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Identify & suggest improvements that can contribute to the effectiveness of community participation and can empower the redevelopment of the disaster area.
MQ: How did the redevelopment in Banda Aceh facilitated community participation?

SQ:
1. What is the role of the community in Post Disaster Urban Redevelopment?
2. What are the main challenges of community participation?
3. How to evaluate the role of the community?
4. How to improve community participation based on its demands?
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UR & PDUR

Ingredients

• COMPLEXITY
• STRATEGIES
• PROCESS
• CHALLENGES

ACTORS & INTERACTIONS

• STAKEHOLDER GROUPS
• HOW TO MAP

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

• THE LADDER OF PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low influence</th>
<th>high influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low stake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least priority Stakeholder group</td>
<td>Useful for decision &amp; opinion formulation, brokering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High stake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important stakeholder group perhaps in need of empowerment</td>
<td>Most critical Stakeholder group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**THEORY FRAMEWORK**

**UR& PDUR Ingredients**

**ACTORS & INTERACTIONS**

**COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION**

**• COMPLEXITY**
  - Recovery vs. Regeneration
  - Physical Envir. Destroyed
  - Civil systems
  - Capacity loss
  - Multiple actors
  - Stress
  - Not planned in advance

**• PROCESS**

**SIZE & SCOPE OF DISASTER**

- Emergency response
- Short-term development
- Long-term development

**CHALLENGES**

- T=0
- T=1
- T=2
- T=3
- T=4
- T=5
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### Theory Framework

#### Ingredients
- UR & PDUR

#### Actors & Interactions

#### Community Participation

### Stakeholder Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low stake</td>
<td>Low influence</td>
<td>Least priority Stakeholder group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High stake</td>
<td>Low influence</td>
<td>Important stakeholder group perhaps in need of empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High stake</td>
<td>High influence</td>
<td>Most critical Stakeholder group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### How to Map

- **International**
- **National**
- **Regional**
- **Local**

- **Public Sector**
- **Private Sector**
- **Civic Societies**
The Theory Framework

Ingredients

UR& PDUR

ACTORS & INTERACTIONS

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of citizen power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. CITIZEN CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. DELEGATED POWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PARTNERSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PLACATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CONSULTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. INFORMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. THERAPY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MANIPULATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholders have the idea, set up the project and come to facilitators for advice, discussion and support. Facilitators do not direct, but offer advice for citizens to consider.

The goal is likely to have set by the facilitator but the resources and responsibility for solving the problem are passed to the stakeholders. There are clear lines of accountability and two-way communication with those giving away the power.

Stakeholders have direct involvement in the decision making process and actioning the decision. Each stakeholder has a clear role, set of responsibilities and powers - usually to achieve a shared common goal. Two-way communication is vital.

Stakeholders have an active role as shapers of opinions, ideas and outcomes, but the final decision remains with the facilitators. Two-way communication is essential.

Stakeholders opinions and views are sought through various means, but final decisions are made by those doing the consulting.

Stakeholders are kept informed of what is going on, but are not offered the opportunity to contribute themselves. Communication is one way.

To educate or cure the stakeholders. The idea is defined and the participation is aimed only to gain public support. ‘If we educate the stakeholders, they will change their ill-informed attitudes and they will support out plans.’
**1.** CONDUCT INTERVIEWS AND ASK ABOUT EACH **T** MOMENT

**2.** IDENTIFY CHALLENGES FOR EACH **T** MOMENT

**3.** MATRIX FOR EACH CHALLENGE

**4.** MAP & SCORE THE STAKEHOLDERS

---

### Research Framework Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low influence</th>
<th>high influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low stake</strong></td>
<td>Least priority Stakeholder group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High stake</strong></td>
<td>Important stakeholder group perhaps in need of empowerment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Identified Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>WHO</strong></th>
<th><strong>WHY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>T= 1</strong></td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central government</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral Org.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local business</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Institutions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic societies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious groups</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1=low, 2=medium, 3=high
5. GRAPH OF CHALLENGES IN EACH T MOMENT

![Graph of Challenges in Each T Moment](image-url)
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THE T S U N A M I

T = 0
THE DEVASTATING TSUNAMI T=0

DISASTER IN BANDA ACEH

Damage US$ 445 Billion

DAMAGED DISTRICTS
- 3 OUT 9 DESTROYED
- 3 HEAVILY DAMAGED

POPULATION
- BEFORE: 264,618
- AFTER: 203,553
- KILLED: 61,065

SOURCE: BPS, 2013

DAMAGED HOUSES
- TOTAL: 38,228
- HEAVILY DAMAGED: 21,412
- PARTLY DAMAGED: 17,219
- NEEDED: 4,193

SOURCE: BPS, 2009

DAMAGED SCHOOLS
- TOTAL: 300
- DESTROYED: 285
- DAMAGED: 285
- GOOD CONDITION: 119
- 110

SOURCE: BPS, 2009

BEFORE

MEURAXA

BEFORE: 38,814
AFTER: 7583
98%
DESTROYED INFRASTRUCTURE

3000 HOUSES DESTROYED

98%
DISASTER IN LAMPASEH ACEH

**DAMAGE**

- 95% houses destroyed
- 5% heavily damaged
- 100% roads destroyed

**POPULATION**

- Before: 5336
- After: 439

FISH & SHRIMPS FARMS DESTROYED
1. **IDENTIFY CHALLENGES FOR EACH T=0 >> DELIVERING: AID, FOOD, WATER**

2. **Influence & interest MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low stake</th>
<th>Low influence</th>
<th>high influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Least priority Stakeholder group</td>
<td>Useful for decision &amp; opinion formulation, brokering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local community</td>
<td>• Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NGOS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Religious groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Financial institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Multilateral Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Governm. Bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High stake</td>
<td>Important stakeholder group perhaps in need of empowerment</td>
<td>Most critical Stakeholder group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAKEHOLDER MAPPING T=0**
### MAP & SCORE

STAKEHOLDERS in T=0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T= 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central government</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial council</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral Org.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local business</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Institutions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic societies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAKEHOLDER MAPPING T=0**
Stakeholders are kept informed of what is going on, but are not offered the opportunity to contribute themselves. Communication is one way.

To educate or cure the stakeholders. The idea is defined & the participation is aimed only to gain public support. ‘If we educate the stakeholders, they will change their ill-informed attitudes & they will support out plans’.
T=1
ONE YEAR AFTER
ONE YEAR AFTER $T=1$

1. 600 AGENCIES
   133 COUNTRIES
   US $6.2 BILLION

2. Banda Aceh

3. +

4. MASTER PLAN
   + OCHA
   =

5. MULTI DONOR FUND

6. Banda Aceh

INTRODUCTION  THEORY  CASE STUDY  RESULTS  CONCLUSIONS
LAMPASEH ACEH VILLAGE

UAE DONOR SHEIKH KHALIFA CITY PROJECT

HOUSING PROVIDER

COMMUNITY DRIVEN APPROACH

ONE YEAR AFTER T=1

470

1

1

US $ 2,3 mln

INTRODUCTION THEORY CASE STUDY RESULTS CONCLUSIONS
Interviews

Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Indonesia
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ISSUES & CHALLENGES

T=1

CHALLENGES T=1

1) Political situation

2) Coordination

3) Collaboration & communication

4) Mismatches in demand & supply

5) Interagency competition

6) Community participation.
## Analysis Challenges

### 1. Political Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Implementation Instruments</th>
<th>Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Coordination & Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Implementation Instruments</th>
<th>Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Collaboration & Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Implementation Instruments</th>
<th>Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Mismatches D&S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Implementation Instruments</th>
<th>Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Interagency Competition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Implementation Instruments</th>
<th>Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Community Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Implementation Instruments</th>
<th>Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Map & Score Stakeholders in T=2

**Public**
- **Central government**
  - Influence: 3
  - Interest: 3
  - Capacity: 3
  - Implementation instruments: 3
  - Affected: 2

**Private**
- **Local business**
  - Influence: 1
  - Interest: 1
  - Capacity: 1
  - Implementation instruments: 0
  - Affected: 1

**Civic societies**
- **Local community**
  - Influence: 1
  - Interest: 3
  - Capacity: 1
  - Implementation instruments: 0
  - Affected: 2

- **Religious groups**
  - Influence: 3
  - Interest: 1
  - Capacity: 1
  - Implementation instruments: 1
  - Affected: 1

- **Local organizations**
  - Influence: 2
  - Interest: 2
  - Capacity: 1
  - Implementation instruments: 1
  - Affected: 1
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**ANALYSIS CHALLENGES**

T=1

4. CHALLENGES GRAPH T=1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUNGS</th>
<th>A. Coordination</th>
<th>B. Collaboration &amp; communication</th>
<th>C. Community participation</th>
<th>D. Design Challenges &amp; Inter-Competition</th>
<th>E. Corruption</th>
<th>F. Funding gaps</th>
<th>G. Mismatched demand &amp; supply</th>
<th>H. Political situation</th>
<th>I. Community culture &amp; beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **CIVIC SOCIETY**
- **PUBLIC**
- **PRIVATE**
Stakeholders opinions & views are sought through various means, but final decisions are made by those doing the consulting.

Stakeholders are kept informed of what is going on, but are not offered the opportunity to contribute themselves. Communication is one way.

To educate or cure the stakeholders. The idea is defined & the participation is aimed only to gain public support. ‘If we educate the stakeholders, they will change their ill-informed attitudes & they will support out plans’.
T = 2

4 YEARS AFTER
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MEURAXA T=2

PROJECTS ARE:
- PLANNED,
- EXECUTED
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INHABITANTS

DEMANDS & REQUIREMENTS

LOCAL LEADERS

BRR

UNHABITAT

EXTERNAL CONSULTANT

T=1

VILLAGE PLAN

INHABITANTS

LOCAL GROUPS

LOCAL BUSINESS

AGREEMENT

NO

YES

SIGNATURES STAKEHOLDERS

CLUSTERS 7-13 FAMILIES

Rph 42 mln per unit
In 5 instalments
20%, 45%, 20%, 15%

START BUILDING

T=2

TIME:

UNHABITAT

BRR

EXTERNAL CONSULTANT
T=2

ISSUES & CHALLENGES

CHALLENGES T=1

1) Coordination

2) Community participation

3) Mismatches between demand & supply

4) Funding gaps

5) Corruption
## Analysis Challenges

**T=2**

### 1. Coordination

#### Identify Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Implementation Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Funds, Law, Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial council</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3, 3, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3, 3, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral Org.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Communication

#### Matrixes of Challenges

### 3. Mismatches D&S

### 4. Funding Gaps

### 5. Corruption

### T=2

**Who**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Implementation Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Funds, Law, Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial council</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3, 3, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3, 3, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral Org.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Private**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Implementation Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2, 1, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Institutions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3, 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 3, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Civic Societies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Implementation Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3, 3, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2, 2, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local organizations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2, 1, 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHALLENGES GRAPH T=2
Stakeholders have direct involvement in the decision making process & actioning the decision. Each stakeholder has a clear role, set of responsibilities and powers - usually to achieve a shared common goal. Two-way communication is vital.

Stakeholders have an active role as shapers of opinions, ideas and outcomes, but the final decision remains with the facilitators. Two-way communication is essential.

Stakeholders are kept informed of what is going on, but are not offered the opportunity to contribute themselves. Communication is one way.
BANDA ACEH

SPATIAL ANALYSIS

1. Sub-urban character
   small compounds

2. City center, ground floor
   shops, housing or storage
   on the other floor’s

3. The post-disaster housing
   mostly at coastal areas
OBSERVATIONS

ADDITIONAL LEVEL

FAMILY COMPOUNDS

NEGLECT RISK

EXTENSIONS

4 EVACUATION BUILDINGS ONLY
INTRODUCTION

THEORY

CASE STUDY

RESULTS

CONCLUSIONS

EVALUATION

1. CHALLENGES

2.

3.

4.

5.

COMPONENTS

EVALUATE

CONCLUDE

Note: 1=low, 2=medium, 3=high.
CONCLUSIONS
OF THE
RESEARCH
# Research Framework

## Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Coordination</th>
<th>B. Collaboration &amp; Communication</th>
<th>C. Community participation &amp; Inter. Competition</th>
<th>D. Design Challenges &amp; Inter. Competition</th>
<th>E. Corruption</th>
<th>F. Funding gaps</th>
<th>G. Mismatches demand &amp; supply</th>
<th>H. Political situation</th>
<th>I. Community culture &amp; beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC BODIES</strong></td>
<td>- HIGH INFLUENCE</td>
<td>- HIGH STAKE</td>
<td>- LOW &gt; HIGH STAKE</td>
<td>- HIGH INFLUENCE &gt; FUNDS</td>
<td>- HIGH STAKE</td>
<td>- HIGH STAKE</td>
<td>- LOW-MEDIUM STAKE</td>
<td>- LOW &gt; HIGH STAKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIVATE BODIES</strong></td>
<td>- HIGH INFLUENCE</td>
<td>- HIGH STAKE</td>
<td>- HIGH STAKE</td>
<td>- HIGH STAKE</td>
<td>- HIGH STAKE</td>
<td>- HIGH STAKE</td>
<td>- LOW-MEDIUM STAKE</td>
<td>- LOW &gt; HIGH STAKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIVIC SOCIETY</strong></td>
<td>- LOW INFLUENCE</td>
<td>- LOW CAPACITY</td>
<td>- LOW STAKE</td>
<td>- LOW-MEDIUM STAKE</td>
<td>- LOW STAKE</td>
<td>- LOW STAKE</td>
<td>- LOW-MEDIUM STAKE</td>
<td>- LOW &gt; HIGH STAKE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC BODIES**
- HIGH INFLUENCE
- HIGH STAKE
- LOW > HIGH STAKE

**PRIVATE BODIES**
- HIGH INFLUENCE > FUNDS
- HIGH STAKE
- HIGH STAKE
- HIGH STAKE
- HIGH STAKE
- HIGH STAKE
- HIGH STAKE
- LOW>MEDIUM STAKE
- LOW-STAKE
- LOW-STAKE

**CIVIC SOCIETY**
- LOW INFLUENCE
- LOW STAKE
- LOW-MEDIUM STAKE

**PUBLIC BODIES**
- HIGH > LOW INFLUENCE
- LOW STAKE
- HIGH STAKE

**PRIVATE BODIES**
- HIGH INFLUENCE > FUNDS
- HIGH CAPACITY
- HIGHER STAKE

**CIVIC SOCIETY**
- LOW > HIGH INFLUENCE
- MEDIUM STAKE

**PUBLIC BODIES**
- HIGH INFLUENCE
- HIGH STAKE

**PRIVATE BODIES**
- HIGH CAPACITY
- HIGHER STAKE

**CIVIC SOCIETY**
- MEDIUM STAKE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T=0</th>
<th>T=1</th>
<th>T=2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manipulation**
- 1. MANIPULATION
- 2. THERAPY
- 3. INFORMING
- 4. CONSULTATION
- 5. PLACATION
- 6. PARTNERSHIP
- 7. DELEGATED POWER
- 8. CITIZEN CONTROL

**Degree of citizen power**
- National
- Regional
- City
- District
- Village
- Project

**Degree of tokenism**
- National
- Regional
- City
- District
- Village
- Project

**Non-participation**
- National
- Regional
- City
- District
- Village
- Project
CONCLUSIONS

- SUFFICIENT LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION
- VILLAGE LEVEL: SHOULD NOT REQUEST CONTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th>T=0</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree of citizen power

Degree of tokenism

Non-participation

T=0

1. MANIPULATION
2. THERAPY
3. INFORMING
4. CONSULTATION
5. PLACATION
6. PARTNERSHIP
7. DELEGATED POWER
8. CITIZEN CONTROL

Gray: no change

: no change

: possible change
Achieve common vision sustainable future

If social structure exists then. Not possible in BA due to deaths

Consult were possible

Try to increase involvement it beneficial for the victims recovery process

Gray: no change
- : no change
---: possible change
**CONCLUSIONS**

**T=2**

1. National
2. Regional
3. City
4. District
5. Village
6. Project

**Degree of citizen power**

1. MANIPULATION
2. THERAPY
3. INFORMING
4. CONSULTATION
5. PLACATION
6. PARTNERSHIP
7. DELEGATED POWER
8. CITIZEN CONTROL

**Degree of tokenism**

Depending on the nature of the project

To be argued if in Strategic projects avoid many consultations

Achieve greater acceptance

Depending on the nature of the project

Gray: no change

: change

: possible change

---

**INTRODUCTION**

**THEORY**

**CASE STUDY**

**RESULTS**

**CONCLUSIONS** 56
HYPOTHESIS WAS: HIGH COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

WAS IT TRUE? NOT ALWAYS, CONTEXT DEPENDED

RQ: How did the redevelopment in Banda Aceh facilitated community participation?

A: Although depending on the approach, UN-Habitat gave community a considerable stake in the process in various ways & phases. Regardless the complaints, it received correctly credits.

Beneficiaries in Banda Aceh have been given a foundation for a sustainable future
Q: What it build back better?

A: In terms of housing YES!
But other aspects also played a role, such as economic and social basis, less attention was given to those.
• Investigate the friction & irritation factors of communities
• Investigate the effects of community participation in large scale projects
• Perform extensive research into the relationships of the stakeholder groups
• Test the suggested model in other case studies
Thank you

Terima Kasih

Questions?