of the fishermen in the affected areas were small-scale fishermen and did not register their boats, so they did not qualify for any compensation from the government. For these fishermen, many INGOs and NGOs stepped in and equipped them with fishing gear and boats. As for those who qualified for the compensation, the amount of 66,000 baht was granted to the owners of small fishing boats, but if the boat was only partially damaged, then the owner was entitled to 30,000 baht for repairs (Kongrut, 2005). This compensation hardly covered half of the actual cost of the boat. The situation was worst for the owners of large boats or trawlers. Many large-scale fishermen expressed their frustration as most donations focused on the small-scale fishermen. “They thought we were already rich because we had bigger boats. But the bigger you are, the larger the wound is” (Kongrut, 2005).

Moreover, the survivors had to present their identification and appropriate legal documents in order to qualify for the government assistance, which proved to be difficult for many victims. Due to the impacts of the disaster, many tsunami victims literally lost
their identities. In order to qualify for compensations and governmental assistance, victims had to have vital documents such as birth certificates, land property titles, boat registration certificates, and/or work permits to show the officers. Due to the flood, many documents were destroyed or lost. Some cases took a very long time for the victims to obtain compensation, healthcare, housing, or receive inheritance from deceased family members due to difficulty of lost documentation. It also prevented affected groups like Burmese workers from receiving any assistance from the Thai government. It is estimated that as many as 60,000 Burmese migrant workers who were affected by the tsunami, worked on commercial trawlers operating out of Phuket and Phang Nga provinces (Scheper, 2006).

[The Burmese migrants] are in the grey zone. They don’t exist in this country. Quite often they are here for labour. Thai employers house them, feed them, and exploit them. Thai government does not recognize their status as refugee[s]. Thai government never signed UN Refugee Convention, which obligates the government to provide humanitarian assistance and protection to people that flee their countries so they are used as cheap labour (Respondent #19).

Many of these people were fearful to request help due to lack of legal documentation. Some unidentified bodies were believed to be those of Burmese migrants, but friends or family members of the deceased were too afraid to claim the bodies for fear of being deported back to Burma.

Another group of victims who were denied compensation was Thai people without citizenship. It was an ongoing problem that has never been resolved. These people lived without identities or citizenship since World War II, as parts of the country (Marid, Tanaosri, and Tawaii districts) were given to Burma, which was under British rule at that time, in order to prevent Britain from taking over the entire country (Chumchonthai Foundation, 2005). As a result of this agreement, a few Thai communities ended up living in Burma. They speak Thai and still practice Thai culture, so to the Burmese and to themselves they are Thai. Some of them crossed the border to live in Thailand. However, to the local authorities, these people are considered Burmese and hence, not entitled to
Thai citizenship. They are caught in the middle, neither Burmese nor Thai. When the tsunami hit their communities, these people were neglected and ignored by the government, as they are not entitled to any help or compensation from the Thai government. The government set up a committee to look after this issue, but according to the victims, the committee did not do much to solve the problem. “They had a meeting to discuss about our situation, but we were not allowed to attend it. I had to wait outside of the room” (Respondent #21).

As mentioned earlier, land disputes in the tsunami affected areas became one of the major issues that slowed the recovery process. The problems emerged when many of the victims could not rebuild the houses on their old land. Through the close watch of the media, both inside and outside of the country, on the recovery of tsunami victims in coastal areas, many land dispute cases rose up from its long-term unresolved roots. Most of these cases took place in Phang Nga province, where the tourism industry began to expand. The government reacted to the land dispute issue by setting up the National helpless Tsunami Tenure Committee with 30 members from departments and ministries relating to land, social development, natural resources and environment, as well as CODI, to come up with solutions for these land conflicts. “[The] Committee has encouraged affected communities to play a central role in gathering information on their land disputes. Once this information is collected, the Committee starts the process of negotiating solutions with all the district and provincial authorities, government departments and powerful private and public landowners who are party to the conflict” (UN Thailand, 2006, p.13). Since its establishment in January 2005, the committee was able to negotiate with the district and provincial authorities, government departments and powerful private and public landowners (see Table 3).

Table 3: Details on land dispute cases (ACHRT, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land owner</th>
<th>Conflicts solved</th>
<th>Conflicts not yet solved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On National Forestry and Marine land</td>
<td>9 communities 842 households</td>
<td>43 communities 3,358 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Treasury Department land</td>
<td>0 communities 0 households</td>
<td>4 communities 186 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On land under Local Authority</td>
<td>On land claimed by private land-owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 community</td>
<td>1 community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 households</td>
<td>23 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>866 households</td>
<td>771 households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monthly meetings on Poverty Alleviation Caravan project are held at the district office. I was fortunate to attend one meeting at Takuapa District Office. The objective was to alleviate poverty by assigning officers from each sub-district to gather information on what the citizens need and the problems they faced are to enable the sub-district officers to become familiar with the problems of citizens under their jurisdiction as well as create trust. Survey questions were asked so that officers can bring the information back to the meeting where other officers from other sub-districts can discuss and come up with solutions to the problems. The problem solving approach did not empower or build the capacity of local community. The set of questions that the officers asked citizens did not enable them to solve their own problems. By doing so, citizens became powerless and at the officers’ mercy.

The attitude of local authorities towards the victims also created delays in the recovery. The victims, especially small fishermen or poor villagers, who claimed they did not get enough help, were viewed as troublemakers. “There is so much help and donations provided by the government, but the victims could never have enough. Private donors, NGOs, and many international organizations provided so much money but they still want more. Some had so many boats, but when new group came in with boats they also want it. It is a never-ending demand” (Respondent #20). This respondent was also frustrated with the media as it presented sad stories of the have-nots by probing the victims to get the answer the media wanted to hear in order to sell the news. According to him, the government tried its best to provide compensations and assist the victims, but it has to follow the criteria and regulations to maintain some order. Private organizations did not have to do so; therefore, they can assist as many people as they want. Local authorities also cannot focus entirely on the recovery projects because they have to resume their
previous responsibilities and tasks, making it more difficult for effective long-term development projects to be implemented.

4.4 SUMMARY

The Indian Ocean Tsunami was the biggest natural disaster in recent memory for Thailand. The disaster impacted not only Thai citizens but also large numbers of tourists from all over the world. The Thai government was praised for its immediate response during the emergency phase. It quickly formed a line of authority to respond to the disaster. Many relief centres were established to assist victims inside and outside of the country. Military troops were sent into the affected areas for search and rescue missions. Due to high number of casualties and the concentration of tourists in the affected areas, many foreign governments sent in search and rescue teams, paramedics, and military troops to assist Thailand with the disaster response. The Thai government declined all financial assistance; instead, it asked that the global community share their knowledge and expertise on disaster management. Thai citizens were generous in the form of providing donations and volunteering, even those who lived outside of the country, to assist the victims in the emergency and recovery phases. A strong centralized command and control approach was used in order to deal with the emergency situation.

During the recovery phase, the government and relief organizations implemented many so-called development projects for the affected communities. Many types of compensation were provided to the victims based on strict criteria. The government ordered the military to take charge of building houses for the victims. The military presented three designs to the victims without their input. That approach was very unpopular among the victims. According to them, houses were too small, and too box-like. They were impractical and ill-suited to their livelihoods and needs. Aid providers did not take the time in working with the community and come up with projects that would respond to their needs. Instead, aid providers implemented projects which they thought would help the community. Large sums of money were wasted on abandoned houses.
Lack of information sharing among relief organizations also made it more difficult for the recovery projects to be effective. Many relief organizations worked with the Thai government in its biggest relief operation. However, like many other situations with a high number of stakeholders, coordination and communication became difficult to achieve. It is understandable that each organization would prefer to collect their own data and manage their own projects, since it looks much better in the reports. Fundraising is the most important task for many organizations. Raising funds for disaster victims is much easier than for development projects; thus, many development organizations found themselves in relief work (Anderson and Woodrow, 1989). Without donations, the organizations would not exist. Therefore, fierce competition among various relief organizations often prevents them from sharing information or working together on relief projects. Signs and billboards indicating projects and names of organizations were everywhere in the affected areas, along the highway, all the way to the entrance path into the coastal community. Some newly built houses also had name plates in front of them indicating the donor names. Lack of effective coordination and communication among agencies in the Thailand case caused complications and confusions during the relief operation. Victims complained about too many organizations came into the area and asking them all sorts of questions. Victims were exhausted from surveys and telling their story. Media also added more pressure on the victims.

The flexibility of the recovery time frame is also a very important factor for success in the disaster recovery process. As seen in the Thailand case, the government put too much pressure on having things done quickly in order to enable the tourism industry to bounce back from such a destructive natural disaster. The government hoped that by increasing the speed of the recovery in the affected areas and implementing early warning systems, it would garner the tourists’ trust and willingness to return to the affected areas for holidays. Such tight time frames create ineffective recovery projects. Many projects did not allocate the time necessary for community input in the planning and implementation stages.

Due to the high level of publicity, many high authority figures made sure that they were
involved in the matter as much as possible. Local officers in the affected areas took on a significant amount of responsibility in carry out the relief operation, coordinating with volunteers, GOs, NGOs and INGOs, and answering to the commands of higher authorities. There were complaints from field staff and local authorities that they did not have enough time and energy to perform their regular responsibilities, assist victims in the relief operation, and welcome important figures to the camp sites. Strict criteria and short time frames for the relief operation created great difficulty for locals to cope with the disaster. In Phuket, high rank officials demanded one of the local tourist organizations to submit a list of all the missing tourists at the end of the day it was requested, which was impossible to do. Many workers were overwhelmed by the number of visits they received each day from their bosses, as well as the media and general public.

Not all affected victims could be helped due to inflexible government criteria attached to obtaining compensation for housing and financial assistance. It was very difficult for many victims to receive compensation due to their inability to obtain death, property, or land certificates to apply for compensation. The loss of documents due to the disaster and the amount it took to identify bodies were two main issues that delayed or prevented victims from qualifying. Many affected parties who did not meet the criteria for compensation found themselves struggling to recover. For example, minorities like people without citizenship, Burmese migrants, and those who did not own houses or land prior to the disaster, did not receive much help. Disaster does not pick who it will victimize. Everyone is affected by it, but to different extents. Certain people, such as the groups mentioned, are more vulnerable than others. Money used to invest in public relations could have easily been used to compensate these people.

The government moved quickly in the emergency phase to ensure that victims and survivors were helped as soon as possible. The need to increase reputation in media eyes and ways to boost up the tourism economy were also responsible for the government’s push toward fast recovery. A lot of money was put into public relation to promote the message of full recovery in all affected areas. The decision to invest money into the one year anniversary ceremony for tsunami victims was done solely by the government
without public input. There is a concern that “…a fast track recovery of the tourism industry may lead to a rapid rebuilding of the infrastructure that existed before the disaster” (UNEP, 2005). Lack of commitment to building codes and regulations exposes Thailand to the same vulnerability to natural disasters and obstructs the achievement of long-term sustainability through proper resource management planning. Rapid, unregulated, and opportunistic reconstruction may also lead to further degradation of local environmental conditions in tourist areas. Although tourism is not the cause of this natural disaster, it can be perceived as a warning sign for Thailand to revise its environmental policies in order to avoid potential future, man-made, environmental disasters.

Lack of commitment to development plans or regulations also puts Thailand back in a vulnerable position to future natural disasters. There may be many plans and research that took place after the tsunami hit that attempts to provide solutions to the vulnerability of the country to natural disaster. However, by not putting the theory into practice, the plans were not implemented. Thailand wasted time and money which could have been used doing something else. For example, the recommendation to include the application of EIA for long-term rehabilitation work with systematic monitoring by UNEP was not taken seriously as many hotel owners received waivers from the authority to rebuild their hotels without having to submit new EA report. More importantly, they are allowed to rebuild to the exact same way and same location that put them in a vulnerable position in the first place. Tsunami Memorial in the Khao Lak Lamru National Park is also another example of lack of commitment. The site was selected and plan for construction was developed prior to EIA. It would be difficult to enforce the regulation if the government failed to follow the same rule.

Although disaster recovery is not an easy task, it is not impossible. Community participation in the decision-making and planning process is crucial for the success of recovery. The affected country should not aim to rebuild back to what it was there before the tsunami. Rather, it should aim to prevent the same mistake from happen again. Community participation in decision-making process will be difficult with varying
conflicting points of interest, with many interested parties and stakeholders. However, as the two case studies in chapter five show, it can be done. Community committees can represent communities and work with aid providers to come up with more appropriate projects that meet the needs of the community.
Chapter 5: Community Participation in the Tsunami Response and Recovery

5.1 INTRODUCTION
The 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami destroyed many poor fishing communities in southern Thailand. The worst hit community was Ban Namkem in Phang Nga province. The community received a lot of media attention and much assistance was provided. After reviewing numerous news and academic reports, I selected this community to be part of my case study on community participation in the disaster recovery process. Ban Namkem experienced much destruction; the entire community needed to rebuild, and there was a high level of community involvement in the recovery projects. Upon arrival, I discovered along the major highway, another small fishing community of Ban Tungwa with a similar destruction and recovery situation as Ban Namkem. The two communities were located in close proximity to one other in the Takuapa district. From observing both communities, I was able to learn about different strategies that could be utilized to involve affected communities in the planning and implementation of relief operation and rehabilitation as well as what the communities learned from the process. The lessons learned from these two communities’ experiences and mistakes can be used to help Thailand or other countries avoid unsuitable recovery projects in the event of future disasters.

5.2 THE STRENGTH OF A SMALL FISHING COMMUNITY AND THE JOURNEY TO RECLAIM THEIR LIVES

5.2.1 Background
Ban Namkem is a small fishing community located along the coastline of the Andaman Sea in Takuapa district, Phang Nga province, Thailand. It used to be a small, quiet fishing community, but the discovery of tin changed the fate of the community. Approximately 50 years ago, the community was booming due to the tin mining development. It was compared to the gold rush movement in the United States and the community was called
“Thai Texas” (Chumchonthai Foundation, 2006). The wealth and fortune from the tin mining industry attracted workers to Ban Namkem from all over Thailand. Many community members maintained a very strong network with those from the same hometown.

Once the tin was almost depleted, around 1981, and companies withdrew, Ban Namkem returned to its fishing roots. Some of the workers moved back to their provinces, while many stayed behind and found new ways to make a living. Fishing became the main choice for most people. There were around 400 small boats and 80 big boats in Ban Namkem before the tsunami hit (Chumchonthai, 2006a). The community was vibrant and crowded with a population of approximately 4,200 people, many of whom migrated there in search of work. People from the same province formed closed networks and ties among themselves. Many small streets in the community were named after different residents’ provinces of origin. Apart from Thai people who moved into the area from other provinces, Burmese migrants made up a large proportion of the labour force in Ban Namkem’s fishing industry. Many of them worked there without proper work permits. They lived there illegally as the main source of labour for this small fishing community. There were fish and shrimp hatcheries as well as mass buying and selling of seafood in the community. Many villagers made a living as a middle-man, buying fresh catch from local fishing boats and selling it to restaurants in the province. Each purchase provided the middle-man with income that could sustain him and his family for months. Eventually tourism developed in the community and many villagers became tourism business owners, creating a variety of jobs and opportunities within the community.

Due to its location along the coastline of the Andaman Ocean, the community became an excellent location for fishing and tourism industries. Lampom Beach is an area along the strip of Ban Namkem community beach front, and is the community’s most beautiful beach. There were approximately 52 homes on this precious piece of land overseeing the shores of the Andaman Sea. The scenic beach was considered by many developers as a prime area for tourism development. The struggle for the residents of Lampom Beach to keep their land ownership began in 2000, when the developers first approached the
community, claiming to have legal ownership of the land, and attempted to evict the community members from their land. The conflict dragged on for three years until the tsunami struck, thereby creating an opportunity for a developer to claim the land. The victims’ stories were picked up by the media and were broadcast in and out of the country. Lampom Beach community members were devastated not only by the loss of their loved ones, but also by the loss of their land.

5.2.2 Immediate response and community collaboration with others

On December 26, 2004, at 9:35 a.m., the sea receded up to 100 meters from the beach for about five minutes at the coastline of the Ban Namkem community. Three minutes later, a two to three meter high wave hit the shore. At 9:43 a.m., walls of six to seven meter high water hit the community, and again at 10:03 a.m., more than 10 meter high waves flooded the entire area for an hour. The flood lasted until noon before it receded back to the sea level (ONEP, 2006).

We saw the water receded so far out in the sea. Not long after that we saw the wall of water moving toward us. It was like a big white wall of water. I told everyone to run upstairs. We were on the second floor of the house and the water was everywhere when we looked out the window. My father and my nephew were missing. I saw the water sucked everything and everyone back into the sea (Respondent #6).

This is the statement from one of the villagers when asked about what happened on that day. The tsunami waves left the Ban Namkem community, resulting in chaos and devastation. Those who survived were frantically looking for lost family members. Neighbours helped each other as much as they could. Because they were the first ones at the scene, the affected parties immediately took on two different roles, victims as well as aid providers.
The Chumchonthai Foundation and CODI were two of the first relief organizations that went into the Ban Namkem community. Both organizations had worked with many urban slum communities and were able to apply their previous experiences to the relief work during the emergency and recovery phases. The foundation was founded in 1992 as the Chumchonmeung Foundation. Chumchonmeung means urban community. Later on in 2002, the organization changed its name to Chumchonthai, which means Thai community, in order to expand its work to both urban and rural Thai communities. It is a
private development organization with funding from Denmark. Its aim is to alleviate poverty in urban and rural Thailand. The organization encourages affected communities to plan and manage their own projects while the staff provide them with technical assistance.

The Chumchonthai Foundation is a sister organization to the Community Organizations Development Institute (CODI). The CODI started off much like the Chumchonthai Foundation, working in urban slums. It was initially called the Urban Community Development Office (UCDO), and was set up in 1992 by the Thai government under the National Housing Authority to address the problem of urban poverty (Boonyabancha, 2004). The organization helped poor communities by establishing a participatory model using a network of community-based savings and credit groups. Loans with low interest rates were provided to these groups based on their capacity to manage savings and loans. The organization also encouraged saving groups to work together and form networks or federations. In 2000, the UCDO merged with the Rural Development Fund and transformed into CODI with 950 community saving groups in 53 provinces. Although CODI was registered as a public organization, it could apply for funding from the annual government budget. The key strategy for CODI to achieve effective development programs was enabling targeted groups to become key players with control over decision making, planning, and implementation of the programs via the formation of savings groups. This strategy was later applied to the recovery projects in the Ban Namkem community.

Upon arrival in Ban Namkem, staff from CODI and Chumchonthai Foundation were fortunate to meet with one of the local politicians, who was also a victim of the tsunami. The lost villagers were scattered, so the local politician suggested to staff that they first set up a tent so that survivors could see and gather in the same place.

The starting point of forming the community-driven process began when we met a group of young men in the community who really wanted to help with the situation. There were a lot of donations dropped off, so we agreed that if everybody was all over the place
it would be difficult to manage and distribute. The victims agreed that Bangmuang Ward Office was the highest area above ground and the safest place [to be used as a relief camp] (Respondent #11).

Gathering in one location would make it much easier to provide assistance. This center would enable the villagers to stay together, making it easier for relief distribution. It was agreed that putting up a temporary relief center with tents for the villagers would be a good starting point. The area next to the Bangmuang Ward Office, which belonged to the Mining and Industries Department, was selected as the camp site. The camp was located close enough to the community for it to be noticeable to the victims, but far enough from the sea so that victims would not feel threatened and terrified by the sound of the waves (Respondent #7).

The Bangmuang relief camp was set up within the first week of the disaster. It was finished on January 1, 2005. The camp was originally planned to shelter approximately 400 people, but within the first few weeks, there were over 850 families or around 3,500 people living in the camp (Respondent #6, 7, 20). According to the registered information collected at the Bangmuang relief camp, there were 740 deaths or missing people in the community. However, the community leaders believed there were around 2,000 people missing or presumably dead (Chumchonthai, 2006a). There were many Burmese labours in Ban Namkem without proper documentation for identification and several of them accounted for the unidentified bodies in the community (Respondent #6). There were damages to 420 boats, 63 tri-cycles, and 130 motor cycles (Chumchonthai, 2006a).

Eventually, approximately 85 relief organizations arrived at the camp to offer assistance. In January 2005, there were approximately 100 volunteers working daily in the camp (Chumchonthai, 2006a). Everyone worked side by side with the victims to deal with the situation at hand without much conflict. The relief camp was able to maintain an acceptable level of organization and implementation because of the regular meetings carried out at the end of each day by representatives of relief organizations and affected communities involved in the camp.
The meeting took place every night at 9 pm to update the situation and issues that arose within the camp. Discussion among volunteers, staff, and victims’ committee took place daily to make sure that everything ran as smoothly as possible and that problems and concerned were addressed and solved (Respondent #20).

However, frustration arose from the continuous visits of government officers from various departments, important figures from around the world, international, national and local media crews, and the general public.

The obstacle for people working during the emergency phase was the time wasted on welcoming different parties and authority figures into the affected areas. Pressure was upon us to provide information and data within a short period of time, which led to many mistakes in the reports (Respondent #22).

The staff and victims were exhausted, not only from the work they did around the camp, but also from what seemed like never ending tasks of answering and briefing those who visited the camp.

Although many organizations were responsible for the set up of this camp, the key players were the victims themselves. In the emergency situation amid all the chaos, many victims supported each other and began to brainstorm and plan for the future of remaining family members, friends, and neighbours. It was a true learning-by-doing situation as none of the people involved had ever encountered such a massive disaster and relief operation. However, with Chumchonthai Foundation’s experience working with urban slum communities and CODI’s expertise in community development, the organizations were able to transfer their knowledge and apply it to the disaster relief operation.

There were over 500 tents in the relief camp. Due to the large number of victims in the camp, a committee was set up to manage the place. People were assigned different tasks such as cooking, sorting out donations, taking care of children, welcoming visitors, patrolling the camp at night, and keeping the place clean, just to name a few. A network
of affected communities was also established, which enabled each community to learn about situations and issues in other communities and how they dealt with similar situations. It also enabled communities to exchange ideas and resources necessary to pull themselves together.

We began to learn to organize ourselves without even realizing it. We, with the help of CODI staff, put up tents in rows. Each row would assign a representative to form a committee. We would meet everyday and discuss the issues and problems within the camp and try to solve them together. We also met with committees from other affected communities that CODI worked with and helped them out as much as we could. For example, if that community did not have any blankets or milk for the children, we would come back to our camp and ask those who had more than they needed to donate what they had for the other community (Respondent #6).

There were over 100 victims who acted as representatives for each row of tents, making sure that things ran smoothly in the camp. The representatives would look after all of the issues and concerns of the victims in their rows and work together to solve it. These issues included finding bodies, conflict over land rights, and contacting the local government for help. This approach helped prevent any future complaints on unaddressed issues. It also created less work for the staff and assured that all problems or issues were properly addressed (Respondent #7).

During the emergency phase, another management project that proved to be effective involved the affected community members and was called relief camp management. Instead of the camp being operated solely by government or relief organizations, the relief camp in Ban Namkem community was partially run by the affected community members themselves. These victims, even though they had lost their family members and belongings, were still capable of taking care of themselves as well as others. Camp security, for example, was operated by community members who took turns volunteering to guard the camp. The guards were in charge of making sure that everyone in the camp followed orders. They were also able to detect any outsiders who attempted to get into the camp site without authorization. Young children were looked after by community
members to prevent kidnapping incidents.

It was a good start for the Ban Namkem community to get themselves organized and working together in solidarity; however, the unity was easily shaken by the flood of well-wishing donors. Massive, unorganized, and unsuitable relief aid quickly became part of the Bangmuang relief camp’s problem. Many private donors visited the camp, handing out cash to the first people they saw. Good intentions actually shook the unity of the community. The problem with these types of donations was that the money was not equally distributed and people ended up feeling angry and bitter. Even at the beginning, when a donation box was set up in front of the camp with seven volunteers looking after the box, many villagers were afraid that the volunteers would keep most of the money for themselves instead of dividing it equally.

The box was there for 15 days and we got about 1.4 million baht in total. We, the committee, thought about set up funding for projects within the community, but the majority of community members wanted us to divide it up. So we did and we ended up with around 900 baht per family, because there were over 1,000 households in the community. That did not last any of us for more than a week. This experience taught us to use the money differently next time. After that we decided not to keep the donation box, but the donors who wanted to give out money still contacted us for direction. Once we did that, some community members were still mad at us. If we guided the donors to one side of the camp, the other side complained about why we went that way and not this way (Respondent #6).

The situation created distrust and conflict among the victims because some felt that the representatives might get more than their share. “It was discouraging for the representatives because they tried to work hard and any distrust made them feel greatly unappreciated, weighing down their performance” (Respondent #7).

World Vision was among the many relief organizations working in the Bangmuang relief camp. At the very beginning, World Vision staff from different parts of Thailand were directed to the affected areas. There were 10 volunteer staff working with the community
during the first few months; later on, there were only two staff in the community (Respondent #22). During the emergency period, the organization focused on the distribution of basic necessities for survivors in the relief camp. This included food, water, clothes, medicines, and whatever items the survivors needed at that time. The victims’ needs were assessed via surveys conducted by staff, who would walk around the camp gathering information on as many victims as possible in order to deliver the most appropriate donations. In the temporary relief camp site called Ban Prutiew, each household received a member card from World Vision working in the camp. The card was used to keep a record of relief assistance provided by the organization (Respondent #23).

Most people I talked to mentioned that they received basic necessities from World Vision. The emergency period identified by World Vision in Ban Namkem is approximately six months. The donations continue until the end of the six month period (Respondent #22). Some heard about the distribution from friends and neighbours and others were contacted directly by the staff of World Vision to receive the handouts.

We assessed the needs of the victims in the very beginning by sending out staff to survey what peoples’ needs were, because if we waited for them to come to us it would be confusing and would risk a repetition of aid. So two staff and nine volunteers went out and identified what the victims needed (Respondent #22).

Relief assistance by World Vision within the relief camp was combined with other organizations that worked inside the camp. None of the interviewees mentioned any specific project that was run by World Vision; however, World Vision’s name came up a lot when they were asked about charity or donation.

5.2.3 The recovery and community participation

BUILDING HOMES

Soon after the search and rescue operation was completed, the government quickly moved forward and began the recovery operation to spur the economy. Housing projects started and by May, many survivors began to leave the camp and move into their new
houses. The first phase of the government’s housing project targeted only those with legal land ownership. This proved to be a problem to many Ban Namkem survivors, because prior to the disaster, they rented their houses. They did not qualify for the government’s housing compensation or relocation schemes.

Ban Namkem’s community layout before the disaster was a highly crowded fishing community with workers from Burma as well as other parts of the country. These migrants worked side by side with the rest of Ban Namkem community members during the booming fishing industry. Houses were built right beside each other and were rented out to the workers. With criteria attached to the compensation, many renters found themselves unqualified, helpless, and frustrated as others moved back to the community with new houses.

In the beginning, the housing project was not applied to the rentals. So we [Ban Namkem Coordinating Centre] asked them to start a saving group and we would try to find an organization that would be willing to provide funding for their housing project. They started with 180 people, but when there were so many unoccupied houses, the government allowed the rentals to apply for the free houses and the saving group was down to 50 members (Respondent #6).

The government’s attitude toward the housing project was to build as many as possible, in order to shelter as many people as possible. However, in order to do so, the houses would have to be low cost and use materials that would allow the government to maximize the number of houses. The outcome of this plan was two housing designs for the survivors to choose from.

The soldiers came and built the house for me. I got to pick from 2 sizes, so I picked 6x6 square meters. But the problem with the house was that it was very small without any division. I have to cook, eat, sleep, and do everything in that room. Also the house is starting to have some cracks here and there and the roof is leaking. I do not know if it would last longer than two more years (Respondent #24).
There are many houses in the community, but very few people actually living in the houses mentioned above. About two-thirds of the families have moved out to live in the new homes, while still owning the much more basic places in Ban Namkem. Two of the respondents in Ban Prutiew admitted to me that they had two houses, one in Ban Prutiew and one in Ban Namkem. When I asked why they took two houses for themselves, one of them replied, “I could not sleep in the house I have in Ban Namkem because I was so frightened by the sound of the waves, so I took the house here for sleeping. The house I have in Ban Namkem is used for business purposes” (Respondent #25). It was necessary for families to keep both because they could not choose between livelihood and security.

The drive into Ban Namkem community was just like driving into a historical place. There were signs and billboards on both sides of the street showing names of the projects that took place within the community. Names of donors were posted on the signs to remind everyone of what was given to the community and by whom. The community looked peaceful and calm, unlike the images seen on TV after the deadly waves struck. It was very quiet. There were few stores open with hardly any customers. The owner of one restaurant said it has been quiet because people are living in different housing projects scattered around the nearby district, making it very difficult for her to make a living (Respondent #26). Another respondent mentioned that he used to own a tricycle and drove around the community selling noodles. His noodle business used to generate a lot of profit because there were so many people in the community. However, now that many of them are dead or have moved away, he can no longer earn the same amount of income as he used to (Respondent #27). The old community is gone forever.

WAVES OF DONATIONS

Many organizations and private donors were responsible for housing projects, donations, and many other recovery projects in Ban Namkem. However, most of them left soon after the emergency period was over and only a few remained behind. It was too simple to think that short-term aid would help the community to recover over the long term. According to the local politicians, some organizations requested that community members form groups and create a proposal or action plan for each group. It may look
like an effective way to help the community start their livelihood, but the lack of long-term assistance made this kind of development project fail. “For example, if an organization came in and said one million baht would be donated to the community if they organized a saving group, there would be a group and financial proposal ready for the staff. Once the money was received and the staff were gone, they would divide it up among themselves” (Respondent #6). Organizations did not stick around to work with the community to evaluate whether or not the funding they provided was used effectively. This created a loophole that allowed some people to take advantage of the situation.

However, a flood of donation money is like a dagger with two blades; it can bring out greed as well as the kindness in people. Throughout my field visits, I heard a few stories of promises not kept. One man was tricked into providing free labour and skill to build a boat for a so-called donor. “A Thai woman came in with her foreign boyfriend and told me that they would help pay for a boat if I built it. So I began to build the boat and when I was about to paint the boat they took the boat with them and I never saw them again” (Respondent #27). It was difficult to believe that people would perceive the situation as an opportunity to take advantage of the misfortune of others. There were also people who went into the affected areas and took photos of the ruins to be used to raise money. However, the community never saw the money.

Sometimes organizations came into the village and put up signs stating that they had donated things for the village, but in fact we never received such donations or if we did it was not the entire village. Just a handful of us received it. This created problems with the village’s credibility. It made the village look bad because visitors did not understand why we were not fully recovered since we had already received so much help. What they did not know was that most donations that came in were not distributed to everyone. Only a few groups received them while others still suffered because it was done in an unorganized way (Respondent #6).

Such unorganized flow of donations made the disaster recovery even more complicated for those who were involved. Donations poured in without proper management, causing large sums of money to be unaccounted for. Most community members cannot remember
the names of organizations that helped them or came into the community, because they were so many and they left too soon.

WAVES OF AID ORGANIZATIONS
Although there were many organizations involved in the relief operation in the Ban Namkem community at the beginning, most of them left after a few months. Upon arrival to the Ban Namkem community, there were only two main aid organizations with offices inside the community, namely the Ban Namkem Community Coordinating Centre and World Vision. As mentioned earlier, World Vision considered the first six months of their work as an emergency period. After six months, the staff began the work for recovery projects and involved the community members. An election of community representatives took place in order to form a committee to work with World Vision staff on the development of recovery projects. World Vision staff in Ban Namkem stated that they were working with 707 households in Ban Namkem community. Out that total, approximately 400 community members gathered in the Ban Namkem School for the election. Eleven representatives were elected to work with World Vision. Currently, the committee has only nine members. The committee acted as the project proposals evaluators. There were request forms available at the World Vision office, which was located inside the community. Each community member could pick up the form and write down what kind of assistance was required. The request would be discussed by the staff and the committee for approval.

World Vision also employed some locals as staff. In Ban Prutiew, a newly built community with 80 percent of the survivors from the Ban Namkem community, a World Vision office was set up and run by staff who were also victims from Ban Namkem (Respondent #23 and 25). Originally, Ban Prutiew was one of the Phang Nga province’s locations for temporary housing units for 210 households made up of local tsunami victims. Later on, many permanent houses were built by private donors such as the former Miss Universe Porntip Narkhirunkanok and the Rotary International Foundation. Opened in April 2005, the office provided assistance to the residents by sending out staff to survey the needs of the community. The residents were also required to register with
the office and were provided with identification cards, which would entitle them to receive aid. World Vision Prutiew’s training and equipment were given to those with ID cards, and one year later, there were 50 additional households that still needed their help. The residents also selected a committee to work with the World Vision staff. The committee would meet regularly on the last Saturday of every month. The first committee consisted of seven representatives, but once the permanent houses were built and people from other communities were relocated to the Ban Prutiew, the committee expanded to 15 people. The projects included occupational training, loans for small businesses, and saving groups.

Of the 707 households in Ban Namkem that World Vision worked with, the organization only assisted around 300 households with livelihood recovery. The livelihood recovery program supported fishermen, small business owners, and farmers, to name a few. The organization also supported the community’s credit union cooperative to ensure there would be loans available for people to improve their livelihood activities. In the livelihood recovery program, community members were encouraged to form groups. Once the groups were formed, proposals of the type of assistance they needed to improve their livelihoods was discussed and approved by the staff and the committee. The three-fold process of requesting livelihood recovery assistance began with the submission of a project proposal, which had to be approved and signed by four committee members. Once the proposal was signed, the committee would meet again to discuss and clarify the objectives and appropriateness of the project. Nine committee members would sign the approval, and the requested project would be assisted and delivered. Each group would be visited regularly by staff to ensure that the donations were used according to the project proposals.

Like many other relief organizations, the World Vision also implemented the boat-building project as a part of its livelihood rehabilitation program. The organization provided 20 boats to the Ban Namkem community. The boats were put together by skilled carpenters hired by World Vision. Originally the project was meant to provide the community members with equipment and material to build the boats. Due to lack of
carpentry skills and time to train the members, the World Vision decided to have the boats built for them instead. The community members participated by painting the boats themselves.

The Ban Namkem Community Coordinating Centre was another organization with an office located inside the community. It evolved from the self-organization of Ban Namkem community members in the Bangmuang relief camp. The head of the centre was one of the main committee members at the relief camp. The centre worked as a linkage for donors and the community to ensure that donations were used in a sustainable and effective way. The strategy used to create effective recovery projects was the development of a Community Savings Bank. The community members were encouraged to set up a savings account with a small amount of money deposited into the account every month. Each member can deposit as little as 10 baht per month. After six months of regular deposits, the member would be eligible to take out a loan. Monthly meetings take place at the Ban Namkem Community Coordinating Centre to inform the community members of loan process. The money for the loans was a combination of community savings and donations from donors. The donations would act as revolving funds to be collectively managed by the community. Loans would be taken out of the funds and returned on the time and conditions agreed upon. This enabled donors to respectfully provide aid and community members to accept the help with dignity. The centre hoped to empower the community by supporting projects that would strengthen the ability of its members to sustain their livelihood.

I observed one of the Community Saving Bank meetings, which took place at the Ban Namkem Community Coordinating Centre. The meeting was set up in a big empty room and the community members sat on the floor.

The Community Saving Bank started with 80 members, and a year later there were 180 members with saving accounts. At the end of their six month saving period, each member was entitled to partial compensation for their medication as well as funeral expenses. The children and the elders in the family would also receive small amounts of money on
special holidays (Respondent #6). The Community Saving Bank was established to provide community members with revolving funds and loans to support and increase their standard of living. It was also intended to promote saving habits for community members to ensure a financially secure future for each household. In Ban Namkem, CODI also worked with community members to plan housing projects for those who did not have legal land entitlement.

Many donors also assisted victims by giving out free boats; however, organizations such as CODI and Chumchonthai Foundation, preferred developing a boat yard with a boat building skills training course as part of their assistance. The boat yard was located within the community and received funds from various sources, namely Dow Chemical, Toyota, Siam Cement Group, Stock Exchange of Thailand, and the Norwegian government (Kongrut, 2005). The program required the participants to cover half of the total expense, which could be divided into monthly payments. The payments would be used as part of the revolving funds for the Community Bank. Loans could also be arranged to buy necessary fishing equipment such as sonar and radar devices for locating fish and underwater rocks, as well as short wave radios. The project had a very good start with many participants.

In the beginning everyone wanted to be part of this boat building project. But when other organizations began to give out free boats, the majority dropped out and chose the free boats instead. We wanted to make it sustainable, but other organizations ruined our chance. It was understandable. Everyone likes free stuff (Respondent #6).

There was also a mental health issue for many survivors in the community. One woman that I talked to said that she was living in fear because every time she heard the waves hit the shore near her house, she panicked and worried that the tsunami waves would come back and take her life (Respondent #28). Her husband who stood nearby said that he had to purchase a radio and TV set with a DVD player for his wife, so she could turn on the music or a movie and not hear the sound of the waves (Respondent #29). Another villager said that her and her family decided to take a house outside of the original community
even though it was further away from the dock where she buys fish to sell at the market due to fear of the waves (Respondent #30). There are organizations and experts who work with survivors of mental related trauma. In the beginning, there were many psychiatrists who went into the affected areas to help. In Bangmung relief camp, the survivors received as many as six or seven visits from psychiatrists. However, one of the relief workers found it rather ineffective. “Imagine you have to cry six or seven times a day. Every time the psychiatrist came in and asked or talked to the victims about their experiences, they cried.” (Respondent #7). According to him, it was a better idea to help them look ahead and work on rebuilding their livelihood rather than reliving the past.

THE TSUNAMI'S SIDE EFFECTS
Ban Namkem community received a lot of attention from the general public because it suffered the most destruction and because of the land dispute in Lampom beach. Lampom Beach is located on the south side of the Ban Namkem community. This piece of land along the Andaman coastline was owned by a mining company that had rented the land from the government for mining purposes over 50 years ago. After the contract expired, the company left, but the workers remained. They continued to live on what was then, public land. However, later on the company saw the opportunity for tourist development, yet was unable to evict the already settled community. “According the Thai Law Society vice chairman Surapong Kongchantuk, villagers who stayed on public land for 10 years or more could apply for title deeds through the land office” (Rajah, 2006). The community representative said the neighbourhood had been there for so many generations.

The conflict in Lampom Beach emerged a few years before the waves wiped them out. Around the early 1970s, the land in this area was rented out to the Hok Chong Seng Company for mining purposes (Pinyorat, 2005). After the concession expired, the land was supposed to revert back to public control. However, in 2002, the community was approached by the Far East Trading and Construction Company, which claimed that the land belonged to the company and forced residents to stay out of the areas. The company had a landownership document issued by the Land Office. This document turned
Lampom villagers from landowners to trespassers. The eviction did not take place, but the threat was constant.

After the waves wiped out the houses on Lampom Beach, the guards were sent by the company to put up fences and prevent anyone from entering. One of the Lampom residents said she tried to go in to look for her daughter and was stopped by the guards. Local police did not help her because the company had already pressed charges and claimed that she, along with the rest of her neighbours, were illegally living on its land (Respondent #30). The residents decided to fight back. The media presented her story and much help was offered to the neighbourhood to support their fight for land. Lampom residents did not receive aid, nor did the rest of the Ban Namkem community, due to the security measures related to the land dispute. They received donations from many private donors and houses were built by independent volunteers who heard their stories from the media and wanted to help them.

Lampom residents marched back from the relief camp on February 25, 2005 to reclaim their land. They could not go back to their land prior to that date because the developer had put up fences with guards preventing any villager from going into the area. Those who tried to enter were threatened by the shooting. Prior to the tsunami, there were 52 households in Lampom Beach, but only 30 households returned to live on their land. Many of them were too scared to move back, so they took the houses that the government built for them in other locations. It took the residents eight to nine months to complete the rebuilding of their homes. The construction was completed under the watchful eyes of media crews from around the world. The funding for these houses came from many sources; mostly private donors from abroad who read about their stories. “Thai embassy in Washington DC funded the building of 15 houses, while Save Andaman network took care of the other 15 houses. The budget was 250,000 baht for each house. BBC news also gave us 1 million baht” (Respondent #30). There were numerous volunteers who went in and helped the remaining members build their houses.
5.3 DISASTER RESPONSE AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN BAN TUNGWA

5.3.1 Background
Ban Tungwa is another community in Takuapa District, Phang Nga province, that was badly hit by the tsunami waves. This community differs from Ban Namkem. Its population is mainly Morklen or as they are referred from both within and outside, the community sea gypsies. There are three main groups of sea gypsies in Thailand, namely the Morken, Morklen, and the Urak Lawoi (UN Thailand, 2005c). Morklen refers to sea gypsies who have adopted a sedentary lifestyle and have acquired Thai citizenship. Ban Tungwa community is located approximately one kilometre from the sea on the main highway. Due to the location, the community blended into the mainstream Thai culture and many of them are married to Thais.

According to CODI (2006), it was during the reign of King Rama VI that the Morklen moved inland and obtained last names, such as Klatalae or Harntalae, from the King. Those with traditional Morklen names preferred to be called Morklen, but those in the new generations of mixed Thais struggled to get away from the Morklen nametag and preferred to be called Thai Mai, which is directly translated to “new Thai,” and to be recognized as Thais rather than as sea gypsy. Although they live in a community that has a big sign in the front stating “Morklen Community,” asked about the history of Morklen, one of the interviewers said, “Don’t call me Morklen, I’m Thai Mai. I was born in Thai hospital and studied in Thai school. I speak Thai” (Respondent #31). Most of the new generation became irritated with the term, while some people still preferred to be called Morklen and tried to promote Morklen culture and language. The tension between the two groups was visible when I conducted my interviews. “Thai Mai are those who are educated, but Morklen is for those who live in Surin Island and can speak Burmese” (Respondent #32). However, another man who was the leader of Tungwa community told me that real Morklen are those with two last names and who have their own language.

Morklen in Ban Tungwa migrated from the Sirae Island in Phuket province. They had moved many times before they ended up in the present area approximately 100 years ago. They camped in different places for varying amounts of time until landowners asked
them to leave the land. Over the past years, the community lived on the land without any proper documentation. None of the community members had any entitlement to the land. The houses were built in a very simple way, but each house was different. Prior to the tsunami disaster, the community dynamic was very individualistic. Most members did not have much contact with their neighbours. They preferred doing their own thing and did not really get together for events. They did not do anything collectively. Moreover, the Thai members who married into the community also found themselves distinct from the others.

Ban Tungwa community, located in the Kukkhak sub-district, not far from Khaolak, Phang Nga’s major tourist destination, was excellent real-estate. There were 71 households prior to the tsunami disaster, 64 of them were Thai Mai and the rest were Thai. In total, there were 327 people living in the community (CODI, 2006). Of the 71 households, 42 members were killed in the tsunami disaster. The community was completely destroyed by the tsunami. Overall, destruction in the community included 18 boats, personal belongings and household items estimated to about 6.9 million baht (CODI, 2006). The community covered 4.16 hectares of the public land (ACHR, 2006). About 74% of the population or 58 households in the community did not have proper documentation for the ownership of their land (CODI, 2006).

After the tsunami hit, Tungwa residents were approached by the local government who wanted to build a hospital on the land that their community had formerly occupied. However, the community members of Tungwa refused to give up their land. The community joined with other affected communities that were experiencing a similar problem of land tenure dispute, in order to negotiate with the government. In Phang Nga province alone, there were about 500 rais (1 rai equals 0.16 hectare) of land that were subjects of land entitlement disputes (Rajah, 2006). The issue was dealt with by the former Deputy Prime Minister Chavalit Yongchaiyuth, who formed the Thai National Land sub-committee to review and resolve the problems (Rajah, 2006). The case was resolved by creating a “…land-sharing agreement under which 16 rai of the disputed land was given to the community cooperative on a long-term collective land lease, and the
remaining 10 rai was returned to the local authority to enable it to build a hospital” (Rajah, 2006).

The right to live on the land was granted for only five years. After the five year period, the community still had to negotiate with the local authority to see if they could continue living on their land. Most villagers expressed considerable frustration over this issue and mentioned that until this problem was resolved, they could not move on with their lives. Moreover, due to this uncertainty, the community did not invest in infrastructure for running water. Instead, each house had to purchase water which was trucked into the community, a far more expensive way to obtain water.

**5.3.2 Assistance for the community after the disaster**

Despite the fact that Ban Tungwa was located one kilometer from the sea, the magnitude of the tsunami waves was so strong that it wiped out the entire village and carried the Navy patrol boat to the bottom of a mountain not far from the village. Several survivors from the community said they were fortunate that there was a mountain located not far from the community since they were able to run up the mountain to avoid the flood. The houses were not strongly built and were located close to each other, which made the community more vulnerable to strong waves like the tsunami. All of the houses in the community were completely wiped out.

**TEMPORARY SHELTERS**

Ban Tungwa community members gathered in the Ban Tungkamin relief camp, located in Kuk Kak sub-district, Takuapa district, Phang Nga province. The camp had 110 temporary shelters for the victims. The tents were set up with help from various organizations. There were 70 Morklen households and 40 Thai households, altogether 290 people in the camp (CODI, 2006). Tents were put up in rows like those in Bangmuang Camp and a similar technique of camp management was applied. CODI provided technical assistance to help the community form a committee and work together toward building their future. Each row had to select a representative who would act on their behalf and attend camp meetings to address issues and concerns that had to be dealt
with. Ban Tungkamin camp had 10 rows of tents, and all ten representatives were in charge of setting up temporary shelters, dividing tasks and responsibilities as necessary to run the camp, as well as coordinating all activities that took place within the camp. The victims were busy and preoccupied with daily activities in the camp such as welcoming the donors who visited the camp, managing the donations, and working together to plan for the future and rebuild their lives.

5.3.3 Fight for Land Rights and Livelihood Recovery

LAND DISPUTES

Shortly after the community members settled at the relief camp, some members went back to their old houses to search for their belongings and discovered a large sign indicating that the areas where their houses used to be would be used for a hospital project funded by the German Embassy. The community members were confused and felt they have to do something to keep their land as it was the only thing they have left after the disaster. The staff from the People Against Poverty Network (PAPN), CODI, and Chumchonthai Foundation, who were working closely together at that time to provide assistance to the tsunami victims, assisted the community with the case. The German embassy was contacted, but denied that there was any hospital project funded by Germany. Tungwa community members, with support from the staff, decided that they should take over the area and physically reclaim their land. They marched back to the community and marked the area with rope to indicate the previous location of their community. The staff and community members began to work together and agreed that the best way to reclaim their land was to quickly rebuild permanent houses on the land.

Tungwa community received assistance and funding from various donors via the three main organizations that continuously worked with the community mentioned above. “We acted as big brother and the community committee came up with their own projects…We connected other organizations for funding, but the projects were developed by the committee” (Respondent #34). However, since the land dispute was a big problem beyond the ability of community members, staff from PAPN stepped in to help. The issue was reported to the Vice Prime Minister General Chaowalit Yongjaiyut, who was also a founder of PAPN. A meeting was scheduled for the beginning of February. A land
Tenure Committee was established to find solutions for the many affected communities without land rights, including the Ban Tungwa community. Staff from all three organizations worked together to prove the community’s right to the land. The major proof of the community’s long-term existence was the communal graveyard, which dated back 300 years before the tsunami disaster.

**BEFORE** the tsunami, the Tungwa village occupied 4.16 hectares of land along the central highway.

**AFTER** Tungwa gave 38% of the land (1.6 ha) to the Provincial Authority and kept 62% (2.56 ha) of it to rebuild their village and homes.

*Figure 4: Map of Tungwa community before and after the negotiation (ACHRT, 2006)*
District officials and the provincial governor were contacted and negotiations to settle the dispute began with the help of the National Land Tenure Committee. Tungwa community was one of thirteen communities that were granted the right to remain on public land. Ban Tungwa community previously existed on 4.16 hectares of land. Negotiations boiled down to a “land sharing” option, which allowed the community to keep 2.56 hectares of their land with five years tenure status under a communal land-lease, while the province received the 1.6 remaining hectares for public use. It was one of the very first successfully negotiated land dispute negotiations for the tsunami-affected communities. However, the villagers are still fighting for their permanent land tenure status, and are concerned as to whether or not they will have a place to live after the five year term is up.

BRINGING THE COMMUNITY BACK TOGETHER
I was fortunate to observe the committee selection process on the day I arrived in the community. The community required a new committee selection, so the staff from CODI, Chumchonthai Foundation, and PAPN were there to assist with the process. The committee selection was done by a show of hands. The villagers sat in rows according to the way their houses were set up with a total of seven rows. Each row selected two representatives to form a committee of 14 people. The names of committee members were announced and accepted by the entire community.

The staff explained to the community that the committee was formed in order to enable them to organize and manage their community themselves since the relief organizations would not stay with them forever. The community was advised to plan their own projects and hire each other for labour instead of hiring outsiders. The committee would have to look after the projects and report back to the rest of the community as to how the money was spent and for what purpose. In order to avoid corruption, the funding could only be taken out with signatures from all committee members. Staff would not get involved in the handling of money. “For example, the children’s center has one million baht to work with. The committee will have to report how the money is spent in the project, how many people receive money for their labour, the kind of materials used, etc. The center has to
be strongly built and cheap material should not be used to cut cost because if something happens then it will be the children in the community that will be hurt. Therefore, everyone has to look after the project together” (Respondent #7). The committee selection took a few hours, but everyone participated fully in the process.

While at the Tungkamin relief camp, many victims received livelihood training from organizations that were there. Most of the respondents could not remember the names of the organizations that provided training. Many of them became frustrated when I tried to probe for names that might have stood out in their minds. One respondent said that she did not know because she is not educated. “Aunty don’t remember their name, little girl. Aunty cannot read. Just a simple villager, you know” (Respondent #33). Although they could not provide me with the names of organizations, they said most of them left soon after the community moved out of the relief camp. The majority of the livelihood training in the camp focused on brick making and basket weaving. These two activities provided community members with income while at the relief camp. Equipment and raw materials were provided to them by the organizations and donors. Brick making required additional equipment as well as electricity. Finished products were gathered and sold on the community members’ behalf; all they had to do was produce them. Unfortunately, community members were unable to produce bricks once they moved back onto their land due to a lack of electricity. Basket weaving was only done by a few members due to a lack of buyers.

Ongoing livelihood projects supported by the three organizations also included revolving funds for the community and fishing project. “We encouraged them to form saving groups. We also provided support for fishermen by providing gear and equipment for them so they could put it together themselves” (Respondent #36). The proposal for each project came from the community itself. Staff called community meetings and asked everyone to provide ideas as to what they would like to do in terms of development projects. Each member voiced his/her interests and discussed with other members what should be done first. “We didn’t take care of them. We supported them. They did everything themselves, including management” (Respondent #36). Staff did not stay with
only one community, but also worked with communities in other provinces. The organizations stayed with the community until they were certain that the community has fully recovered. Regular visits in the beginning slowly decreased to enable the community to be on its own.

SUITABLE PERMANENT HOUSES FOR MORKLEN
A total of 12 organizations provided funding for the housing project in the Ban Tungwa community. Housing construction in Ban Tungwa occurred prior to any settlement was reached. As soon as the community decided to reclaim its land, the villagers worked with volunteer architects to come up with houses designed to meet their lifestyle. The houses were made of wood with lots of windows; large, open rooms; and an open-air lower level. This design maximized air circulation, making the house cooler and offering protection from strong heat common to the southern part of Thailand. Seventy-one permanent homes were built by members of the community (see Photo 3). Donations were made by different organizations in the form of building equipment and materials. Each house had 49 square meters of living area, a 12 square meter veranda, a 21 square meter kitchen, a toilet at the back, and an open-air lower level beneath the house, which could be used to raise animals. The houses lined up nicely with small cement roads throughout the community. They were very big compared to the houses built by other organizations. The community is an eye catcher, since it is located right on the side of the main highway.
While community members were grateful for the assistance of volunteer architects and experienced construction workers, all who were interviewed had some complaints. I asked the former community leader whether the location of each house in the community was based on the community plan prior to the tsunami or whether a new decision was made as to who would get a house in the front row and who would get a house in the back row. He said it was supposed to be based on name drawing, but somehow the head of the construction workers took over and decided where each was supposed to live.
After mentioning this, he concluded, “They gave us our new lives. I’m just grateful that they helped us. They were good enough to help us. At least I have a house” (Respondent #35).

A year later, there were only a few houses that were considered completed in the community. After several interviews, complaints emerged about unequal housing conditions. Many villagers were unhappy with the fact that only 20 houses were completed with toilets, kitchens, and paint while the other 50 houses remained somewhat unfinished. The paint job was a big problem for many houses because of the material and the distinctive appearance that set some apart from others. Without any paint, the wood was easily destroyed by rain and strong sun. Moreover, the visible differences between the painted and unpainted houses also created uneasy feelings among community members. The reason behind the inequality was the lack of funding. The organization only provided enough funding for 20 houses. This would have been acceptable if other organizations would have provided funding for the rest of the houses; however, that was not the case and the remaining villagers ended up feeling left out.

In addition to the housing project, CODI, Chumchonthai Foundation, and PAPN worked closely with the community to build the Morken Cultural Center to showcase Morken culture, tradition, and lifestyle for those who were interested. It was hoped the center would bring in tourists and provide an opportunity for the community to start its own Ecological and Conservation Tourism as an industry and a way to generate income. These three organizations also helped community members establish a Community Market to provide an opportunity to sell their catches without a middleman. There were also several projects that helped women build the skills necessary to earn some income like sewing, making batik, or food preservation. In addition, funding was provided to fishermen for boats and fishing gear.

**STRUGGLE AFTER THE WAVES**

The villagers also suffered from a lack of fresh water. Each household had water tanks to capture rain water; however, during the dry season, this method was insufficient. The
community relied on fresh water from the well, but as a result of the disaster, sea water flooded the area and mixed into ground water sources, causing problems for agriculture and livelihood. At the time of my interviews, the community had to purchase water by having trucks come into the community to fill up water tanks. “We have to purchase water for drinking and bathing. We have a water truck come into the community every month. Each family spends more than 1,000 baht per month for water” (Respondent #32). At the community meeting, the concern of flooding within the community was also raised. Many members felt that there should be small canals around the community to ensure that flooding would not occur during the upcoming rainy season.

Like the situation in Ban Namkem, the amount of money and donations that went into the Ban Tungwa community was significant. The word Morklen seemed to attract a lot of donors who wanted to help this unfortunate minority. However, some people also used the name to get money from relief organizations. I was told by the former community leader that World Vision had just come to talk to him regarding requests they received from one of the community members, but he did not know anyone in his community who would make the request. “He asked this person if there was a village leader he could contact and the individual said no, so he decided to come here in person. This was a problem because there were so many people who took advantage of Morklen and used our name to get help and donations” (Respondent #35). There were also false statements by field staff of some organizations claiming that one of the construction projects was completed by the community members themselves, when in fact Burmese workers were hired to do the job. “They took a photo of Morklen holding a brush pretending to paint the house” (Respondent #35). This caused problems for the rest of the community members who did not have their houses painted because no more funding was available for them due to false information.

A sea gypsy lifestyle does not place much importance on saving for the future. Sea gypsies make a living based on self-sufficiency. Some community members had a difficult time managing the compensation they received. When many donations were given to them in a short period of time, the illusion of wealth emerged. “When the
tsunami struck, we lost our family members. Each received compensation of 10,000 to 30,000 or even 100,000 baht…They thought they would never finish this large sum of money they received” (Respondent #35). Money was used to purchase new cars or other things. Many donors contributed to this illusion. For example, Samsung Ltd. from Korea put up a big sign in front of the community that they had donated 7 million baht worth of household appliances for the Morklen community. However, according to one of the community members, the sign caused her more harm than good. “I lost many job opportunities because of the sign. People thought Morklen had enough help already, so they did not hire me” (Respondent #38).

The community also faced the challenge of working together as a unit. As mentioned earlier, there seemed to be an internal conflict between those who called themselves Morklen versus those who called themselves Thai Mai. Also, the lifestyle they had prior to the disaster was very individualistic with very little contact with one another. In the beginning, everyone worked together to plan for development projects within the community. They had the same goal for reclaiming their land. Once the houses were built, the ties seemed to loosen as people went their separate ways, rebuilding their lives. “Lately when the community leader asks for members to attend meetings, nobody wants to come out because there is no money involved. To attend meetings means less time to earn a living” (Respondent #33). Despite the difficulty of getting together and working towards the same goal, many of them are very hopeful and excited about their future plan. They look forward to a community center, a playground for little children, and most importantly, a legal right to their land so that the next generation will have a place they can call their own.

5.4 SUMMARY
The two small fishing communities of Ban Namkem and Ban Tungwa may have slowly recovered from the destruction caused by the tsunami waves, but it seems only a physical recovery has occurred. Many villagers are still struggling to reclaim their lives. Loss of their loved ones was difficult to deal with, but the loss of their livelihoods and land made the villagers’ recovery even more difficult. Much help went into the communities in the
hope of assisting them with recovery. However, the overwhelming amount of charity and
donations created a disturbing side effect for the community. Some members became
dependent on handouts. The dynamic of community ties also changed due to the
relocation of many victims. Ban Namkem became quiet, without much opportunity for
generating income, while in Ban Tungwa, community members began to feel uneasy
toward one another as a result of the unequal distribution of aid.

There was also a need for a systematic approach to donation collection and distribution
for relief assistance. Lack of an effective system for donation collection and distribution
led to mistrust and inequality of aid within the affected community. Since Thailand had
never encountered such a large-scale natural disaster as the tsunami, the distribution and
collection of aid and donations were not as effective as they should have been, causing a
great deal of conflict among the victims. One primary location to collect and distribute
donations would have minimized conflict within the community. By enabling
representatives of affected community members to participate in donations management,
the communities were able to discuss and decide on what could be done with the
donations and who was missing out on help. Such an approach helps to build a
foundation for long-term and sustainable community management. It was also important
to keep in mind that perceived favouritism or corruption might create problems.
Therefore, assistance from outsiders was important to maintain balance within the
community and to promote transparency. Relief organizations should be involved only as
technical assistants providing the skills and information necessary for the community to
carry out their own projects and to help ensure that corruption does not take place.

Effective relief assistance should promote self-reliance for the affected parties. Although
the immediate impact of a disaster may create vulnerabilities, victims are still capable of
helping themselves as well as assisting others around them. It is very important to turn
grief into motivation in order to help each other move forward. It is demonstrated in both
case studies, that by enabling community members to participate in rebuilding their own
lives, many were able to transform their sadness and sense of loss into understanding and
community bonding. Many community members became involved in various recovery
projects. Regular community meetings and discussions occurred. People began to understand and exercise their rights. They became active members of society rather than waiting for government officials to tell them what they could and could not do.

Monetary donations created a great deal of conflict and mistrust among community members. Many victims reported that they did not receive as much money as their neighbours or friends and suspected that those who received more were cheating or keeping the money meant for others. It was very difficult for victims to receive equal amounts of money or donations when there were so many donors with different donation strategies. Some donors preferred to drive into the community and hand out money to the first people they saw. Others contacted community leaders and requested mention of their donations in community announcements. These donors had good intentions of helping victims, but the wrong strategy can easily do more harm than good. It is impossible for any single donor to assist everyone in the community equally. Whether they like it or not, their money will not be enough for victims to help themselves over the long term. However, if donations are provided to communities in a whole sum and distributed in the form of evolving loans, then the money will enable communities to rebuild themselves in a more sustainable way.

Communication between key players involved in relief operations is also a very important factor which can lead to effective and sustainable disaster recovery. Information obtained from regular meetings and discussions in the relief camp during the first few weeks was crucial in planning disaster recovery projects. The meetings enabled stakeholders to learn what was happening in the camp and what needed to be done next. It also prevented the repetition of aid and allowed for the planning of recovery projects which would respond to the needs of the victims. The key players who provide technical assistance to the affected community in disaster recovery project planning should also have experience working in community development. For example, the staff from Chumchonthai Foundation or CODI worked on community development prior to their involvement in the tsunami disaster relief operation. Their expertise helped the community build a network and bond within as well as outside of their community.
Another good reason to have the affected community involved in the planning and implementation of recovery projects is to address issues of transparency and mistrust that the general public may have of the recipient community. The head of the Ban Namkem Coordinating Centre expressed his concern over misrepresentation of the affected community by the media due to reports of various donors with high donation figures, which were not necessarily correct. The same issue happened in the Ban Tungwa community. Samsung Company Limited put up a sign stating that electrical equipment with an equivalent value of seven million baht was donated to the community. This sign was located right at the entrance of the community for everyone to see, but none of the community members received anything.

In summary, the best way to ensure success in the recovery process is for the relief organizations and/or the government to take a ride in the passenger seat and enable the affected community to drive its own disaster recovery project. Assistance and technical support are the only tasks that relief organizations should perform during the disaster recovery period in order to guarantee meaningful public participation. If an organization provides too much aid in the form of donations or planning for disaster recovery for the affected community, problems of dependency and unsuitable aid will occur. By including the community in the decision-making process, less time will be wasted on inappropriate projects or disagreement and conflict within the community.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

6.1 INTRODUCTION

While bringing sorrow and destruction, the Indian Ocean Tsunami on December 26, 2004 also left Thailand with many valuable experiences and lessons. The tsunami disaster brought the unity and kindness of the nation to the forefront, while also triggering the help and generosity of strangers. In addition, the unity of many small communities, the dedication and sacrifice of aid providers and the strength and courage of individuals to fight for justice and rights were also revealed. It also provided the chance to tackle many unresolved issues from the past. Presently, the country has physically recovered from the disaster; however there are still many lingering issues that Thailand needs to address. The lessons learned need to be applied in order to improve the response and recovery aspects of disasters in the future.

Within the context of the 2004 tsunami, this research set out to establish approaches to meaningful public participation in disaster response and recovery by i.) identifying and describing the response and recovery projects undertaken in post-tsunami Thailand, ii.) examining the participation of affected communities in decision making processes for disaster response and recovery, and iii.) identifying obstacles to successful participation in disaster response and recovery. The disaster response and recovery activities, which took place in Thailand, were identified at the national and local levels in Chapters four and five. The projects identified in the aforementioned chapters included activities such as search and rescue, temporary relief camps, and donations in the response phase, as well as housing projects, compensation, livelihood rehabilitation, and policy planning and recommendation in the recovery phase.

The findings show that community members in the two case studies were presented with opportunities to participate in various levels of disaster response and recovery projects. However, there were a few obstacles that either prevented or decreased the capacity of community members to participate. These issues are discussed toward the end of this chapter.
6.2 THAI RESPONSE TO THE TSUNAMI

The results of the research show that the Thai government quickly formed a line of authority in response to the disaster with the Prime Minister as the main commander. Ministries took over the affected areas and coordinated the implementation of the national disaster response. Many relief centers were established to assist Thai and foreign victims. Military troops were sent into the affected areas for search and rescue missions. Due to the high number of casualties and the concentration of tourists in the affected areas, many countries sent search and rescue teams, paramedics, and military troops to assist Thailand with the disaster response. The Thai government declined all financial assistance, but asked that the global community share their knowledge and expertise on disaster management. Thai citizens and foreign nationals showed their generosity by sending donations and volunteers to assist victims in the emergency response and recovery phases.

Like many sudden onset disasters, immediate help came from those who survived. Local victims were helping each other as well as tourists. In Phuket, the Southern Disaster Victim Relief Collaboration Center was set up to assist the victims. The victims could submit their requests for help and assistance at the Center, but the service proved to be ineffective under such disastrous situations. Many victims were unable to go into the center to submit their requests for various reasons, such as lack of transportation, injuries, and/or psychological trauma.

The centralized chain of command established at the outset seemed to work well during the emergency phase as it enabled things to move along very quickly, and ensured the success of the search and rescue operation. Despite the chaotic nature of the disastrous period, there was evidence of coordination between the Thai government and relief organizations during the response phase. For example, many search and rescue teams from different countries flew to Thailand via Utapao Airbase, which was opened especially for the international search and rescue flights. Centralized command with ultimate authority and power is believed to be the most effective way of managing
disaster situations and keeping the society experiencing the disaster together (Cuny, 1983, p. 226).

While there was criticism of the Thai response effort, as outlined in the results chapters, it is interesting to consider these criticisms in light of how other countries have responded to recent disasters. It is not possible for humanity to stop natural disasters like hurricane Katrina in the United States, the Red River flood in Canada, or the Indian Ocean tsunami in Thailand. All people can do is to minimize the level of damage that these natural disasters may cause. In the case of the August 29, 2005 hurricane Katrina, it is now clear that damages would have been minimized if there was coordination among the responsible parties, namely the mayor, the governor, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). FEMA was created to oversee and administer relief. As an agency, FEMA answers to the higher authorities in the affected areas. Hurricane Katrina’s tragedy shows that a well-established disaster management agency means nothing if the coordination is ineffective.

The order for evacuation from Mayor Ray Nagin of New Orleans was announced only 20 hours prior to the disaster. FEMA could not intervene if the mayor did not request the Governor of Louisiana, Kathleen Blanco, for FEMA assistance (Schroeder and Yocum, 2006). “The result of layered bureaucracy inherent to centralized decision making is slow and delayed action” (Sobel and Leeson, 2006). Moreover, some 120,000 New Orleans residents did not have cars to evacuate the city on such short notice, or they had very few options for short-term lodging after the hurricane, due to a high level of poverty (Alexander, 2006; Beaudoin, 2007). It was the most destructive natural disaster in the history of the United States with a death toll of almost 1,300, quoted by the Washington Post on October 19, 2005 (Schroeder and Yocum, 2006). FEMA refused any help from private donors like Wal-Mart and turned down assistance from Chicago’s mayor offered days before the hurricane hit. Victims were starving in the overcrowded Superdome, which was used as a temporary shelter (Schroeder and Yocum, 2006).

In the case of the 1997 Red River flood in Manitoba, Canada, the response was initiated
at the municipal level with community participation. Canada has a provincial agency that looks after emergency situations called Manitoba Emergency Management Organization (MEMO), which acts as the central organization to coordinate government action (Buckland and Rahman, 1999). MEMO declared a mandatory evacuation order on April 27, 1997 after little consultation with municipal officials, forcing residents in ring dike towns and rural farmsteads in the flood-affected areas to leave the areas. This put local officials in a difficult position, as they risked losing community support or government rehabilitation funds. Although most residents were generally satisfied with the MEMO response to the flood, some local communities found the order to be unnecessary and inappropriate. “If government intervention is to foster community-based disaster management, then it must support existing local networks and social norms of trust and reciprocity. This cannot be achieved through command-and-control style management” (Buckland and Rahman, 1999). The order caused some conflict within the community as some people disagreed and some did not.

Even with the coordination support of FEMA and MEMO, there were many problems in both cases. The Thai government has no such coordinating agency and was forced to work with different agencies and tried its best to assist the victims. The government endeavoured to coordinate with the international organizations that entered the country to help with the disaster. The rest of Thai society helped the victims by setting up donation boxes or gathering clothing and canned foods to send into the affected areas. I have experienced fundraising for Tsunami victims first hand, in the company of other Thai people in Chicago. The speed of the Thai disaster response did not come from the work of the government alone, but also the kindness of the entire nation, and the global community.

The comparison of three cases shows that the effectiveness of disaster response requires more than coordination among stakeholders. One agency will not be able to implement a successful disaster response without help from other parties. The agency in charge must be willing to coordinate and most importantly work with others, even those that they may not have planned to work with, to ensure victims receive help quickly and that loss of life
is minimized. It is necessary in this context to avoid command-and-control management without consultation with affected parties. It would help speed up the disaster response process as well as avoid any conflict. Last but not least, the affected countries need to learn from their experiences and prevent the same mistakes from happening in the future by planning ahead and revising actions after a disaster event instead of waiting for the disaster to strike.

In both the response and recovery phases, the Thai national government put too much pressure on local governments to have things done quickly. Many local officials were overloaded with additional tasks. They had to respond to commands from higher officials as well as to the needs of the victims. Frustration arose from the continuous visits of government officers from various departments, important figures from around the world, international, national and local media crews, and the general public. “The obstacle for people working during the emergency phase was the time wasted on welcoming different parties and authority figures into the affected areas” (Respondent #22). There were also a few complaints about the tight timeframe and unrealistic expectations imposed by the national government. For example, Respondent #2 mentioned the demand for a list of all the missing tourists with a 24 hour deadline. District staff were asked to collect information and write up reports, while at the same time they were expected to assist the victims and carry out their usual responsibilities prior to the disaster. Short and strict timeframes also prevented the affected parties from participating in the decision making process for recovery activities. Lack of input from the affected communities led to confusion, frustration, and tension between decision makers and communities, which in turn delayed the redevelopment projects and wasted the time, money, and energy of all the parties involved. Government housing projects implemented by military troops were a good example of a project’s failure due to lack of community participation. Many houses were abandoned due to unsuitable design, location, or poor materials.

As mentioned earlier, many countries sent out experts and technicians to assist Thailand with disaster response and recovery. Such large-scale operational work required efficient communication and coordination, as it involved many parties. Many organizations went
into the affected areas and began their work with the victims with limited coordination with other aid organizations or local authorities. For example, World Vision claimed that they did not have to contact other organizations in the areas they were working in because they had many staff that could carry out their own recovery projects (Respondent #19). World Vision staff collected data from the victims by interviewing each of them to assess their needs and plan recovery projects. Many organizations did the same type of interviews and assessments without sharing collected information. The repetition of assessment work confused and frustrated the victims as they would be asked similar questions by different organizations over and over. Many of the interviewees I talked to said they did not remember most of the organizations that questioned them because there were too many. Lack of communication and coordination among donors and aid providers disturbed communities and wasted the time and resources of the affected communities as well as the aid providers.

The findings also demonstrate that the majority of recovery projects and policies that the Thai government implemented focused on economic and tourism recovery. The government claimed that by boosting the tourism industry, the affected communities would benefit from increased financial flow. The reconstruction of the tourism industry was initiated soon after the emergency phase. Assistance was provided to many business owners to ensure rapid reconstruction of infrastructure in tourist areas. For example, many hotels did not have to resubmit their Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report as long as the building was to be rebuilt in the same way it was prior to the disaster. Hotel owners were not required to modify their design or building location to take into account possible future disasters. As well, with the pronounced focus on tourism, small fishing communities located within the affected provinces were largely ignored. The government clearly supported the tourism industry with actions such as the establishment of the Designated Area Sustainable Tourism Administration (DASTA) which took over the town planning, for example on Phi Phi Island. Another example is the collaboration between the World Tourism Organization (WTO) and the United Nations (UN) on the Phuket Action Plan (PAP) to speed the process of recovery in affected tourist areas in Phuket. Both plans benefited business and hotel owners, and the
interests of small fishing communities were not represented in either plan. Moreover, both plans were established without any mention of public input or community consultation. The livelihood of many small fishing communities in the areas directly affected by these two establishments would suffer due to over-dependency on the tourism industry.

Lack of commitment to development plans or regulations also put Thailand in a vulnerable position in relation to future natural disasters. For example, recommendations to include the application of EIA for long-term rehabilitation work with systematic monitoring by UNEP were not taken seriously when many buildings received waivers from the ONEP to rebuild without having to submit another EA report. More importantly, developers were allowed to rebuild in the exact same way and in the same location that put them in a vulnerable position in the first place. Tsunami Memorial in the Khao Lak Lamru National Park is another example of lack of government’s commitment. The site was selected and the plan for construction was developed prior to EIA. It would be difficult to enforce the EIA regulation if the government itself fails to follow its own rules.

6.3 IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN RESPONSE AND RECOVERY

The participation and involvement of affected communities is important even in times of disaster when all the decisions must be made in an immediate fashion and are more intense. Failure to involve the affected communities will have results similar to any development project where a lack of meaningful public participation leads to time consuming and costly delays and development projects which are not popular with the affected community. As found in this study, some community members did not participate in the attempts that were made to involve them in recovery decisions because they were very busy trying to make ends meet – to survive. As well, if development projects were no longer perceived as a threat to daily chores then there was little incentive. Some people also tended to believe that others already represented their interests (Sinclair and Diduck, 2002).
The interviews with community members who were victimized by the disaster show that even during the disaster, survivors were capable of taking care of themselves as well as others. They had the ability to organize and plan the steps that needed to be taken. The sorrow and grief were there, but the suffering did not mean they lost the ability to take control of their lives. It is important that relief providers offer an opportunity for victims to be part of program implementation, since humanitarian aid happens as soon as disaster strikes. The local survivors are first on the scene and can deliver aid as well as identify what needs to be done. Survivors as First responders have also been established in reviews of other disaster events (Wachira and Sinclair, 2005). Much like public participation in EA, community involvement in a post-disaster recovery project requires similar steps.

Respondents felt that recovery activities should aim to engage affected community members by enabling them to plan, manage, and have control over implementation, so that projects are sustainable and answer the needs of the community. Through involvement, community members indicated that they would become informed and better able to understand the political, social, economic and environmental issues related to their community’s wellbeing. It was also clear that community participation in the decision-making process could empower and promote the solidarity of the community, which in turn enables community members to protect themselves from outsiders’ exploitation, as shown in the fight for land rights in Ban Tungwa community. Community members worked together to stay on their land.

Relief organizations and the government of Thailand recognized the benefits of involving the affected communities in decision-making, as is demonstrated by many of the disaster recovery guidelines created by each organization that outlined the importance of getting community input. However, the results show that there were clearly weaknesses in implementing the community involvement aspect of the guidelines. Many relief organizations, including the Thai government, came up with disaster recovery plans or guidelines based on information collected from the affected communities via community
surveys. The affected communities were asked to identify their needs in surveys, semi-structured interviews and focus groups. The officials or staff made decisions based on the data they collected and implemented the plans or projects. There was no opportunity for discussion of plans and projects implemented, they were selected based only on the survey information, and there was no opportunity for dialogue about the chosen approach. This also created a resistance in communities to any future projects because they did not feel that their opinions were taken seriously. The initial contact gave them false hope that their views and opinions would be more meaningfully considered.

Transparency is required in disaster response and recovery projects because the process involves large amounts of money and donations. Without a transparent accounting system, the general public may mistrust the aid organizations, as well as there being internal distrust within the recipient communities. The head of the Ban Namkem Coordinating Centre expressed his concern over the misrepresentation of the amount of money his community was receiving based on media reports which were not necessarily accurate.

We want to be part of the project. We want to be able to look at the financial statement and see how the money is being used, because some organizations said the fund is 10 million baht when in fact it was less than one million baht. Some even put up the signs and billboards stating the organization names and the amount before spending any money. It will put the community in a bad spot if the media and the public start to question the whereabouts of the money. We want to be able to monitor the financial status of the project (Respondent #6).

Transparency in the donation process is a sensitive issue, but necessary in order to protect the reputations of both the donors and recipients. Trust building results by making the financial part of the project accessible to all parties, as it facilitates working together toward the same goals. More regulation and coordination is necessary for recovery projects so as to avoid future complications and conflicts in projects involving multiple
funding agents.

By involving victims in the emergency phase, the bond and connection they form enables victims in the same community to continue to work together in the recovery phase. The community will be able to build on what they have done before and draw from their previous experiences. They will be able to identify issues that matter to the community and discuss what can be done to solve the problems at hand without having to wait for experts or outsiders from various organizations to tell the community what to do.

6.4 OBSTACLES TO SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

A flexible timeframe is a very important factor for the success of a disaster recovery process. As seen in the Thai case, the government put too much pressure on having things done in a short amount of time in order to enable the tourism industry to bounce back from such a destructive natural disaster. The government hoped that by increasing the speed of the recovery in the affected areas and by implementing an early warning system, it would be able to increase the tourists’ trust and willingness to return to the affected areas for holidays. Such a tight time frame created ineffective recovery projects, as many of these projects did not include community input in the planning and implementation stages. Despite time constraints, community participation is necessary to avoid any favours and maintain balanced decisions as well as increase the community’s acceptance of the decisions (Sinclair and Diduck, 1995). Many abandoned houses in the affected areas are the result of implementing projects without community input.

Multi-tasking and role switching to relief operation and community assistance are possible but only in the short term. At the national level, many Ministries were assigned extra responsibilities to take over relief operation in the affected areas. Many of the local officials spent most of their time welcoming, briefing, and/or explaining the situation at hand to visiting officials, important visitors like the ambassadors from different countries, and news reporters. In the mean time, the local officials were also required to assist the victims in ongoing relief projects. In long-term projects, such as development or recovery, there needs to be a disaster response and recovery agency that can take on
projects with a longer timeline. The existing Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation’s responsibility lies in promoting public awareness of prevention of disasters and accidents through disaster mitigation policies and civil defence activities (Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation, 2006), which does not involve implementation and monitoring of long-term recovery projects. Many organizations withdrew after a few months and switched back to their original roles. Local authorities also had less time to spend on projects for tsunami affected communities, because there were other tasks and responsibilities that they needed to attend to post disaster.

There was no consensus on the success of the tsunami disaster response in Thailand. The rapid response of the Thai government was effective for the search and rescue operations, but in terms of aid distribution and relief operations, errors were made that should be examined. For example, cooperation and communication between various relief organizations from within and outside of the country were not as effective as they should have been. The tight timeframe and overwhelming number of tasks carried out by field staff, as well as the strict criteria for aid, prevented the government from reaching out to all victims. These factors discouraged the field staff from implementing programs that would enable the community to participate and voice their concerns.

Thai people never relied much on the government for compensation or assistance during the disaster. Thailand does not have a welfare system, which exists in many developed countries. Most of the time, it was the family or network of friends who offered assistance when the disaster struck. Many victims would pull themselves together and stand on their own feet instead of waiting for help, because it is not commonly available to them, nor did they expect the government to provide it. Many Thai victims accepted that the disaster was fate and that it was beyond anyone’s control. Many of the affected individuals I interviewed replied that they were grateful just to receive any help at all from the government. They did not view it as their right but more as their good luck to receive help from the government or be involved in disaster response and recovery decision making. This kind of attitude corresponds with the set roles the government and the citizens, especially the poor with minimal education, play in relation to each other.
The government is the provider, while the affected citizens are receivers. It is a parent/child kind of relationship where the parents know what is best for the children without having to ask for any input. This is the attitude toward civic engagement of many government authorities in Thailand.

Another excellent example of how cultural norms and mores can be obstacles to meaningful public participation, was the lack of mention, or complaints from, the affected community members about the absence of a warning system. There were complaints about the timeliness of compensation and conflict resolution regarding disputed land, but none of the interviewees mentioned anything related to a tsunami warning system. I think it is very important that the community understands their rights as well as the government’s responsibilities. This attitude must change in order for affected parties to fully participate in any decisions that would affect their livelihoods and their future.

Many relief organizations offered their services to the tsunami affected communities. Ban Namkem and Ban Tungwa communities were showered with donations and assistance from many different sources. Even though community members were provided with opportunities to participate in the planning stage of some recovery projects provided by a few relief organizations, many members were swayed by donations and projects that some organizations gave or did for them without their involvement.

Unsuitable donations are obstacles which prevent communities from fully participating in redevelopment projects. Many private donors visited the affected areas and handed out cash to the first people they saw. Good intentions actually shook the unity of the community. The problem with these types of donations was that the money was not equally distributed and people ended up feeling angry and bitter. The community leader at Ban Namkem mentioned that it was very difficult to involve the community members in a boat building project when there were organizations donating free boats. When the boat building project first started, there were several members who signed on, however once they heard of other organizations that provided free boats, they all dropped out and
only a few people remained, which made it very difficult to complete the project due to a lack of labour. The projects were intended to build self-reliance, but it was also understandable that people would decide to take free boats because there was far less work involved.

6.5 RECOMMENDATIONS

Although my research focused mainly on two phases of disaster management, namely response and recovery phases, it is necessary to address the importance of preparedness and mitigation phases. These two phases enable the policy planners to minimize the negative impacts of disaster that may occur in the future by learning from previous disaster experiences. Rapid response to the disaster during the emergency phase was necessary to carry out activities such as search and rescue. However, the government needs to provide a longer timeframe when dealing with recovery activities such as housing or provision of compensation. Community input needs to be included in the planning and implementation of recovery projects. Moreover, there should be some flexibility when dealing with compensation for affected parties. The government may need to offer other alternatives that would enable some victims who did not have proper documents to receive compensation. For example, many Burmese workers lost their work permits and were afraid to contact the government because they did not know that they were entitled to compensation. Some victims who were not able to submit their request for compensation due to various reasons should be provided with a longer timeframe to submit a compensation claim.

The community should be involved very early in disaster response and recovery. For example, Ban Namkem community took control of the recovery project soon after the tsunami hit. The Chumchonthai Foundation and CODI staff asked the community leader for suggestions on what should be done as soon as they arrived at the scene. This was a very important step as it not only enabled relief providers to come up with appropriate projects that would answer the community's needs, but also built trust and partnership between the community and the relief providers. Establishment of trust and partnership created a strong foundation for sustainable future developments and recovery projects.
that may be implemented in the affected community.

This study also found that communities should get involved the minute disaster strikes, and that aid organizations should understand they are there to assist and are not the owners of projects. Relief organizations and/or government need to take a ride in the passenger seat and enable the affected community to drive their own disaster recovery project. Assistance and technical support are the only tasks that relief organizations should perform during the disaster recovery period in order to guarantee meaningful public participation. If an organization provides too much aid in the form of donations or planning for disaster recovery for the affected community, the problem of dependency and unsuitable aid will occur. Moreover, if the affected community is left out of the decision making process, the community may lose trust as was the case in Tungwa community, where problems and conflict ensued.

During the recovery phase, meetings and discussions become a therapeutic way of dealing with grief and sorrow. The meetings and discussions are also an opportunity to rebuild community ties and networks which may be lost due to the disaster. The outcomes are more than just effective redevelopment projects. The participating communities also accumulate social capital that can be applied to future developments. Including the affected community’s opinion in the planning process of disaster recovery is crucial because there is less opportunity for the authorities or aid providers to manipulate the situation and implement projects that are beneficial to them rather than to the affected community. In normal times, meetings for decision making may be perceived as a disruption of daily life but in times of disaster, meetings and discussions become a therapeutic way of dealing with grief and sorrow by looking forward to the future. Community participation also rebuilds community ties and networks that may be lost due to the disaster. Regular meetings that everyone can attend to discuss all the issues and concerns related to the community will also expand community knowledge regarding their rights and ability to detect any mischief that may take place in the community. Participation should also empower and increase the voice of the vulnerable groups through discussion. A more systematic disaster response and recovery would have
enhanced the ability of the players to provide aid with less energy, time, and money expended.
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## Appendix A: List of Relief Projects by Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Partner(s)/Donor(s)</th>
<th>Donor Committed (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>- Legal framework</td>
<td>- To be Determined/Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>178,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- (Thailand) 2 special relief flights; A 25-member Police Disaster Victims Identification (DVI) team assisting local authorities* - Coral Reefs and coastal habitats assessment, rehabilitation and management</td>
<td>- To be Determined/Australia</td>
<td>133,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>- (Thailand) In-kind - 22-member team specialized in disaster identification</td>
<td>International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies/Belgium</td>
<td>66,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>- (Thailand) 160 tons of medicines, water and foodstuffs</td>
<td>- To be Determined/Brazil</td>
<td>1,325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>- (Thailand) Team of physicians and forensic medical professional to help in the relief effort*</td>
<td>- To be Determined/Chile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Donors to be identified</td>
<td>- Rapid Relief and Recovery Fund</td>
<td>- United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization/Donors to be identified</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Livelihood Assessment Missions –</td>
<td>- International Labour Organization/Donors to be identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Voluntary Return and Reintegration of Displaced Migrant Workers from Myanmar</td>
<td>- International Organization for Migration/Donors to be identified</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergency Procurement</td>
<td>- Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)/Donors to be identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- UNDAC Mission</td>
<td>- Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)/Donors to be identified</td>
<td>53,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Long-Term Recovery and Preparedness Workshop</td>
<td>- Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)/Donors to be identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- National Lessons Learned Workshop</td>
<td>- Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)/Donors to be identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- HIV Prevention in the Post-Tsunami response</td>
<td>- United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)/Donors to be identified</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- United Nations Development Programme/Donors to be identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Partner(s)/Donor(s)</td>
<td>Donor Committed (USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support to Thailand Resident Coordinator and Humanitarian Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/Donors to be identified</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Small Grants Programme: Livelihood Ecology Restoration in 9 Tsunami</td>
<td></td>
<td>- United Nations Development Programme/Donors to be identified</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affected Coastal Sub-Districts in Phang Nga Province (EC/SG)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- UN OPE/Donors to be identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergency Relief Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization/Donors to be</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rapid Relief and Recovery Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Educational Program Damage Assessment Missions</td>
<td></td>
<td>- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization/Donors to be</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Post-traumatic Stress Counselling through Performing Arts - Socio-</td>
<td></td>
<td>identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Rebuilding in Post-Tsunami Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community Learning Centres</td>
<td></td>
<td>- United Nations Fund for Population Activities/Donors to be identified</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergency Health Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>- United Nations Fund for Population Activities/Donors to be identified</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Assessment of Reproductive Health Care Service for Vulnerable</td>
<td></td>
<td>United Nations Fund for Population Activities/Donors to be identified</td>
<td>69,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups in Tsunami Affected Areas of Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Assessment of Health Care Services for Un-Registered Burmese</td>
<td>- United Nations Children's Fund/Donors to be identified</td>
<td>World Health Organization/Donors to be identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migrants in Tsunami Affected Areas of Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergency Shelter - Short-Term Recovery Assistance</td>
<td>- World Health Organization/Donors to be identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Short-Term Recovery Assistance</td>
<td>- United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization/Donors to be identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Medium and Long-Term Recovery Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergency Assistance to Support the Rehabilitation in Earthquake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tsunami Affected Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2,368,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Partners/Donor(s)</th>
<th>Donor Committed (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>- (Region/Thailand) Support to displaced undocumented migrant workers and other mobile populations in the field of health care, shelter, and basic needs (Unmarked funds channelled by the donor through OCHA, distributed per the Humanitarian Compliance)</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration/Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>198,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>- (Thailand) Disaster Victim Identification Unit of three experts</td>
<td>To be Determined/Estonia</td>
<td>60,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>- Andaman Marine Habitat Mapping (ANDAMAP)</td>
<td>To be Determined/European Commission; France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>- (Thailand) Dispatch of a 29-member victim identification team*</td>
<td>To be Determined/European Commission Humanitarian Aid Office</td>
<td>633,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanitarian Aid Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>- Andaman Marine Habitat Mapping (ANDAMAP)</td>
<td>To be Determined/European Commission; France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>- Environment rehabilitation</td>
<td>To be Determined/Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Scientific Institutional Partnership and Development of PMRC Aquarium</td>
<td>To be Determined/Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>- (Thailand) Food, medicines and other humanitarian and medical assistance and services</td>
<td>To be Determined/Greece</td>
<td>605,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- (Region/Thailand) Emergency Assistance to the Tsunami-affected fishing communities in Southern Thailand</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme/Greece</td>
<td>637,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- (Region/Thailand) Emergency Assistance to the Tsunami-affected farmers to restart agricultural production in Southern Thailand</td>
<td>United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization/Greece</td>
<td>323,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergency Assistance to the Tsunami Affected Fishing Communities in Southern Thailand</td>
<td>United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization/Greece</td>
<td>637,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergency Assistance to the Tsunami Affected Farmers to Restart Agricultural Production in Southern Thailand</td>
<td>United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization/Greece</td>
<td>637,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Partner(s)/Donor(s)</td>
<td>Donor Committed (USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>- (Thailand) in kind - provision of aircraft and personnel, medical staff to</td>
<td>- To be Determined/Iceland</td>
<td>580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assist the transportation of Swedish citizens severely injured from Thailand to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>International Labor</td>
<td>- Post-Tsunami Livelihood Recovery in the Tourism Sector in Phuket and Phang</td>
<td>- United Nations Development Programme/International Labor Organization</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Nga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>- Support to Displaced and Undocumented Migrant Workers and Other Mobile</td>
<td>- International Labor Organization/International Organization for Migration</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization for</td>
<td>Populations in the Field of Health Care, Shelter and Basic Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>- (Thailand) Contributions from pre-positioned funds</td>
<td>- Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)/Ireland</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- (Region/Thailand) To provide counselling to teachers, health and social</td>
<td>- United Nations Children's Fund/Ireland</td>
<td>1,688,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>workers as well as support to unaccompanied children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- (Region/Thailand) Support to displaced undocumented migrant workers and other</td>
<td>- International Organization for Migration/Ireland</td>
<td>130,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mobile populations in the field of health care, shelter, and basic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>- (Thailand) 3300 body bags, 500 gas masks and special protective suits for</td>
<td>- To be Determined/Israel</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the disaster area; A medical delegation that included 13 doctors and 3 nurses;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistance in the identification of bodies - dispatch of a police forensic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unit to assist in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- (Thailand) In kind-medicines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>- (Thailand) Children and families support public health social services,</td>
<td>- Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Thailand/Italy</td>
<td>1,321,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Psychological reintegration-training-violence prevention against female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- (Thailand) In kind - series of humanitarian airlift (health and medical) and</td>
<td>- To be Determined/Italy</td>
<td>1,221,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>logistics/operations support and transport costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergency Assistance to the Tsunami Affected Fishing Communities in Southern</td>
<td>- United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization/Italy</td>
<td>630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Partner(s)/Donor(s)</td>
<td>Donor Committed (USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>- (Thailand) In kind - blankets, water purifiers, power generators, medicines</td>
<td>- To be Determined/Japan</td>
<td>106,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- JPY 10 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- (Thailand) Dispatch of Japan Disaster Relief/Rescue team, medical team and Japan Self Defence Force units*</td>
<td>- To be Determined/Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- (Thailand) Dispatch of two Japan Disaster Relief expert teams (DNA identification and rescue management)*</td>
<td>- To be Determined/Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- (Region/Thailand) Emergency Assistance to the Tsunami-affected farmers to restart agricultural production in Southern Thailand</td>
<td>- United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization/Japan</td>
<td>77,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- (Region/Thailand) Emergency assistance to the Tsunami-affected fishing communities in Southern Thailand</td>
<td>- United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization/Japan</td>
<td>162,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergency Assistance to the Tsunami Affected Fishing Communities in Southern Thailand</td>
<td>- United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization/Japan</td>
<td>162,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergency Assistance to the Tsunami Affected Farmers to Restart Agricultural Production in Southern Thailand</td>
<td>- United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization/Japan</td>
<td>77,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Japan Social Development Fund (JSDF)</td>
<td>- Emergency Response to the Tsunami Affected Communities in Southern Thailand</td>
<td>- World Bank/Japan Social Development Fund (JSDF)</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Post-Emergency Response to the Effects of the Tsunami on Vulnerable Populations in Southern Thailand</td>
<td>- World Bank/Japan Social Development Fund (JSDF)</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Legal Aid Services for Poor and Vulnerable People Affected by the Tsunami</td>
<td>- World Bank/Japan Social Development Fund (JSDF)</td>
<td>1,850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Korea, Democratic People's Republic</td>
<td>- (Thailand) Cash (part of US$ 150,000)</td>
<td>- To be Determined/Korea, Democratic People's Republic</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Korea, Republic</td>
<td>- (Thailand) Cash for emergency assistance (part of $600,000 regional pledge) (Thailand) Dispatch of '119' rescue teams*</td>
<td>- To be Determined/Korea, Republic - To be Determined/Korea, Republic</td>
<td>106,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>LAO PDR</td>
<td>- (Thailand) Cash</td>
<td>- To be Determined/LAO PDR</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Partner(s)/Donor(s)</td>
<td>Donor Committed (USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>- (Region/Thailand) Support to displaced undocumented migrant workers and other mobile populations in the field of health care, shelter, and basic needs (Unclassified funds channelled by the donor through OCHA, distributed per the Humanitarian Coordinator)</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration/Lithuania</td>
<td>133,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>(Region/Thailand) Reproductive health (Distribution by RC's office of unclassified Dutch funds)</td>
<td>United Nations Fund for Population Activities/Netherlands</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>(Thailand) to cover costs incurred in responding to the tsunami, particularly to fund the contribution of 25 New Zealand police and civilian staff deployed into the international disaster victim identification operation in Phuket, Thailand</td>
<td>To be Determined/New Zealand</td>
<td>3,586,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Region/Thailand) Emergency Alternative Livelihood systems</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme/New Zealand</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Region/Thailand) Responsive Assistance on the Rehabilitation of Natural Resources and Environmental Damages in the Affected Areas of Thailand</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme/New Zealand</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Region/Thailand) Expanding EH care services to tsunami-affected areas [formerly-Emergency Relief for Ranong and Phuket Provinces (Unclassified funds channelled by the donor through OCHA, distributed per the Humanitarian Coordinator)]</td>
<td>United Nations Fund for Population Activities/New Zealand</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>(Region/Thailand) Support to displaced undocumented migrant workers and other mobile populations in the field of health care, shelter, and basic needs (Unclassified funds channelled by the donor through OCHA, distributed per the Humanitarian Coordinator)</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration/Nigeria</td>
<td>4,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>(Thailand) Surgical supply kits included on Norwegian Medvac flight to Phuket* (Thailand) Telecommunications technician sent to UNDAC Thailand - NOK. 085 million (Part of NOK 50 million)</td>
<td>To be Determined/Norway</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)/Norway</td>
<td>13,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Partner(s)/Donor(s)</td>
<td>Donor Committed (USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)</td>
<td>(Thailand) Emergency cash grants</td>
<td>Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)/Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>(Thailand) Identification of victims (forensics)</td>
<td>To be Determined/Portugal</td>
<td>15,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Private Funds</td>
<td>(Regional/Thailand) Support to displaced undocumented migrant workers and other mobile populations in the field of health care, shelter, and basic needs (Unearmarked funds channeled by the donor through OCHA, distributed per the Humanitarian Coordinator)[Pa</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration/Private Funds</td>
<td>30,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Rolls Royce</td>
<td>Small Grants Programme: Livelihood Restoration of Fisheries Communities in Phang Nga Bay (GEF/SREP)</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme/Rolls Royce</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>(Thailand) 3 mts bottled potable water, 60 large tents, 3,500 blankets, 6,000 bed sheets, 10 water purification units (value included in the total in kind contribution of USD 0,200,000)</td>
<td>To be Determined/Russian Federation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>(Thailand) In kind - foodstuffs, medicines, tents and blankets</td>
<td>To be Determined/Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>783,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>(Thailand) Emergency humanitarian assistance</td>
<td>Thai Red Cross/Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>(Thailand) Dispatch of 2 rescue services teams*</td>
<td>To be Determined/Sweden</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>(Thailand) Distribution of clothes, blankets, mosquito nets, food, household items and medicines. Also some reconstructions of houses and fishing facilities in Ranong</td>
<td>PMU-Interlife/Sweden</td>
<td>53,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Management of coral reefs and coastal ecosystems for sustainable development</td>
<td>To be Determined/Sweden</td>
<td>1,183,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>(Thailand) Emergency aid in cooperation with COOF Bangkok</td>
<td>Swiss Humanitarian Aid/Switzerland</td>
<td>175,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>(Thailand) Support DVI team travel and transportation costs</td>
<td>Swiss Humanitarian Aid/Switzerland</td>
<td>168,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>(Thailand) Emergency fund for Embassy</td>
<td>Swiss Embassy/Switzerland</td>
<td>221,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>(Thailand) Rebuilding of fishermen community on 2 island in southern Thailand</td>
<td>Swiss Humanitarian Aid/Switzerland</td>
<td>2,118,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Livelihoods and ecosystem recovery on Koh Phratoung after the December 2004 tsunami</td>
<td>To be Determined/Switzerland</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Partner(s)/Donor(s)</td>
<td>Donor Committed (USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>(Region/Thailand) Support to displaced undocumented migrant workers and other mobile populations in the field of health care, shelter and basic needs (Unearmarked funds channeled by the donor through OCHA, distributed per the Humanitarian Coordinator)</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration/Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>185,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>(Thailand) To contribute to relief efforts that are being carried out in the affected countries (Part of US$ 1,280,000)</td>
<td>To be Determined/Turkey</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Thailand) To contribute to relief efforts carried out in the disaster-stricken countries (Part of additional contribution of US$ 3,720,000)</td>
<td>To be Determined/Turkey</td>
<td>375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>Economic impact assessment of coastal resources</td>
<td>To be Determined/UNEP</td>
<td>51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mapping the distribution of mangrove forests along the coasts of six tsunami affected provinces of Thailand</td>
<td>To be Determined/UNEP</td>
<td>51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish marine and coastal resources and environment database system</td>
<td>To be Determined/UNEP</td>
<td>71,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination mechanism for Thailand Post Tsunami Technical assistance</td>
<td>To be Determined/UNEP</td>
<td>25,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>(Region/Thailand) Responsive Assistance on the Rehabilitation of Natural Resources and Environmental Damages in the Affected Areas of Thailand (Unearmarked funds channeled by the donor through OCHA, distributed per the Humanitarian Coordinator)</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme/United Kingdom</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Region/Thailand) Support to community-based recovery planning and disaster resilience (Unearmarked funds channeled by the donor through OCHA, distributed per the Humanitarian Coordinator)</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme/United Kingdom</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Region/Thailand) Support to Thailand UNRHC/HC and the tsunami affected provinces (Unearmarked funds channeled by the donor through OCHA, distributed per the Humanitarian Coordinator)</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme/United Kingdom</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High-resolution satellite imagery rapid assessment of coral reefs and mangroves</td>
<td>To be Determined/United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency allocation from pooled funds (balancing)</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Partner(s)/Donor(s)</td>
<td>Donor Committed (USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency allocation of pooled funds to project</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency allocation from pooled funds (balancing entry)</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency allocation of pooled funds to project</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency allocation from pooled funds (balancing entry)</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency allocation of pooled funds to project</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>571,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency allocation from pooled funds (balancing entry)</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>571,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency allocation of pooled funds to project</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency allocation from pooled funds (balancing entry)</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency allocation of pooled funds to project</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>790,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency allocation from pooled funds (balancing entry)</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>790,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>10,040,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Education</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIV/AIDS Prevention, Care and Support</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>790,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Support to Thai Local Authorities for Multi-Sectoral Emergency Assistance (at least 10 Districts), Including Assessment, monitoring, emergency Logistics, Communications and Recovery Cost</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>2,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water and Environmental Sanitation</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency allocation of pooled funds to project</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme/United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency allocation from pooled funds (balancing entry)</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme/United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Partner(s)/Donor(s)</td>
<td>Donor Committed (USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable Eco-Tourism Development in the Affected Southern Provinces of Thailand</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support to Thailand Resident Coordinator</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support for Thailand Early Warning System Development</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Planning for Andaman Coast - Integrated Coastal Resource Management</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Crafts Programme: Livelihood Restoration of Fisheries Communities in Phuket and Ranong (CEF/SPG)</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>117,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean up Operation</td>
<td>To be Determined/United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>382,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-depth assessment of mangrove and other coastal forests affected by tsunami in southern Thailand</td>
<td>To be Determined/United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>173,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity Strengthening for Management of Thailand's Andaman Sea Coastal Zone</td>
<td>To be Determined/United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>408,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>United Nations Environmental Programme</td>
<td>Rapid Assessment of Disaster Impact on Environment</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Assessment of Tsunami Impact</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>United Nations Environmental Programme</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
<td>In-Depth Assessment of Mangroves and Other Coastal Forests Affected by Tsunami in Southern Thailand</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>United Nations Fund for Population Activities</td>
<td>Expanding Rural Health Care Services to Tsunami Affected Areas</td>
<td>United Nations Fund for Population Activities</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Health Assistance</td>
<td>United Nations Fund for Population Activities</td>
<td>United Nations Fund for Population Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>(Thailand) Emergency relief activities (USAID/OFDA)</td>
<td>Thai Red Cross/United States of America</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Thailand) Administrative (USAID/OFDA)</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development/United States of America</td>
<td></td>
<td>215,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Thailand) Restoration of fisheries and fishing infrastructure in Ranong Province (USAID/ANE)</td>
<td>University of Rhode Island/SUCCESS LWA/United States of America</td>
<td></td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Long term monitoring of environment in both Gulf of Thailand and Andaman sea, and international waters (BOB/PLME)</td>
<td>To be Determined/World Bank</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>World Food Programme/World Food Programme</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Partner(s)/Donor(s)</td>
<td>Donor Committed (USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
<td>(Region/Thailand) Support to displaced undocumented migrant workers and other mobile populations in the field of health care, shelter, and basic needs</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration/World Health Organization</td>
<td>122,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td>(Thailand) Distribution of 2,000 survival kits to communities affected in Kanti provinces*</td>
<td>World Vision/World Vision</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 83,066,951 USD = 3,322,678,037 Baht

(TEC, 2006)
Appendix B: Informed Consent Form

Research Project Title: Rapid environmental impact assessment and public participation: A case study in a post-tsunami Thailand

Researcher: Wannasorn Kruahongs

This consent form, a copy of which will be left with you for your records and reference, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

My name is Wannasorn Kruahongs and I am a Masters student at the University of Manitoba in Canada. I am currently in the process of conducting my Masters Thesis research. The purpose of this research is to establish approaches to ensure meaningful public participation in the post-disaster Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment (REA) context. REA refers to a process carried out by a relief organization to assess any potential impacts that may arise from the implementation of proposed development projects following disaster situation. Public participation plays an important role in assuring that all potential social, environmental, and economic impacts are taken into account before development projects proceed. I hope to understand more about how a relief organization involves people in REA processes, and whether the local community finds such involvement to be helpful.

You will be asked to participate in an informal interview. You may choose to have me interview you individually and/or in a group. You will decide the time and place that is most convenience for you to be interviewed. Your interview should take no longer than
one hour. If you feel that it is too long, you can ask me to stop. Your interview will be recorded for reliability purpose. I will use both tape recorder as well as field notebook to record your answers. If you do not want to be tape recorded it is not mandatory. Please feel free to not discuss any themes or questions you do not feel comfortable with. You may also end your participation in this research at any time during the interview; the recording machine will be turned off immediately and the researcher will not ask anymore questions.

Your identity and all the information you share with me will be kept confidential. Once the interview is transcribed, you will receive a draft of my initial analysis and you can give me your feedback and ensure that the information gathered is complete and accurate. Your information will be kept in secure computer files and I will use pseudonym to keep your identity confidential. Only my university advisor (Dr. John Sinclair) and I will get access to your name and response.

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researchers, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and/or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

Wannasorn Kruahongs  Email: swingit_golf@yahoo.com
Telephone: 1-204-2751085 or 1-662-6151175

Dr. John Sinclair  Email: jsincla@ms.umanitoba.ca
Telephone: 1-204-4748374

This research has been approved by the University of Manitoba Human Ethics Review Committee. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project you may contact any of the above-named persons or the Human Ethics Secretariat at 474-7122, or e-mail margaret_bowman@umanitoba.ca. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.
Thank you very much for your time and participation,

Wannasorn Kruahongs

________________________________________________________________________

Participant’s Signature                                                  Date

________________________________________________________________________

Researcher and/or Delegate’s Signature                               Date

Note: This letter will be translated into Thai since the research is conducting in Thailand.
Appendix C: Questions for Semi-Structured Interviews

Relief organization staff –

1. Please explain your organization’s role in tsunami relief in Thailand.

2. Does your organization require EA or other pre-development environmental decision making to be done prior to development? If yes, please briefly explain how this decision making process works. (Can you provide a copy of the policy or regulation that guide the process?)

3. Can you specifically explain how local community members are involved in the decision-making process? (note – I may inquire about a number of issues relating to meaningful public participation, as outlined below. For example, if it is not clear from the response I could ask about the timing of the process, whether resources are provided, etc. (See list below).

4. In what ways do you encourage the active participation of interested parties? Can they obtain the information on the project, if so how? If not, why not?

5. Can the participants receive and/or provide feedback on how their inputs are used, if so how?

6. Have you worked with Thai community before and on what project?

7. Please describe your relationship with the communities you have worked with.

(Note: The key components of meaningful public participation as outlined below may be seen as further prompts when discussing public participation).
Checklist for meaningful public participation (Johnson and Dagg, 2003; Bond et al., 2004):

- It should take place early in the decision-making process.
- It should be an interactive consultation (two-way communication).
- It should provide real opportunities of access of information and provision of key information.
- The consultation should be continuous throughout the EA process.
- There should be opportunities for feedback.
- It should be an inclusive and transparency process, where the decisions are accountable.
- It should empower stakeholders through integration of their inputs in the final decision.
- It should take into account the values of stakeholders.

Government officials –

1. Please explain your department’s role in tsunami relief process.
2. Do you work with relief organizations that require EA to be done? If yes, please state the organization name and your role in the development of EA.
3. Has your department completed any project EA’s in the post tsunami context? If yes, please describe the regulation and guideline you use for the development of EA. (If the answer is no, then ask – Are you familiar with the requirement for EA under the environmental act (ICNEQA)? In
your opinion, why do you think your department has not required EA of
development projects in post tsunami Thailand? (Then skip to question 5).

4. Does your department include public participation process as part of EA?
(note – I may inquire about a number of issues relating to meaningful
public participation, as outlined below. For example, if it is not clear from
the response I could ask about the timing of the process, whether resources
are provided, etc. (See list above)

5. Have you work with this community before and on what project?

6. Please describe your relationship with the community.

Local community –

1. What are some of the key post-tsunami development activities being
undertaken in your community? Who has initiated them?

2. Do you know about the [insert project name] being undertaken by [insert
agency name]? If yes, please indicate how you found out about the project
and describe your understanding of it.

3. Was there any public participation as part of decision making for this
project? If yes, how did you hear of it? (If the answer is no, then ask –
Should the local community have been more involved? Why or why not?
And if yes, through what mechanisms? Then skip to question 7).

4. Did you attend any public meetings or participate in any way in the
decision making around this project? If yes, how did you participate?
Were you satisfied with the participatory process? Please explain why or why not?

5. In the case of participation through representatives or committee, please describe the criteria you use to decide who should be in the committee or representing you? Are you satisfied with the representatives? Please explain why or why not?

6. Was information or any other kinds of support provided? (note – I may inquire about a number of issues relating to meaningful public participation, as outlined below. For example, if it is not clear from the response I could ask about the timing of the process, whether resources are provided, etc. (See list above)

7. Have you heard back from the relief organization about how your inputs are integrated into the final decision? How did you hear about it? What do you think about it?

8. What are the benefits of participating in the process?

9. Have you worked with this organization and/or the government officials before? If so, on what projects?

10. Are there any suggestions or comments for all projects you have mentioned?