

¹ SLAGW Tsunami Report

As of July 2007

1. Background

1.1 A committee consisting of Messrs Dakshi De Silva, Kenneth Abeywickrama and Suraj Navaratne was appointed at the meeting of the Board of the Sri Lanka Association of Washington DC (SLAWDC) and its tax exempt subsidiary, the Sri Lanka Association of Greater Washington (SLAGW) (*hereafter, jointly referred to as the Association*) held on April 28, 2006, to examine the management of the Sri Lanka Tsunami Relief Project (SLTRP) and provide a report for the Association. The purposes of this report were to evaluate whether (1) the objectives of the project were achieved (2) draw lessons from the management of the project for future large-scale fund-raising activities of SLAGW and (3) to abide by the commitment made by the President to the membership at the 2006 AGM to provide a comprehensive report regarding the disbursements of the Tsunami funds.

1.2 The South Asian Tsunami of December 2004 was one of the biggest human tragedies in recent memory and Sri Lanka was one of the principal victims. The details of human suffering portrayed in the international media aroused a very generous response from the American public, including people of all classes and ages. Some private tsunami relief charities were registered within a day and eventually raised several million dollars². SLAGW, which was already registered as a tax-exempt charitable organization in the US and in Sri Lanka, began the SLTRP within days after the tragedy struck on December 26, 2004. It was the biggest project undertaken to date by SLAGW and its work was given excellent publicity in Sri Lanka and the US. The Association's website was at its best, carrying very professional presentations and visuals of the project work and key project directors. High profile meetings with political

¹² eg. Asia Relief

leaders in Sri Lanka added to the stature of the project. The total donations received amounted to almost Nine Hundred thousand (\$900,000), and the project disbursements were finally completed only by the end of 2006.

1.3 The Annual General Meetings (AGM) of SLAWDC and its subsidiary, SLAGW, held on **March 26, 2005** and **March 25, 2006**, and the Special General Meeting (SGM) of **November 05, 2005**, produced tensions that were unprecedented in the 30 year history of the Association. Several members criticized the management of the project and the level of transparency in relation to information made available to the membership at large, since full and clear accounts of the various projects were not made available to the general membership at the 2005 AGM. Due to the lack of transparency regarding the disbursement of the Tsunami funds, and the incomplete financial statement for that period, the members adopted the annual report on condition that an audited report was produced within 90 days and presented to the membership at a SGM to be held before the end of June 2005. However, the resolution requesting a special general meeting to examine properly audited accounts within three months was not complied with until November 05, 2005.

1.4 SLAGW was never set up or intended for the management of such a large project. Nevertheless the President Mr. Nihal Gunawardene took upon himself without the full consensus of the Board (see attached "Motion to dissolve entire Board") to raise funds and build partnerships with various organizations, including registering SLAGW as a Private Voluntary Organization (PVO) with USAID within two months of the tsunami.

1.5 Major natural disasters are often a magnet for amateur relief workers as well as professional confidence tricksters and Sri Lanka was no exception. The Chief Operating Officer of the Sri Lanka Reconstruction and Development Agency was quoted saying

that the performance of most non-governmental agencies (NGOs) that took over tsunami relief work was unsatisfactory with a few exceptions³.

The success of a project is not measured by the volume of funds raised and disbursed but the achievement, within these limits, of specifically defined objectives. To evaluate the project, the committee sought to identify the specific objectives, the methodologies employed, whether the objectives were achieved and the lessons to be learnt from this experience.

2. Objectives & Management of Tsunami Relief Project

2.1 Two major project management shortcomings were apparent from the start.

1. A project of such a size requires a documented project proposal that should have (a) clearly defined time-bound objectives, (b) established modes of operation, (c) allocated responsibilities to individuals, (d) agreed benchmarks of performance and (e) an agreed process of evaluation and review at the end of the fixed time periods, together with properly audited accounts. These proposals should have been presented to and approved by the majority of the Board prior to implementation and subsequently disclosed to the general membership. None of these things were done.
2. It is an unwritten rule, and in most other cases a written rule, that voluntary associations with annually elected office-bearers do not undertake long-term projects without a cut-off date. Even Rotary International, the biggest voluntary service organization in the world with over 35 million members, has this as a fixed rule. Major projects that continue over many years provide the justification for the office-bearers to keep themselves in office or hinder the new office-bearers who come with new project ideas.

³ Colombo Page, 22 December 2006.

2.2 In most cases, fund raising and disbursements were completed without proper documented proposals, and lacked approvals from the Board of Directors. Approvals were on an ad hoc basis resulting in no clear set of rules or policy being adopted for fund disbursements,

According to the minutes of the Board Meeting of January 30, 2005, the President when questioned on disbursements stated that SLAGW recognized two special types of funding, apart from a general fund. There would be “first tier” partners in Sri Lanka with whom it would have a continuing relationship. Funds earmarked for their programs would be in “non-discretionary accounts⁴ for disbursement at the direction of the President”. The “first tier” partners were stated as follows:

- (1) Adopt Sri Lanka;
- (2) Read-Write;
- (3) Sri Lanka Helpage;
- (4) Sarvodaya.

The “second tier” partners were:

- (1) International Center for Ethnic Studies of Kandy;
- (2) USLSNY;
- (3) Friends of Lanka Tsunami Relief;
- (4) Schools for Sri Lanka.

First Tier partners had their own representatives in the US through whom some of the funds were raised. Second Tier partners were essentially organizations, that some SLAWDC members personally wanted to support, and raised funds on behalf of them... These proposals were approved by the Board in January 2005.

2.3 There is no documented project proposal laying out the objectives, the management and administration, the accounting procedures, and the manner of

⁴ “Non-discretionary Accounts” referred to contributions made by donors to charities of their nomination.

evaluating projects. It must be stated that such a large project which involved the disbursement of almost one million dollars merited a more professional management approach.

2.4 The guidelines published in the minutes of the Board meeting were found to be inaccurate. The guidelines presented by the President in March 2005 were challenged by the Board members and an amended set of guidelines were proposed and approved by a vote. However, the amended version was kept out of the recorded minutes of that meeting (see annex for the guidelines published in the minutes and the guidelines approved by the Board).

2.5 In addition to the President's micro management of the "non-discretionary" accounts, the disbursement of the General Fund was also intended to be micro-managed by him,. The minutes of the Board meeting of March 06, 2005, records this statement by the president, unusual for a volunteer association with elected members. *"The President responded (to a query raised by the President-Elect) that he felt a great sense of responsibility to many donors and concerned members who urged him to carry on the work he started on tsunami relief and rehabilitation fearing a veritable breakdown if the massive effort was poorly managed or opportunities squandered by his departure.*

2.6 By taking on all these responsibilities on behalf of the Association, which is confirmed by the hundreds of documents that were generated from his business office every month, the President of the Association was often working full time on SLAGW projects, a resource unavailable to most others and labor which no other future office-bearer would be willing to undertake. At the same time, this unilateralist approach to management caused disaffection, first, among many of the Board of Directors and, later, among most of the general membership.

3. Collection of project funds

3.1 The collection of project funds involved literally thousands of Sri Lankan Americans and American well-wishers of Sri Lanka. The spontaneous generosity of mainstream Americans was overwhelming. The response to fund-raising events by Sri Lankan-Americans involving school children, customers at stores, participants at special events, was beyond all expectations. The tragedy of the Asian tsunami had received wide publicity in the US media and there was much sympathy for the victims. SLAGW members were able to raise substantial collections at their workplaces for tsunami relief for Sri Lanka.

3.2 The outstanding achievement of the Board, and in particular the President, was reflected in the initial collection of funds. SLAGW initiated a number of successful and innovative schemes for raising funds which included the December 31, 2004 New Year's Eve Dance turned fund raiser at the Bethesda Hyatt, concerts, restaurant collections, meetings at homes, church services, personal visits to corporations, letter writing, etc., all of which need to be commended. The business contacts of the President played a major part in raising funds from the corporate sector and must be noted with appreciation. It was stated by the President that a former Sri Lanka Ambassador was also associated with him in some of this corporate fund-raising for the Association.

3.3 On-line donations presented some concerns. The Board meeting of January 30, 2005, noted that on-line donations were arriving at the rate of about \$15,000 daily and Laktel who were assisting SLAGW during the initial phase of online donations were finding it difficult to cope with the volume. To handle these on-line donations, special arrangements were made by the President to "receive funds directly (to SLAGW) and not through a third party (such as Laktel). There was no proper documentation to identify these direct online donations. Arrangements had also been made without Board awareness, to move these accumulated funds to CDs (\$150,000) and Money Market Funds (\$70,000) at the Chevy Chase Bank until they were disbursed.

3.4 The decision to allow SLAGW to act as a conduit for funds raised in the UK on behalf of an organization in Jaffna, Sri Lanka, is a troubling one as it skirts on the legitimacy of using an Association in the US with non-profit status for a project which it could not reach or evaluate. It is our understanding that one Ms. Sushila Raja organized the transfer of £4,000 from Ms. Maduri Rajkumar, Surrey Helping Hands, 14 Kneller Road, New Malden, Surrey KT3 5NE, UK, to SLAGW. The Association in turn remitted some of the monies in US dollars to the Centre for Child Development (a registered NGO in Sri Lanka, as stated by the sponsors), School Front Lane, Jaffna. The records states that Sarvodaya also received Rs.841,500 on behalf of the Center for Women & Development and Rs.247,500 on behalf of Center for Child Development. There is no record of an association between Sarvodaya and these two organizations on their website. The Sarvodaya website lists support for 35 camps in Jaffna run by the TRO, an organization now banned in Sri Lanka and some other countries. These monies were then sent to the Synergy Community Network, 35 Kachcheri East Lane, Jaffna, Sri Lanka, the implementing agency for the project (see Section 5.3).

4. Disbursement of funds to charities

4.1 Donations policy

The choice facing the Association in relation to SLTRP was to be pro-active in collecting funds and then transferring these to (a) a single or a few well accepted charities or service organizations in Sri Lanka or (b) deciding to be involved in identifying a number of charities and supporting these. At the AGM of March 26, 2005, Mrs. Sheila Codippily pointed out that donations to SLAGW for the specific purpose of helping the Tsunami victims should have been disbursed immediately for emergency relief through the NGO's in Sri Lanka – such as the Rotary, Lions and Sarvodaya. It was also pointed out that the president had independently applied to USAID for Private Voluntary Organization (PVO) Status for SLAGW with the potential to raise the Association to the level of an Aid Agency. The President rejected this idea and the minutes record that *“He (the President) also took issue with those who wanted SLAGW to write big checks*

to established foreign NGOs by citing our knowledge of what works well in Sri Lanka for community empowerment and development in this crisis without resort to foreign NGOs who will require a massive learning curve to be effective on the ground.” As a compromise, Mr. Terry Kuruppu suggested the creation of an advisory committee that could work with the President and the Board in looking for tsunami relief projects. However, the President did not appoint a Board of Advisors.

4.2 The approval and accounting procedure for donations

Table 1 (as shown below) gives a list of the disbursements approved by the Charitable Committee and later by the Board of Directors. Table 2 (as shown below) gives the disbursement of SLTRP funds that could be identified from the Accounts files available. Since donations were being made to such a large number of organizations and persons in Sri Lanka, many members of the Board of Directors were unaware on how donations were being disbursed. Most of the disbursements were made by a core group consisting of the President, Secretary and SLAGW Treasurer, who were the pro-active participants in the projects. The Committee for Charitable Giving met twice but did not make any significant contribution towards evaluating projects, a task that could not be undertaken due to lack of time for preparation since proposals were not given to members until the day of the meeting.

4.3 No separate SLTRP accounts for review

The SLAGW Treasurer’s Report for the period February 01, 2005 to January 31, 2006, prepared for the Executive and Advisory Board Meeting on February 26, 2006, does not have a separate account, even in brief, for the SLTRP. However separate accounts are recorded for the minor projects by the SLAWDC Treasurer for AGM expenses, Sinhala/Tamil New Year Festivities, MP Sajith Premadasa’s reception, Computer Fund,

NY/DC Cricket Match, 2005 Special General Meeting, and Administrative expenses. Since the biggest project has not merited a separate account, it was noted and criticized by some members at the AGM of 2006.

The delays in the submission of properly audited accounts raised queries at the 2005 AGM. The accounts provided at the AGM of 2005 were not properly audited by the Association's Honorary Auditor who stated that he signed these on trust as he was not given time to examine the documents. In any event, the transactions were too numerous for an internal auditor working on a voluntary basis and hence there was a request by members for the services of an external auditor. It was proposed that there should be a Special General Meeting in three months to examine the accounts audited by an external auditor and other issues. The President agreed to do so. However it was not done until November 5, 2005. The SLTRP accounts up to January 2006, audited by an external auditor, were submitted at the AGM of March 25, 2006. These accounts were re-examined by the current Treasurer who is satisfied that these are properly documented. Information is available in the current Annual Report.

5. Evaluation of benefits from donations

In a charitable project, the collection and distribution of funds is not a benefit. The benefits lie in the services provided to the targeted needy persons by the recipients of donor funds. The Evaluation Committee had difficulty obtaining information for this study because complete records of recipients' addresses were sometimes not recorded in the accounts or other documents available. The approved list of donors (Table 1) and the identifiable payments by names (table 2) do not tally. There are 23 organizations for which payments were approved at Board meetings. There are 34 recipients that were identified.

Based on the available information, letters were sent to 11 recipients whose names and addresses were clearly available (see Table 3). The addresses of most of the other recipients are not traceable from the records of the Association.

Replies were received from some of them and their responses are summarized here.

1. **Bikes for the World (Mr. Keith Oberg).** This was a successful and cost effective operation. The organization supplied 959 used bicycles, 200 new bicycles and 185 mountain and BMX bicycles. It received \$1,500 from the Association for storage and loading containers while its sister organization, Brunswick Corporation, gave \$1,000 towards shipping costs. The bicycles were sent to Akurala, Amapara, Jaffna and Matara.
2. **Dutch-Bar, Batticaloa.** Rs.857,280 was sent to an organization named Pasindu Steel in Kurunegala in the name of Mr. K.M. T. De Silva to provide 264 metal cabinets and Rs.190,160 to Singer Company to supply 15 sewing machines for members of the Dutch-Bar, a Burgher Community Association in Batticaloa. However, when the committee contacted the President of Dutch-Bar, Mr. Ivoe Balthazaar, the former President with whom the SLAGW had corresponded earlier, wrote to state that they had not received any of the metal cabinets or the sewing machines promised and that he was still living destitute in a refugee camp. The current President of SLAGW, Mr. Lasantha Dahanaike visited Sri Lanka in November 2006 and tried to contact Mr. K.M.T. De Silva but he was unable to contact him and there were no telephone numbers either for Pasindu Steel or the recipient Mr. De Silva in the Sri Lanka Telephone Directory. When Mr. Balthazaar was contacted via phone by Mr. Dahanaike, he stated that Dutch-Bar had been dissolved and that he was not in contact with any of the previous committee members. The disposition of these items that were paid for remains a mystery.
3. **Synergy Community Network, Jaffna.** This organization stated that they received Rs.247,500 from SLAGW through the Center for Child Development which received the money through Sarvodaya (refer to Section 3.4). Rs.500,000 had been approved at Board meetings but the organization indicate the receipt of Rs.247,500 from SLAGW. According to the audited accounts, which this organization sent us, it received a total of Rs.522,200 from the following: Donations – Rs.100,000, Sri Lanka Association – Rs. 247,500, Surrey Helping

Hands of UK – 174,000, subscriptions – Rs.700. Out of this sum of Rs.522,200, the organization states that it spent Rs.64,900 (12%) on tsunami relief and Rs.56,351 (11%) on a tsunami micro-candle manufacturing project, and the rest on administrative expenses as follows: office administration – Rs.15,299, rent on premises – Rs.9,000, travel – Rs.5,698, vocational training – Rs.57,728, printing & stationery – Rs.18,300, Meetings and refreshments – Rs.8,425, herbal project expenses – Rs.27,906, motor cycle – Rs.48,500, computer & CD burner – Rs.32,000, furniture – Rs.15,500, name and notice board – Rs.8,130, cash in hand – Rs.154,463.

4. **Agromart Foundation.** This organization acknowledged receipt of 21 sewing machines. The Association sent Rs.564,160 to the Singer Company for these machines. The sewing machines were given to 21 women entrepreneurs in Galle. Agromart is an NGO that offers economic development services, especially for women entrepreneurs. It is a well-organized and managed NGO in Sri Lanka.
5. **The Hindu Board of Education, Jaffna.** This organization acknowledged a donation of Rs.950,000 from SLAGW. This sum was approved at a Board meeting and the same amount was remitted. The organization stated that the money was used for the reconstruction of *“the building that was used to accommodate children (that) was completely destroyed during the ethnic war”*.
6. **Helpage Sri Lanka.** This organization was given Rs.1,986,160 from SLAGW. It wrote (letter dated July 17, 2006) to confirm that of the monies received, Rs.1,486,000 was used at their eye-clinic in Dehiwela to carry out cataract operations for indigent elderly persons and Rs.500,000 was given to Shanthi Community Animation Unit of Dehiwela on a request by one Mrs. Aelene De Silva. Current SLAWDC/SLAGW President, Mr. Dahanaike met with Mr. Hitler Wickremasinghe, a Director of Helpage in November 2006 and verified the status of these projects.

7. **Adopt Sri Lanka.** This organization did not respond to our inquiries. Mr. Dahanaike met with Ms. Sharon Ward, the General Manager in November 2006. Ms. Ward told Mr. Dahanaike that some of the SLAGW funds were used to build homes in Mirissa but Adopt Sri Lanka was not willing to assist SLAGW's past president's request to assist Janavijaya Foundation because the homes build by Janavijaya in Habaraduwa were for military personnel. She further stated that the past president had advised them to break off communications with the Association as he could not vouch for the new office-bearers. The \$400,000+ raised by Adopt Sri Lanka in the US and transferred to their account in Sri Lanka by SLAGW had gone into their general fund.

8. **Eco Village-Target Agriculture Weligama**

Mr. Dahanaike met with Thomas Gerbracht, Chairman of Target Agriculture in November 2006 and toured the eco-friendly fruit cultivation fields and the homes that have been constructed for the workers that were affected by the Tsunami.

9. **Nidro Supply Pvt Ltd.**

The organization did not respond to our initial inquiries. SLAGW gave this organization headed by Ms. Dawn Austin Rs.519,460 to rehabilitate the village of Maruthamuni in Kalumunai. The project was to assist the weaver cooperative to resume handloom production. Ms. Austin was not available to meet with President Dahanaike while he was in Sri Lanka. It must be noted that Ms. Austin is a relative of the past president. After many requests, Nidro finally supplied some information regarding this project. An on-site visit to this village probably should be done at a later date by a SLAWDC member.

10. **Friends of Lanka Tsunami Relief:**

Mr. Dahanaike met with Mrs. Sumi De Silva, Project Coordinator in November 2006 and visited the ten homes in Akurala. This project should be completed by April 2007. Currently FOLTR is requesting SLAWDC members to assign ten names for the homes.

11. St. Mary's Convent Matara:

President Dahanaike and President-elect De Silva met with Sister Sandamali Kurera, the Principal of SMC in October 2006. The money provided by SLAGW has been used to tile the new Montessori built on Brown's Hill in Matara. The Montessori will be officially opened on March 26, 2007.

12. Janavijaya Foundati on Habaraduwa

President Dahanaike and President-elect De Silva met with Ven Rajawelle Subhuti Thero, Coordinating Director of the Janavijaya Foundation. According to the renegotiated contract, SLAGW agreed to make the final payment to complete only 12 of 25 homes in Habaraduwa, (as there were no funds available to build all 25 homes as committed to by the past President.) An on-site visit was also done to look at the on-going construction.

13. Sarvodaya

President Dahanaike visited the Early Childhood Development Unit in Moratuwa in November 2006 and met with Malini, the assistant to Bianca Abeygoonawardane who is the coordinator of this project. SLAGW received an update on the progress of the construction of the pre-school in Trincomalee.

It has to be concluded that while some organizations did tsunami relief work, others did what they considered charitable work which has no relation to tsunami relief. While this may seem satisfactory from their point of view, donors in the USA would not take kindly to the idea of their funds being used for purposes other than tsunami relief. It is a betrayal of their trust in the Association.

6. Conclusions relating to the TSP

1. Lack of pre-project planning made transparent and orderly management and evaluation difficult. Ad-hoc decisions on how the project should be managed were made at different committee meetings which, according to the available minutes of meetings, were almost always initiated by the President.
2. The determination of a small group headed by the President to micro-manage the project led to dissension among members and shortcomings that could not be corrected during the life of the project as criticism was rejected.
3. The decision to allocate funds to a large number of organizations in Sri Lanka was a mistake. Many of these organizations were unknown and decisions to fund their projects were done on the basis of recommendations and brief visits to Sri Lanka. In retrospect, we find that some organizations used the funds for tsunami relief while others used it for their own purposes unrelated to tsunami relief. If the donors were to know this, they would be quite unhappy about the results of their goodwill. It would have been better to concentrate on a few well-known Sri Lankan charities which have a track record in the country. It should have been realized that a disaster of this nature always attracts charlatans and fortune hunters anywhere in the world.
4. The decision to route a donation from UK through the Association to another party which was also a conduit for transfers to other organizations was a serious mistake. Sarvodaya Sri Lanka, the first direct recipient of this money, did not reply to our inquiries, despite being the largest service NGO in that country.

5. Separate detailed accounts should have been maintained for this project. This task, together with the auditing of accounts, should have been contracted to an external company as it was too complex for Association members working on a voluntary basis. The evaluators had great difficulty identifying donors and recipients. The lists extracted from available documents are incomplete. However, the final accounts are balanced.
6. The regulations of the Association were not observed either in substance or spirit. When a large number of members called for a Special General Meeting to discuss the management of the SLTRP, this meeting was held only after numerous requests, memos, and petitions from the Board of Directors and the membership.

7. General Conclusions

1. The Association should not undertake on-going long-term projects. Much larger international associations such as Rotary and Lions have specific rules that individual clubs should not undertake on-going projects. The life of a project should not extend beyond the legitimate period of office-bearers of the time. Otherwise a change of management is not possible and, even if new office-bearers come in, they are constrained by past commitments.
2. All special projects involving large sums of money must be based on documented project proposals and project implementation procedures approved by the Board. Since such projects are large and the accounting is time-consuming, approved external accountants should be hired and paid from the project monies. These accounts should be finally audited by an approved external auditor for presentation with the final evaluation report of the project and tabled at the AGM of the Association.

3. The management of special projects should involve members of the full Board and should not be micro-managed or privatized in the hands of one or two or three office-bearers.
4. Office-bearers must treat other members with due courtesy and respect when facing criticism. Rude behavior is totally unacceptable, whether in written documents or at Association meetings. People guilty of such conduct should have no place in the Association.
5. The general membership needs to be more alert in the future. If there is a possibility that the rules are not being followed, the membership should address the potential problem immediately by summoning an emergency special general meeting of the Association. Since SLAGW has non-profit status, it could be vulnerable to law suits if the governing rules are not followed. The general membership, especially some senior members, were remiss in hesitating to rectify commissions and omissions, on the basis that controversy should be avoided.
6. The Advisory Board of the Association should be more pro-active to ensure that transparency is maintained in all financial matters.

Table 1

Project funding approved at Board meetings

Dates	01.30.2005	02.26.2005	03.06.2005 Information Provided by President as A fait accompli	08.16.2005 Charitable Committee Approved
Projects				
1. St. Mary's Convent, Matara	\$11,400	Rs.953,550		\$25,000 + \$3,000
2. Nidro, Weavers Co-op, Ampara		Rs.1,333,000		
3. Parish House repair, Matara		Rs.127,400		
4. Sarvodaya, Vellore Pre-School		Rs.1,333,000		
5. House for Human Rights, Batticaloa		\$1,350		
6. Synergy Community Net, Jaffna		\$5,000		
7. Third Eye, bicycles, Batticaloa		Freight only		

8. Agromart, sewing machines, Galle		\$7,563	Rs.500,000	
9. Central Women & Dev., Jaffna		Rs.641,000 + 50 bicycles		
10. Dutch Bar sewing equip, Batticaloa		Rs.1,082,000	Rs.1,269,000	
11. Children's Home building, Jaffna		Rs.950,000		
12. Village Restoration, Talpe		Request denied		
13. Balapitiya Livelihood Rehabilitation		Rs. 210,000 Request denied		
14. Sacred Heart Convent, Galle			Rs.64,000	
15. Hindu Board of Education			Rs.950,000	
16. Center for Women & Development			Rs.641,000	
17. Janavijaya Pre-School, Trincomalee				\$10,000
18. Manalkadu Fishing Village Housing, for 50 houses, Point Pedro				Provisionally approved
19. Sarvodaya Leadership Training				Decision deferred
20. HelpAge, Sri Lanka				\$20,000 as matching grant for a donation from Ohio
21. Support for fishing in Eastern Province				Decision deferred
22. Jeeva Jothi Children's Home, Batticaloa				Decision deferred
23. Ratmalana Deaf & Blind School				Decision deferred
24. Engineers without Borders				

Table 2

List of identified Donations/Payments

Organization	Recipient	Dates	Amounts (Rs.)
1. Panadura Child Welfare Association		01.06.05	11,748
2. Manrosa Home for Love	Manrosa, Dankotuwa	01.06.05	24,475
3. Richmond Fellowship Lanka		01.06.05	24,475
4. Nest	Kare House, Hendala	01.06.05	24,475
5. Seva Vantha of Mahaweli	Mahaweli Authority	01.06.05	107,690
6. Home for Human Rights		01.17.05	132,660
7. St. Mary's Convent	Lal Fernando	01.17.05	203,710
"	"	01.17.05	250,160
"	"	01.17.05	250,160
"	"	01.17.05	250,160
8. St. Mary's Rectory	Fr.C. Hewawasam	01.27.05	135,160
9. Sarvodaya Child Care Center	Sarvodaya	02.17.05	600,160

	“	01.26.06	732,696
10. Nidro, Maruthamuni Weavers	Ms. Dawn Austin	02.17.05	519,460
11. Agro Mart	Singer Sri Lanka Ltd.	03.24.05	564,160
12. Dutch Bar, Batticoloa	Singer Sri Lanka Ltd.	04.11.05	190,160
“	Pasindu Steel Ltd.	04.29.05	251,555
“	“	05.15.05	420,160
“	“	06.24.05	200,160
“	“	07.14.05	236,960
13. International Center for Ethnic Studies	ICES, Kandy	03.24.05	1,340,468
“	“	05.13.05	445,729
14. Hindu Board of Education	Hindu Board, Jaffna	03.24.05	950,500
15. Methodist Church	-	-	\$375
16. Good Shepherd Convent	-	-	\$250
17. Bikes for the World	Keith Oberg	-	\$1,000
“	“	-	\$500
18. Target Agri	Mr. Thomas Gerbracht		\$75,000
19. Adopt Sri Lanka Housing			\$150,000
“	“	03.23.06	\$180,246
20. Lion's Club of Galle		05.10.05	506,824
21. Center for Women & Development	Sarvodaya	03.24.05	641,500
22. Center for Child Development	Sarvodaya	07.13.05	247,500
23. Read Write Sri Lanka	Ms. Imalka Senadhira	07.13.05	400,160
”	“	08.02.05	397,360
“	“	11.02.05	400,000
“	“	03.10.06	653,000
“	“	03.21.06	300,000
24. Rotoract Club of Kandy	Rotoract Club, Kandy	07.14.05	253,250
25. Janavijaya Tsunami Relief	Janavijaya Foundation	08.26.05	992,160
“	“	10.20.05	1,050,160
“	“	01.31.06	5,000,160
“	“	08.11.06	2,500,000
“	“	12.22.06	1,000,000
26. St. Mary's Rehabilitation Trust	St. Mary's Convent	08.26.05	2,480,160
“	“	12.09.05	1,006,160
27. Mr. Sivaji De Soysa	Mr. Sivaji De Soysa	08.02.05	29,950
28. Helpage Sri Lanka	Helpage	08.30.05	1,986,160
29. SARASI Musical Center	SARASI	10.06.05	582,150
30. Muslim Women's Research & Action	Muslim Women's	10.20.05	300,000
31. Lanka Humanitarian Development. Fund	LHD Foundation	10.20.05	3,850,160
“	“	02.16.06	3,300,160
“	“	03.20.06	3,850,160
32. Trico Maritime Pvt. Ltd.	Trico Co. Ltd.	11.02.05	61,000
33. Friends of Lanka Tsunami Relief	Friends of Lanka	11.30.05	1,890,000
“	“	03.24.06	1,050,000
“	“	09.08.06	1,260,000
34. Social Scientists' Association	S. S. Association	12.22.05	200,160
35. Panadura Child Welfare Society	P. C. W. Society	12.29.05	12,160
36. Fr. Peter Pillai Mem Fund	Fr. Peter. P. Mem Fund	12.09.05	3,018,160
37. Synergy Community	Synergy	03.10.06	250,000

38. Mithuruwela Cancer Sup Network	Mithuruwela	03.20.06	121,160
Total			Rs47,456,815
			\$407,371
Total in US\$ (\$1.0 = Rs.101)			\$877,240

-
- Data collected from SLAWDC Board minutes
2. Correspondance received from recipients
 3. On-site visits to projects in Sri Lanka and Interviews by Board members.
 4. SLAWDC Annual Reports