



## **Cross-Cultural Learning from the Tsunami: Professional Planners from Australia and Sri Lanka**

TREVOR BUDGE<sup>1</sup>, ANDREW BUTT<sup>2</sup> AND RANGAJEEWA RATNAYAKE<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> La Trobe University, Bendigo and Chair of the Planning Institute of Australia's Post  
Tsunami Planning Project

<sup>2</sup> La Trobe University, Bendigo, Australia

<sup>3</sup> University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka

t.budge@latrobe.edu.au, a.butt@latrobe.edu.au, rangajeewa\_r@yahoo.com

*(Revised paper received, May 2009)*

---

**ABSTRACT** The processes of cross-cultural interaction between professional planners, and the shared learning experiences resulting from this, are shaped not only by the history of planning practice, but also by a set of perceived norms regarding the role, power and capacity of planners. Recently in Sri Lanka, the role of Australian planning practitioners in directly assisting in post-tsunami projects, as well as in sharing knowledge and developing local planning capacity, has been utilised and extended to on-ground projects and national, provincial and local plan preparation. This paper utilises the learning experience of that programmes, the observations of a planning academic at a Sri Lankan University and the results of two of the authors working with a team of planners in the formative stages of the development of a strategic planning exercise for a town in south east Sri Lanka. It explores the contribution of Australian planners, the two-way flow of professional learning and knowledge, the opportunities provided by such situations and the barriers to assuming transferable models of project-based learning. It provides important observations on challenges to cross-cultural teaching in an Australian university setting and the emerging needs for planning curriculum in Australia to embrace the reality that increasing numbers of students will work in international planning and development settings.

**Keywords:** cross- cultural planning, internationalised planning, participatory planning, models of planning

---

### **Introduction**

Since early 2005 the Planning Institute of Australia (PIA), the Institute of Town Planners of Sri Lanka (ITPSL) and the Ministry of Urban Development in Sri Lanka have been in partnership to deliver post tsunami assistance to affected communities. The partnership was initiated as a result of a request from a senior Minister in the Sri Lankan government to PIA to assist after the devastating event on 26 December 2004 that saw over 30,000 Sri Lankans lose

their lives and thousands more have their homes destroyed. The request stated in part that the government was "particularly appreciative of the initiative of your Institute ... [which]... has enabled your Institute and Australian planners to gain a much greater appreciation of the particular needs for planning assistance in Sri Lanka so as to assist in the rebuilding of affected areas in our country. Joint initiatives between Sri Lankan and Australian planners will also assist in building the capacity of our

country's planners and the communities."<sup>1</sup>

After a substantial effort financial support of over \$1million was obtained from AusAID and Red Cross for a structured five year program of assistance to be conducted by PIA. The significance of this funding initiative should not be overlooked because organisation had never funded a program of the type that PIA had put forward. The program involved four initiatives:

1. Support at the national level to assist the National Physical Planning Department (NPPD)
2. Support to the Urban Development Authority (UDA) with local level planning
3. Capacity building with education and training programs
4. Support for base mapping

The program submission identified that there are a number of key planning-related tsunami reconstruction problems that the proposed project seeks to address [including]

- The need to build local capacity and provide practical education, training and assistance to help rebuild Tsunami affected communities and foster sustainable governance systems, economic and community development
- The need to review national and regional spatial and strategic plans to support more robust settlement patterns, infrastructure investment decisions and economic development
- The need for revised local town plans and governance systems for settlements directly affected by the Tsunami to create a sustainable future for these communities."

In order to conduct the program PIA has sourced volunteer qualified Australian to work 'on the ground' with Sri Lankan planners on national and provincial plans, local structure plans, urban design frameworks planners, economic development and governance initiatives. The first group of planners from Australia arrived in Sri Lanka about two years ago. To date over 25 planners have worked in Sri Lanka on the program. While the time from the initial agreement to act and the arrival of the first planners seemed an extraordinarily long period of frustrating delays, in reality the long lead time and the meticulous planning and preparation has served the program extremely well (Budge 2007a).

Specifically the PIA, ITPSL and UDA managed planners have involved in:

- preparing urban design guidelines in character precincts, which include the beach front, housing and historical areas in a series of towns along the southern coast of Sri Lanka
- reviewing and developing the broader structure planning for the National Physical Plan and the provincial and town plans that sit within it
- linking major transport infrastructure proposals to settlement patterns and trying to introduce staging related to the timing of the infrastructure
- integrating the development and redevelopment of Tsunami affected south east coastal towns in particular Hambantota given its designation as a major growth centre and site of a new international port that is under construction
- workshops and providing training programs on various issues with local and Colombo-based teams of planners

- working with planners at the local level to share skills and explore different ways to approach planning issues.

### **Adapting Models to deliver Planning Programms in Developing Countries**

Planning programs at Australian universities have not traditionally been geared to provide skills and knowledge in relation to disaster responses or to work at grass root levels in developing countries. The learning experiences of students have understandably been built around models of planning much more likely to be found in their own urban and industrialized settings. Perhaps and partly as a consequence, traditional planning model implemented in Western countries and by planners in Asian countries have largely been based on top down approaches to education, assistance and projects. The localized impacts of the tsunami on communities in coastal Sri Lanka together with the emphasis in the PIA programme on local capacity building have prompted a rethinking of that model in this instance, albeit that it has been crafted as an on ground response to local needs (Budge 2007b). This model, for western planners to work with local planners at the grassroots level, and largely self determine the program of assistance based on local assessments, has also challenged the national planning agencies in Sri Lanka, the traditional approach of the local planning Institute and relevant government agencies and authorities.

The partnership between the two national planning institutes has a high level structure and support but is geared to provide a series of locally based projects that are designed to provide on-ground assistance with local capacity building among local planners in the field. The program particularly targets four of the United Nations supported

Millennium Development goals. It specifically focuses on assisting with the planning and development of key local infrastructure, building local economic development, employment opportunities, environmental sustainability and training to support local capacity building.

There is a demonstrated need and challenge for university planning programs to relate to and contribute to continuing professional exchange with the capacity to provide for shared project-focused practice. This can provide a model for the transfer of planning ideas at an institutional and personal level across cultures. In an era of potentially recurring natural disasters in rural areas and communities associated with climate change, of greater contact between Australia and developing countries particularly in Asia and of more planners seeking work or being assigned to work in such settings, the current curriculum range of planning programs perhaps needs to be broadened to embrace these concepts.

### **Context for internationalised planning**

The process of inter-cultural practice and exchange in planning, like other areas of policy transference, raises significant challenges for practitioners. In the case of working within rural areas of a developing country and a world environment of rapid change, these challenges include not only the need to reflect on local needs and differences, but also differences in resources, institutional, organisational and policy capacity.

The considerable literature on planning practice that identifies and promotes the recognition of cultural diversity is often framed from within a multi-cultural first world urban setting. Planning practice that is reflective of cultural needs is frequently set within an urban based environment and the need for developing 'cultural competence', working with local policy-makers and

practitioners as a process of empowerment (i.e. Reeves 2005), or as a means for planners to 'un-learn' assumed norms (i.e. Sandercock 1997). Centrally, these ideas relate to the need for planners to develop awareness in their practice of the different expectations and needs within a multi-cultural society. Moreover this literature emphasises the way in which planning practice cannot be assumed to be a normative process of revealed truths, but rather a process responsive to community expectations. Significantly most of the PIA programmes have been conducted in small towns and communities in largely rural settings, remote both physically and in terms of control from a centralized bureaucracy. Conversely, the institutional arrangements for this involvement have been at the national level and within a framework of operations based on urban control models. At both levels the Australian planners were confronted with the circumstances that their own education, training and workplace experience had not equipped them well to understand different cultural and political contexts. Their point of reference was a western traditional model, Eurocentric and with a British settler society attitude to land, resources and governance. Adapting to models of governance where there had been hard won independence off the back of centuries of exploitative colonialism against a proud assertive indigenous heritage was both confronting and instructive. Those who could quickly embrace this new socio-political environment within which to operate generally fared better.

In an international cross-cultural setting, this process of cultural competence at the local level presents additional challenges – particularly where skills transference is sought among professionals. In the case of working in Sri Lanka, a clear

understanding of the scope for planning success is important, but so to is the need to reflect on perceptions of 'development' and more generally 'proper planning outcomes'. Sardar (1999) identifies the *development project* as being a product of Eurocentric ideals, with the West prescribing a future and a pathway to a developed (westernised) state, and assuming supremacy in this action. While such philosophical (or ethical) dilemmas require reflection, at a local level planning practice and action is most typically mediated through a set of strategic objectives, generalised observance of regulations and legislation. These circumscribe action, but with the emphasis on seeking and delivering locally relevant 'development' outcomes.

### Sri Lankan Planning Models

The structure of planning and planning administration in Sri Lanka has a strong tradition of utilising the British model of the preparation of town plans and their implementation through regulation. The original post-World War II legislation of 1946 (Town and Country Planning Ordinance) was modelled on earlier UK legislation and still forms the backbone of plan approval at a central level. The overall bureaucracy in the country is top-heavy, hierarchical and risk adverse, and in many respects land use planning sits within such a structure and mode of operation. As such, land use planning frequently struggles for recognition and relevance in a setting where government is much more directive than based on an inclusive and collaborative style of decision making and implementation. In 1997 a Presidential Task Force undertook a study on processes of urban development in Sri Lanka and recommended the need for the formulation of a National Physical Planning Policy and a National Physical Plan for Sri Lanka. The amendments to the 1946 Ordinance established the

National Physical Planning Council (NPPC) that established the political will for the preparation of a National Physical Planning Policy and Plan for approval by the President.

This national physical plan provides an umbrella plan for nine provincial plans and then local district plans. These are essentially strategic plans addressing land use, economic development, infrastructure provision and development goals (Gunaratna 2001, Wijewardena 2001). In theory, this structure and capacity provided a style and substance and importantly a role for planning that some have argued has been lacking for years in Australia and in other western settings. The difficulty in Sri Lanka was that such an approach challenged traditional bureaucracies and power settings.

While the new National Physical Planning Department was charged with the production and carriage of such plans and the new National Physical Planning Council chaired by the President was created to approve such plans, initially at least, there was no traction across government to adopt and implement such a model. The allocation of some resources as part of the PIA program to work with a high level team of planners at the national level has been of considerable importance in raising the status of planning and ultimately seeing key documents signed off by the President. This process involved redesigning the initial set of descriptive heavy documents into a set of key land use action initiatives framed partly as an economic development strategy. While this high level action was taking place, at the local level the day-to-day planning processes were proceeding within settings of much more immediate needs around the functioning of communities and the meeting of daily needs. The experience of the PIA volunteer planners consistently reflected this dilemma, present in many developing countries,

that is the lack of consistent bureaucratic direction while facing on-ground needs that systems are not designed to address.

The internationalisation of planning practice, particularly in post-colonial settings, has occurred with varied success. Ward (2000) identifies processes ranging from *borrowing* to *imposition* of approaches to planning with varying degrees of local initiative and control, at least initially. In the case of Sri Lanka, it is apparent that planning action has been largely drawn from a British planning tradition, particularly the strong master-planning traditions of the 1960s (Van Horen, et.al 2004), as well as from the (re)distributive functions of the highly centralised (and often centrally planned) state that emerged after independence.

The often used western society approach to planning as a governance and managerial exercise in an industrial setting is still dominant in Sri Lanka. However it is apparent that in some respects this is being set aside and blended with emerging theories of adaptation and community and participative approaches which are now widely embraced in many western settings. Consultative and participatory processes and steps are sometimes implicit in the preparation of local plans in accordance with planning legislation such as the *Urban Development Authority Act 1978*. However, often the plans lack an integrated strategic planning approach and have therefore generally resulted in a separation of plan making and plan implementation. Participatory development planning at the local (town or city) or regional level planning is not something well tested in Sri Lanka. There have been isolated efforts by various agencies and a number of NGOs to prepare sector-wise participatory development plans for villages.

The development and implementation of an alternative

planning model has been prompted by the demands of tsunami reconstruction. Its intellectual roots are based on the theories and practice of community planning and economic development as a local level initiative. This learning process has been largely experiential as much as it has followed a textbook approach. The initial successes of this method of delivery raises the prospects and possibilities, starting with partnerships between planning institutions. Perhaps there are numerous ways forward in achieving an agenda that as planners we all share.

### **The Embilipitiya Project**

In order to explore some of these ideas and processes, the two Australian authors of this paper had the opportunity in July 2008 to be part of a team of planners to participate in an exercise in what would be known in Australian terms as a structure plan for the town of Embilipitiya. Embilipitiya is located approximately 65km south of Ratnapura and 40km north of Hambantota on the main road corridor from Colombo to the south-east coastal region – about 150km from Colombo. The town has a population of over 20,000 and is identified in the National Physical Plan (NPP) as a major growth centre, given its location and agricultural production base and as a major transport hub on the proposed Asian Highway and new railway line as set out at the national level. The region has experienced growth since the colonial period due to the general processes of urbanisation, major irrigation development – a feature throughout much of rural Sri Lanka (Perera 1998) as well as a deliberate policy to encourage relocation of communities from the fragile (landslide affected) mountain regions nearby. More recently, the NPP has identified the growth potential of the locality linked to the projections for growth in

Hambantota (projected regional population growth to 1 million) and as a consequence of a range of regional development actions (Anputhas 2005) including a large international port facility (currently under construction).

Current planning issues in Embilipitiya and its region are linked to general processes of growth, the expansion of agricultural production and processing, increased traffic movements, the potential for a service centre role linked to the redevelopment of the Hambantota port area, and the identification of the town as a growth node within the NPP. Like many other small Sri Lankan towns, the urban core of the town with its part planned areas and part organic growth is surrounded by small rural holdings, most of which were established under various land reform programs since independence. This gives the area a distinct rural feel and also underlines the need to consider the community and personal value of the land resource.

The outcomes sought for planning intervention within this project were assessed as broad – they range from highly local processes of design and the management of movement to much broader regional development objectives related to agriculture and tourism. Additionally, the process is largely top-down in its execution. As is typical, local guidance is only sought as a filter for ideas generated by planning professionals based in Colombo. On the one hand we found the processes informative, there were stated national objectives with priorities for new infrastructure such as a major railway station on a new national railway line to be constructed so as to run past the town. On the other hand there was no timeline for implementation of what would be such a vital element in any structure plan let alone a settled route that would be 'given' by another government agency. Nationally set priorities dictated that

productive agricultural land designated on maps was not available for urban expansion and yet sites within the core of the town seemed capable of supporting any proposal and had to meet no apparent criteria. Local aspirations through the District Council seemed to embrace a wide range of economic development initiatives but with no evident mechanism or financial arrangements that could possibly deliver on them.

Some mapped information was readily available, other information seemed to be held by a range of organisations and access to it was often problematical. In almost all aspects no relevant information was held locally nor was any expected to be. It was clear that plan preparation was essentially based on a cursory field trip and observation and some formalised meetings with vague agendas that were largely procedural rather than directed at obtaining meaningful information that would inform the plan. The plan would essentially be prepared remotely and presented to the local Council leaders in a perpetuation of a top-down model of planning. This model reflected the colonial past and the assumptions of that model by the post colonial elite who had assumed control of the planning system (Perera 2002). Perera notes that such models appear to be widespread in jurisdictions where a colonial model was imposed on local aspirations.

In discussion with the team that was working from Colombo, it became clear that the plan would not be based on seeking to progressively implement proposals based on accommodating possible contingencies and circumstances that might arise. Rather, it was a master plan that would be imposed regardless of whether the intelligence on the ground indicated that the plan had little likelihood of being implemented. This type of tension has been the subject of considerable recent

discussion by Perera (1998 and 2008). The concept that the process was in many respects as important as the plan itself was not part of the exercise.

All these elements stood in rather stark contrast to what teams of volunteer PIA planners had experienced and had been implementing in a number of locations within which they have been working. Operating with local offices and planners of the Urban Development Authority based in these towns the planning processes appeared to have broken away from the centrally directed model that was taking place in Emblipitiya. The fact that there was no UDA office in Emblipitiya resulted in a completely different approach. Because the government structures provided no apparent base for input to the planning process none was sought or demanded. The affect of the tsunami on coastal towns had seen the staff complement in many UDA offices increase dramatically and had assumed their own momentum. The concept of entirely different systems of control and management in areas relatively proximate to each other challenges models of planning administration and control. This then had been overlaid with different approaches to consultation and local delivery and determinism.

### **Learnings and cultural exchange**

Australian planners, particularly young planners, are increasingly being attracted to work in overseas settings. While that may mean for many a stint in south east England it is for an increasing number meaning time in developing countries particularly Asia. Planners are volunteering for such programs in large numbers. Of the 75 planners on the PIA books that have indicated a willingness to work in Sri Lanka as part of the volunteer program the majority are less than 30 years of age. Large Australian consulting firms are working across Asia

and planners are increasingly part of multi-discipline teams that are working on one-off projects or are based in Asia. How well equipped are these planners for what they will find in a developing country setting?

The realities, difficulties and excitement of operating in such environments are best told in the words of some of the participants of the PIA program in Sri Lanka. Mary Hoffman, a planner with the City of Melbourne, has written:

*"Imagine yourself in a country where language, religion, custom and culture are foreign. Imagine negotiating your way through the mixed ethnic landscape with limited verbal communication, relying heavily on unfamiliar visual and other sensory cues to guide you in your understanding and on decisions regarding even the simplest matters. Do you cling to the familiar? Are you drawn to the enduring British legacy of the Victorian-era railway and the avenues of the garden city movement – in a mind-mapping of the colonial imprint? Add to this Sri Lanka's inherited British legal system, cricket, and a post-colonial bureaucracy, (which is frightening in its complexity and seemingly operating in a 1950s time-war), and you may have nearly reached the limits of your known world. In this context, it makes sense that planning is designed to direct and facilitate foreign aid and investment, and it makes sense that 'big brother' aspirational, yet altruistic, planning is alive and well. It makes sense for Australian planners to work alongside and not independently of Sri Lankan planners, and it makes sense to take the time to understand what already works and what doesn't, rather than impose an ill-fitting Australian standard."*

Hoffman (2006)

Sam Kernaghan, an environmental planner with Parsons Brinkerhoff in Sydney spent most of his time in working with the National Physical Planning Department developing the first

National Spatial Plan for Sri Lanka, and reflected on the comparative lack of national-scale planning in Australia. He observed that...

*"Preparing a national plan is a rare opportunity, certainly from an Australian perspective anyway, and one that we were very excited to be involved in. The irony that the Australian Federal Government was funding planning in Sri Lanka through AusAID was not lost on us."*

Kernaghan (2006)

In discussions with Australian planners in Sri Lanka and those who have returned it is evident that they assess that the Australian planners are strongly of the view that their skills have been enhanced and their capacity to undertake a range of programmes is considerably extended. There has been capacity building among these young Australian planners as a consequence of the situation and the professional exchange with Sri Lankan planners. Similarly local planning personnel in the Urban Development Authority talk enthusiastically about their experience of working with the Australian planners and of skills developed and their overall learning from the exercise. The exposure by both groups to different planning cultures and techniques proved mutually beneficial. In particular the emphasis by the Australian planners on participative approaches with the community has challenged traditional views of planning processes. In turn the Australian emphasis on achieving on-ground implementation and construction with the translation of vision and plan to specific coordinated infrastructure outcomes has been important in that approach. One difficulty to be overcome in each instance is that, despite theoretical processes being universal, both Australian and Sri Lankan planners identified how terminology to describe different sorts of plans have become localised and that there exists an almost national jargon of plan descriptors. This



also flows through to concepts around levels of achievement in advocacy, regulation and delivery.

### **Challenges and lessons from cross-cultural project-based teaching and learning, and professional development**

So, what have been the lessons from this international collaborative program as it moves into the third of a five year program? Substantial planning exercises have been completed, adopted and implementation is commencing in a number of places. The overall outcomes and achievements have in one sense been beyond the initial expectations although in others the draconian bureaucratic structures and the 'silo' like operation of many arms of the government can prove to be immensely frustrating. In reality, it is the grinding poverty and lack of money to implement good ideas and plans that is most discouraging.

Substantial gains have been made in working relationships across cultures and in new methods of working. For instance the PIA planning contingent has been responsible for initiating and conducting highly successful; extensive community consultation exercises where none had been used before nor provided for within existing mandated processes. It is important to remember though that in many respects much of the program is in uncharted water. While that has been disconcerting for some members of the teams that is not without precedent in planning practice and previous experience in workplaces have served many members of the teams well. It's a style of operation and a capacity that should receive more attention in our planning education. One suspects that it is a skill and acquired learning that some other professions struggle with. On reflection the lessons learnt have been many but the key outcomes can be summarised as:

1. A successful program is built on strong relationships and partnerships at an individual, organisational and institutional basis. Systematically building those relationships is critical because without the partnerships they can easily fall apart at the first hurdle.
2. Establishing a framework that is clear yet reflexive to changing circumstances is critical to long term success. The program has to be able to adapt and take advantage of opportunities that come along but also tread water when circumstances dictate.
3. Selecting the right people is critical to the success of the program. The ability to work productively in a team over long periods when the team not only is thrust together in a work situation but finds itself at close quarters outside of work hours. Leadership and direction are critical elements.
4. Building the credibility of the program at the national and local levels simultaneously turned out to be highly beneficial. It gave the program support at both levels, allowed for an interchange at different levels and ensures that the work at different levels informed each other. As the credibility of the program gained momentum so did the acceptance of ideas and initiatives put forward. For some participants particularly those with experience, it appears that it may have been challenging to be required to re-learn planning in a new institutional and cultural environment.
5. Skills learnt in terms of planning were in once sense new but in reality and on reflection were adaptations of existing skills in new social, cultural and political situations.

6. Working in real teams with local Sri Lankan planners has turned out to be a great success. The PIA planners became part of a Sri Lankan team on projects headed by a Sri Lankan planner. This immediately cut out what appears to have been a shortfall of many projects and programs where the team from the developed country forms their own unit with their own agenda.
7. Seeing the whole exercise as a shared capacity building, skills enhancement and learning program for Australian and Sri Lankan planners considerably strengthened the whole program and its achievements.

Discussions by the authors with returning Australian planners have consistently identified the immense impact that the experience of working on the program in Sri Lanka has had on the participants. There have been numerous comments along the lines that more was learnt in their time in Sri Lanka about planning and the practice of planning than in any exercise or project that they had been involved in Australia. Typical comments revolved around concepts such as 'placing their lives and planning in a different and better context and frame of reference', 'gaining greater levels of understanding of the value sets of the community' and 'appreciating the value of different systems and processes and the value of the systems that they had frequently criticised in Australia.'

## Conclusions

The paper identifies challenges for Australian planning education. Are the skills, attributes and knowledge that have been discussed in this paper taught and learned in our Australian planning programs, or can they be acquired just by working in the planning sector and doing

business in a commercial world? They would appear to be skills that serve planners well no matter what the setting. Is it relevant that each of us examine our programs to determine whether they are explicitly provided for in the tasks that students must undertake or whether they are unstructured outcomes as a result of what we do in planning courses? These skills we suspect are frequently acquired as part of participating in a university planning program but often they are not deliberately structured as explicit outcomes. Similarly even though opportunities for Sri Lankan graduates to work overseas are limited, there is an increasing number of students from developing countries who are finding employment overseas. A similar question about the nature of planning education can also be asked about Sri Lankan programs; how well equipped are graduates to compete in overseas job markets and apply skills learned in different settings. Experience with the overall program which has now facilitated a number of Sri Lankan planning practitioners to receive AusAid fellowships that provide for ten weeks intensive immersion into the workplaces of Australian planners has proven beneficial in developing skill sets that can be utilised in Sri Lanka. A critical outcome of the whole program must be an ongoing contribution to ensuring that the education of Sri Lankan planning students will equip them to stay and work in Sri Lanka and make a substantial contribution to the creation of healthy communities and cities.

The whole experience of PIAs participation in the post-tsunami recovery program described in this paper has clearly been a great opportunity to provide a significant and important contribution to planning in Sri Lanka. Australian planners have felt that they had made some very important contributions to some specific projects, notably high level strategic planning

advice to the NPPD, UDA and on-ground project work in towns like Hambantota and Tangalle and more recently in Hikkaduwa. Strong working relationships have been developed with planners and staff in the NPPD and in the UDA and with the planning profession generally in Sri Lanka.

The often used western society approach to planning as a governance and managerial exercise in a post-industrial setting has been set aside and comprehensively blended with emerging theories of adaptation and community and participative approaches which are now widely embraced in many western settings. The development and implementation of this alternative planning model has been prompted by the specific demands of tsunami

reconstruction in Sri Lanka. Its intellectual roots are based in the blending of the theories and practice of community and economic development, and community capacity building within a strategic planning framework as a local level initiative with an adaptation of the traditional western approach to planning as a post-industrial concept. The initial successes of its delivery raise the prospects and possibilities of a new approach that has potentially wider application and capacity to be extended to other regions and jurisdictions. Starting with partnerships between institutions represented at this gathering, there are numerous ways forward in achieving an agenda that as planners we all share.

## Note

1. Letter from honourable minister of Urban Development and Water Supply to PIA President April 2005.

## References

- Anputhas, M. et al 2005, *Bringing Hambantota Back to Normal: A Post-Tsunami Livelihoods Needs Assessment of Hambantota District in Southern Sri Lanka*, International Water Management Institute.
- Budge, T 2007a, 'New Approaches to Capacity Building Models for Asian Planners: The Tsunami Reconstruction Partnership between the Institute of Town Planners Sri Lanka and the Planning Institute of Australia', paper presented at the *Asian Planning Schools Association Congress* Colombo Sri Lanka 26-27 August 2007.
- Budge, T 2007b, *Report to PIA on Implementation of an Education and Training Program as part of the PIA Tsunami project* unpublished.
- Dolowitz, D. & Marsh, D 1996, 'Who Learns What from Whom?: a Review of the Policy Transfer Literature' *Political Studies*, 44 pp. 343-357.
- Hoffman, M 2006, Postcard from Sri Lanka, Planning Institute of Australia.
- Kernaghan, S 2006, Postcard from Sri Lanka Planning Institute of Australia.
- Gunaratna, L 2001, *Impact of Past and Present Regional Development on the Proposed Future Physical Development of Sri Lanka, Background Information for Preparation of National Physical Planning*, Urban Development Authority.
- National Physical Planning Department 2007a, *Guide to Urban, Physical Infrastructure Development and Environmental Conservation Sri Lanka in 2030*, Ministry of Urban Development and Sacred Area Development.
- National Physical Planning Department 2007b, *Sabaragamuwa Region Physical Plan 2007 – 2030*

- 
- Ministry of Urban Development and Sacred Area Development.
- Perera, N 1998, Territorial Spaces and National Identities: Representations in Sri Lanka *South Asia* XX pp. 23-50.
- Perera, N 2002, Indigenising the Colonial City: Late 19<sup>th</sup> century Colombo and its Landscape, *Urban Studies* Vol 39, No 9, pp.1703-1721.
- Perera, N 2008, The planners' city: the construction of a town planning perception of Colombo *Environment and Planning A*, Vol 40, pp. 57-73.
- Reeves, D 2005, *Planning for Diversity: Policy and Planning in a World of Difference*, Routledge, London.
- Sardar, Z 1999, 'Development and the Locations of Eurocentrism' in Munck & O'Hearn (eds) *Critical Development Theory: contributions to a new paradigm*, Zed Books, London.
- Sandercock, L 1998, *Towards Cosmopolis - Planning for Multicultural Cities*, Wiley, Chichester.
- Van Horen, B. Leaf & Pinnawala 2004, 'Localizing a Global Discipline: Designing New Planning Programs in Sri Lanka', *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 23 pp. 255-268.
- Ward, S 2000, 'Re-examining the International Diffusion of Planning' in Freestone (ed) *Urban Planning in a Changing World*, Spon, London.
- Wijewardena, H 2001, Economic Policies Affecting Development, *Background Information for Preparation of National Physical Planning*, Urban Development Authority.