

Report of the 2007 National Dialogue

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	02
2. Presentations	03
2.1. Mr Deshal De Mel (<i>Institute of Policy Studies</i>)	03
2.2. Ms Ruwanthi Ariyaratne and Mr Sumedha Ponnampereuma (<i>Department of Commerce</i>)	05
2.3. Mr Sarath Fernando (<i>Movement for National Land & Agricultural Reform</i>)	06
2.4. Ms Chatrini Weeratunga (<i>United Nations Development Programme</i>)	07
3. Discussion of Related Issues	08
4. Evaluation of the 2007 National Dialogue	10
5. Conclusion	10
<i>Annex I – 2007 National Dialogue Agenda</i>	11
<i>Annex II – Participant List</i>	12

Report for the 2007 National Dialogue

1. Introduction

The Law & Society Trust in Colombo is the advocacy partner in Sri Lanka for the Linkages between Trade, Development and Poverty Reduction (TDP) project, co-ordinated by CUTS-Centre for International Trade, Economics & Environment (CUTS-CITEE) in Jaipur, India, with support from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Netherlands, and the Department for International Development (DFID), UK.

Sri Lanka's third National Dialogue, scheduled for 2007, took place on July 26, 2007. The venue for the dialogue was Hotel Renuka in Colombo. The dialogue was originally scheduled to be held on July 19, but LST was forced to postpone the event by a week due to the security blanket that was placed on the city of Colombo on the same day by the government. Due to this postponement, however, a number of confirmed participants, including the First Secretary of the Royal Netherlands Embassy and the Deputy Minister for National Integration, were unable to attend the dialogue on the new date.

The objective of the 2007 National Dialogue was to provide an opportunity for discussion and debate between the stakeholder representatives drawn from policy makers, civil society organisations (CSOs), private sector, inter-governmental organisations, academics and the media on trade policies and their impact on development at national level.

Speakers who represented different stakeholder groups were invited to speak on the theme of coherence between trade and development policies at the national level. Ms Ruwanthi Ariyaratne and Sumedha Ponnampereuma from the Department of Commerce spoke on the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and developmental impacts on Sri Lanka, including its interests at the WTO level, while Deshal De Mel from the Institute of Policy Studies (IPS) discussed the developmental impacts of trade liberalisation, with special reference to trade in services. Sarath Fernando, from the Movement for National Land and Agricultural Reform (MONLAR), spoke on poverty reduction through alternative approaches to international trade expansion, while Ms Chatrini Weeratunga, from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), highlighted the impacts of trade policy on human development and discussed a new methodology to assess these impacts. In addition to the speakers, there were 23 other participants from various stakeholder groups, such as the government sector, non-governmental organisation (NGOs) and civil society sectors and the media.

The format of the dialogue took the form of a roundtable discussion in two sessions. In the first session, two speakers presented their papers followed by questions and discussion

among the participants. This format was repeated in the second session as well with the next two speakers presenting papers and concluding the National Dialogue with a discussion.

2. Presentations

2.1 Mr Deshal De Mel

The first presentation was made by Mr Deshal De Mel, a research officer at IPS, who spoke on the topic of “developmental impacts of trade liberalisation with special reference to trade in services”.

Deshal began his presentation by acknowledging the importance of policy makers obtaining a sound understanding on trade in services to equip them to take better decisions, especially as trading in services is a new phenomenon. Trade in services has become a key component of the market in Sri Lanka, contributing 56.2 percent to the gross domestic product (GDP) and 41.2 percent to employment. Deshal explained the four modes into which the services sector is categorised under the General Agreement Trade in Services (GATS) agreement: Mode 1, i.e. cross-border services (such as telecommunication); Mode 2, i.e. consumption overseas (such as education and tourism); Mode 3, i.e. commercial presence in the country (such as foreign banks in Sri Lanka); and Mode 4, i.e. the movement of natural persons (such as temporary migration). The liberalisation of services entails the removal of barriers from these four modes to give market access.

Sri Lanka is considered unilaterally among the most open economy in South Asia, particularly in Mode 3. Exchange controls have been removed for Modes 1 and 2 although Mode 4 remains protected requiring permission to be granted before a foreign worker could be employed. Deshal said more restrictions placed on Mode 4 applied to low-skilled workers and if this mode was liberalised, Sri Lanka would be able to send higher skilled workers abroad for employment and thereby potentially move up the value chain than at present. He felt that being able to send higher skilled workers would reduce the social problems, which are now created due to the migration of low skilled workers, as well as affecting remittances. While Mode 1 is still at a fairly immature stage in Sri Lanka, with just 25 (foreign) firms operating in the country at the end of 2006, the risk of brain drain and social costs, which may be caused by Mode 4 liberalisation, needs to be recognised. However, since Mode 4 provides a labour-intensive form of growth which is technology-based, there are benefits in terms of competition and skills transfer at domestic level.

At the moment, Sri Lanka is committed to the GATS agreement, Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) with India and Pakistan, the South Asian Free Trade Area/ Bangladesh India Myanmar Sri Lanka Thailand Economic Cooperation (SAFTA/BIMST-EC) agreements and the Comprehensive

Economic Partnership Agreement (CEPA) which is being negotiated with India. Flexibilities exist in the liberalisation of services, such as the GATS request offer approach where, for example, when the Sri Lankan Government receives a request to open a particular sector, the government is free to agree/disagree with the request, as was the case when New Zealand requested Sri Lanka to open the maritime sector. A similar approach is being followed by Sri Lanka in its negotiations with India in CEPA.

Deshal next talked of the developmental benefits of liberalisation by giving the example of the benefits to the consumers when a market is opened and competition affects resource allocation, prices and consumer surplus. For example, the monopoly held by one telecommunications manufacturer was broken when this sector was opened and today there is a good choice of telecommunications services for the consumer. Mode 3 impacts on the telecommunication, finance and transport sectors in Sri Lanka have had resonating beneficial impacts on the rest of the economy. Similarly, foreign direct investment (FDI) impacts the development of infrastructure, such as maritime services. Addressing shortages, Deshal said healthcare services in Sri Lanka are limited outside the Western Province and, therefore, investment could be made to remedy the shortages which exist in health personnel/resources. Furthermore, there is a shortage of specialists at the moment and with greater foreign investment Sri Lanka would be able to attract such specialists. He also talked about the rigidities in factor markets, particularly labour, which results in poor response to shocks, and the brain drain and social costs of Mode 4 liberalisation by other countries.

Speaking on the risks of liberalisation of services, Deshal admitted that it was difficult to predict the future impact/s of liberalising services, as there was a shortage of data relating to the impacts of trading in services and, therefore, there is the risk of negotiators making sub-optimal commitments under pressure. He further said there was no regulatory system, which is particularly important in professional services to ensure quality, safety and health standards, security and rules. There would also be the risk of rural disparities, due to the divergence in infrastructure, as weak infrastructure of rural areas would hinder proper market access.

Deshal, speaking on the maturity of the service sector, said the business process outsourcing (BPO) sector needs stringent conditionalities for investment and Mode 4 liberalisation could be used to fill the gaps in the labour market, such as health specialists. However, it must be kept in mind that this has the possible effect of deterring domestic capabilities due to the inability to break into the market once capabilities are achieved.

In conclusion, Deshal believed there were several opportunities to gain from trade in service and particularly in Mode 1 and 4 exports area. Domestic liberalisation may reap benefits such as competition and skills transfer, but only if there is proper regulation, in terms of data and analysis and infrastructure, which would widen the capacity of trade negotiators and domestic stakeholders.

2.2 Ms Ruwanthi Ariyaratne and Mr Sumedha Ponnampereuma

The second presentation for the day was made by Ruwanthi Ariyaratne and Sumedha Ponnampereuma, Assistant Directors of Commerce at the Department of Commerce, who spoke on “WTO and developmental impacts on Sri Lanka & Sri Lanka’s interests at WTO level”.

The presentation by the Department of Commerce gave a brief overview of Sri Lanka’s relations with the WTO. The speakers said the main objective of the formation of the WTO was to achieve trade liberalisation among member countries. Sri Lanka has had a long history in multilateral trading, under GATT/ WTO and there is, admittedly, public concern that Sri Lanka will be overwhelmed by the liberalisation of trade.

Sri Lanka’s interests in the Non-Agricultural Market Access (NAMA) agreement can be categorised into offensive and defensive interests. Offensive interests include the reduction of high tariffs and tariff peaks on export products; the issue of preference erosion; and the proposal by ACP countries on the 10-15 years phase out period for the most favoured nation (MFN) reduction. Sri Lanka is concerned that it will not gain market access to the US for a long time if this proposal is implemented and has proposed that countries disproportionately affected by this solution be given preferential access to these markets. Defensive interests include the development of domestic industries and maintaining already low tariffs.

The three pillars of negotiations in agriculture are export subsidies, domestic support and market access. Sri Lanka’s interests in agriculture are providing policy space for the protection of domestic agriculture, self-designation of products critical for food security, livelihood security and rural development, of which 50 percent of the tariff lines be exempted from tariff reduction and 50 percent subject to minimal reduction and a special safeguard mechanism.

Sri Lanka’s interests for the Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) are, firstly, public access to medicine, particularly the provisions under TRIPs Articles 31f and 31h, which restrict the access to medicine for developing and least-developed countries (LDCs) without/no manufacturing capacity of drugs; and, secondly, that compulsory licensing beyond TRIPs be made available to Sri Lanka, where its drug production capacity is inadequate to meet epidemic situations.

Speaking on geographical indicators, which identify goods as originating in a particular territory/ country where a given quality, reputation or other characteristic of the good is essentially attributable to its geographical origin (such as Ceylon Tea). Sri Lanka is seeking expanded protection for wines and spirits and similar protection for other products.

Finally, this presentation addressed the need for trade remedies of anti-dumping, countervailing and safeguard measures to allow domestic industries to re-adjust to increased competition brought about by the liberalisation of trade. There will be a trade remedies bill, which would address anti-dumping, countervailing and safeguard measures and envisages the enabling of investigations into dumped and subsidised goods, and into the necessity of imposing temporary safeguard measures.

The discussion by participants which followed these two presentations is included in section 3 below.

2.3 Sarath Fernando

The second session of the dialogue began with Sarath Fernando, Director of MONLAR, who spoke on “poverty reduction through alternative approaches to international trade expansion”.

Sarath Fernando took an unconventional line of argument which goes against general economic theories of trade by making a sweeping statement that a world without any trade is a better place. His intention in making such a statement negating the benefits of trade, seemed to stem from a frustration with the prevailing economic trade system, which favours bigger and more powerful countries. He advocates reverting to the very early stages of commerce where sharing and exchange was a part and parcel of transactions, as he feels the present system of trade is unproductive. He said trade has gained such a stranglehold on countries that now it has become a matter of survival for they are asked to survive or simply disappear if they cannot fit into the present trading system.

Sarath said the present situation is such that it is necessary to think of survival, rather than development, because 2/3rds of countries are unable to enter the market that is now in existence. He explained that under the poverty alleviation programmes in Sri Lanka, Janasaviya and Samurdhi, 1.2 million families live on less than US\$5 a month. He said some foods which can be produced/obtained locally with very little cost, such as fresh milk, have been neglected and 80 percent of the milk available is imported. He expressed disappointment that the same policy document has been reproduced by successive governments over the years, with only a few minor changes, and went on to criticise the Supreme Court decision which was of the view that Shell Gas was free to increase its prices, whereby ignoring the concerns of the consumers.

Speaking on patenting issues, Sarath said he disagreed with the idea of patenting, as he believed that nothing was created by one single person but rather inventions/ creations were the result of wisdom and experience accumulated over generations of individuals. He felt that in the name of development, if patenting was to exist, then the creative abilities of people are stifled; therefore, it is imperative that Sri Lanka thinks alternatively.

Sri Lanka, Sarath said, is a primary example of the implications of privatisation. As an illustration, he explained that, due to policy considerations, it was decided that small-scale paddy farmers should be assisted because rice is the main form of livelihood. Therefore, when land was given, there were inbuilt precautions in place so as to ensure peasants did not lose their land and that rice was produced at an affordable price. Health and water, too, must be available at an affordable price. Yet, with the privatisation of trade, it was profit-making that was encouraged, rather than affordability. To address the reduction of poverty and hunger, optimum use of natural resources which are free, such as sunlight and water, must be made. More trees need to be planted, so that there will be less drought (and thereby hardship) and the use of traditional/ayurvedic medicine must be given prominence, instead of the present emphasis on Western/allopathic medicine.

At the moment, Sri Lanka offers the largest tax holidays going up to 20 years and industries are given electricity at low rates. The argument that economic growth trickles down and, thereby, reduces poverty is often used when implementing various development projects. Yet, the real result of such projects is the migration of people from poor villages to urban areas as cheap labour who will, most likely, not even receive trade union protection.

2.4 Ms Chatrini Weeratunga

Ms Chatrini Weeratunga, a research associate at the UNDP, spoke next on the “impacts of trade policy on human development” and presented a new methodology the UNDP had formed to assess the impacts of trade policy on human development.

Chatrini began her presentation by acknowledging that trade can be a powerful source of economic growth. In fact, South Asia posted a GDP growth of 8.7 percent, while East Asia and the Pacific grew by 8.9 percent in 2005. Furthermore, trade, as a percentage of the GDP, increased from 20 to 34 percent in South Asia and 45 to 81 percent in East Asia and the Pacific for the 1990-2003 period. Despite such growth, however, progress in reducing poverty varies widely among the sub-regions and South Asia still accounts for 43 percent of the world's poor, despite its growth rates in the last decade. Therefore, while economic growth is necessary, it is insufficient for human development and neither trade nor growth can be ends in themselves, but instead is a means towards the larger goals of human development.

Chatrini said the link between human development and its relationship with trade is dynamic and works both ways. On one hand, economic growth provides the resources to permit sustained improvements in human development, and on the other hand, human development improvements raise people's capacities to boost economic growth.

Human development impact assessment of trade policy means the assessment of impact and feasibility of a particular trade policy or reform, at multilateral (such as WTO

obligations/accession commitments), bilateral (such as WTO-plus commitments) and unilateral reform levels, from a human development perspective. Human development impact assessment outcomes can mainstream human development concerns into trade negotiations and domestic policy-making by demonstrating likely/existing effects of trade policy.

Speaking on the methodology of the assessment, Chatrini said there will be descriptive and modelling approaches and social and economic tools. The tools and techniques for assessment will depend on the policy or measure being assessed, data, time and technical skills available and short-term and long-term impacts. At the moment, there is a pilot assessment being conducted on the phasing out of the Multi-Fibre Arrangement (MFA) in four countries (Bangladesh, Cambodia, Laos and Nepal), utilising indicators such as employment, income, working conditions, food expenditure, nutrition quality and remittances to village. The methodology being used in Bangladesh is the economic modelling, ex ante-assessment, and in Cambodia, Laos and Nepal the survey method.

Chatrini concluded with a short discussion on the challenges in such assessment programmes. These include definitional problems with human development, as different indicators are appropriate for different situations, constraints in data availability, determining likely impacts of policy changes on relevant indicators of human development and determining causal relationships and channels of influence from policy changes to human development outcomes.

3. Discussion of Related Issues

The discussions which followed the two sessions of the dialogue addressed a range of issues.

Prior to the removal of the MFA in Sri Lanka, there were doomsday predictions that Sri Lanka would not survive. However, this did not come to pass because Sri Lankan industries have managed to adapt. Shortages in labour are driving some garment factories out of business. For instance, in Hambantota, while there is a lack of labour, there is also much unemployment among youth. The question was raised as to the reasons behind why the unemployed refused these factory jobs. In answer to this question, a participant said the main reason behind this phenomenon was that parents were reluctant to send their children for such jobs and, therefore, managed to keep them at home. Mr Sarath Fernando, in answer to this question, said he believed that people can survive with what nature can provide free of charge and Sri Lanka still has that ability. He talked of the regenerative capacity of nature and stressed the need for the sustainable use of the environment.

A question/comment was raised by Dilshani Samaraweera, referring to the presentation by Deshal De Mel, about the nature of the waivers under the TRIPS agreement. There are certain concessions for countries that cannot manufacture their own drugs/medicines, under the TRIPS agreement, in cases of emergency. What constitutes an emergency and how is it defined? In Sri

Lanka, can a large aging population come within this definition? What procedures, waivers are given in such an emergency? In answer, it was said that countries can issue compulsory licences, although this is a complicated procedure. Patent holders are multinational companies and they have a right to make money. In a national emergency, the country could issue a compulsory licence. For instance, in a disaster situation/emergency, like the *tsunami*, the Sri Lankan Government can issue a compulsory licence, if it has the capacity to manufacture the necessary drugs/medicine. However, if Sri Lanka has to import the drugs, two compulsory licences are necessary because, for e.g., if the drugs/medicines is to be imported from India, two compulsory licences for import and manufacture are necessary. However, in this instance, the WTO must be notified, stating the quantity, type of the imported drug, etc. Therefore, there is a lot of procedure involved. All these details are supposed to be posted on the WTO website. A follow up question was raised about what is considered an epidemic. Governments have to decide this. So far no country has used these provisions (re emergency provisions under the TRIPs).

A question was raised by Ruki Fernando, in reference to the presentation by the Department of Commerce. Ruki questioned who constituted the “stakeholders” and the procedure behind international trade-related consultations. In answer, the speaker from the Department of Commerce said Sri Lanka has negotiated trade agreements with India/Pakistan and when Sri Lanka was about to enter into the Preferential Trade Agreement (PTA) with India, various ministries, such as agriculture, finance were consulted. Officials and members from the Chamber of Commerce and the business community were consulted before decisions were made on international trade agreements. Ruki asked whether consumer and labour groups and fisheries were considered stakeholders and the speakers said under the FTA/WTO agreements, the normal practice was to obtain the views of the business/commercial sector, while the consumers’ views are represented by the Consumer Affairs Authority. They admitted that labour groups are not represented.

It was observed that, in relation to donor/lending agencies, in the late 1980s and 90s, the World Bank placed very stringent conditions on lending, which led to the liberalisation of economies. Yet, there is now less pressure on structural economic reforms, as the World Bank and the IMF now give loans while placing conditions that certain projects/sectors should be targeted. Therefore, the conditions laid down now are more project-specific and sector-specific.

A question was raised as to whether Sri Lanka is able to stem the outflow of specialists (brain drain) and whether there was any mechanism to prevent this trend. In answer to this, it was explained that as an alternative to permanent migration, Mode 4, which covers jobs on contractual basis (temporary migration), can be used. Thereby, specialists who go abroad on a contractual basis would come back and give their services to the country and, therefore, this (Mode 4) can be used as a half way home between permanent migration.

The final comment discussed was in reference to the presentation made by Chatrini Weeratunga. The participant questioned why, when four Asian countries were selected for the post-MFA human development impact assessment pilot project, Sri Lanka was not included in this study. Since the four selected countries were least developed countries, such a study could be done on Sri Lanka as well.

4. Evaluation of the 2007 National Dialogue

At the end of the dialogue, an evaluation form was completed by the participants, which aided LST in receiving feedback about the issues discussed at this dialogue. All the participants said they felt that their understanding of the issues/debates on trade and development has been improved through this discussion. They expressed that, while the issues addressed at the national dialogue were very useful ones, it was difficult to come to broad-based consensus or conclusions on such national issues. A couple of participants expressed the need to show more direct linkages between trade and poverty alleviation, using actual results/impacts of trade liberalisation/trade policy in Sri Lanka. One participant questioned that, while an event such as this was informative and useful to the English-speaking population, how LST intended to reach the Sinhala-speaking majority.

The participants identified various other areas that could be addressed under the theme of trade and development policies, such as gender issues within this theme, the impact of globalisation, in general, instead of just the globalisation of trade, in development and poverty, issues of governance encompassing accountability, transparency, consistency and participatory processes, non-tariff barriers and the international human rights standards/framework related to trade, development and poverty.

5. Conclusion

The four featured speakers at the national dialogue spoke on four varied subjects within the theme of coherence between trade and development at the national level. The participants, drawn from different stakeholder groups, contributed to the discussion and thereby played a vital role in achieving the objective of the Dialogue, which was to provide an opportunity for discussion and debate between the stakeholder representatives.

**ANNEX I - AGENDA FOR THE 2007 NATIONAL DIALOGUE ON COHERENCE
BETWEEN TRADE & DEVELOPMENT POLICIES**

July 26, 2007
Hotel Renuka
Colombo 03

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| 09.00 am – 09.15 am | Registration |
| 09.15 am – 09.30 am | Introduction to the Project/National Dialogue |
| 09.30 am - 10.00 am | Mr Deshal De Mel
Research Officer
Institute of Policy Studies (IPS)

<i>Topic: Developmental Impacts of Trade Liberalisation with Special Reference to Trade in Services</i> |
| 10.00 am – 10.45 am | Ms Ruwanthi Ariyaratne &
Mr Sumedha Ponnampperuma
Assistant Directors of Commerce
Department of Commerce

<i>Topic: The WTO and Developmental Impacts on Sri Lanka & Sri Lanka's Interests at WTO Level</i> |
| 10.45 am – 11.15 am | Discussion |
| 11.15 am – 11.30 am | Tea Break |
| 11.30 am – 12.00 noon | Mr Sarath Fernando
Director
Movement for National Land and Agricultural Reform (Monlar)

<i>Topic: Poverty Reduction through Alternative Approaches to International Trade Expansion</i> |
| 12.00 noon – 12.30 pm | Ms Chatrini Weeratunga
Research Associate
United Nations Development Programme

<i>Topic: Impacts of Trade Policy on Human Development: A New Methodology</i> |
| 12.30 pm – 01.00 pm | Discussion |
| 1.00 pm – 02.00 pm | Lunch |

ANNEX II – PARTICIPANT LIST

	NAME OF PARTICIPANT	ORGANISATION	CONTACT DETAILS
1.	Ruwanthi Ariyaratne Assistant Director of Commerce	Department of Commerce 4 th Fl, Rakshana Mandiraya, Vauxhall Street, Colombo 02	ruwanthi@doc.gov.lk
2.	Sumedha Ponnampereuma Assistant Director of Commerce	Department of Commerce 4 th Fl, Rakshana Mandiraya, Vauxhall Street, Colombo 02	sumedha@doc.gov.lk
3.	Chatrini Weeratunga Research Associate	United Nations Development Programme 23 Independence Avenue, Colombo 07	4526400 (ext 509) Chatrini.weeratunga@undp.org
4.	Deshal De Mel Research Officer	Institute of Policy Studies 99 St Michaels Road Colombo 03	2931368 deshal@ips.lk
5.	Sarath Fernando	Movement for National Land and Agricultural Reform 1151/58A, 4th Lane, Kotte Road, Rajagiriya	2865534/ 4407663
6.	Niloufer Lebbe Project Officer	Diakonia Sri Lanka 80/4, 1/1 Layards Road Colombo 05	2502450/ 0773 413963 niloufer@diakonia-srilanka.org
7.	Saama Rajakaruna Development Officer	Canadian International Development Agency 12 Amarasekera Mawatha Colombo 05	2502640/ saama_rajakaruna@cida-psu.lk
8.	Dilshani Samaraweera Freelance Journalist	Sunday Financial Times 54 Chitra Lane Colombo 05	dilsh100@yahoo.co.uk
9.	Sarath Dassanayake Assistant Director	Export Development Board 42 Nawam Mawatha Colombo 02	2300730/ sarath@edb.tradenets.lk
10.	A. Sivanesaselvan Deputy Director	Sri Lanka Press Institute 65/5 Ward Place Colombo 08	5353635/ siva@slpi.lk
11.	Yvonne Schokman Senior Manager	Board of Investment 14 Baron Jayatilleke Mawatha Colombo 01	yvones@boi.lk

12.	Amrit Rajapakse Attorney-at-law	22 De Kretser Place Colombo 04	0773 867172 amrit_r@bigfoot.com
13.	Amal Siriwardene Accountant	Lanka Software Foundation	2713523 (Res)/ 2697105 (Off)/ amal_siri@yahoo.com
14.	Dr Frank Niranjan Senior Research Officer	Sri Lanka Council for Agricultural Research Policy	2697103/ niranjanfr_03@yahoo.com
15.	Sujeevan Perera Director	Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry Sri Lanka (FCCISL)	2304253/ sujeevan@fccisl.lk
16.	Roshan Madawela Director	Research Intelligence Unit Bartleet House 65 Braybrook Place Colombo 02	4718258/ info@riunit.com
17.	Charan Rainford Researcher	International Centre for Ethnic Studies 02 Kynsey Terrace Colombo 08	
18.	Thiranthie Udukumbura Project Assistant (FRP)	Law & Society Trust 3 Kynsey Terrace Colombo 08	2684845
19.	Dilhara Pathirana Information Officer	Law & Society Trust 3 Kynsey Terrace Colombo 08	2684845
20.	Dulani Kulasinghe Researcher/Coordinator	Law & Society Trust 3 Kynsey Terrace Colombo 08	2684845
21.	Ruki Fernando Coordinator	Law & Society Trust 3 Kynsey Terrace Colombo 08	2684845
22.	Laura Binger Law student	Harvard Law School	
23.	Malarmathy Intern	Law & Society Trust 3 Kynsey Terrace Colombo 08	2684845 tmmathy@gmail.com
24.	Shehani Nayagam Law student	Royal Institute Colombo	shehanilst@gmail.com
25.	Tharini Gunasekera Law student	Royal Institute Colombo	tharini.lst@gmail.com
26.	Nirasha Perera Law student	Royal Institute Colombo	nirasha.p@gmail.com
27.	B. Skanthakumar Co-ordinator, Economic, Social & Cultural Rights Programme	Law & Society Trust 3 Kynsey Terrace Colombo 08	2684845 lst_kumar@eureka.lk
28.	Manikya Kodithuwakku Project Officer (TDP)	Law & Society Trust 3 Kynsey Terrace Colombo 08	2684845 manikyak@gmail.com