

# **Independent Final Evaluation**

## **Employment Generation and Livelihoods through Reconciliation Project**

ILO TC Project Code: LKA/16/02/NOR

Evaluation Title: Employment Generation and Livelihoods through Reconciliation

Type of Evaluation: Final

Country: Sri Lanka

Date of the Evaluation: September – November 2018

Name of Consultants: Ruth Bowen and Rachel Perera

ILO Administrative Office: ILO Country Office for Sri Lanka and the Maldives (CO-Colombo)

ILO Technical Backstopping Office: DEVINVEST/EMPLOYMENT

Project Duration: 1 November 2016 – 31 October 2018

Donor: The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Total Project Budget: US\$ 1.8 million

Evaluation Fieldwork Dates: 30 September – 16 October 2018

Evaluation Manager: Jittima Srisuknam

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
ABBREVIATIONS.....	v
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	vi
I. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Project Overview.....	1
II. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY.....	3
2.1 Objectives and Scope.....	3
2.2 Evaluation Methodology.....	4
2.3 Evaluation Limitations.....	9
2.4 Organization of the Report.....	10
III. EVALUATION FINDINGS.....	11
3.1 Relevance and Design Validity.....	11
3.2 Effectiveness of the Interventions.....	17
3.3 Management Effectiveness.....	32
3.4 Efficiency of Resource Use.....	35
3.5 Sustainability and Impact Orientation.....	37
IV. CONCLUSIONS.....	39
4.1 Relevance and Design Validity.....	39
4.2 Effectiveness of Interventions.....	39
4.3 Management Effectiveness.....	41
4.4 Efficiency of Resource Use.....	41
4.5 Sustainability.....	41
V. GOOD PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED.....	42
5.1 Good Practices.....	42
5.2 Lessons Learned.....	42
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	44
ANNEXES.....	47
ANNEX A: Project Performance on Indicator Targets.....	48

ANNEX B: Data Collection Matrix.....	50
ANNEX C. List of Documents Reviewed .....	56
ANNEX D: Field Visit Itinerary .....	58
ANNEX E: List of Persons Interviewed .....	63
ANNEX F: ILO Emerging Good Practices and Lessons Learned Templates .....	69
ANNEX G: Stakeholder Workshop Discussion Outputs.....	79
ANNEX H: Independent Final Evaluation Terms of Reference.....	84

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluators wish to thank all of the ILO Employment Generation and Livelihoods through Reconciliation (EGLR) project staff for providing extensive in-depth information and practical support to the implementation of the evaluation. Thank you to the Country Director, Ms. Simrin Singh, ILO Country Office for Sri Lanka and the Maldives, and the Country Office staff in Colombo for their perspectives on the project and for timely logistics assistance. The contribution of the ILO Coop Unit, Geneva, was also very valuable.

We are grateful to the many stakeholders who participated, contributing their time and valuable perspectives, including the representatives of national government, local government departments and administrative offices, private sector peak bodies and individual companies.

Not least, we are most thankful to the producer organizations and their members in the Northern Province for sharing their experience with the evaluation team.

Thank you to the Evaluation Manager, Ms. Jittima Srisuknam, Programme Office for Thailand and Lao PDR, for her coordination and support to the evaluation process as a whole; and to Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka, the Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officer of ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific for her advice and oversight.

## ABBREVIATIONS

CEPA	Centre for Poverty Analysis
CO	ILO Country Office
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DFAT	Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
DoA	(Provincial) Department of Agriculture
DoCD	(Provincial) Department of Cooperatives Development
DoF	(Provincial) Department of Fisheries
DS	District Secretariat/Divisional Secretariat
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
EFC	Employers' Federation of Ceylon
EGLR	Economic Generation and Livelihoods through Reconciliation Project
FCS	Fishing Cooperative Society
GA	Government Agent
ILO	International Labour Organization
IUU	Illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing
LEED	Local Empowerment through Economic Development
LKA	Sri Lankan Rupee
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MFA	Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MOLTUR/MOL	Ministry of Labour and Trade Union Relations
MoTC	Ministry of Trade and Commerce
MSME	Micro, small and medium enterprises
NAQDA	National Aquaculture Development Authority (Ministry of Fisheries)
NCE	National Chamber of Exporters
NPC	National Project Coordinator
PwD	Persons with Disabilities
TOR	Terms of Reference
TSF	Taprobane Sea Food (PVT) Ltd.
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	UN Evaluation Group
VCD	Value Chain Development

Exchange rate used: 1 USD=167 Sri Lankan Rupee (LKR) at 29 October, 2018.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Project Description and Evaluation Background

The International Labour Organization (ILO) implemented the Employment Generation and Livelihoods through Reconciliation (EGLR) project in Sri Lanka from 1 November 2016 until 31 October 2018. Funding is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, with a total budget of US\$1.8 million.

The EGLR project represents an extension of the Local Empowerment through Economic Development (LEED) project, implemented by ILO from 2011-2016 with funding from the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT). The LEED project responded to the need to rebuild livelihoods in the Northern Province in the aftermath of the 26-year civil war which ended in May 2009. The key innovation introduced by LEED was to employ a market-driven approach to livelihood development, linking northern primary producers with southern Sri Lankan export and domestic markets.

Recognizing the need to extend and scale-up the effort, EGLR focuses on strengthening livelihoods in the fruit and vegetables and fishery sectors, targeting vulnerable communities and extending the geographical coverage to new districts. Strategically, EGLR continues to address the north-south development gap and the perception of inequality between the two main communities that was at the heart of the protracted conflict.

Overall, EGLR aims to contribute to sustainable peace and conflict transformation by reducing conflict-related economic inequalities and enabling more equitable and inclusive economic development in the economic recovery and reconciliation process in Sri Lanka. The project goal is *to promote an enabling environment for competitive, sustainable enterprise development and creation of 2,000 decent and productive employment opportunities among the vulnerable people including women in the conflict affected Northern region in Sri Lanka by June 2018.*

Three Immediate Outcomes are proposed to achieve the project goal:

1. Improved export earnings through mutually beneficial business partnerships in fruits and vegetables sector;
2. Developed/improved mutually beneficial partnerships in fishery sector; and
3. Improved gender responsive development interventions.

The project operates in the five districts of the Northern Province: Vavuniya, Mullaitivu, Kilinochchi, Jaffna and Mannar, including newly resettled areas in Jaffna. It targets smallholder farmers and fishers and their communities, with special attention to women and female-headed households and persons with disabilities. Producer organizations, such as cooperative societies, are the main point of contact between the fishing and farming communities and the project.

**Evaluation background:** The final evaluation of EGLR was commissioned by the ILO and conducted from mid-September to November 2018. Its purpose is twofold: - to support accountability and to contribute to organizational learning of the ILO, the donor, implementing partners and other interested parties. It is expected that the results of the evaluation can be considered in the strategic planning for the next

phase, known as the “LEED Plus” project, which commenced in September 2018 with joint Norwegian and Australian funding.

The evaluation was guided by a set of questions organized under the criteria of relevance and design, effectiveness of interventions, management effectiveness, efficiency and impact orientation and sustainability. The evaluation is based on evidence obtained during qualitative interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries and a desk review of project documentation and reference material. The evaluation team carried out interviews in Colombo with ILO staff, national government and private sector stakeholders, and conducted field work in four of five implementation districts in the Northern Province. The field work culminated in a stakeholder workshop held in Kilinochchi on October 15 2018 with participants from province and district government agencies, cooperative societies and their members from fishing and farming communities and the private sector.

## **Main Findings and Conclusions**

### **Relevance and Design**

With poverty still widespread in the Northern Province, EGLR continued to be relevant to community needs for sustainable livelihood development. The expansion to Jaffna and Mannar districts reached more communities who suffered damage to their livelihoods in the aftermath of the conflict and who have not previously been supported through a market-driven approach. On the other hand, a more comprehensive economic and social assessment in the newly included communities would have been valuable to reassess the approach and increase the relevance of the interventions.

The cooperatives and their members found the support to production inputs, training to improve production and cooperative organization and links to southern markets highly relevant to their needs. From the perspective of international and local exporters and retailers the partnerships with northern producer associations have provided a source of reliable, high quality agricultural and seafood products at stable prices. At the national level, EGLR supports the government’s vision of economic growth through exports, tackling unequal development across provinces and inclusive employment.

The evaluation found that the project’s intervention logic was essentially sound, but lacked clear objectives for local government capacity to support and sustain the approach. Moreover, the expression of the design in the results framework could have been much more rigorous to enable results-based monitoring and evaluation.

### **Effectiveness of Interventions**

EGLR has largely achieved its goal and outcome targets of improved livelihoods of small-holder farmers and increasing employment. It reached over 2,000 beneficiaries and raised cumulative income to over US\$2 million for each sector over two years. It has also enabled Sri Lankan and international export companies to source more fruit and vegetable and fisheries products reliably and at stable prices.

**Cooperative capacity.** Among the cooperatives previously supported by LEED, in Kilinochchi, Mullaitivu and Vavuniya North, production incomes and commercial viability have reached high levels of maturity.

These benefits were extended to some cooperatives in Jaffna and Mannar, but were not seen to the same extent in the newly supported areas such as the Jaffna islands and the re-settled area of Tellipalai, which came on board later in the implementation.

EGLR's provision of business development services and soft skills training and mentoring helped many cooperatives to become better governed, commercial enterprises, providing financial and social welfare services to members. However, among cooperatives that flourished under LEED, some threats have emerged in the form of accumulated business losses and crop diseases. The newly formed cooperatives are making stable incomes from sales to supermarket chains, but not yet reaching break-even point without external subsidies to running costs. The evaluation concluded that the process of support needs to be more customized and should allow sufficient duration to build cooperatives' independence.

In the **fruit and vegetables sector** the targeted cooperatives have established lucrative business partnerships with export and domestic buyers for crops including Lady Red Papaya, banana, passion fruit and Moringa leaves. Comprehensive evidence of changes in individual incomes as a result of the interventions is not available, but there are good indications from project reports and evaluation interviews that household incomes have improved, reaching 40,000 – 50,000 LKR (US\$ 240-300) on average per month. EGLR also enabled more crop diversification as a successful resilience strategy. Buyer demand influenced crop selection decisions; however, full value chain studies would have been useful to potentially expand the benefits.

**In fisheries**, EGLR built on the LEED strategy, successfully supporting most of the targeted fishing cooperatives to become purchasing enterprises, thereby increasing fishers' incomes by cutting out the middle-man traders. Incomes of crab fishers have reached \$360 per month on average. The project also helped more fishing households and communities to re-build their fishing assets, both individually and collectively, and to redeem their debts to traders. EGLR capitalized on opportunities in aquaculture to help farmers set up collective sea cucumber farms as a lucrative source of livelihood for those not involved in sea fishing, and to venture into mud crab farming. The ILO's partnership with Taprobane Sea Foods has helped to expand local employment for women in crab processing plants, creating around 600 jobs in total, meeting decent work standards. However, some fishing communities targeted remain vulnerable - the purchasing practice has not yet reached all the cooperatives and some fishing communities remain highly indebted, suggesting the need for intensified support.

**Gender equity.** As targeted beneficiaries, women made up more than half of those provided with production inputs. Women are the major beneficiaries of employment generated in seafood processing; while there is room for improvement in the quality of jobs in sea cucumber processing. As a result of the project's advocacy, inroads are gradually being made in increasing women's participation in traditionally male dominated cooperatives. Men are still the majority of cooperative boards of management, but some women elected to boards are demonstrably empowered and taking an active role in the direction and vision of the cooperative. Cooperative members in both sectors recounted an increased recognition that women can be breadwinners alongside men, changes in household management of finances, and



increased spending on education and health, which they attributed to gender discussion forums and women's increased economic role.

### **Management effectiveness and efficiency**

The management arrangements and staff capacity have been highly effective in the project delivery. The main gap identified by the evaluation was the lack of an M&E Officer during most of the project, limiting the effectiveness of the M&E system. The monitoring and evaluation system lacked baseline information to support systematic comparisons and was under-utilized in terms of reporting and making management adjustments. The project demonstrated a strong level of cost-effectiveness, with a high proportion of funds dedicated to the implementation of programme activities. The allocation of human resources was efficient with delivery achieved through a small team of field staff with extensive expertise. The evaluation observed that the project could have developed a more effective communications and knowledge sharing strategy towards national replication and scale-up. Significantly, however, EGLR has shared its experience internationally, with notable influence on practices in other post-conflict countries.

### **Sustainability**

The evaluation found that the capacities of most of the producer cooperatives to select new products, access wider markets and negotiate with buyers have been sustainably improved. As business enterprises the cooperatives have reached varying degrees of independence. Some require little further external support while others are likely to require more support to reach financial sustainability. Among individual farmers and fishers the evaluation found a high degree of confidence that their livelihood means are now more stable.

Private sector engagement in the North, particularly through the National Chamber of Exporters (NCE), shows signs of continued growth. The local government agencies in agriculture and fisheries are supportive of the cooperatives approach and the Cooperatives Department itself was engaged; but the project was less focused at the level of government capacity to sustain and expand the overall approach.

### **Emerging Good Practices and Lessons Learned**

The evaluation identified several good practices of EGLR which provide potential models for replication:

- The central approach of strengthening producer cooperatives as viable business enterprises has proven to be an effective approach for inclusive economic development;
- Sea cucumber farming models share benefits equitably among small producer teams, including women, markets are assured and farming meets environmental sustainability;
- Supporting women's producer associations was highly effective in building the economic independence, social standing and empowerment of conflict-affected women;
- Fostering champions among private sector peak bodies such as the NCE played a pivotal role in introducing new export partners, strengthening north-south trust.

The evaluation identified the following lessons learned:

- Effective monitoring and evaluation requires adequate resources, time and expertise.

- It is important to establish a practical system for communications and feedback with the range of local government agencies, and to establish an ongoing role of key agencies in support of the economic development approach.
- Building producer cooperative society viability requires several years of intensive support.

## Recommendations

The recommendations are directed towards future projects and specifically the next phase of the LEED project, as well as broader application where relevant. Full details are provided in the report.

1. **In future geographic and community targeting**, continue and intensify project support to the most vulnerable communities and cooperative societies supported under EGLR, especially those supported in Jaffna islands, re-settled areas and Mannar district where interventions are still in their infancy. *(ILO, donors, implementing partners; high priority; medium term; medium resources)*
2. **Develop and apply a systematic capacity assessment framework for cooperative societies and producer groups from the outset to identify needs, track progress and determine the exit point for project assistance.** *(ILO project team, Province/District Department of Cooperatives; high priority; short to medium term; medium resources)*
3. **In future project governance and partner coordination under LEED Plus** increase ownership of government stakeholders at the sub-national level through regular reporting and dialogue with the relevant line ministries and administrative government. Explore the feasibility of utilizing existing sub-national coordination institutions for project reporting and coordination. *(ILO and government partners; high priority; short-medium term; low resources)*
4. **Improve monitoring and evaluation system and resourcing.** Ensure that the M&E framework defines a set of relevant and specific indicators with target values to be achieved at appropriate milestone intervals and collect baseline data for the key indicators to enable assessment of progress and outcomes. *(ILO; high priority; short term; medium resources).*
5. **Implement an innovative communications and advocacy strategy.** Ensure that learning from implementation is documented and shared at the project level, nationally and internationally through a comprehensive communications and advocacy strategy. *(Project team, ILO HQ, New Delhi DWT; high priority; medium term; medium resources)*
6. **Address occupational safety and health concerns in seafood processing plants.** Work with sea cucumber processing exporters and local cooperative societies to improve the OSH and working conditions of employed sea cucumber processors to meet decent work standards. *(ILO, export partners, fishery federation; high priority; short-term; low resources)*
7. **Enhance gender and inclusion strategies and project staffing.** Suggested strategies to increase the advancement of women and persons with disabilities include: mentoring programs matching successful women with those starting out in production and cooperative management; replicate the PTK women's entrepreneurship model; strengthen the gender and social inclusion expertise in the team with a dedicated staff member located in the field, ideally fluent in Tamil language. (Full

details in the report) (*ILO and implementing partners; high priority; medium term; medium resources*)

8. **Provide psychosocial support or linkages to such services in conflict-affected communities.** (*ILO, in collaboration with government/other development parties; high priority; medium-long-term; medium resources*)
9. **Expand debt release among fishers leveraging alternative funding sources such as cooperative society guaranteed bank loans** and hence reduce the reliance on project grants. (*ILO project, cooperative societies and federations; medium priority; medium term; medium resources*)
10. **Establish stronger collaboration with the Export Development Board for expanded markets for northern producers and fair trade advocacy.** (*ILO, private sector, national/provincial Department of Cooperatives; Medium priority; medium term; low resources*)

# **I. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

## **1.1 Background**

The Employment Generation and Livelihoods through Reconciliation (EGLR) Project has been implemented by the ILO in Sri Lanka from 1 November 2016 until 31 October 2018. Funding is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, with an initial budget of approximately US\$ 1.3 million, increased to US\$1.8 million through an Addendum to the project budget of US\$540,000 signed in December 2017.

The project represents an extension of the ILO's Local Empowerment through Economic Development (LEED) project carried out in the Northern and Eastern provinces from 2011 to 2016 with funding from the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT).

The ILO commissioned the final independent evaluation of the project in September 2018 in accordance with the ILO's evaluation policy.

## **1.2 Project Overview**

Emerging from the 26-year civil war in the north and east of Sri Lanka in May 2009, the communities in the Northern Province faced enormous challenges due to widespread destruction of infrastructure, loss of lives, massive population displacement, loss of livelihood opportunities and widespread unemployment and underemployment. Agriculture remained the basis of the northern economy with crops, livestock and fisheries as the major sub-sectors, but upgrades were badly needed to create more jobs and decent livelihoods. The industrial sector in the Northern Province still remains underdeveloped, owing to the impact of the conflict on its economy. Poverty is still more widespread than in the southern parts of the country.

In this context, the ILO initiated the LEED project focusing on the reduction of conflict-related inequalities and promoting equitable and inclusive economic development. It employed a market-driven approach linking Northern primary producer communities with southern Sri Lankan export and domestic markets.

Recognizing the need to extend and scale-up this effort, EGLR builds on the LEED project, focusing on scaling up the activities in the fruit and vegetable and the fishery sectors and targeting vulnerable communities, with a specific focus on women and women-headed households. Strategically it focuses on the north-south development gap and the perception of inequality between the two main communities that was at the heart of the protracted conflict in the country. The EGLR project uses the networks that the ILO has already built among the government and private sector key organizations under the LEED project to execute the project.

The project operates in the five districts of the Northern Province: Vavuniya, Mullaitivu, Kilinochchi and Jaffna and Mannar, including newly resettled areas such as Palali & Mylitty. Implementation in Jaffna and Mannar was expanded in 2018 under the project Addendum signed with the donor.

At the impact level, the EGLR project aims to contribute to sustainable peace and conflict transformation by reducing conflict-related economic inequalities and enabling more equitable and inclusive economic development in the economic recovery and reconciliation process in Sri Lanka. The project goal is *to promote an enabling environment for competitive, sustainable enterprise development and creation of 2,000 decent and productive employment opportunities among the vulnerable people including women in the conflict affected Northern region in Sri Lanka by June 2018.*

The EGLR project sets three immediate outcomes to achieve the project goal:

**Immediate Outcome 1.** Improved export earnings through mutually beneficial business partnerships in fruits and vegetables sector;

**Immediate Outcome 2.** Developed/improved mutually beneficial partnerships in fishery sector; and

**Immediate Outcome 3.** Improved gender responsive development interventions.

**Target groups and beneficiaries:** The main target groups of the project are the resettled small farmers and fishers and their communities in the Northern Province. The project also prioritizes women, women heads of households and persons with disabilities with direct assistance. Producer organizations, such as cooperatives, are the main point of contact between the fishing and farming communities and the project. The project supported a total of 18 cooperatives and two fishery federations towards increasing their market linkages and profitability.

### **Management and Implementing partners**

From November 2016 through 2017, the project was managed by a National Project Coordinator, with a field team comprising two field coordinators, a Finance and Administration Officer and a driver. In April 2018, two additional field coordinators joined the team, followed by a Monitoring and Evaluation Officer in June, cost-shared with the Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labour (CLEAR) project. In May 2018, a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) was appointed to oversee the ILO Sri Lanka Jobs for Peace and Reconciliation Programme, including EGLR and the incoming LEED Plus project launched in September 2018, with funding from the Norwegian MFA and Australian DFAT. The ILO's Country Director and the project focal point provide support from Colombo.

At the national level the EGLR project continues to work with the Ministry of Labour and Trade Union Relations (MOLTUR); respective line ministries and technical departments, such as the Provincial Department of Agriculture, Department of Fisheries, Department of Cooperatives Development; and private sector peak bodies such as the National Chamber of Exporters (NCE) and the Employers' Federation of Ceylon (EFC). Through the Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) it also engages with trade union representatives. Most coordination is done at the sub-national level through the provincial and district Department of Cooperatives Development (DoCD), the National Aquaculture Development Authority (NAQDA) in Kilinochchi and provincial and District Departments of Agriculture, District Secretary Offices and Divisional Secretariats.

## II. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Objectives and Scope

#### Objectives

The purpose of the final evaluation is to support accountability and to contribute to organizational learning of the ILO, the donor, implementing partners and other interested parties. It is expected that the results of the final evaluation of EGLR can be taken into account in strategic planning for the next phase of the project that has commenced through the LEED Plus Project, jointly funded by the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), Norway.

The objectives of the evaluation as stated in the Terms of Reference (TOR, **Annex H**) are to assess the:

- relevance of the intervention objectives and approaches, particularly in promoting and strengthening sustainable competitive enterprises and productive and sustainable employment in the Northern Province;
- project implementation effectiveness including the progress in achieving its expected outcomes; effectiveness of gender mainstreaming throughout all interventions; effectiveness of increasing sustainable employment and enterprise development opportunities for vulnerable people including women in the Northern Province; effectiveness of narrowing disparities in the capacities, power structures, cultural gaps and subsequent terms of trade between Northern and Southern businesses and producers; and effectiveness of management arrangements;
- efficiency of resource use; and identify
- factors that influenced (positively or negatively) the sustainability of the EGLR project interventions;
- good practices at the project level that can and should be replicated;
- lessons learned that could be useful to strengthen the next phase of the project.

#### Scope and clients

The evaluation scope covers the full geographic scope of the project and all of the interventions the ILO has implemented under the EGLR project from the start in November 2016 until the time of final evaluation field mission in October 2018.

The primary clients of the evaluation are the beneficiaries, ILO CO-Colombo, the donor, project management team, and business associations. Secondary clients include but are not limited to the social partners, relevant provincial departments, divisional secretariats and targeted district secretary offices, Coop ILO Geneva, and the DWT-New Delhi and Bangkok and other development partners. The evaluation findings are directed particularly to the project implementing partners and ILO units responsible for backstopping the project.

## 2.2 Evaluation Methodology

### Evaluation team and management

The evaluation was conducted by a team of two independent evaluators, comprising an international consultant and a local consultant. The International Consultant acted as the lead and was responsible for oversight of the evaluation and preparation of the deliverables. The consultants worked closely throughout the preparation and field work and jointly prepared the stakeholder workshop presentation.

The evaluation was managed by an independent ILO officer based in the ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, with backstopping by the Regional Monitoring and Evaluation officer at ILO ROAP Bangkok.

### Approach and Ethical Considerations

The evaluation uses a mixed methods approach including quantitative and qualitative evidence to answer the evaluation questions. The qualitative evidence was based on interviews with relevant stakeholders that have participated in and are intended to benefit from the project as well as analysis of project-related documents and other contextual material. The analysis incorporated quantitative target values tracked and reported by the project including the Progress Reports, monitoring and evaluation system data.

The evaluation team was careful to observe confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. The evaluation adheres to confidentiality and other ethical considerations throughout, following the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Ethical Guidelines and Norms and Standards in the UN System, 2016.<sup>1</sup> To mitigate bias during the data collection process project staff were not present during interviews with other stakeholders and beneficiaries.

The evaluators took care to integrate diversity, equality and cultural sensitivity in the evaluation approach. The gender dimension was considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and findings. The evaluation also utilised the standards for evaluation as described in the ILO's Policy Guidelines for Evaluation (3rd edition 2017)<sup>2</sup>.

### Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The TOR provided a set of specific questions to guide the evaluation, organized according to the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of (1) Relevance<sup>3</sup>; (2) Effectiveness of Interventions; (3) Effectiveness of Management Arrangements; (4) Efficiency of Resource Use; and (5) Impact Orientation and Sustainability. The lead evaluator refined the questions, making adjustments for clarity and adding selected questions, and shared with the Evaluation Manager and the EGLR team for comment during the inception period. The final evaluation questions are listed below.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed\\_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms\\_571339.pdf](http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_571339.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> The evaluator added the related criteria of design validity to this category since some of the evaluation questions are more related to design coherence and validity than relevance of the interventions.

## Relevance and Design Validity

1. How relevant are the project interventions to promote and strengthen sustainable competitive enterprises and productive and sustainable employment in the Northern Province?
2. Has the EGLR been able to adapt its approaches to the changing context to address priority needs of the people, district and province?
3. To what extent is this project aligned with ILO's mandate as envisaged in the DWCP 2013-2017 and DWCP 2018-2022?
4. Have the EGLR interventions been relevant to the needs of women, people with disabilities, and other marginalized and disadvantaged groups?
5. To what extent are the outcomes in line with provincial, districts' and people's priorities?
6. To what extent have relevant lessons learned and recommendations of the evaluations of the LEED project been applied in the approach and design of EGLR? How effectively did ELGR apply this learning?"
7. To what extent is the project theory of change valid and & coherent?
8. Was the geographic scope, scale of implementation and timeframe of the project appropriate to achieve the desired results?

## Effectiveness of Interventions

9. Achievement of outcomes and outputs
  - a) To what extent has the project achieved its intended outcomes and outputs? What factors have contributed to achieving or non-achievement?
  - b) What have been the positive and negative and intended and unintended results?
  - c) Have the quantity and quality of the outputs produced been satisfactory?
  - d) Has the approach taken in the empowerment activity efforts been effective?
10. Assess the effectiveness of gender strategies. In particular a) Did the benefits accrue taking into account the different needs of men and women? b) How effectively have the project interventions mainstreamed gender throughout all interventions, not just Outcome 3?
11. How effectively has the project increased sustainable employment and enterprise development opportunities for vulnerable people, including women, in the Northern Province?
12. How effectively have the project interventions narrowed disparities in the capacities, power structures, cultural gaps and subsequent terms of trade between Northern and Southern businesses and producers?
13. Has the project partnership approach been appropriate and effective in contributing the outcomes?
14. How has the peace and reconciliation aspect been addressed through the project?<sup>4</sup>
  - a) Has there been any effort to achieve reconciliation through the project or is it expected that the eventual reconciliation will emerge through the project activities?
  - b) What effects do the interventions have on people with regard to sustaining peace and reconciliation?
15. New initiatives planned for the project:
  - a) Have the original plans for new initiatives taken place? E.g. Blue swimming crab hatcheries.
  - b) Has planning been sufficient for new initiatives? What were the obstacles?
  - c) Has the project introduced new activities beyond those conducted under the LEED project?
16. Has there been a focus on identifying new risks and mitigation measures under EGLR? Several things have been continued over the years (e.g. cultivation of papaya and crab processing). a) What could be the risks of continuation of the same work? What are the market trends? c) Do project staff have the capacity to do regular assessments?

---

<sup>4</sup> The project's contribution to peace and reconciliation is addressed in two ways in the report: As a question relation to the design theory and as question of impact.



17. Differentiate between districts: (a) Have there been differences in the outcomes/results among the districts where the project was implemented? b) Has there been a focus on identifying the differences and the need of different approaches in implementation?

### **Effectiveness of Management Arrangements**

18. To what extent do the project management capacities and arrangements put in place support the achievement of the planned results?
19. To what extent have stakeholders, particularly employers' organizations and trade unions been involved in project implementation?
20. To what extent are the main target groups of the project and the project key stakeholders satisfied with the technical support provided by the ELGR project team and ILO specialists?
21. Has the project received adequate administrative, technical, and if needed, political support from concerned ILO offices (CO Colombo, HQ technical departments, and DWT-New Delhi, if relevant)?
22. Monitoring & Evaluation. How effectively has the project management and ILO monitored project performance and results?
  - a) Is a monitoring and evaluation system in place and how effective has it been?
  - b) Are appropriate means of verification for tracking progress, performance and achievement of indicator values defined?
  - c) Are relevant information and data systematically collected? Is reporting satisfactory? Is data disaggregated by sex (and other characteristics if relevant)?
  - d) Is information regularly analysed to feed into management decisions?

### **Efficiency of Resource Use**

23. Have resources (funds, human resources, time etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve results (outputs and outcomes)?
24. Have resources been allocated to integrate gender equality, disability in the design and monitoring of activities? Have they been used efficiently?
25. Have the outputs been delivered in a timely manner? If not what factors hindered timely delivery? Any measures taken?
26. To what extent have the project resources been leveraged with other related projects or programmes to maximise impact?
27. Have the results been achieved at an acceptable cost compared with other alternative approaches? If so, which types of interventions have proven to be more cost effective?

### **Impact Orientation and Sustainability**

28. To what extent are the results of the interventions likely to be durable, able to be maintained or even scaled-up and replicated by intervention partners after the major assistance has been completed?
29. What strategies has the ELGR project put in place to ensure continuation of the mechanisms, tools and practices provided once the support from ELGR ends? To what extent are these strategies likely to be effective?
30. How effective has the programme been in establishing national/local ownership?
31. Is there a clear exit strategy at project level, factoring in environmental, operational and financial sustainability beyond the project interventions?
32. There may be trends that cooperatives are no longer the preferred model among for local economic activities among national authorities This may be a point to be verified (in an appropriate way) with relevant National authorities during stakeholder meetings, and may influence sustainability planning.

### **Data Collection Methodology**

In response to the evaluation questions, the lead evaluator prepared a Data Collection Matrix (included at **Annex B**) which presents the evaluation questions together with the sources of data and main data collection methods that were used to answer each question. In the analysis, the evaluators triangulated

information from various sources and stakeholder perspectives as far as possible to ensure reliable and robust conclusions. The data sources and methods included:

- Review of documents directly related to the project and context-related materials;
- Individual interviews and group discussions with Colombo CO staff, EGLR project staff, ILO specialist in Geneva by Skype
- Individual interviews and group discussions with partner cooperatives, government stakeholders, private sector partners
- Observations of fishing and agriculture interventions in the communities
- Stakeholder workshop held in the Northern Province following field visits to present the preliminary findings of the evaluators and solicit further perspectives on the project achievements.

**Timing and process:** The evaluation took place from Mid-September to end of October, 2018, with reporting finalized in November, 2018. It included the following main phases:

**Inception:** During the inception period, the Evaluation Team organized and reviewed the documents provided by the project team and identified the key stakeholders to be interviewed, in consultation with the NPC, and EGLR team. See **Annex C** for the list of documents and reference material reviewed. Briefing interviews were held with the evaluation manager, the CTA and the project NPC. A Skype interview was also held with the manager of the COOP Unit in Geneva. The evaluation team developed the field visit itinerary in consultation with the NPC and staff prior to the field visit, with discussion focused on the cooperative selection criteria.<sup>5</sup> During the mission the itinerary was further adjusted with project field staff. This was necessary to allow for individual interviews with the project staff, which had not been clearly scheduled, and a more efficient arrangement of the site visits. The Inception Report, including the evaluation work plan and methodology, was finalized following the start of the evaluation mission on 4 October, 2018, as the field schedule was still under discussion.

**Data Collection and field visit:** The field visit to Sri Lanka took place from 29 September to 16 October. It included initial meetings with Colombo based ILO staff, donor representatives, national government stakeholders, and private sector partners. These were, followed by a series of meetings with cooperatives boards and beneficiaries in four districts along with government stakeholders. **Annex D** provides the final field itinerary; the list of persons interviewed is included at **Annex E**. The evaluation team developed a set of interview and focus group discussion guides for each main stakeholder group based on the evaluation questions and sub-questions. These guides were used for semi-structured interviews and were intended to be flexible to allow particular topics to be followed up as necessary. The use of the question guides ensured a consistent approach within stakeholder groups.

---

<sup>5</sup> In order to develop selection criteria, the evaluation team requested information from the EGLR project team about the interventions per district and the profile of the targeted producer groups in terms of year of registration, number of members, sector of production (agriculture, fisheries, SME) and type of business (aquaculture, sea fishing, fruit and vegetables) and identification of any key models.

**Stakeholder workshop:** The field visits culminated in a Stakeholder Workshop held in Kilinochchi District on 15 October, 2018. The purpose of the workshop was twofold: first, for the evaluation team to present their initial findings and receive feedback from the stakeholders; second, to gather further perspectives on the project's achievements and future directions from a broader range of stakeholders than those met during field interviews, and to solicit additional recommendations for sustainability and the future interventions.

The workshop was attended by approximately 50 representatives from the Northern Province, including local government, cooperative boards and beneficiaries; the National Chamber of Exporters and project staff. The group discussion questions and outputs are included at **Annex G**.

Following the workshop de-briefing meetings were held with the evaluators and project team in Kilinochchi, and separately with the ILO Country Director, Country Office staff and the Norwegian Embassy representatives on 16 October.

**Analysis and Reporting:** The evaluators progressively analyzed the data during the field visit and following the completion of the field visit and stakeholder workshop. The report drafting and finalization was completed between 18 October and 20 November, 2018.

### **Sampling of beneficiary cooperative societies and summary of interviews**

As the cooperatives are the main entry point for the project interventions, a sample of cooperatives was selected to visit based on criteria proposed by the evaluator:

- Coverage of at least three districts, including a new area not included in the LEED project
- Representation of fisheries and agriculture cooperatives, including a range of production models – aquaculture
- Inclusion of groups of special target groups - women, differently abled persons
- A mix of highly successful and less successful cooperatives in terms of independence and operational capacity

The selection of cooperatives went through a series of revisions in consultation with the Project team based on analysis of information on profile of the cooperatives. A total of 10 primary producer groups and two secondary producer groups (Cooperative federations) were met (Table 1). One adjustment to the cooperatives to visit was made during the field mission to allow a better balance of business models among the fisheries cooperatives.

**Table 1: Cooperatives and Federations Met**

District	Agriculture/MSME	Fisheries	Total
Kilinochchi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vinayagapuram – Mulangavil</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fishery Federation Jeyapuram - Poonakary</li> <li>• Valaipadu Cooperative</li> <li>• Iranaimatha Cooperative</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>
Mullaitivu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Olirum Valvu (Agr/MSME)</li> <li>• Young Farmers' Club</li> <li>• Puthukudiyiruppu Women's Entrepreneur Coop Society</li> </ul>		<b>3</b>
Vavuniya	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vavuniya North Farmers Coop</li> </ul>		<b>1</b>
Jaffna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Palali Agriculture Producers – Tellipalai</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fisheries Federation of Jaffna</li> <li>• St. Thomas FCS – Eluvaitivu Is.</li> <li>• St. Xavier FCS – Punkudutivu Is.</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>

The evaluation team interviewed a total of 184 persons, representing the following stakeholder groups as indicated in Table 2.

**Table 2: Number of Interviewees by Stakeholder Group**

Stakeholder Group	No. of Interviewees	Gender Identification	
		F	M
Donor	3	2	1
EGLR Project team	7	1	6
CO Staff and ILO Geneva	7	3	4
Government	9	2	7
Private sector partners	7	3	4
Cooperative members & employees	151	68	83
<b>Total</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>79 (43%)</b>	<b>105 (57%)</b>

### 2.3 Evaluation Limitations

The evaluation is not able to assess impact in a rigorous manner as there was no systematic baseline information. Additionally, the range of parallel development assistance activities in the region makes attribution difficult. The timeframe did not permit interviews with non-beneficiary households to make comparisons of progress with primary producers who are not members of the assisted cooperative societies. However, the evaluation does assess the contribution of the project to changes in the key dimensions such as cooperative society functioning and communities' livelihoods based on qualitative accounts and quantitative data where available.

It was not always possible to distinguish between the outputs and results achieved by LEED and results achieved during the period of ELGR implementation as many stakeholders perceive the assistance to be part of one ILO project, though the evaluators asked interviewees to focus on the EGLR period. At the level of broader outcomes, the achievements reported are rightly due to the cumulative efforts under both LEED and EGLR.

The evaluation was commissioned close to the end of the project, with field work concluding two weeks before the project close, therefore there was no time remaining to incorporate lessons from the evaluation in the EGLR exit strategy for the targeted cooperative partners. While there is an excellent opportunity to apply such lessons under LEED+, there is no guarantee that all of the same cooperative societies will continue to receive support. The timing also meant that the project team was busy with project closure activities as well as management of inception assessments for LEED Plus, which limited the time the staff could spend with the evaluation team.

## **2.4 Organization of the Report**

Following the current section, Section III presents the findings of the evaluation in response to the evaluation questions, organized according to the main evaluation themes; Section IV provides the main conclusions of the evaluation; Section V presents the key lessons learned and emerging good practices that the evaluation identified. The recommendations of the evaluation are presented in Section VI.

## III. EVALUATION FINDINGS

### 3.1 Relevance and Design Validity

This section addresses the relevance of EGLR’s interventions to achieve the project goal and objectives, and whether the strategies continued to be relevant and were adapted as needed to the changing context. It also assesses the relevance to the expressed needs of particular stakeholder groups and the strategic fit with ILO and wider development frameworks.

The second part addresses the clarity of the intervention logic or “theory of change”, and its expression in the design document; including how the goal of peace and reconciliation is expected to come about; the extent to which learning from LEED evaluations was included in the design of the strategies and implementation approach, and the feasibility of the designed scope. The assessment draws on document review and individual and group interviews with a wide range of stakeholder perspectives from national to local level.

#### 3.1.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit

##### Needs analysis and selected interventions

Overall, the evaluation found that the interventions have continued to be highly relevant to needs at producer and producer organization level. A more comprehensive needs assessment in the newly included Jaffna island communities would have been valuable to reassess the approach and increase the relevance of the interventions in these areas. The North-South business partnerships approach has also been relevant to the needs and interests of international and local exporters and retailers to source reliable, high quality products. At national government level EGLR is well-aligned with the government vision for export development and promoting national harmony.

The two-year phase of EGLR has essentially identified and addressed the same issues as those addressed by LEED relating to the need for inclusive and sustainable livelihood growth in disadvantaged Northern communities. The evaluation finds that this approach did have continuing relevance given that the Northern Province, along with the Eastern Province, is reported as still economically disadvantaged compared to other parts of the country. Although the Project Document does not provide an analysis of the status of poverty disparities between the north and south, the disparities are well-documented in the LEED Plus Project Document, which reports that the poverty headcount index in 2016 remained higher in districts such as Mullaitivu (12.7%) and Kilinochchi (18.2%) compared with the National index of 4.1.<sup>6</sup>

In expanding the reach to new beneficiaries in the previously supported districts of Vavuniya, Mullaitivu and Kilinochchi, and addressing the problems of severely damaged agriculture and fisheries livelihoods in the new included districts of Jaffna and Mannar, the project addresses needs not met under LEED. Despite the lack of a comprehensive assessment of the poverty and livelihoods situation at the baseline,

---

<sup>6</sup> Sri Lanka Department of Census and Statistics. Poverty Indicators, 2016. LEED+ Project Proposal.

the evaluation interviews with communities and beneficiaries indicated that many had poor productivity and incomes prior to EGLR, and found the direct support to productive inputs and markets highly relevant. Individual cooperative board members eloquently expressed the value of EGLR's support at the Evaluation Stakeholder Workshop.

"We struggle for our survival in the sea. The ILO was like a catamaran when we were drowning" Poonakary Fisheries Federation member. Stakeholder workshop.

The Project Document relies largely on the description of LEED's approaches and documented success to justify its interventions.<sup>7</sup> The approach taken was to continue the strategy of local economic development for the most part channeled through the cooperatives model; scaling up production and beneficiary reach in existing locations and extending to new areas including recently re-settled communities such as Thelipallai, and isolated island communities in Jaffna (Eluvaitivu, Pungkudutivu, Delft), and Mannar. However, when the EGLR phase entered significant improvements to incomes and cooperative organizing had already been made in the districts and producer groups supported by LEED as reported by the final evaluation, while the evaluation observed a considerable variety between the maturity of cooperatives and the needs of communities. To some extent EGLR has tailored responses to needs in the newly target cooperatives and the interventions are therefore relevant (e.g. providing fishing gear to fishers in Jaffna islands), but the evaluators found that there was not sufficient in-depth assessment of the broader community situation and potential barriers to economic and social participation, including the psychosocial scars of the conflict. It appears that the short timeframe did not permit the team to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the economic and social situation of cooperative members and their communities.

The strategy of working through producer cooperatives and associations and strengthening their market linkages has proven to have continued relevance to the interests of northern producer groups and communities, as well as those of southern and regional exporters, based on the comments of private sector interviewees, local government, and cooperative boards. Representatives of Taprobane Sea Foods (TSF) and the National Chamber of Exporters (NCE) interviewed praised the ILO approach, its contribution to strengthening their business partnerships and their awareness of labour standards. According to the representative, TSF is proud to be associated with ILO as the international authority on labour standards. The evaluation concluded that the cooperative model is an appropriate approach to strengthen community cohesion and economic resilience in the Northern region. The institutional choice of cooperatives as the vehicle for economic development was also determined as the best option among alternative models in the CEPA case study as part of their impact study series for LEED.<sup>8</sup> The cooperative movement has a long history in the North and all fishing boat operators are required to be members of a cooperative. It provides a platform for collective bargaining for household based small-scale entrepreneurs. There are also some risks associated with cooperatives, as discussed under the section addressing the effectiveness of interventions (Section 3.3).

---

<sup>7</sup> The Project Document is the funding application to the MFA Norway. The document provided to the evaluation team may not be the final version as it contains some editorial comments.

<sup>8</sup> Centre for Poverty Analysis. 2016. Series #3. Case Study on Cooperatives in Vavuniya and Kilinochchi. July 2016.

**Relevance to the needs of women and people with disabilities:** Regarding the felt needs of women and female-headed households, interviews with women farmers in various cooperatives confirmed that EGLR met their needs for improved productive farming capacity, and was especially helpful for sole income earners with families to support. In fishing communities processing plants provided needed job opportunities. Women participants’ perceptions of the project’s benefits and relevance to their needs are discussed in more detail in the section addressing the effectiveness of the interventions.

Support to PWDs has mainly been mainstreamed through beneficiary targeting for direct supports, as well as support to one association of persons with disabilities, Olirum Valvu. The evaluators met with several beneficiaries with disabilities who had found the preferential provision of equipment such as irrigation systems very valuable. The evaluation was not able to identify other specific strategies that the project applied to assist PWDs, such as targeted job training schemes or occupational adjustments.

### **Relevance to Sri Lanka DWCP and national priorities**

EGLR, like the LEED project before it, is well-aligned with Sri Lanka’s Decent Work Country Programming. The project fitted well with the Sri Lanka DWCP 2013-2017, with its focus on enabling disadvantaged groups in rural conflict-affected and economically disadvantaged areas to have access to more and better jobs and expanded markets.<sup>9</sup> During 2018, EGLR continued to fit closely with the Sri Lanka DWCP for 2018 – 2022 and is directly relevant to Country Priority 1, “the creation of sustainable, inclusive and decent employment”. It contributes, together with the ILO-WFP initiative, to ILO Sri Lanka’s “Jobs for Peace and Resilience” programme, under the global flagship programme. This programme supports ILO Recommendation No. 205 on Decent Work and Employment for Peace and Resilience.

The 2018 – 2022 DWCP in turn contributes to the United Nations Sustainable Development Framework (UNSDF) covering the same period, signed on August 2017 between the Government and the United Nations (UN) in Sri Lanka.<sup>10</sup>

Individual government representatives interviewed, including the MOLTUR, supported the overall alignment of LEED and EGLR with national programme for economic development in the north. In particular, the Northern Province Commissioner of Cooperatives highlighted the value of the ILO model in bringing private sector investment, supporting the government’s policy for cooperative-based growth.

### **3.1.2 Design Logic and Feasibility**

The overall intervention logic of EGLR is that within each targeted sector, (1) organizing more producers into cooperatives and improving cooperatives’ business management capacity and governance; (2) expanded market-driven production in value chains and building market linkages; and (3) cross-cutting the sectors, improved economic access for women and vulnerable groups; together are expected to lead to increased and stable incomes for the communities, within an enabling governance and business

---

<sup>9</sup> ILO DWCP 2013-2017. Country Programme Outcome LKA107.

<sup>10</sup> The projects fits specifically with Strategic Area 3: Human Security and Socio-economic Resilience.



environment. In turn, higher incomes and more stable livelihoods are expected to contribute to the impact of narrowing the north-south development gap and enabling stronger peace and reconciliation. To some extent increased harmony between communities and ethnic groups i.e. “reconciliation”, and north-south business partnerships and exchange are also expected to contribute to employment and economic development in a virtuous circle.<sup>11</sup> The contribution to peace and reconciliation is essentially expected to flow naturally from reduced development disparities and increased community well-being. The project did not introduce distinct non-economic strategies to build reconciliation. As cross-cutting issues, gender equity and disability inclusion strategies were put forward to ensure that the benefits are equitable and inclusive.

The evaluation considers this logic, which can also be described as the Theory of Change, expressed through the project document description of the rationale and in various project presentations, to be clear and mostly valid. Assumptions regarding climate change, natural threats and disasters are appropriately included in the theory. The evaluator observed that changes in the capacity of local government such as province administration and technical line agencies to understand the business partnerships concept and the cooperatives model, in order to contribute and to eventually play a role in market intermediation was under-emphasized. The role played by sub-national government authorities has been more focused on providing necessary authorizations and beneficiary selection, while they have not been direct recipients of capacity building, other than technical training for agriculture officers.

**Table 3** presents the expression of the project logic in the Results Framework drawn from the project M&E system.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> The project title itself reflects some circularity: ‘Employment Generation and Livelihoods *through* Reconciliation’. But the intended logic is that reconciliation will come about via employment generation and livelihoods improvement rather than vice-versa.

<sup>12</sup> The results statements are those used in the project’s monitoring and evaluation framework, which were modified compared with the statements in the original project document.

**Table 3: EGLR Framework of Goal, Outcomes, and Outputs**

<b>Development Goal:</b>	To contribute to sustainable peace and conflict transformation by reducing conflict-related economic inequalities and promoting and enabling more equitable and inclusive economic development in the economic recovery and reconciliation process in Sri Lanka		
<b>Project purpose:</b>	Promotion of an enabling environment for competitive, sustainable enterprise development and creation of 2,000 decent and productive employment opportunities among vulnerable people including women in the conflict affected Northern region of Sri Lanka by June 2018		
<b>Immediate Outcomes</b>	1.Improved export earnings through mutually beneficial partnerships in the fruit and vegetables sector	2.Improved mutually beneficial partnerships in the fisheries sector	3. Improved gender responsive development interventions
<b>Outputs</b>	1.1Developed new producer and exporter partnerships 1.2Farmers mobilized into farmer group/cooperatives 1.3 Improved producer organization capacity while linking with Business Development Services	2.1 Developed new producer and export partnerships 2.2 Established cooperative buy-back schemes 2.3 Strengthen supply chain linkages with exporters 2.4 Improved producer organization capacity while linking with BDS	3.1Facilitated access to BDS support for selected women 3.2 Improved capacity of women on employment, leadership and advocacy 3.3 Increased awareness and sensitization on gender equality

(Note: \*The wording is slightly different in the project document and the M&E Framework)

Analyzing the above results framework, the evaluator found that the project logic was not expressed clearly at a number of levels.<sup>13</sup> At outcome level, improved national cooperative policy, produce certification schemes and support to capacity of technical agencies in fisheries and agriculture, which are included as enabling environment efforts according to the project description, are not represented in the framework.

At output level, under the fruit and vegetables sector outcome, there is no output for improved productivity of the producers. It may be intended under Output 1.2, but this is not clear. The meanings of the output statements are not entirely clear and are not expressed as results to be achieved; neither are the outputs discrete results. Moreover, the project document did not provide a detailed narrative of the strategy to explain the outputs. One has to read various project-related documents including the progress reports to understand the framework and the activities supporting each output. A more rigorous logical framework would have helped in the delivery, monitoring and measurement and reporting of results. With the LEED Plus project proposal development the ILO has, however, made marked improvements to project design and the results measurement framework.

<sup>13</sup> This applies to both the results statements in the project application document and in the monitoring and evaluation results framework.

## Feasibility of Scope and Duration

Given the two-year timeframe, the evaluation considers the planned focus on two production sectors to have been appropriate and manageable within the time, human and financial resources. The scope of coverage of 18 primary producer/processing associations and two federations has proved to be manageable for the team in practice but the duration of interventions in the newly formed cooperatives was too short to see them reach self-reliance. The duration of support for those cooperatives only assisted in the second year was also too short, as discussed in Section 3.3. The expansion to the Jaffna island communities in the second year came about in part due to donor interest in working there. The donor representatives noted that in these communities other support programmes had previously been channeled through the UNDP. The decision to begin working there was however reasonable, considering that the LEED Plus project was under discussion in late 2017 and the intervention could therefore be continued.

## Building on learning from LEED reviews and final evaluation

To a large degree EGLR has continued the same approaches employed by LEED. In some aspects, the project has adapted or refined its approach based on LEED learning and evaluation. For example, EGLR learned from the experience and evaluation of LEED that women continued to be underrepresented in producer association decision-making boards, and responded by raising the priority of gender equity strategies in the EGLR design. However, emphasis on inclusion of people with disabilities was not given the same high profile.

The LEED final evaluation provided a set of recommendations for future local economic development work in the Northern region. **Table 4** presents the response of EGLR as discussed with the NPC and observed by the evaluation. The current evaluation concurs with the intention of most of the recommendations, though only partially with the recommendation to eliminate direct project subsidies. The project could have done more in design and implementation to take stock of the status of the cooperatives, strengthen value addition at source, and produce and disseminate appropriate knowledge products.

**Table 4: Response to LEED Final Evaluation Recommendations**

LEED evaluation recommendations	Response by EGLR
1. Take stock of the status and conduct viability assessment of all the cooperatives/associations/enterprises	Largely not followed. Minimal viability assessment per cooperative done and documented. Tracking over time not systematically documented.
2. Strengthen value chain at source by promoting value addition to primary produce at the source and encouraging processors to re-locate closer to production	To some extent. In fisheries more processing done close to the shore through TSF and sea cucumber partnerships. In F&V it is more difficult to attract processors to the north, but some processing at source is done by buyers e.g. Cargills.
3. Support capacity development and service facilitation and eliminate direct capital subsidy with the exception of social protection	The EGLR team did not agree with the recommendation based on the view that incentives are still needed among disadvantaged beneficiaries. Likewise, the evaluation concurs that some direct capital assistance is justified in the case of newly

LEED evaluation recommendations	Response by EGLR
	supported communities, but suggests that some of the direct subsidy to members could have been withdrawn from successfully functioning cooperatives.
4. Promote strong linkages and cross-collaboration among ILO-CO Colombo projects where appropriate	Strong linkage has occurred through shared staff, complementary approach of ILO-WFP Peace Building project focusing on the women's cooperative PTK.
5. Produce appropriate knowledge products and disseminate widely across the ILO system and web-based open access forum	Not sufficiently developed by EGLR.
6. Allocate adequate ILO CO staff time for regular monitoring and supervision through individual work programmes	CO staff supervision time appears to have been adequate under EGLR, but no M&E oversight for most of the duration.

## 3.2 Effectiveness of the Interventions

Responding to the evaluation questions under the effectiveness dimension, the evaluation assesses EGLR's progress of implementation in delivering the planned interventions and its success in achieving its objectives, both quantitatively against the project's outcome and output targets, and qualitatively based on stakeholder accounts and document analysis. This section also assesses the project's effectiveness in cross-cutting strategies for gender equity and inclusion and the effectiveness of the partnerships approach.

### 3.2.1 Implementation progress

Building on the existing approaches, producer associations, private sector and government partnerships of the LEED project, the team was able to proceed quickly with implementation once the project commenced, according to the project team and other ILO staff. EGLR's delivery progress has been timely and few delays were experienced as reported by the project staff and stakeholders.

In the first year, the project concentrated its support in the three districts of Vavuniya, Mullaitivu and Kilinochchi, and initiated limited interventions in Jaffna and Mannar districts (one cooperative in each). In 2018, with the benefit of the additional budget provided by the project Addendum, the project provided continued support to cooperatives the first three districts and extended its coverage to fishing cooperatives in Jaffna and helped to establish and support an agricultural cooperative in the resettled area of Tellipalai, also in Jaffna. From March 2018 EGLR also provided support to the Olirum Valvu association for differently abled people in Mullaitivu district for development of a rice flour processing enterprise and marketing assistance.

By the first annual reporting in October 2017, 13 cooperatives had been supported and around 1,100 beneficiaries received direct supports. As of October 2018, 20 producer organizations, including two federations have been supported and 2,025 direct beneficiaries have been reached, including those employed in food processing seafood processing plants.

The only marked delay observed by the evaluation team was in the implementation of support to the newly targeted fishing communities in Jaffna provided under the Addendum signed in December 2017. For example, the implementation in two of the cooperatives Jaffna only got underway after April 2018 – St. Thomas FCS (Eluvaitivu island) received support through the Jaffna federation in July 2018 and in St. Xavier FCS (Punkudutivu island) received its support in April 2018. These initiatives were channeled via the Jaffna FS Federation (contract September 2017 – March 2018). It appears that it took some months between signing the implementation contract and with the fisheries federation and arranging the registration and initial inputs for the sea cucumber farms in Punkudutivu and delivering the cold store freezer and debt relief grants in Eluvaitivu. Setting up a cucumber farm requires obtaining licenses from NAQDA and organizing the farming pens and juvenile sea cucumber inputs. This late initiation of support has resulted in a relatively short duration of 4-6 months to enable significant progress to be achieved in terms of increased productivity and fisher incomes. The project team and donor indicated the likelihood that the next phase of the project will continue support to these communities newly reached by EGLR, but it is not entirely guaranteed.

There were some variations between the actual interventions and those foreseen in the project document, which were justifiable and based on the EGLR team's review of the contextual conditions. For example the blue swimmer crab hatchery was not pursued and this remains a wild catch product. Initially the project planned to support a Mud Crab hatchery, but due to the high cost of the hatchery and lack of technical experts in the sector the project decided to drop the initiative. The project has supported a model farm on Mud Crab in collaboration with NAQDA and ILO plans to support its commercialization under LEED+.

**Comparison of results and approaches between districts:** The evaluation team noted that progress has been steady and consistent in the three districts that continued from LEED's long term intervention - Kilinochchi, Mullaitivu and Vavuniya. There was no marked difference in approach among these three, other than the sectoral focus on fisheries in Kilinochchi, which included the emphasis on individual debt relief schemes. EGLR's support is generally customized at the cooperative level, rather than at the district level. However, results have been weaker in the areas that been introduced only under EGLR, such as the Palali agricultural Cooperative Society in Tellipalai, and a number of fisheries areas in Jaffna. In Palali, EGLR's support built the cooperative from scratch, and there is still a long way to go to build a commercially viable operation and financial management capacity, which appears to primarily due to the short duration of support.

The evaluation discussions with stakeholders in Jaffna indicated that these areas remain highly affected by the conflict, lacking basic infrastructure and transport. The signs of trauma and community fragility are also evident in cases of gender-based violence and problems of alcohol abuse. These communities would have benefited from earlier and longer intervention in the project life. The expansion to the Jaffna island communities in the second year came about in part due to donor interest in working there. The donor representatives noted that in these communities other support programmes had previously been channeled through the UNDP. The decision to begin working there was taken in consideration that the LEED Plus project was under discussion in late 2017 and would be able to continue the intervention. The evaluation suggests that based on LEED and EGLR experience, supporting cooperative enterprises

for livelihood recovery in resource poor areas, either physically isolated or severely damaged by the conflict, is a long-term endeavour, requiring comprehensive community needs assessments.

### 3.2.2 Overview of Achievements against Outcome and Output Targets

The project has reached 2,025 new beneficiaries beyond those supported by LEED and has expanded its geographical coverage to Jaffna and Mannar. The development of business and governance capacity reached some 18 primary cooperatives and two fishing federations have been revitalized, especially Poonakary Federation in Kilinochchi district. The cooperatives supported by ILO have received numerous export awards for their performance from the National Chamber of Exporters –Vinayagapuram Farmers’ Cooperative, Vavuniya North Fruit Growers Cooperative, Young Famers Club and Puthukudyiruppu (PTK) Women Entrepreneurs’ Cooperative in the fruit and vegetable sector, and Valaipadu FCS, Iranaimatha Nagar FCS in fisheries received awards in 2018. Some have received repeat awards in successive years.

Based on the results reported in the Monitoring and Evaluation system, EGLR has successfully achieved most of its intended output indicator targets and reached or exceeded most Immediate Outcome targets. These results are summarized in Table 5.

**Annex A.** provides more detailed performance data reported at the end of the project.

**Table 5: EGLR Key Achievements on Outcomes and Outputs**

<p><b>Overall Achievements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved livelihoods for 2,025 men and women primary producers and processors in fruit and vegetable, fisheries and MSME sectors</li> <li>• 18 agricultural and fisheries cooperatives, including 2 federations supported for organizational capacity, improved productivity and market linkages</li> <li>• 1,050 jobs created in seafood processing and agriculture value adding.</li> </ul> <p><b>Immediate Outcome 1: Fruit and Vegetables Sector/MSME</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cumulative income of newly supported fruit and vegetables producers reached US\$2.15 million over 2 years</li> <li>• Mutually beneficial business partnerships between producers and 5 exporters</li> <li>• 1,000 cooperative members were linked to supply chains through inputs</li> <li>• 6/7 agricultural cooperatives/MSMEs were reorganized or revitalized (Exceeding target 5)</li> </ul> <p><b>Immediate Outcome 2: Fishery sector</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US\$2.6 million cumulative income of new fisheries beneficiaries over two years</li> <li>• 2 major exporters in multiple partnerships with fishery producers (Taprobane SeaFood (Pvt) and Suganth International)</li> <li>• 385 fishers linked to markets through cooperatives</li> <li>• 640 people employed in seafood processing/aquaculture farms</li> <li>• 8/11 fishery coops targeted with increased production and marketing capacity</li> </ul> <p><b>Immediate Outcome 3: Gender responsive development interventions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1,114 women represented in production and marketing across the sectors (target 1,200, 55% of total farmer/fishers/processing workers)</li> </ul>
--

- 620 female producers directly supported - 504 in fruit and vegetables, 116 in fisheries
- 63 women cooperative members are represented on cooperative boards (across all cooperatives)<sup>14</sup>
- 1,211 women and men received gender training

Source: M&E Database, October 2018

As indicated by the statistics, EGLR's results are impressive with regard to export revenue to the Northern economy and the large number of primary producers and seafood processing employees benefiting. The impact on the communities is actually wider than apparent in the figures as the number of primary producers and processors benefiting does not include the wider cooperative membership who benefit from improved markets and sales. Regarding impact on individual household incomes, comparable before and after income data was difficult to identify, in the absence of baseline data. However, the project reports that household income from the targeted crops/sea food products has increased in both sectors and this was supported anecdotally by the evaluation interviews. The overall average household income reported is 43,333 LKR (\$260)/month; almost reaching the indicator target of 48,000 LKR (\$287)/month.<sup>15</sup> Per sector, the project reports estimated incomes of 40,000 to 50,000 LKR (\$240-\$299)/household/month among fruit and vegetable growers, and up to 60,000 LKR (\$360)/household/month among crab fishers.<sup>16</sup> TSF Crab processing workers earn from 30,000 – 40,000 LKR/month (\$180 – \$240) based on the amount of crab processed.

The usefulness of the reported M&E data to capture the achievements of outcomes and impacts is limited, however. Some key elements of change are not tracked and captured – changes in household economic status and other household benefits, changes in cooperative capacity, to name some examples. Also, some of the M&E indicators do not provide very meaningful information, such as the number of women on cooperative boards project-wide. Women's economic participation is well demonstrated in the numbers, particularly in agriculture, but changes in their participation in cooperative management and decision-making are not captured.

To complement this overall picture, the following sections (3.2.3 through 3.2.8) discuss the extent of EGLR's achievements and benefits qualitatively at the institutional and individual levels and highlight the key factors contributing to success and limitations.

### **3.2.3 Strengthening Cooperative Organizational Capacity**

Strengthening producer cooperatives in terms of size of membership, structure and leadership, business management, marketing capacity and inclusive policies is the central pillar of EGLR, building on the approach pioneered under LEED.<sup>17</sup> EGLR has delivered support to individual cooperatives and at the fishing federation level in the form of training (on business development and business management

---

<sup>14</sup> The percentage of board members who are women is not available.

<sup>15</sup> Monitoring and Evaluation Database. See Annex A.

<sup>16</sup> Data from project team presentation. These incomes are average monthly estimates. There is a high degree of seasonal variation, based on the evaluation interviews.

<sup>17</sup> EGLR has initiated the formation of two cooperatives, working with the Divisional Secretariats, in Tellipalai, Jaffna and Udayarkattu in Kilinochchi.

skills, leadership, cooperative governance), capital operating grants, and through facilitating exporter contacts and deals, and exposure visits to producers elsewhere in the country. The approach has proven successful overall, with varying levels of capacity observed, based on the evaluation meetings with 10 cooperatives/producer associations and two fisheries federations. The results observed were mixed in terms of factors such as business capacity, commercial viability and governance.

Based on comments of the EGLR team and evaluation meetings, it was possible for the evaluation to identify some cooperatives that are performing well on indicators such as ability to negotiate with buyers, identify new markets and business management. For example, cooperatives such as Vinayagapuram, Vavuniya North, Young farmers Club, PTK Women Entrepreneurs CS in fruit and vegetables, and Iranaimatha and Valaipadu in fisheries can negotiate with buyers on their own and are not dependent on ILO subsidies for their employees or premises.

**Training benefits:** Cooperative board members met by the evaluation team attested to the value of EGLR's training in leadership, accounting, and business management.

**Membership numbers:** The project support has helped expand membership in several cooperatives – a prime example is PTK Women Entrepreneurs, which has seen the rapid growth of membership since it began as an informal group of 15 women, was supported by LEED as a registered cooperative with an initial membership 70, and now has a membership of 1,500 women. By all accounts this has been a great success. However, the manageability of such a large membership may be challenging, and a consideration for future guidance under LEED Plus and the Peace-Building Fund initiative.

**Business operations:** EGLR continued working with many of the cooperatives supported or established under the LEED project, including Vavuniya North, Young Farmers' Club, Vinayagapuram and PTK. EGLR has enabled these cooperatives to increase their capacity to source inputs, advise their members and negotiate fair prices with buyers. Cooperative membership has enabled the primary producers to benefit from fair market prices as well as financial and social benefits of being part of a cooperative. Some cooperatives purchase the produce of non-members as well as members, some requiring them to join the cooperative. The evaluation noted that even the mature cooperatives can suffer setbacks - the North-South company formed as a joint venture between Vavuniya North and CR Exports has suffered a net loss over the last 5 years, which representatives attributed to the low allocated small profit margin. This suggests the importance of building strong business management and auditing practices.

In the newly re-settled area of Tellipalai, EGLR worked with the DS office and Grama Nilidhari officers to form farmers in the local community into the Palali cooperative during 2017. The cooperative has succeeded in selling fruit and vegetables to Cargills supermarket chain, and is benefiting from the processing facility built with the funds. However, the ILO/project is still subsidizing the salary payment of the cooperative manager, as well as some other running costs. Looking at the product sales income and the costs of running the cooperative, it is still a long way from break-even point if ILO's support were to cease. The cooperative management staff are not yet sufficiently capacitated to calculate the overall profit and loss balance.

**Governance capacity:** Capacity on governance issues was more difficult to assess, but some cooperative seem to be unduly influenced by political affiliations, while others are not adhering to the national law on women as office bearers.



**Role of the fishery federations:** ILO channeled the support to some fishery cooperatives via the federations, to improve the efficiency of the process and enhance ownership of the federations. The role of the federations is to act on their members behalf, for example in protecting fishing rights in their area covered. The federations can potentially play a strong leadership role - this was evident in one federation more than another and there appears to be scope to strengthening federations' leadership capacity.

**Fisheries purchasing enterprise model:** Cooperatives such as Iranaimatha Nagar and Valaipadu in Kilinochchi were first supported to become purchasing enterprises under LEED. This was strengthened under EGLR with continued facilitation of the relationship with major crab exporter, TSF. The model is now well established whereby the cooperative purchases the catch, including Blue Swimmer Crab, fish and cuttlefish from the fishers at a fair price (considerably higher than that paid by middle agents), and sells to the exporter and other local buyers with a margin retained as profit for the cooperative enterprise. This approach prevents the fishers getting into debt to the agents. It replaces the former practice of fishers selling their catch to a middle man. EGLR has replicated this model in cooperatives such as St. Antony in Mannar. Due to time limitations, the model has not been introduced in newly reached cooperatives such as Punkudutivu and Eluvaitivu. No information is available for progress in Delft. However, St. Thomas cooperative in Eluvaitivu initiated purchasing practices itself, selling the catch by auction.

**Fisheries indebtedness ('buy-back' scheme):** Continuing a practice developed under LEED, EGLR has assisted more fishers to redeem their debts to richer fishermen and purchasing agents, through the 'buy-back' scheme. Following the conflict, the majority of fishers got into debt to purchasing agents to upgrade their fishing gear and were forced to sell their catch to agents at a low price to repay their debts – effectively a form of debt bondage. EGLR provided further grants to the cooperatives via the federations to provide amounts of \$300 on average to repay the agents. The cooperatives set up a re-payment scheme which is used to continue to redeem the loans of other fishers. In Iranaimatha Nagar FCS (Kilinochchi) the evaluators were informed that 80 fishers have redeemed their loans, while around 50% of cooperative members are still in debt. In St. Thomas FCS, Eluvaitivu, EGLR also supported debt relief with a grant of 1million LKR (US\$6,000), used to release 24 fishers so far. Here it was notable that prior to EGLR entry the cooperative itself was able to access a guaranteed loan from the Bank of Ceylon to redeem the debts of several members with reasonable repayment conditions. Not all of the targeted fishing communities have so far received ILO cash grants, such as St. Xavier in Punkudutivu where 80% of households are still in debt.<sup>18</sup> The evaluation finds that grants for debt relief was a strong practice in the early stages, especially for severely affected communities, but providing grants to cooperatives does not appear to be a sustainable approach in the long term.

**Enabling factors:** Factors that appear to have enabled the success of EGLR's intervention include the adaptability, ambition and initiative of the cooperative management boards. For example, PTK Women's board and leadership are dynamic, disciplined and well organized. St. Thomas FCS shows signs of initiative and dynamism having identified their own system for debt relief. Newly formed cooperatives tend to be less well organized. As observed by the project staff and the evaluation team, threats to the

---

<sup>18</sup> This support may have been delayed due to the upcoming board elections and the project decision to delay certain activities until after the election.

fair distribution of benefits can come in the form of political affiliations of cooperative leaders, corruption and poor financial management. To some extent the ILO was able to nurture these enabling qualities, but political factors are largely external to project influence.

**Delivery and monitoring:** In terms of the capacity building delivery strategy overall, the evaluation observed that the project could have been more focused on assessing capacity needs and tailoring support to capacity development, although those that have been supported from start-up have clearly received more intensive support.

### 3.2.4 Fruit and Vegetables Sector: Strategies and Effectiveness

Through cross analysis of stakeholder interviews and project progress reports the evaluation identified the following strategies employed by EGLR to promote stable incomes in the fruit and vegetable sector and discusses their relative success.

**Market links and fair trade:** Markets for particular produce had already been established under LEED, such as the export market for the Red Lady Papaya. As an outstanding achievement, Vavuniya North CS was awarded fair trade certification for its Red Lady Papaya production in 2017 after five years of effort and support from ILO.<sup>19</sup> The project continued to assisted primary producer cooperatives and their members to find stable markets for their produce by linking them with various export buyers and national retail chains. As a result, the targeted cooperatives and beneficiaries have continued to find stable markets for Red Lady Papaya and bananas for export to the EU and the Middle East. The National Chamber of Exporters partnership was particularly beneficial to the efforts of EGLR, actively bringing together the producers in the north and buyers in the south.

The fair trade element is assured through the brokerage of fixed price contracts with the buyers – under which the producers agree to sell only to a particular buyer in return for a fixed price over a number of years. The challenges to this strategy that remain are the costs for buyers by sourcing products in the North compared with other regions, including storage and transport. Key buyer partnerships have been established with Lulu International, Dubai, the largest hypermarket chain in the Gulf countries, Ceylon Biscuits Limited, MA'S Tropical Food, Beyond Ceiling (Pvt) Ltd, EOAS Organics and national supermarket chains, Cargills and Keels. The engagement of the NCE has been instrumental in the introduction of high level exporters through missions and exhibitions.

**Market-based selection of crops:** A key factor in success has been in the selection of crops with continuing market demand. EGLR did not invest in extensive value chain analysis of different crops, but the choice to continue support papaya cultivation has paid off. The Red Lady Papaya for export has consistently brought high prices. However, some producers experienced challenges in meeting their export contracts, due to crop failure caused by plant disease and climate conditions. The project and the agriculture department are still working through these cultivation issues. However, even when crops failed due to disease the farmers have persisted with papaya given their experience of high profits.

---

<sup>19</sup> The certification process was carried out by the Global Certifying Body for Fair Trade- FLOCERT

**Diversification of crops for emerging markets and resilience strategy:** Partly through the EGLR support and partly through cooperatives' own initiatives, a variety of other crops have been introduced with high or potentially high market value. For example in Vinayagapuram Cooperative EGLR supported farmers with papaya, banana, and passion fruit seedlings. On its own initiative the cooperative is propagating lemon grass to sell to other growers. Households grow a mix of crops which covers seasonal patterns and the possibility of failure of a particular crop.

Several cooperatives, such as PTK and Young farmers Club, have started growing Moringa Leaf for sale to OAS Exports. ILO assisted with the introduction to the seedling supply company. The export value of the crop for medicinal purposes is high and the cooperative have already reaped the benefits, but there are current issues with the organic certification due to chemical infiltration from neighbouring lands. The project staff suggest the long term solution is to introduce organics zoning by the agriculture department. Seeking fair trade and other certification is another strategy that the project has followed to help farmers gain higher premium, but so far this has not proven very successful as the market demand for fair trade products is not high.

**Collective infrastructure for land clearing, packaging and storage:** Attracting investors through support for collective infrastructure, including packing plants and storage and transport vehicles. Support for processing centres has been pivotal to success of the cooperatives to attract buyers by having the facilities to clean and pack the products according to the buyers' stipulations. Packing plants at source also reduce the transaction costs for buyers. This facility is still a perceived outstanding need in cooperatives such as Vinayagapuram.

**Targeted beneficiary access to inputs and cultivation skills:** Expanding on individual support under LEED, EGLR provided farming inputs at individual level in the form of seedlings, drip irrigation systems, fencing etc. Women and persons with disabilities were particularly assisted with irrigation systems given their disadvantages in carrying water. EGLR worked with the Extension Officers to deliver training in growing techniques. Some external factors threaten the sustainability of crops including papaya virus disease. The Vavuniya Department of Agriculture claimed that this could have been avoided if their expertise had been sought earlier.<sup>20</sup>

Overall the levels of success and satisfaction with the support are high. Individuals met by the evaluation team are experiencing a mix of success with their crops. Lack of water is still a major challenge in Vinayagapuram for example, where not all the beneficiaries have drip irrigation pipes. Mulching practices could be improved. Several cooperative representatives and individuals described the challenge of monkeys attacking crops and fencing, and elephants are a major problem in some areas.<sup>21</sup> Some places cannot be planted due to the proliferation of elephants.

---

<sup>20</sup> Vavuniya Department of Agriculture informed the evaluation stakeholders meeting that the department has the expertise to address the issue.

<sup>21</sup> According to anecdotal reports, elephant owners in other parts of the country abandon unwanted elephants in parts of the Northern Province. This is a cause of further tension and resentment towards people in the south. The elephants are not originally wild or local to the region.

EGLR's priority to vulnerable people such as female headed households demonstrated considerable success based on several interviews by the evaluation. One male beneficiary living with a disability was able to reliably produce more crops as a result of the irrigation system installed. In the same cooperative the evaluation team met a widow and mother of two children whose farming production had expanded and who was able to buy more assets with her increased income. The beneficiaries were reportedly selected via the local administration or Grama Nilidhari officers. There was little evidence available to the evaluation team as to the basis of their selection, but they were intended to be members who had not received direct support under LEED and who were deemed vulnerable. Generally, the selection appears to have worked well but some negative reactions of neighbouring farmers were mentioned, where crops were reportedly damaged by a jealous neighbor.

At the individual beneficiary level, the provision of inputs delivered via the cooperative societies in the form of seedlings, irrigation, farming equipment has enabled the targeted farmers to improve their productivity and incomes. The project also facilitated the provision of technical training by the Agricultural Instructors of the Provincial department of Agriculture. The evaluation interviews with groups of farmer beneficiaries indicated that they were generally very satisfied with the material support provided. In terms of the economic benefits, the project reports that individual incomes of direct beneficiaries increased from around 30,000 LKR (\$179)/household/month to 40,000 -50,000 LKR (\$240-\$299)/household/month.<sup>22</sup> Individual farmers interviewed by the evaluation highlighted the increased stability of their income, whereas before the cooperative buyers partnerships they would sometimes have no buyers for their crops.

**Value adding and SME development:** EGLR supported one cooperative, Olirum Valvu association for persons with disabilities, which focuses on rice flour processing and value adding.<sup>23</sup> The project provided infrastructure for the processing building and equipment and support to marketing. This fledgling social enterprise provides employment for four women who are single heads of households. The cereal products are sold to the local supermarkets. As observed by the evaluation, the products appear to have strong potential but the association needs more expertise in packaging and marketing, as well as incentives to become more independent of donor support.

Several other cooperatives have ventured into value-adding, such as fruit juice sold to the local women's canteen enterprise and powdered papaya for the Italian market. While the project aimed to increase value-adding in the sector, the level of value adding supported by the project appears modest, and there is strong interest among the cooperatives to expand their operations into fruit processing.

### 3.2.5 Fisheries and Aquaculture – Strategies and Effectiveness

EGLR's strategies in the fisheries sector were mainly channeled through the fishery federations in Poonakary-Kilinochchi and Jaffna and their member cooperatives, in parallel with facilitation activities with exporters and in coordination with government authorities, primarily NAQDA. The evaluation

---

<sup>22</sup> EGLR team project presentation.

<sup>23</sup> Olirum Valvu means "Blooming Light".

assesses the main elements of the approach. Note that the fisher debt buy-back strategy is discussed above under cooperative-level capacity development.

**Exporter partnerships with benefits to wild catch fishers and seafood processing employment:** Two main export partnerships have been maintained and strengthened during EGLR. EGLR continued to facilitate linkages of cooperatives with Taprobane Sea Food (Pvt) Ltd, with two-fold benefits – first, purchasing the wild catch from the cooperative, providing a fair income to the fishers; and second, supporting the development of sea food processing plants at the shore, increasing employment opportunity. In total, over 600 jobs were generated in seafood processing. The Taprobane Sea Food Company, which sells to major buyers such as Thai Union sea food internationally, was already buying seafood in the North prior to EGLR during the period of LEED. However, EGLR has helped establish new processing centres and strengthened the fair trade purchasing practices. The HR representative of TSF explained how the stronger partnership has been a win-win situation for the company and for the communities. The evaluation team visited one of the newly established (set up during EGLR period) crab processing plants at Valaipadu. Following a strategy for increasing local empowerment, the project helped put the ownership of the building in the hands of the local cooperatives, while the processing company rents the premises, bringing additional revenue.

In other cooperatives, such as St. Xavier in Punkudutivu, the processing facilities are not owned by the cooperative and buyer agents still operate. In these villages the prices fishers receive are still comparatively low, and TSF is compelled to buy from these agents due to particular contract arrangements.

The second major exported linkage facilitated is with Suganth International which purchases and processes sea cucumbers predominantly for the Chinese market. This is a growing export market and the project has helped to set up model farming practices with the processing side managed by the exporter.

**Access to fishing resources for fishing households:** The coastal districts suffered in different ways as a result of the conflict. In Kilinochchi people were repeatedly displaced and lost their fishing resources, whereas in Jaffna islands the communities were not displaced by the conflict but large numbers of the population left the community. The people in these islands lost some of their fishing grounds to the navy, but these areas are gradually being released. Common to both districts was the need to re-build fishers' access to boats, nets and other fishing gear. EGLR has continued from LEED supporting with fishing nets and gear, and boats in three cooperatives of the Jaffna federation bringing a better share of income from the catch.

The fishing families interviewed attested to the improvements to their income as a result. The threat to fishing livelihoods posed by Indian trawlers which damage fish stock and nets with the trawling methods was frequently raised in interviews with fishing cooperative members. Other boats from “outside” use dynamite blasting to fish –an equally damaging method. The federation representatives have traveled to India to negotiate in this regard but the problem is ongoing.

**Aquaculture expansion:** EGLR has made a significant advance beyond LEED in expanding the aquaculture productivity of cooperative members. Some farms are well established such as in Nachchikuda, Kilinochchi. Capitalizing on a lucrative export market in China, the potential of sea cucumber has been identified by the NAQDA and the strategy supported by EGLR. It aligns with the government's sustainable fisheries approach in reducing the reliance on wild catch fishery. EGLR has been instrumental in expanding aquaculture among cooperatives in Kilinochchi, Jaffna and Mannar, in line with the government plans for aquaculture development. Based on market analysis showing lucrative markets for sea cucumber, the project's inputs for sea cucumber farming have brought substantial incomes for the cooperative members. For example, in Iranaimatha, five communal farms with teams of six were established with the harvest in March 2018 bringing income of 50,000 LKR (\$300)/person per harvest. In Punkudutivu the sea cucumber pens have been built and juvenile will arrive in a couple of weeks. The farmers will then need to raise the cucumber for 8-10 months to harvest them. In terms of challenges, the evaluation team learned that threats to sea cucumber farms continue in the form of poaching and sea area disputes.

**Mud crab farming:** EGLR invested in a value chain study to investigate the demand for mud crab. Based on the finding that the demand is high and the need to protect wild crab stocks the project established a model farm in Mantai West in Mannar in collaboration with NAQDA. Initial results are positive and the potential for more farms is being explored.

### 3.2.6 Effectiveness of Gender Strategies

As noted earlier, promoting gender equitable benefits of economic development; and especially assisting the most vulnerable women-headed households was a stated priority of EGLR, and LEED before it. The approach taken was to promote women's participation, benefits and voice grass-roots community level, cooperative level and institutional policy level. The assessment of the extent of success and contributing factors draws on the interviews with cooperative members and institutional players, including NAQDA, TSF, Vavuniya Department of Agriculture, and the Provincial and Kilinochchi District Commissioners of Cooperatives.

**Participation in the economy and economic gains. In agriculture,** women have long played an active role, and the project has capitalized on this, promoting the access of women farmers to inputs as direct beneficiaries. Quotas for women direct beneficiaries ensured that benefits have accrued to women who represent 50% of producer beneficiaries. Women farmers interviewed responded that they are comfortable working alongside men, and they are able to farm papaya and other new crops as successfully as men. Women represent the majority in several of the cooperatives, such as the Young Farmers' Club in Mullaitivu and in Vavuniya North. In the PTK women's cooperative women's empowerment as producers and business entrepreneurs is especially evident and the cooperative has won several awards for export achievements.

**In fisheries,** women have traditionally not been active, fishing being a male dominated occupation and cultural norms in these communities prohibiting women from working on the shore. Some inroads have been made in this pattern, with some women now owning and operating boats and increasing interest

among a few to take part in the wild catch. Women-headed households have been targeted with extra assistance through provision of boats and fishing gear that their sons use for fishing.

“The project helped open our eyes. We know that women can go to sea, do sea fishing and many other things.” (Male fishing federation member, Poonakary)

“These days women come to the shore and work with sea cucumbers. 100% of the sea cucumber processing units are women” (Male fishery federation member, Poonakary)

Most of the livelihood gains to women in fisheries, have come through opening up opportunities in aquaculture and seafood processing, rather than wild catch fishing, as seen in the project’s M&E reporting. Sea cucumber farming, mud crab farming and seaweed harvesting offer lucrative opportunities for women alongside men.<sup>24</sup> In communities where the ILO has been engaged over several years, change among men interviewed in Iranaimatha Nagar and Valaipadu on the acceptance of women working on the shore is highly significant. However, changes in women’s participation in fisheries and the gender division of labour appear to be very gradual. In the cucumber farm teams being set up in Punkudutivu only two out of the team of six will be women, while all the processors of sea cucumber observed in Nachchikuda were women – a lower status and likely lower income task than that of aquaculture farming. The project could have done more to ensure a higher proportion of women will benefit from sea cucumber farming in the newly supported areas.

More jobs have been opened up for women in crab processing plants through the partnership with TSF, over 300 in total (52 in Valaipadu visited by the evaluation team). These jobs meet national standard wages and conditions, and reasonable attention to occupational safety and health as observed in the visit to a small new plant at Poonakary - Valaipadu. With unemployment high, there is competition to obtain jobs in the processing TSF crab processing plants. The evaluation team met one 53 year old who failed to get a job there and is doing seaweed planting and harvesting instead, with a lower return than the factory jobs offer. Even well-educated young women with potential for university entrance find work at the crab processing factories.

Ms Maria<sup>25</sup>, 24 years old, started working with TSF crab processing centre in Valaipadu in 2014 after 3 months’ training. She graduated with Advanced Level and her dream was to get into university but she decided to work at the plant to help support the family. She is now a supervisor with a take home pay of around Rs.23,000 (\$137). She is happy to work here. Her father’s income as a fisherman hardly meets the needs of the family and most of her income is spent for her sisters’ education at university and high school. She is studying an external degree program in the evenings.

In sea cucumber cleaning and processing the operation is managed by the exporter and the ILO supported the drying shed for the cleaned product. The evaluation team observed that working conditions are still poor, with women working in crouched positions for long hours on the earth floor,

---

<sup>24</sup> Seaweed harvesting is a value chain that has not been directly supported by the project but several communities in Kilinochchi are pursuing it and the NAQDA representative mentioned its potential as an export earner.

<sup>25</sup> Name changed for confidentiality reasons.

and no consideration of gloves. The ELGR fisheries field officer is aware of this situation and is working with the exporter to encourage better working conditions.

**Participation in cooperative decision-making and wider social empowerment.** One of the key strategies to empower women was to encourage cooperatives to increase women’s representation on cooperative boards of directors. Most cooperative have decision-making boards that range in number from 7-11 members. While the national Cooperatives Amendment Act (92/11) states that at least two women should be represented on boards and one of the Officer Positions must be held by women, the project sought to increase women’s representation to 50% on every cooperative board. This has shown varied success – in agriculture cooperative societies, women’s representation was frequently above 60%, such as the Young Farmers Club, though in Vavuniya where women make up 71 % of the 350 members, the majority of the board members are men (4 out of 7). The PTK Women Entrepreneurs’ Cooperative Society in Mullaitivu is a prime example of women’s empowerment enabled by the project and LEED.<sup>26</sup> PTK is a dynamic group of women entrepreneurs, including war widows and former combatants, taking a leading role in the community, and led by a President who is seeking election in local government. Significantly, the women expressed how their role in this cooperative has helped them break cultural barriers that discriminate against widows in Sri Lanka.

“We are breaking cultural barriers for widows, we keep our Pottu”<sup>27</sup>

In fisheries, the discussions with cooperative boards in Valaipadu FCS and Iranaimatha FCS demonstrated that women have been empowered as vocal members of the boards, though few actually hold office bearing positions. In Valaipadu two of nine board members are female. There was a “buzz” of engagement and confidence among these new women board members and women cooperative members at Valaipadu regarding their role in the cooperative and in the fisheries business. This was echoed in the presentations they made at the stakeholder workshop, which testifies to the contribution of ILO to their self-confidence and leadership potential. At the membership level, they credited LEED/EGLR with promoting female membership to reach 80 out of 280 members. Before the ILO projects women were not permitted to be members of the fishers cooperative society.

In newly supported cooperatives women’s membership is still low, with no women on the board in St. Xavier and St. Thomas FCS, but they have been motivated to employ women as cooperative staff. The changes taking place in attitudes to women’s role were perhaps more striking among the fishing communities observed by the evaluation, given that women have traditionally not played a breadwinner role.

**Changes in gender roles at the household level:** The interviewees in Valaipadu highlighted changes that individual members have made in their households that they attributed to taking part in the gender discussion forums, and the recognition that “women can do as much as men”. Male fishers said that as

---

<sup>26</sup> EGLR direct support to PTK stopped in early 2018 following the start of the EMPOWER project implemented by ILO and World Food Programme under the UN Peace Building Fund, channeling \$2.5 million to the development of economic and peace-building initiatives.

<sup>27</sup> The forehead mark worn by Tamil women which identifies the wearer as a married Hindu woman, which it is customary to wipe off upon widowhood.



a result of the project's influence, women are recognized as better at managing finances than men, and can be trusted not to waste money, so the men now tend to hand over their earning to their wives to manage. Interviewees also shared that women's management of finances means that more of the family income is devoted to children's education and that fewer children out of school and alcoholism is reduced.

In a farming cooperative – Vinayagapuram - cooperative members reported that the ILO training and awareness activities contributed to many changes: marketing is now done by women as well as men, women are more independent, men's attitude to holding the money has changed and women check household expenditure more. It was not clear to the evaluators whether the ILO actually encouraged households to assign household financial management to women, or whether these patterns relate to shifting cultural norms, but the interviewees attributed the changes to the project influence.

The gender analysis carried out under EGLR for the LEED+ Phase indicated that the EGLR team has found that discussion forums worked more effectively than a more traditional gender training approach.<sup>28</sup> However, women's responsibility for childcare did limit women's participation in gender forums as heard in some individual cases.

**Psychosocial impacts of the conflict on women and men:** The evaluation interviews with individual women frequently heard about the deep-seated wounds that remain due to the loss of husbands and other family members. Men are also highly affected by the conflict with signs of alcohol abuse in some communities. Future work in these communities explore the need for linking members with psychosocial counselling or community building through the Women's Development Societies, an existing government structure.

**EGLR implementation of the gender strategy and resourcing:** While men can be equally effective champions for gender change, it may have been helpful to have a Tamil-speaking female staff member as a role model. In addition, the evaluation observed that the strategy could have been more proactive in promoting gender champions and mentoring by successful women entrepreneurs. Compared with the LEED implementation, EGLR's gender strategy appears to have taken a more informal approach, largely based on discussion forums and advocating for promotion of women on cooperative boards, but lacking a detailed gender action plan and no gender focal point on staff until the second year.

### 3.2.7 Effectiveness of partnerships strategies

EGLR has evidently worked hard at maintaining partnerships with the private sector, the government technical agencies and the government administrative agencies, building on the relationships established during LEED. As discussed earlier in the report, the ILO has been very successful in establishing private sector partnerships in support of marketing products and decent work standards, especially with the NCE and a number of international and domestic buyers. The NCE recognises the high potential of sourcing products in the North and there is also a spirit of national reconciliation in its effort.

---

<sup>28</sup> Verite Research. Gender Gap Assessment. Draft for comments. August, 2018.

The project has cooperated closely with the Cooperatives Department at province and district levels where Cooperatives Development Officers are involved in monitoring the use of capital working grants. The project has also maintained close engagement with the Divisional Secretariats in the selection of beneficiaries. However, the Provincial Cooperatives Commissioner expressed that the ILO should provide more information to the department from the outset. A similar view regarding sharing information with and reporting government was expressed by a representative of the Department of Agriculture at district level. The evaluation observed that the government institutional environment is challenging given the complexity of dealing with multiple technical line agencies and administrative authorities at different levels, and there are also individual personality factors that affect the relationship and communications. In future the ILO could do more to engage the government agencies at a proactive level, ensure that they are well informed and provide capacity building support to their role in facilitating the economic development strategies.

### **3.2.8 Contribution to local and national cooperative policy**

At a local policy level the project promoted individual cooperatives to review their by-laws and statutes in order to make them more independent, inclusive, member driven. In the absence of a National Cooperative Policy for Sri Lanka the ILO LEED project drafted a Roadmap for Cooperative Development in Sri Lanka in 2012. One of the recommendations of the roadmap was to draft a National Cooperative Policy for Sri Lanka. With the support of Coop Unit at ILO HQ a policy document was prepared. It has gone through the review of the cabinet in 2013 and 2018 respectively and is currently in the hands of the Ministry of Industry and Commerce.

Once adopted it will contain all the elements highlighted in the ILO's Recommendation 193 on the promotion of cooperative development. The cooperatives will no longer be treated as just an association of people, but as enterprises connected with broader market economy. The new policy would minimize government intervention in cooperatives governance and gender would be mainstreamed at all levels of the cooperative movement.

EGLR's success on the ground, coupled with its advocacy work at national level have stimulated media interest and also led to enquiries from the National Office of Reconciliation and Unity<sup>29</sup> which is keen to learn and adopt the approach to support social cohesion and its peace building and reconciliation efforts.

In the fisheries sector, ETC Lanka consulting group was commissioned to investigate Fair Trade certification for fisheries to meet the demand for sustainably and ethically sourced seafood and attract premium prices. However, fair trade certification is very expensive, so as an interim solution they have developed a Code of Conduct for the fishery supply chain compatible with the FLOCERT certification that

---

<sup>29</sup> The Office for National Unity and Reconciliation (ONUR) has been established to lead, facilitate, support and coordinate matters related to national unity and reconciliation in Sri Lanka. The office works with all stakeholders including state, civil society and international partners as well as the general public in making sure our mandated vision and mission is achieved in a meaningful, sustainable, and collective manner.

ensures both producers and traders meet Fair Trade standards. This still requires institutional ownership to become operational, potentially through the Export Development Board.

### **3.3 Management Effectiveness**

This section addresses the effectiveness of project management arrangements and technical capacity, ILO support, governance and stakeholder involvement, monitoring and evaluation effectiveness and the related aspect of documentation and knowledge sharing.

#### **3.3.1 Management arrangements and technical support**

The evaluation found that the management and project staffing in terms of the number of staff and their deployment has been highly effective in the delivery of the project. One gap which seems to have limited effectiveness is the lack of an M&E officer during most of the life of the project, as well as gaps in dedicated gender technical support.

The location of the EGLR management and field team in Kilinochchi provided an effective and responsive approach. EGLR management was coordinated by the NPC, responsible for oversight of the project delivery, assignment of tasks to the team and reporting. The team members individually informed the evaluators that the NPC was highly task oriented in team coordination and management, contributing to efficiency in the delivery of the interventions. Based on staff interviews, the team appears to have been very cohesive and worked efficiently according to annual, monthly and weekly plans.

The number of field staff, beginning with two field coordinators, and expanding to four in 2018, has enabled frequent contact and monitoring of the field activities. The delegation of the field team roles to cover the agriculture and fisheries sectors, with the new staff assigned to support marketing and IT support has provided a strong mix of sectoral expertise, especially in the second year. The new staff have been assigned additional focal point responsibilities respectively disability issues and gender. The team is also supported by a local finance officer, with additional financial oversight from CO, and a driver. Financial management of the budget disbursement and financial reporting appears to be maintained at a high standard. Several of the staff including the NPC have attended training in Geneva on the application of the MyCoop tool and the core staff have developed a high level of expertise during their LEED and EGLR tenures, based on the comments of ILO GVA and Colombo staff. The project has also been fortunate to have had a consistent core team membership through LEED and EGLR.

In June 2018 a Monitoring and Evaluation officer joined the staff in Colombo, responsible for EGLR M&E and the preparatory assessments for LEED Plus, funded under EGLR as well as another Country Office project. However, she has not been closely involved in the monitoring and evaluation of EGLR itself. Her first assigned priority was to work urgently on the CLEAR project and then to assist with the design of LEED Plus. The CTA, appointed in May 2018, is based in Colombo and overseeing three projects of the Jobs for Peace and Resilience Programme, including EGLR and the development phase of LEED Plus. He has not had a close involvement in the management and technical advice for EGLR, given the timing of his arrival, but is familiar with the project and provides guidance when needed. At country level, the Country Director and the project focal point provide support from Colombo.

The beneficiaries at the level of cooperative societies and federations reported that the field officers have been in frequent contact and provide excellent support to them. Government officers from NAQDA and the Cooperatives Department/district also informed the evaluation team that the field officers have established a strong relationship of trust and respect in the communities.

From the perspectives of the staff, the size of the team and their work assignments worked well but they would have liked a dedicated M&E officer on the project team.

### **3.3.2 ILO technical backstopping**

The project focal point in CO Colombo has been responsible for backstopping technical issues and reporting, and is well versed in ILO's cooperative approach having formerly worked in the field under LEED.

The Coop/DEVINVEST unit in Geneva has provided technical materials and advisory inputs to the team and also conducted a site visit. However, based on a range of comments/observations the project could have requested and received more support from other ILO technical specialists, including the regional New Delhi Decent Work Team on gender issues. EGLR did draw on a considerable number of ILO tools such as My.Coop, TDIM (Territorial Diagnosis and Institutional Mapping), and the 'community contracting' tool; however, overall, the evaluation noted that the ILO's wider technical expertise on matters of gender and value chain development has been under-utilized.

### **3.3.3 Project governance and involvement of tripartite stakeholders**

EGLR did not establish an advisory or steering committee at the national level, unlike the preceding LEED project. This was a rational choice as most of the implementation and desired outcomes are focused at the local level – from province to district to division and village administration Grama Nilidhari<sup>30</sup>. For national accountability and information sharing and guidance the ILO presents the progress of EGLR at the quarterly Decent Work Country Program meetings. The Director General for the Department of Labour under the MOLTUR was satisfied with this arrangement and has followed the progress with interest. The evaluation team was not able to meet the representative of the Employers' Federation of Ceylon, so the perspective of the employers' peak body was not available.

At the province and district levels, EGLR has kept the government administration at local level informed of project activities and has liaised individually with technical line departments and agencies at district and provincial level including NAQDA, the Commissioners of Cooperatives (province and district) and Ministry of Agriculture. However, the large number of agencies relevant to the project and the complexity of administrative and technical offices presented a challenge for coordination and several representatives expressed that they would like to have been more informed and more closely involved in implementation decisions.

---

<sup>30</sup> Lowest administrative level in Sri Lanka.

### **3.3.4 Monitoring and Evaluation Effectiveness**

The evaluation concluded that the monitoring and evaluation system was not sufficiently rigorous, and also not well utilized. The team did not have a dedicated monitoring and evaluation officer for most of the period and insufficient resources and time appear to have been devoted to M&E.

While the M&E framework established a reasonably comprehensive set of indicators and target values at the impact, goal, immediate outcome and output levels, the indicators and matching targets are not expressed consistently. For example, some indicators are expressed as a percentage and the target values and performance as a number.

According to the project staff, the indicator data was collected by the field staff through field visits to the cooperatives rather than providing a set of systematic data collection tools for the cooperatives to complete. This was not an efficient means of data collection. The framework reports on updates of project achievements against indicators per quarter and annually. However, in terms of utilization the project reports to the donor do not include tables of results achieved against the results framework. The project team appears to have made limited systematic use of the M&E data in making management decisions. The team themselves expressed the view that the system was not well developed. In fact, data for several indicators for the gender equity outcome were not completed in the first version provided to the evaluation team, and were subsequently updated by request.

Considering that gender concerns were intended to be highlighted, it would have been valuable to provide a breakdown by sex of the number of women and men beneficiaries, the number of women among primary producers (fisheries and agriculture) and the number of women and men in paid employment.

Regarding the progress of individual cooperatives and a consolidated tracking of cooperative capacity progress, it would have been useful to develop a quantitative system for monitoring individual cooperative performance along relevant dimensions and tracking this over time. The number of cooperatives/federations reaching an optimal level could then have been reported. As noted earlier, the evaluation advises the new project to establish a capacity and performance framework for the cooperatives and to track such performance.

Since a baseline survey was not conducted, insufficient baseline data was available for comparing subsequent performance. For example of average individual incomes generated through the initiatives could have been compared at baseline and end of project. In the next LEED phase, the ILO has rectified the planned M&E strategy by systematically establishing performance indicators and conducting a baseline survey.

### **3.3.5 Communications and knowledge sharing**

EGLR has supported some outstanding intervention models and emerging innovative practices, but the documentation and communications of the achievements has been under-resourced and weak. In addition the team's capacity in communications was not as strong as their sectoral expertise, based on

evaluation observations of reporting and key informant comments. It would be worthwhile investing in staff training in communications in the coming phase.

While the NPC has presented the market-driven local economic development models at various international forums at the invitation of ILO Geneva, there could have been more extensive documentation and a clear communication strategy, considering that this was an extension phase of approximately five years of LEED implementation.

### 3.4 Efficiency of Resource Use

The assessment of efficiency encompasses questions related to the efficient allocation of human resources and funds; including cost effectiveness compared with alternative approaches; allocation of resources to gender equity and disability; the extent of joint leveraging of project resources together with other projects and cost-effectiveness compared with alternative approaches.

#### Cost effectiveness of funds allocation

The distribution of the project funds is presented in Table 5. The figures represent actual expenditure and committed expenditure for 2018, and the total of the project budget is committed.

**Table 5. Expenditure Breakdown**

<b>Expenditure Category</b>	<b>Expenditure USD</b>	<b>% of cost</b>
<b>Subcontracts(Including admin cost)</b>	1,114,089	61.1%
<b>Evaluation</b>	30,000	1.6%
<b>International experts</b>	167,034	9.2%
<b>ILO national staff salary and travel costs</b>	253,052	13.9%
<b>Other ILO operational and admin. cost</b>	259,369	14.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,823,544</b>	<b>100</b>

Admin cost of subcontracts: \$33,423

From an aid effectiveness perspective, EGLR has channeled a high proportion of its funds to the implementation of the programme, at 61%, compared with 28% spent on staff salaries and operational costs. Staff salaries and travel cost represent a modest 14%. The project has been cost-effective in its strategy of assigning the key project management position to a National Officer throughout the project and adding international expertise half way through the second year. Within the subcontracts category, the assessment studies conducted for the preparation of LEED Plus – gender, disability and the baseline study together amount to US\$51,000 and have been cost-effectively sourced in Sri Lanka. The cost of international experts, includes expertise for the development of the LEED Plus project document and

Value Chain Study under the project Addendum, and represents 9%.<sup>31</sup> The cost of evaluation at 1.6%, can be included with the operational costs category and is in keeping with the norms for evaluation costs. The location of staff in the field is effective from a delivery point of view and also cost effective as the office is shared with other UN agencies in Kilinochchi.

### **Human Resource Efficiency**

EGLR has operated with a fairly small team of management and technical experts, especially during its first year when there were only three management and technical staff. The team has made remarkable achievements considering the number of staff and the scale of interventions, including the cooperative society and beneficiary coverage, as well as the fact that much of the work has been hands-on capacity building and mentoring. Efficiencies and technical effectiveness have been enhanced through recruiting local agricultural extension officers to carry out the agricultural training. In other training and capacity building activities the intention was that the effects of the training would spill-over to others in the community rather than having large numbers attend, according to staff interviews. The number of participants per training event was not available to the evaluation team, however.

### **Resourcing for integration of gender equality and disability**

The project did not allocate specific resources in term of staffing to gender and disability concerns until Year 2, when focal point responsibilities were assigned separately to the two new field staff. In terms of resources for integrating gender equality, substantial resources have been allocated through Outcome 3 which provides for direct beneficiary support to around 620 women beneficiaries across the two sectors. Gender training for beneficiaries has also received modest but effectively used funding. Gender concerns are also integrated efficiently through the support to processing plants in fisheries generating employment for some 300-400 women. Support to persons with disabilities is channeled directly through the Olirum Valvu association for PwDs. In addition, differently abled persons are members of many of the cooperatives supported. However, the project has not directly supported specific strategies to include the access of PwDs.

### **Leveraging project resources with other related projects**

ILO Colombo has strategically leveraged the funds available from EGLR together with the funding available for other programmes. For example, EGLR supported PTK Women's Entrepreneurs' Cooperative to a limited extent in 2017 and then channeled substantial funding to this group under UN Peace Building fund. The funding of CTA, who has oversight of the whole Jobs for Peace and Resilience programme, is cost shared between RBSA, LEED Plus and UN Peace Building Funds, representing effective leverage of resources from multiple donor sources.

---

<sup>31</sup> The CTA is cost-shared between LEED+ and the ILO Regular Budget Supplementary Account.

### 3.5 Sustainability and Impact Orientation

The evaluation assesses theme of sustainability with regard to the strategies undertaken for continuing the EGLR practices and results and its exit; as well as the extent to which the results and approaches supported by ELGR are likely to be durable or scaled-up beyond the project. Sustainability strategies, prospects and scale-up potential are reviewed at the levels of cooperative partners, North-South export/buyer partnerships, and national and local stakeholder ownership and policy environment.

EGLR's central approach towards sustainability was to build the sustainability of the producer organizations and their access to larger markets, in the context of necessary liaison with relevant technical agencies and administrative authorities. The evaluation found that this has resulted in varying degrees of cooperative financial sustainability and sustainable production capacity. Private sector engagement, particularly through the NCE, shows strong indications of durability. The project has been less focused at the broader level of national and local government capacity and policy development on economic development to sustain and expand the gains and overall approach. However, the provincial line agencies are supportive of the cooperative-focused approach. In fisheries, the Sustainable Fisheries Improvement Plan provides a strong platform to continue aquaculture expansion among cooperatives.

**Cooperative level sustainability & members' livelihoods:** The approach to building sustainable livelihoods of the communities has been to strengthen the capacity of the cooperatives to form business partnerships and operate financially sustainable purchasing enterprises. Regarding the sustainability of cooperatives to continue to operate commercially and to manage their relationships with export partners, and seek new markets, several appear to be ready to operate without ILO's support. Some examples are described earlier in this report. For example, the North-South Company joint venture between Vavuniya North Cooperative Society and CRE exports is in a strong position to continue gaining export revenue, but will need to improve its business model. There are others which clearly need further business management support to operate commercially without ILO's support to operating costs. The robust business partnerships established with at least seven major exporters look likely to remain and flourish in the coming years, bringing continued incomes to the cooperative members.

However, the exit strategy at the level of individual cooperatives has not been clear, as noted earlier in the report. The monitoring of the cooperatives was not sufficiently systematic to identify when the project should withdraw direct and also technical support.

**North-South business partnerships:** EGLR was highly successful in its strategy of engaging the NCE in support of its efforts to link Northern Province producer cooperatives with Southern buyers and exporters. The commitment of the NCE to continue this approach is evident in the various trade forums organized by the NCE in Jaffna and Kilinochchi in 2018, as reported in their quarterly publication, and in the practice of presenting annual exports awards.<sup>32</sup> The interviews with the representatives of NCE confirmed their ongoing commitment to introducing more buyers to the north.

---

<sup>32</sup> National Chamber of Exporters. Sri Lankan Exporter, April-June, 2018.



**District and provincial government capacity and ownership:** While the project has clearly contributed to the economic development strategy for the Northern Province in the fisheries and agricultural sectors, the project's cooperative-focused fair trade approach is not yet fully owned by the local government stakeholders, as indicated in interviews with these stakeholders. This means the exit of the ILO at this point in time could leave a vacuum in terms of which agencies would carry forward and coordinate the work undertaken by the ILO in building cooperative society capacity, facilitating access to capital and attracting public or private investment in value-chain infrastructure.

While the project has influenced the technical capacity of the agricultural extension officers, further effort to establish the understanding of the cooperatives model will be needed in the future. This was evident in the desire of one district DOA representative to be included on the Board of one of the cooperatives, when the law and the principle of cooperatives is that they should be independent of government influence. Other agencies such as the cooperatives commission at Provincial level expressed the need for greater information exchange with the project. To a large extent, the project is seen as a development agency endeavour.

**Cooperatives policy and sustainability of fair trade practices:** At the policy level, EGLR's contribution to the Cooperatives Act review is eventually expected to bring sustained improvement to the governance of cooperatives. Furthermore, EGLR has successfully inculcated an understanding of fair trade principles among producers and buyers, such as TSF. The project has played a role in developing a code of conduct for fisheries fair trade which will be available beyond the project. However, it is not clear which institutional stakeholders will continue ILO's fair trade advocacy and intermediation role beyond the project. This could potentially be carried forward by the private sector together with government and interested non-profit groups.

**National and international replication:** At the levels of ongoing support to local economic development in the region, the main exit strategy has been to plan with support from the Australian DFAT and Norwegian MFA to replicate, enhance and scale-up the approach of LEED and EGLR in the Northern and North-Central Province. The ILO is therefore in a strong position to support scale-up in the new LEED phase.

While the project did not invest substantially in documentation and advocacy towards replication and scaling up, through the ILO Coop unit in Geneva, EGLR has taken the opportunity to share the good practices of LEED/EGLR at various international forums, including a papaya exhibition in Italy, a Coop2 Coop trade fair. As noted by the Coop unit manager, LEED materials have been shared in other post-conflict situations such as among ex-guerilla groups in Colombia where 100 cooperatives were set up.

## **IV. CONCLUSIONS**

### **4.1 Relevance and Design Validity**

Building on the North-South business partnerships strategy pioneered through LEED, channeled through producer cooperatives, EGLR has continued to be relevant to the need to for improved livelihoods in the Northern Province. The evaluation found that the interventions have continued to be highly relevant to needs at producer and producer organization level. The expanded coverage to reach Jaffna and Mannar districts reached more communities which suffered damage to their livelihoods in the aftermath of the conflict and who have not previously been supported through a market-based approach. On the other hand, a more comprehensive assessment in the newly included communities would have been valuable to reassess the approach and increase the relevance of the interventions. The business partnerships approach has also been relevant to the interests of international and local exporters and retailers to source reliable, high quality products. At national level, EGLR supports the government's vision of economic growth through exports, tackling unequal development across provinces and inclusive employment. The continued sectoral focus on fisheries and fruit and vegetables is well justified.

The project's intervention logic is essentially sound, based on the ingredients of building cooperative capacity as commercial enterprises; expanding cooperatives' business partnerships for market-driven production in the focus sectors; and improving the participation of women and vulnerable groups, leading to improved livelihoods in the North and improved north-south relations. However, the design could have included more emphasis on local government capacity to support the intervention approach. Additionally, the expression of the design in the results framework could have been more rigorous for the purposes of evaluability and results-based monitoring and evaluation.

### **4.2 Effectiveness of Interventions**

EGLR has largely achieved its goal and outcome targets of supporting improved livelihoods to small-holder farmers, fishers and processing employees. It has reached over 2,000 beneficiaries and brought substantial increased income to the communities. It has also benefited the Sri Lankan and international export companies who have been able to source more fruit and vegetable and fisheries products reliably and at stable prices.

Production processes and commercial viability have reached high levels of maturity in the cooperatives supported for a number of years under LEED and EGLR - Kilinochchi, Mullaitivu and Vavuniya North. These benefits have extended to some parts of Jaffna and Mannar. However, the benefits are not seen to the same extent in the newly supported areas such as the Jaffna islands, and newly re-settled areas in Tellipalai, Jaffna, which may be attributed to the shorter duration of support.

Cooperative capacity: The project's assistance support for soft skills training and mentoring the targeted cooperatives has helped many of them to operate effectively as commercial enterprises, following good governance guidelines and providing financial and social welfare services to members. For those cooperatives that flourished under LEED, threats emerged in the form of losses accumulated due to low

profit margin, accompanied by poor auditing practices. Other threats are posed by reaching an unmanageable size. Newly formed cooperatives are progressing but not yet reaching break-even in the absence of ILO's subsidy to staff and running costs. The evaluation concluded that the process needs to be more customized, and allow plenty of time to build cooperatives independence, while emphasising good business practices.

In the fruit and vegetables sector lucrative business partnerships have been strengthened with existing export partners and new ones have been initiated for crops including Lady Red papaya, bananas, passion fruit and Moringa leaves. While changes in incomes as a result of the intervention are not available consistently across the communities, there are strong indications that incomes have improved in most places and the income sources are more stable. The EGLR phase has enabled increased diversification of crops but this was not supported by full value chain analysis and rather arose from buyer demand and opportunity.

**Fisheries livelihoods:** The strategy of supporting coops to become purchasing enterprises continued to prove successful in increasing fisher's income through cutting out the agents who formerly bought the crab/fish catch from the fishers. This practice has not yet reached all the cooperatives involved. The project continued from LEED in helping fishing communities to re-build their fishing assets, both individually and collectively. Aquaculture in sea cucumber and mud crab is well suited to many of the northern coastal areas and EGLR has helped farmers set up collective sea cucumber farms. This has proven to be lucrative and a source of livelihood for those not involved in sea fishing. The employment opportunities in TSF processing plants are highly valued by the communities and the jobs meets decent work standards. The evaluators suggest that TSF could be encouraged to promote more local people and women as production managers.

Threats to fishers continue in the form of Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated fishing by Indian trawlers and Sri Lankan boats from elsewhere. Significantly, some communities continue to be highly indebted to fish traders who buy the catch and sell to the exporters.

**Gender equity:** As a targeted direct beneficiaries women, and especially women-headed households, comprised more than half of those provided with production inputs – seedlings and irrigation in agriculture; fishing boats, and aquaculture inputs in fisheries. Women were also the major beneficiaries of employment generated in seafood processing, though there is room for improvement on the quality of jobs in sea cucumber processing. Young men have not benefited similarly from employment generation, which is one limitation of the outcomes. Regarding women's participation in cooperative decision making, inroads are gradually being made in these traditionally male dominated cooperatives. Men are still the majority of cooperative board of management membership, markedly so in fisheries, but the evaluation observed that some of the women who have been elected to boards are demonstrably empowered and taking an active role in the direction and vision of the cooperative.

The effort to influence women's empowerment was reflected in widespread accounts of changes in household management of finances, women's influence on spending on education and health attributed

to the project gender awareness activities, and recognition that women can be breadwinners alongside men, even in the fisheries.

### **4.3 Management Effectiveness**

The evaluation found that the management and project staffing in terms of the number of staff and their deployment has been highly effective in the delivery of the project. The project would have benefited from an M&E Officer for the whole of the project period.

The monitoring and evaluation system was underdeveloped, lacking baseline information and was under-utilized in terms of reporting and making management adjustments.

Knowledge sharing and communications regarding the successful practices of the project had some impacts on international practices on post-conflict economic development, by the project could have developed a more effective communications strategy towards national replication and scale-up.

### **4.4 Efficiency of Resource Use**

The project has demonstrated a strong level of cost-effectiveness with regard to the distribution of funds to programme and operational costs with a high proportion of funds dedicated to the implementation of programme activities. The allocation of human resources was efficient with delivery achieved through a small team of field staff with extensive expertise.

### **4.5 Sustainability**

The central approach towards sustainability undertaken by EGLR was to build the sustainability of the producer organizations' capacity to access wider markets through the business partnerships established. This was approached in the context of liaison with relevant technical government agencies and administrative authorities. The cooperatives have reached varying degrees of sustainable production capacity, financial sustainability and buyer negotiating capacity. Some require little or no further support while others, particularly those newly supported have not reached autonomous status.

Private sector engagement, particularly through the NCE, shows strong indications of durability. The project has been less focused at the broader level of national and local government capacity and policy development on economic development to sustain and expand the gains and overall approach. However, the provincial line agencies in agriculture and fisheries are supportive of the cooperative-focused approach. In fisheries, the government's ADB-funded Northern Province Sustainable Fisheries Improvement Project provides a key platform to continue cooperatives' involvement in aquaculture expansion.

## V. GOOD PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

### 5.1 Good Practices

The evaluation identified a number of effective strategies used by EGLR to enhance viable livelihoods in post-conflict communities. The following key good practices initiated or enhanced under EGLR are highlighted that are considered innovative and worthy of replication and scale-up. These examples are described in more detail in **Annex F**.

- **Strengthening producer cooperatives as viable purchasing enterprises in agriculture and fisheries is an effective economic and social empowerment model in vulnerable communities.** The cooperative model demonstrated multiple benefits for attracting investors, achieving economies of scale and offering financial and social services to members. The model has proven to be worthy of further support in the Northern Province.
- **Sea cucumber farm aquaculture model.** The expansion into sea cucumber farming with inputs for juveniles, pens and feed has provided a robust model for replication. The benefits are equitably shared among small producer teams, including women; it is environmentally friendly and protects sea stock and the market of the crop is assured and lucrative. Women stand to benefit so long as their representation in the producer groups is maintained.
- **Supporting women’s producer associations as a vehicle for empowerment of conflict- affected women.** The PTK model demonstrates the advantages of working with producer groups managed by and for women in communities affected by conflict, providing a platform for building their economic independence, social standing and empowerment.
- **Fostering champions among private sector peak bodies proved highly effective.** The project garnered lasting engagement of the NCE which played a pivotal role in introducing new export partners, strengthening north-south trust and motivating the Northern cooperatives.

### 5.2 Lessons Learned

- **Effective monitoring and evaluation requires adequate resources, time and expertise.** EGLR did not have the time and dedicated staff resources to establish a comprehensive M&E system capable of capturing changes clearly and reliably to serve accountability and management decisions. ILO has recognized this weakness and is dedicating resources to establish a useful set of indicators, establishing baseline conditions and targets by which performance can be reliably monitored and evaluated.
- **Governance and institutional coordination.** The project faced challenges in maintaining ownership and information flow with the wide range of relevant administrative and technical government agencies. It is important to establish a practical system for communications and

feedback regarding the project progress and interventions, establishing the ongoing role of these agencies beyond the intervention.

- **Achieving cooperative society commercial viability requires long-term investment of support.** The combined experience of EGLR and LEED demonstrate that building the capacity of producer cooperative societies in post-conflict situations to be able to operate viable commercial enterprises is a long-term endeavour, requiring several years of intervention support.

## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are directed towards future projects and specifically the next phase of the LEED project. They may also serve broader application by ILO and other development partners in post-conflict livelihoods development. The key parties suggested to lead implementation are cited after each recommendation, followed by the suggested priority level (high, medium, low); timing (short, medium and long-term); and level of resource implications (low, medium, high).

1. **In future geographic and community targeting**, continue and intensify ILO project support to the most vulnerable communities and cooperative societies supported under EGLR, especially those supported in Jaffna islands, re-settled areas and Mannar district where interventions are still in their infancy. *(ILO, donors, implementing partners; high priority; medium term; medium resources)*
2. **Cooperative society capacity assessment, monitoring and exit**. Develop and apply a systematic capacity assessment framework for cooperative societies and producer groups from the outset to identify needs, track progress and determine the exit point for project assistance. This will enable the implementers to customize assistance provided; track progress towards an autonomous and well-functioning state and identify the exit point when the cooperative has reached an optimal level of capacity.

As a first step, define the desired characteristics of a well-functioning cooperative. The capacity framework should comprise several dimensions such as Governance (leadership and organizational structure); Business management and inter-organizational linkages (networks, joint ventures, marketing capacity); Human resources and financial management (planning, accounting); Infrastructure facilities (buildings, technology); and Social Inclusion. Each dimension may include several indicators on which the cooperatives can be graded. E.g. Business management: Able to calculate profit and loss; able to identify and negotiate with new market partners. The assessment and scoring could be made at regular intervals and the overall score plotted over time. An exit point score range would be defined to determine when the ILO will withdraw support. *(ILO project team, Dept of Cooperatives; high priority; short to medium term; medium resources)*

3. **Future project governance and partner coordination**. To increase ownership of government stakeholders at the sub-national level, the LEED+ phase should include regular reporting and dialogue with the relevant line ministries and administrative government, including the Department of Cooperatives, Ministry of Fisheries and Ministry of Agriculture. Regarding governance at the sub-national level, rather than establish a new project advisory committee at province level the ILO and partners should consider using existing government platforms such as the Provincial aid coordination meeting and district coordination committees as platforms to report on progress and receive advisory comments. *(ILO and government partners; high priority; short-medium term; low resources)*

4. **Monitoring and evaluation system and resourcing for LEED Plus.** Ensure that the M&E framework defines a set of relevant and specific indicators with target values to be achieved at appropriate milestone intervals and collect baseline data for the key indicators to enable assessment of progress and outcomes. The number of indicators should be manageable and limited to the most useful and results reviewed regularly to inform project implementation and changes in course as required. The role of the officer should be to guide the data collection, while field staff should be responsible for collecting the data and checking submissions of data by cooperatives or other implementing agencies. The project team should provide simple reporting formats, ideally entered digitally, to enable consistency and efficient collection and aggregation. *(ILO; high priority; short term; medium resources).*
  
5. **Implement innovative communications and advocacy strategy.** Under LEED+ and other ongoing projects, ensure that learning from implementation is documented and shared at the project level and internationally through a comprehensive communications and advocacy strategy. Documentation may take the form of case studies, videos, social media releases; and shared at two levels: i) exchange meetings among participating project stakeholders at all levels and national audiences; ii) among international audiences including other development partners, ILO Geneva and Regional Offices. *(Project team, ILO Geneva, New Delhi DWT; high priority; medium term; medium resources)*
  
6. **Address occupational safety and health concerns in seafood processing plants.** Work with sea cucumber processing exporters and local cooperative societies to improve the OSH and working conditions of employed sea cucumber processors to meet decent work standards. *(ILO, Export partners, fishery federation; high priority, short-term; low resources)*
  
7. **Enhance gender and inclusion strategies and staffing.** Suggested strategies to increase the advancement of women and persons with disabilities: a) Include mentoring programs matching successful women with those starting out in production and cooperative board roles; b) Replicate the women's entrepreneurship model of PTK Women Entrepreneurs' CS; c) Increase women's access to participate in training through child care services and location of training close to home d) Develop more livelihood opportunities for women in fishing communities including fishing net production training; e) work with export processing plants to include training opportunities and career promotion for women; f) develop specific targets and strategies to support benefits to and inclusion of persons with disabilities; g) Strengthen the gender and social inclusion expertise in the team with a dedicated staff member located in the field, ideally with fluency in Tamil language. *(ILO and implementing partners; high priority; medium term; medium resources).*
  
8. **Provide psychosocial support or linkages to such services in conflict-affected communities.** Future economic development interventions in the conflict affected areas should offer linkages and referrals to psychosocial counseling to widows, and others suffering deep seated loss. *(ILO,*



*in collaboration with government and other development parties; high priority; medium-long-term; medium resources)*

9. **Expand debt release among fishery members leveraging alternative funding sources:** In future work with fishery and other cooperative societies, promote successful models of debt relief taken by cooperative societies, for example, access to Bank of Ceylon loans to pay the debts of bonded fishers, and reduce the reliance on project grants. *(Project team, Cooperative societies and federations; medium priority; medium term; medium resources)*
  
10. **Establish stronger collaboration with the Export Development Board for expanded markets and fair trade advocacy.** *(ILO, private sector, Department of Cooperatives; Medium priority; medium term; low resources)*

## **ANNEXES**

## ANNEX A: Project Performance on Indicator Targets

Source: EGLR M & E Report, Updated 17 October, 2018

Outcomes/Outputs	Indicator & Target	Cumulative Achievement 17 Oct 2018	% Achievement
<b>Impact objective:</b> By 2018, promotion and strengthening of competitive sustainable enterprise and productive and sustainable employment in conflict affected Northern region in Sri Lanka	# of new sustainable livelihoods created in the agriculture, fisheries and SME sectors for men and women (Target: 2,000)	2,025 <i>Includes people employed in seafood, agriculture processing and coop producer members.</i>	101%
	# of primary producers supported (Target: 2,000)	2,025 <i>(same as above).</i>	101%
	# of women in decision making positions in producer organizations & cooperatives (Target: 50)	63 <i>This includes 30 women in the board level and rest are focal points for the cooperatives in the village level</i>	126%
<b>Interm. Outcome 1:</b> Gender sensitive local business increased income by 20% through partnerships in project locations	20% increase in producer income – 48,000 LKR/HH/Month <i>(Average monthly income per house hold.)</i>	43,333 (2018)	90%
	# of productive employment created through partnerships - 1000 new jobs; increase income up to 48,000 LKR/ Person/ Month	1050	105%
<b>Immediate Outcome 1:</b> Improved export earnings from mutually beneficial business partnerships in fruit and vegetables sector	Increase income by 1 million/sector/year among new beneficiaries (Target:\$2,000 over 2 years)	US \$2,150,000 <i>This is the total income, not only additional income generated. This income was calculated from the total exports value and national supply information from the producers' coops.</i>	108%
<b>Output 1.1:</b> Developed producer and export partnership	# of mutually beneficial business partnerships developed between producers in the target population and the exporters (4 partnerships)	5	125%
<b>Output 1.2:</b> Mobilized farmers into farmers groups/cooperatives	# of producers in the target population linked to supply chains through cooperatives (1,000 producers)	1,000	100%
<b>Output 1.3:</b> Improved producer organization capacity while linking with BDS Cooperative organisations re-organized/revitalized	# of supply organizations reorganized/revitalized (5)	6	120%
<b>Immediate Outcome 2:</b>	Increased income by \$ 1	US \$ 2.6 million	130%

Outcomes/Outputs	Indicator & Target	Cumulative Achievement 17 Oct 2018	% Achievement
Developed/improved mutually beneficial business partnership in fishery sector	million/sector/year in new beneficiaries (\$ 2 million)		
Output 2.1: Mutually beneficial partnerships developed between producers in the target population and the exporters	# mutually beneficial business partnerships	2	
Output 2.2: Establish cooperative buy-back system	# of producers in the target population linked to supply chains through cooperatives (400 fisherman)	385 <i>Represents 20-25% of the members from the targeted fishermen societies, with minimum level of debt.</i>	96%
Output 2.3: Strengthening supply chain linkages with exporters	# employed in seafood processing plants and # of people benefited from aquaculture farms (Target: 600 families)	640	107%
Output 2.4: Improved producer organization capacity while linking with BDS	# of producers with improved production and marketing capacity (Target: 5 coops)	8	160%
<b>Immediate Outcome 3: Improved gender responsive development interventions</b>	% of women and men at board and membership levels. 60% of women [30% FHH] & 40% of men in new areas. (Target: 100)	105 <i>According to the EGLR team this is "the total number of men and women in the coop board and members level. Out of 105 total members 55% are women and the rest 45% are men".</i>	105%
Output 3.1: Facilitated access to BDS support for selected women	# of female producers supported in the target population (Target 600, of whom 30% will be FHH)	620	103%
Output 3.2 Improved capacity of women on employment, leadership and advocacy	# of women represented at membership and board level (Target: 50 women) *This is same as 3 <sup>rd</sup> impact indicator	63	126%
Output 3.3: Increased awareness and sensitized the gender equality	# of men and women with enhanced knowledge and changed attitudes towards gender equality concerns (Target: 1,200)	1,211 <i>According to EGLR team, change was assessed based on the training and follow-up. There are observed changes in leadership roles political participation.</i>	101%

## ANNEX B: Data Collection Matrix

The data collection methods to be used to gather the perspectives of each group of stakeholders will take the form of individual or small group interviews.

	Evaluation Questions	Source of Data							
		Document Review	EGLR staff	ILO Staff	Donor	Govt, employers & workers organizations	Beneficiaries	Target Coops	Private sector buyers
	<b>Relevance and Design</b>								
1	How relevant are the project interventions to promote and strengthen a) sustainable competitive enterprises and b) productive and sustainable employment in the Northern Province?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2	Has the EGLR been able to adapt its approaches to the changing context to address priority needs of the people, district and province?	X	NPC, Field staff		X	X	X	X	X
3	To what extent is this project aligned with ILO's mandate as envisaged in the DWCP 2013-2017 and DWCP 2018-2022?	X	X		X				
4	Have the EGLR interventions been relevant to women, people with disabilities, and other marginalized and disadvantaged groups and their needs?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
5	To what extent are the (planned) outcomes in line with provincial, districts' and people's priorities?		X			X	X	X	
6	To what extent have relevant lessons learned and recommendations of the LEED project been applied in the approach and implementation of EGLR? How effectively did ELGR apply this learning?	X	X		X				
7	To what extent is the project theory of change valid and coherent? (Evaluator added)	X	X	X	X	X			
8	Was the geographic scope, scale of implementation and timeframe appropriate to achieve the desired	X			X	X			X

	Evaluation Questions	Source of Data							
		Document Review	EGLR staff	ILO Staff	Donor	Govt, employers & workers organizations	Beneficiaries	Target Coops	Private sector buyers
	results? (Added)								
	<b>EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERVENTIONS</b>								
9	<b>Assess the Project Achievements</b> a) To what extent has the EGLR project achieved its expected outcomes? What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended project outcomes? b) What have been the positive and negative and intended and unintended results? c) Have the quantity and quality of the outputs produced been satisfactory and in line with planned outputs? d) Particularly in the empowerment activity efforts - . Assess whether the approach has been effective.	M&E data Progress reports	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10	Assess the effectiveness of gender strategies; a) Did the benefits accrue taking into account the different needs of men and women? b) How effectively have the project interventions mainstreamed gender throughout all interventions, not just outcome 3?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
11	How effectively has the project increased sustainable employment and enterprise development opportunities for <b>vulnerable people including women</b> in the Northern province?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
12	How effectively have the project interventions narrowed disparities in the capacities, power structures, cultural gaps and subsequent terms of trade between Northern and Southern businesses and producers?	X	X	X	X	X		X	X

	Evaluation Questions	Source of Data							
		Document Review	EGLR staff	ILO Staff	Donor	Govt, employers & workers organizations	Beneficiaries	Target Coops	Private sector buyers
13	Has the project partnership approach been appropriate and effective in contributing the outcomes?		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
14	<p><b>Reconciliation aspect of the project:</b> The ELGR project aims to contribute to peace and reconciliation.</p> <p>a) How has the reconciliation aspect been addressed through the project?</p> <p>b) What effect/s do the interventions have on people with regard to sustaining peace and reconciliation?</p> <p>c) Has there been any effort to achieve reconciliation through the project or is it expected that the eventual reconciliation will emerge through the project activities?</p> <p><b>Evaluator note: See also Question 12 above on narrowing disparities in capacities, and economic indicators between north and southern provinces.</b></p>	X	X	X		X			X
15	<p><b>New initiatives planned for the project:</b></p> <p>a) Have the original plans for new things taken place? E.g. Blue swimming crab hatcheries.</p> <p>b) Has planning been sufficient for new initiatives? What were the obstacles?</p> <p>c) Has the project introduced new activities beyond those conducted under the LEED project? (Re-phrased)</p>	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
16	New risks and mitigation measures: Has there been focus on identifying new risks and mitigation measures? (A) similar programme has been implemented for (a) number of years. Several things have been continued over the years (e.g. cultivation of	X	X	X		X		X	X

	Evaluation Questions	Source of Data							
		Document Review	EGLR staff	ILO Staff	Donor	Govt, employers & workers organizations	Beneficiaries	Target Coops	Private sector buyers
	papaya and crab processing). a) What could be the risks associated with the continuation of the same work? b) Has optimum levels been assessed? What are the market trends? c) Do project staff have the capacity to do regular assessments								
17	Differentiate between districts. Have there been differences in the outcomes/results among the districts where the project was implemented? a) Has there been a focus on identifying the differences and the need of different approaches in implementation? b) E.g. Mullaitivu compared with Vavuniya; or resettled areas compared with Kilinochchi.	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
<b>EFFECTIVENESS OF MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS</b>									
18	To what extent do the project management capacities and arrangements put in place support the achievement of the planned results?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
19	To what extent have stakeholders, particularly employers' organizations and trade unions been involved in project implementation?		X	X		X			
20	To what extent are the main target groups of the project and the project key stakeholders satisfied with the technical support provided by the ELGR project team and ILO specialists?		X		X	X	X	X	X
21	Has the project received adequate administrative, technical, and if needed, political support from concerned ILO offices (CO Colombo, HQ technical		X	X					



	Evaluation Questions	Source of Data							
		Document Review	EGLR staff	ILO Staff	Donor	Govt, employers & workers organizations	Beneficiaries	Target Coops	Private sector buyers
	departments, and DWT-New Delhi, if relevant)? If not, why?								
22	Monitoring & Evaluation. How effectively has the project management and ILO monitored project performance and results? 70 Is a monitoring and evaluation system in place and how effective has it been? 71 Are appropriate means of verification for tracking progress, performance and achievement of indicator values defined? 72 Are relevant information and data systematically collected? Is reporting satisfactory? Is data disaggregated by sex (and other characteristics if relevant)? 73 Is information regularly analysed to feed into management decisions?	X	X	X				X	
	<b>EFFICIENCY</b>								
23	Have resources (funds, human resources, time etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve results (outputs and outcomes)?	X	X	X	X			X	
24	Have resources been allocated to integrate gender equality, disability in the design and monitoring of activities? Have they been used efficiently?		X			X		X	
25	Have the outputs been delivered in a timely manner? If not what factors hindered timely delivery? Any measures taken?	X	X			X		X	X
26	Have the project resources been leveraged with other related projects or programmes to maximise impact?		X	X					

	Evaluation Questions	Source of Data							
		Document Review	EGLR staff	ILO Staff	Donor	Govt, employers & workers organizations	Beneficiaries	Target Coops	Private sector buyers
27	Have the results been achieved at an acceptable cost, compared with alternative approaches with the same objectives? If so, which types of interventions have been proven to be more cost-effective?	X	X	X					
	<b>IMPACT ORIENTATION AND SUSTAINABILITY</b>								
28	Assess the extent to which the results of the interventions are likely to be durable and can be maintained or even scaled-up and replicated by intervention partners after (the) major assistance has been completed.		X	X		X	X	X	X
29	What strategies has the ELGR project put in place to ensure continuation of the mechanisms, tools and practices provided (once) the support from ELGR ends? To what extent are the strategies likely to be effective?		X	X		X	X	X	X
30	How effective has the programme been in establishing national/local ownership (and will this ownership likely support the continuation of the approaches?)		X	X		X	X	X	
31	Is there a clear exit strategy at project level, factoring in environmental, operational and financial sustainability beyond the project interventions?	X	X				X	X	
32	There may be trends in Sri Lanka and the region (i.e. in Myanmar) that cooperatives are no longer the preferred model from the national authorities. Government of Sri Lanka is seeking some academic inputs in this regard. This may be a point to be verified (in an appropriate way) with relevant National authorities during stakeholder meetings.	X	X	X		X			

## ANNEX C. List of Documents Reviewed

### EGLR Project Documents

- Project Document: Funding Application to Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs: Employment Generation and Livelihoods through Reconciliation. Version sent to ILO HQ. (No date)
- Signed Funding Agreement between Embassy of Norway and the ILO CO for Sri Lanka and the Maldives. Dated 5 November, 2016
- Approval Minute 30 November, 2016. PARDEV Minute Sheet
- EGLR Project Addendum, December 2017
- Final Budget EGLR, Revised Add 1-1
- EGLR Progress Report November 2017 Final
- Annexes 1,2,3,4 to the Progress Report. November 2017
- EGLR Progress Report December 2017 – July 2018
- Workplan for February to October 2018
- Monitoring and Evaluation database

### Data compiled by EGLR for the final evaluation

- EGLR Monitoring and Evaluation Results. Updated 16 October, 2018
- EGLR Budget and Expenditure Summary as of 23 October, 2018
- List of Subcontracts, by name of recipient, date, inputs and value.
- Background information per targeted cooperative/federation: Location, date established, main activities, project interventions.

### ILO Sri Lanka Documents and LEED 2011-2016 Documents

- Sri Lanka Decent Work Country Programme 2013 – 2017
- Final Report Sri Lanka-ILO Decent Work Country Programme Review: DWCP 2013 – 2017. Theo Van der Loop, Sunil Chandrasiri & Ramani Gunatilaka. 13 October, 2017
- Sri Lanka Decent Work Country Programme 2018-2022
- Independent Final evaluation of Local Empowerment and LED: SRL1004AUS\_Eval\_Final\_2016\_Ganesh Rauniyar. September 2016.pdf
- Centre for Poverty Analysis. 2016. LEED Impact Study Series. #2. Case study on the Fruit and Vegetable Sector; #3. Case Study on Co-operatives in Vavuniya and Kilinochchi; # 4. Summary Report, July 2016.
- ILO EGLR. Value Chain Assessment for LEED Plus.
- Verite Research. 2018. Gender Gap Assessment. ILO/LEED. Draft for Comments. August , 2018

### Other References

- ILO. Promotion of Cooperatives Recommendation 2002 (No. 193). [https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100\\_ILO\\_CODE:R193](https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_CODE:R193) Accessed 15/11/2018
- ILO. 2010. Gender Mainstreaming in Local Economic Development Strategies. A Guide. ILO Bureau for Gender Equality.

- ILO & International Cooperatives Alliance.2014. Cooperatives and the Sustainable Development Goals: A contribution to the post-2015 development debate. Frederick o. Wanyama. ILO Enterprises Department, Cooperatives Unit, Geneva.
- ILO. 2014. Promoting Cooperatives: An information guide to ILO recommendation No. 193. International Labour office, Geneva.
- ILO. My.COOP training package: <https://www.itcilo.org/en/areas-of-expertise/rural-development/my-coop-managing-your-agricultural-cooperative>
- ILO. **THINK.COOP**  
[https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/cooperatives/publications/WCMS\\_616148/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/cooperatives/publications/WCMS_616148/lang--en/index.htm)
- UN Office of the Resident Coordinator, Sri Lanka. United Nations Sustainable Development Framework Sri Lanka, 2018-2022

## ANNEX D: Field Visit Itinerary

Date and Time	Venue	Task	Key Person to meet	Person Responsible contact details	Notes/logistics
<b>Saturday 29 September</b>					
16:00	Colombo	Consultant arrival Flight UL405			
<b>Sunday 30 September</b>					
17:00 – 19:00	Colombo	Evaluation team preparation			
<b>Monday 1 October</b>					
0930 - 1030	Colombo ILO Office	Meeting Director ILO Sri Lanka	Ms. Simrin Singh	Dilki/Farzan	
1030 – 1130	ILO office	Meeting CTA and back-stopping officer Country Office	Mr. Thomas Kring Mr. Farzan Razzak	Dilki/Farzan	
1200 – 1300	ILO office	Meet M&E Officer –Project & Country Office M&E focal point	Ms. Dilki Palliyeguruge Mr. Asitha Senaviratne	Dilki/Farzan	
1400 – 1500	Embassy of Norway, 49 Bullers Road, Colombo 05	Norwegian Embassy interview	Ms Monica Svenskeru (Consular) Ms Vidya Perera (Senior Advisor)	Dilki/Farzan	
1600 – 1700	Ministry of Labour, Kirula Rd, Colombo 05	Meeting with Ministry of Labour	Mr. A.Wimalaweera, Commissioner General, Department of Labour		
<b>Tuesday 2 October</b>					
0930 – 12:00	Colombo 532/4k, Sirikotha Lane, Colombo 03	Meeting with National Chamber of Exporters (NCE)	Mr. Shiham Marikkar Secretary General		
12:30 – 13:30	Colombo 54/1, Welikada, Rajagiriya	Meeting with ETC Lanka PVT Ltd	Mr. Sumedha Managing Director		
14:30-16:30	ILO Office	Briefing by EGLR NPC	Nihal Devagiri		

Date and Time	Venue	Task	Key Person to meet	Person Responsible contact details	Notes/logistics
15:00 - 16:00	Colombo	Meeting with Employers Federation of Ceylon	Mr. Khanishka Weerasinghe (DG)		Not available for the appointment - cancelled
<b>Wednesday 3 October</b>					
10:00 – 12:00	Colombo – Cinnamon Grand Hotel	Meeting with Tabrobane Seafood Company (TSF)	Ms. Danushki HR & Communications Manager		
14:00 – 21:00	Friends Inn	Travel to Kilinochchi			
<b>Thursday 4 October</b>					
09:00 – 12:00	ILO Project Office	Meeting with the project team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview presentation</li> <li>• Finalization of field itinerary</li> <li>• Planning for stakeholder workshop</li> </ul>	NPC, Fisheries officer, Horticulture officers, Marketing officer		NPC not available due to training in Colombo
13:00 – 14:30	Kilinochchi town	Meeting with the Assistant Commissioner Cooperatives, Department of Cooperatives	Mr. Subasinghe		
16:00 – 17:00	Kilinochchi (Poonagary)	Meeting with regional manager National Aquaculture Development Authority (NAQDA)	Mr. Nirooparaj		Technical support and certifications from government body to implement aquaculture-interventions
<b>Friday 5 October</b>					
09:30 -11:00	Kilinochchi (Jeyapuram – Poonagary)	Meeting with Fishery Federation	Mr. Francis		
13:00 –14:00	Kilinochchi (Valaipadu – Poonagary)	Meeting with Valaipadu Fish Coop Meeting with Valaipadu beneficiaries	Mr. Immanuel		
15:00 – 16:00		Visit Valaipadu crab processing	Mr. Leenas		

Date and Time	Venue	Task	Key Person to meet	Person Responsible contact details	Notes/logistics
		centre and interviews with employees			
17:00 - 18:00		Return travel			
<b>Saturday 6 October</b>					
09:00 – 13:30 Departure 8:15	Kilinochchi (Nachchikudah)	Iranaimatha Fishermen Coop: meeting board members and beneficiaries. Observation at sea cucumber processing operation	Mr. Mickel		
14:00 – 1100	Kilinochchi (Vinayagapuram, Mulangavil)	Vinayagapuram Coop. Society Meeting with board, followed by meeting with beneficiaries	Mr. Murali		
17:00 – 18:00		Visit beneficiary farms			
<b>Sunday 7 October</b>					
10:00 – 18:00		Evaluation team –Data compilation, methodology for stakeholder workshop, complete Inception Report			
<b>Monday 8 October</b>					
09:00 – 12:00	Mullaitivu (Mallavi - Thunnukai)	Meeting with board and key members at Olirum Valvu group	Mr. Sutha Mr. Vijithan		MSME of differently abled people
13:00 – 14:00	Vavuniya (Sannasi Paranthan)	Meeting at Vavuniya North farmers Coop - board members	Mr. Rasendram		
14:00 – 16:00	Vavuniya	Visiting the field and interview several beneficiaries	Mr. Kiruba		
<b>Tuesday 9 October</b>					
09:00 – 12:00	Mullaitivu (Palampasi – Oddusuddan)	Meeting at Young Farmers Club	Mr. Nishanthan		
		Field visit and meeting with group of beneficiaries	Ms. Krishanthy Mr. Suthan		
12:00 – 13:00		Travel to Vavuniya District			
15:00 – 16:00	Vavuniya District DoA Office	Meeting Deputy Director Agriculture, Vavuniya	Ms. Sakilabanu		

Date and Time	Venue	Task	Key Person to meet	Person Responsible contact details	Notes/logistics
<b>Wednesday 10 October</b>					
8:15 – 09:15		Travel to Mullaitivu			
0930 – 10:30	Mullaitivu (Kaively, Puthukudiy- eruppu)	Meeting at PTK Women’s Coop	Ms. Selvi		
1030 – 1300		Field visit and interview individual beneficiaries and women leaders	Ms. Janthini		
13:00 – 14:00		Travel and lunch			
14:00 – 19:00	EGLR Office	Individual interviews with project staff: NPC, Finance, Marketing	Devagiri Nihal		
<b>Thursday 11 October</b>					
09:00 – 10:00	Jaffna (Thellipalai)	Meeting with DS – Waligamam North, Thellipalai	Mr. Sivasiri		
10:30 – 12:30	Jaffna (Palali East)	Meeting at Palali Agriculture Producers Coop (Tellipalai)	Mr. Navaratnam		
13:00 - 14:00	Jaffna (PDoA Office, Nallur)	Provincial Director of Agriculture	Mr. Sivakumar		Cancelled due to unavailability
1500 – 16:00	Jaffna CCD office, Kaithady	Meeting with Provincial Commissioner of Cooperatives Department	Mr. Vaheshan		
<b>Friday 12 October</b>					
07:00 – 9:00	Travel to ferry				
9:30 – 11:30	Eluvaitivu island, Jaffna	Meeting with Cooperative Board and beneficiaries at St. Thomas FC			
14:00 – 15:30	Jaffna Town	Jaffna District Fishery Federation	Mr.Thavaselvam		
<b>Saturday 13 October</b>					
8:00 -10:00	Travel to Jaffna				
10:00 – 14:30	Punkudutivu	Meeting at Punkudutivu Fishing Cooperative	Mr. Jebarasa		
15:00 – 17:00		Return travel			



Date and Time	Venue	Task	Key Person to meet	Person Responsible contact details	Notes/logistics
Sunday 14 October					
09:00 – 18:00	Kilinochchi	Preparation of workshop presentation and logistics	N/A	Evaluation team	
Monday 15 October					
0900-1230	Kilinochchi Friends Inn	Stakeholder workshop		Evaluation team	
13:30 – 15:00	Kilinochchi	De-briefing with project staff	NPC, Devagiri Nihal		
15:00 – 22:00		Travel to Colombo			
Tuesday 16 October					
0900-11:00	ILO CO	Debriefing with ILO CO & EGLR focal points	Simrin Singh, Thomas Kring, ILO CO staff		
11:30- 12:30	Embassy of Norway	Debriefing with donor	Ms. Monica Svenskerud Ms. Vidya Perera		
Wednesday 17 October					
01:10 am		Depart Colombo UL407			

## ANNEX E: List of Persons Interviewed

No.	Name	Affiliation	M	F
<b>Government of Sri Lanka</b>				
1	Mr. A. Wimalaweera	Commissioner General of Labour, Department of Labour, MOLTUR	X	
2	Mr. Nirooparaj	Provincial Assistant Director, National Aquaculture Development Authority (NAQDA)	X	
3	Mr. S. Sivasiri	Divisional Secretary, Waligamam North, Thellipalai, Jaffna	X	
4	Ms. Radhi Naguleswaran	Deputy Director, Planning		X
5	Mr. Thirusendhooran	Development Assistant	X	
6	Mr. Sivakumar	Provincial Director of Agriculture, Northern Province	X	
7	Mr. P. Vaheesan	Commissioner – Department of Cooperatives Development, Northern Province	X	
8	Mr. Subasinghe	Asst. Commissioner of Cooperatives, Kilinochchi District	X	
9	Ms. Sashikala Banu	Deputy Director, Vavuniya District Department of Agriculture		X
<b>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Embassy of Norway, Colombo</b>				
10	Ms. Monica Svenskerud	Counsellor / Deputy Head of Mission		x
11	Ms. Vidya Perera	Senior Advisor		x
12	Mr. Henrik L. Reinertesn	Intern	x	
<b>ILO CO Colombo and Geneva HQ</b>				
13	Ms. Simrin Singh	Country Director, ILO Sri Lanka and the Maldives		x
14	Ms. Simel Esim	Manager, Coop Unit, Enterprises Department, Geneva (Skype call)		x
15	Mr. Thomas Kring	Chief Technical Advisor, Jobs for Peace and Resilience	x	
16	Ms. Dilki Palliyeguruge	M&E Officer, LEED Plus, EGLR		x
17	Mr. Abdul Razak M. Farzan	CO Programme Officer, EGLR CO focal point	x	
17	Ms. Pramo Weerasekara	Senior Programme officer, ILO CO Colombo		x
18	Mr. Khairul Islam	Value Chain Specialist, LEED Plus	X	
<b>EGLR Project Team</b>				
19	Mr. Nihal Devagiri	National Project Coordinator	X	
20	Mr. Vikneshan	Field Coordinator, Marketing	X	

No.	Name	Affiliation	M	F
21	Mr. Thabesan Sivalinganathan	Field Coordinator, Fishery sector	X	
22	Mr. Semarasa Vasudevan	Field Coordinator, Horticulture sector	X	
23	Mr. K. Thirukumaran	Field Coordinator, Horticulture/IT/Gender	X	
24	Mr. S. Suganthan	Finance / Administration Officer	X	
25	Mr. Krishanthan	National Programme Officer	x	
<b>Private sector partners</b>				
26	Mr. Shiham Marikkar	Secretary General, National Chamber of Exporters (NCE)	X	
27	Ms. Kema Vasenth	Executive Technical Services, NCE		x
28-30	Names not available	Staff NCE	2	1
31	Mr. Sumedha Karunathilake	Managing Director, ETC Lanka Pvt. Ltd.	X	
32	Ms. N. Danushki Hapuarachchi	Head of HR, Communication & Sales, Taprobane Sea Food Company		X
<b>Participants in Cooperative/Federation Group Discussions and Individual Interviews</b>				
<b>KILINCHCHI DISTRICT:</b>				
<b>Fisheries Cooperative (FC) Societies Union, Poonakary</b>				
33	Mr. Joseph Francis	President, FCSU	X	
34-41	Members	FCSU	6	2
42-43	Employees	FCSU	1	1
<b>Valaipadu St. Anne's Fisheries Society</b>				
44	Mr. I. Immanuel	President	X	
45-47	Office bearers / board members		3	
48-50	Cooperative employees		1	2
51-54	Beneficiaries			4
55-56	TSF seafood primary processing centre employees		1	1
<b>Iranaimatha Nagar Fishermen's Cooperative Society</b>				
57	Mr. P.E. Michael	President	X	
58-59	Office bearers / board members		2	
60	Cooperative employee		X	
61-66	Member beneficiaries		3	3
67-70	Employees of Suganth sea cucumber processing plant			4
<b>Vinayagapuram Farmers' Cooperative Society, Mulangavil</b>				
71	Mr. P. Dharmakulasingham	President	X	
72-	Office bearers / board members		3	3

No.	Name	Affiliation	M	F
77				
78-79	Employees		2	
80-89	Beneficiaries		4	6
<b>MULLAITIVU DISTRICT:</b>				
Olirum Valvu				
90	Mr. T. Vijithan	President	X	
91-97	Office bearers / board members		5	2
98	Cooperative employees		X	
99-101	Beneficiaries		3	
Young Farmers Club				
102	T. Nidharshan	President	X	
103-106	Office bearers / board members		2	2
107	Employee		X	
108-114	Beneficiaries		3	4
Puthukudiyirruppu Women Entrepreneurs Cooperative Society				
115	Ms. S. Kalaiselvi	President		X
116-118	Office bearers / board members			3
119-122	Employees			4
123-129	Beneficiaries			7
Vavuniya North Cooperative Society				
130	Mr. S. Rajenthiran	President	X	
131-132	Office bearers / Board members		2	
133	Employee		1	
134-144	Beneficiaries		4	7
<b>JAFFNA DISTRICT:</b>				
Jaffna District Fishery Federation				
145	Mr. V. Thavaselvam	President	X	
145-148	Office bearers / Board members		4	
149-150	Employee		1	1
St. Thomas Fishermen's Cooperative Society, Eluvaitivu				
151	Mr. T. Selvadas	President	X	
152-156	Office bearers / board / beneficiaries		5	

No.	Name	Affiliation	M	F
157-158	Employees			2
St. Xavier Central Fisheries Cooperative Society, Punkudutivu				
159	Mr. S. Anton Sebarasa	President	X	
160-161	Office bearer / board member		1	1
162-172	Beneficiaries		6	5
Tellipalai Cooperative Society				
173	Mr. Navaratnam	President	X	
174-184	Employee / beneficiaries		6	5

Summary of Final Evaluation Workshop Participants – October 15, 2018*				
	Cooperative members, office bearers		61	26
	Government officials		8	4
	National Chamber of Exporters Representative			1
	EGLR staff		4	
	Evaluation team			2

\*List of Participants provided overleaf.

**Participants at Final Evaluation Workshop, Friend's Inn, Kilinochchi - 15 October 2018**

No.	Name	Organization	Gender
1.	N Sathiyapama	PTK Women Coop	F
2.	J.Deshanthini	PTK Women Coop	F
3.	M.P Rajeswary	PTK Women Coop	F
4.	K.Tharmakunavathy	PTK Women Coop	F
5.	K.Thevambikai	PTK Women Coop	F
6.	S.Kalaiselvi	PTK Women Coop	F
7.	J.Tharani	Vallaipadu Fish Coop	F
8.	V.Mery Pramila	Olirum Valvu	F
9.	A.Arulthasan	Olirum Valvu	M
10.	S.Vinaygamoorthy	Olirum Valvu	M
11.	A.Thiraviyanathan	Olirum Valvu	M
12.	K.Sobika	Olirum Valvu	F
13.	AJeyakiruba	Olirum Valvu	F
14.	U.Amala Joycise	Vallaipadu Fishermen Coop	F
15.	Y.Ann Lumina	Vallaipadu Fishermen Coop	F
16.	S.Emanuvel	Vallaipadu Fishermen Coop	M
17.	J.Nishanthini	Vallaipadu Fishermen Coop	F
18.	A.Anthony	Irranimatha Fishermen Coop	M
19.	P.Micheal	Irranimatha Fishermen Coop	M
20.	S.J Kennady	Irranimatha Fishermen Coop	M
21.	A.A Newmon	Irranimatha Fishermen Coop	M
22.	S.Delvin lenas	Irranimatha Fishermen Coop	M
23.	P.Tharmakulasingam	Vinayagapuram Farmer'sCoop	M
24.	V.Mohanathan	Vinayagapuram Farmer'sCoop	M
25.	M.Muralitharan	Vinayagapuram Farmer'sCoop	M
26.	M.Vijitha	Vinayagapuram Farmer'sCoop	F
27.	A.Sivakumar	Vinayagapuram Farmer'sCoop	M
28.	J.Vasikaran	Poonakaty fisher Union Coop	M
29.	S.Kirubaharan	Poonakaty fisher Union Coop	M
30.	Y.Francis	Poonakaty fisher Union Coop	M
31.	S.Thamiilanapn	Poonakaty fisher Union Coop	M
32.	P.Thavarajah	Nallayan Fishermen Coop	M
33.	J Canjuice	Nallayan Fishermen Coop	M
34.	Kiryaharan	Udayarkadu Farmers'Coop	M
35.	A.Sivarasa	Udayarkadu Farmers'Coop	M
36.	T. Navaratnam	Pallaly Farmers'Coop	M
37.	S.Piramila	Pallaly Farmers'Coop	F
38.	M.Mathanaruban	DS Office Vali North	M
39.	Anthany	DS Office Vali North	M
40.	Y.Gayan	Vavu North Fruit Grow Coop	M
41.	U.Kirubaharan	Vavu North Fruit Grow Coop	M
42.	S.Rasenthiram	Vavu North Fruit Grow Coop	M
43.	T.Dangeswaran	Vavu North Fruit Grow Coop	M

No.	Name	Organization	Gender
44.	S.Vipulini	Vavu North Fruit Grow Coop	F
45.	S.Kirushanthy	Young Farmers Club	F
46.	K.Ananthakalavalli	Young Farmers Club	F
47.	T.Nishanthan	Young Farmers Club	M
48.	M.Manotheepan	Young Farmers Club	M
49.	M.Manosuthan	Young Farmers Club	M
50.	N.Premathas	Young Farmers Club	M
51.	M.Manotheepan	Young Farmers Club	M
52.	A.Shakilapanu	Deputy Director Agri-Kilinochci -	F
53.	A.Sharmila	DDA Office Vavuniya	F
54.	S.S A. Lumbert	DDA Office Vavuniya	M
55.	R.Ranjan	DDA Office Vavuniya	M
56.	U.Sabsinghe	Asst. Commissioner Coop Kili	M
57.	P.Atputhachanren	Deputy Director Agri-Kilinochci	M
58.	R.Malini	DDA Office-Kilinochchi	F
59.	R.Srirubi	DDA Office Kilinochchi	F
60.	Nirubaraj	NAQDA -Kili	M
61.	Hema	NCE	F
62.	Ruth Bowen	Evaluator	F
63.	Rachel Perera	Evaluator	F
64.	Paranthaman	DS Vavuniya Noth	M
65.	P.Niroshan	AI Mullaitivu	M
66.	Satheeskuman	DS Office Poonakary	M
67.	Vijeyakumar	DS Office Poonakary	M
68.	N.Devagiri	ILO EGLR Office	M
69.	S.Thabesan	ILO EGLROffice	M
70.	K.Thirukkumar	ILO EGLR Office	M
71.	S.Vasudev	ILO EGLR Office	M
72.	S.Suganthan	ILO EGLR Office	M
73.	M.Sevatkodiyon	ILO EGLR Office	M
74.	V.Thavachselam	Jaffna Fishermen Coop Union	M
75.	S.Natkunam	Jaffna Fishermen Coop Union	M
76.	S.Jeevachandren	Jaffna Fishermen Coop Union	M
77.	P.Loshana	Jaffna Fishermen Coop Union	F
78.	K.Thinesh	Jaffna Fishermen Coop Union	M
79.	S.Theepan	Jaffna Fishermen Coop Union	M
80.	N.Vijeyan	Jaffna Fishermen Coop Union	M
81.	R.Jeyamukunthan	Jaffna Fishermen Coop Union	M
82.	Visuvalingam	Jaffna Fishermen Coop Union	M
83.	S.Sivagnanam	Jaffna Fishermen Coop Union	M
84.	P.Nevethan	DDA Office Mullaitivu	M

## ANNEX F: ILO Emerging Good Practices and Lessons Learned Templates

### ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

**Project Title: Employment Generation and Livelihoods through Reconciliation (EGLR) in Sri Lanka**

**Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/16/02/NOR**

**Name of Evaluator: Ruth Bowen and Rachel Perera**

**Date: 19 November, 2018**

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

GP Element	1. Strengthening producer cooperatives as viable commercial enterprises in agriculture and fisheries for economic and social empowerment of vulnerable communities
<p><b>Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.</b></p>	<p>The key intended outcomes of the project were improved export earnings for communities engaged in the fruit and vegetables and fisheries sectors respectively, in the Northern Province of Sri Lanka through mutually beneficial partnerships with buyers.</p> <p>The project selected producer cooperative societies as the vehicle for improving market access for fruit and vegetables and fisheries through facilitating business partnerships with export and domestic buyers to secure more stable markets. The ILO supported the cooperatives to operate as purchasing enterprises, purchasing produce from primary producers at fair and stable prices and selling to buyers under long-term contract, with a profit margin to support the coop operations.</p> <p>Farmer and fisher members of the cooperatives benefited by having more secure and stable incomes from their produce and from collective infrastructure for storage and packing. This replaced the former practice of farmers selling at the farm gate or shore to traders who sell on to export and domestic buyers with low or fluctuating prices.</p>
<p><b>Relevant conditions and context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b></p>	<p>Provided that sufficient capacity building support is provided to the cooperatives in terms of business management, organizational capacity and transparent governance, the cooperatives can become financially viable commercial enterprises bringing significant income improvement for their members.</p>
<p><b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b></p>	<p>The cooperative society model was an effective vehicle to link vulnerable populations with markets and with government agencies for efficient delivery of technical support.</p>



<b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>	The impact was demonstrated in higher average monthly incomes to farming and fishing households compared with before the intervention. The beneficiaries included vulnerable households in general, with priority to women, female-headed households and people with disabilities.
<b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>	The model is replicable elsewhere in Sri Lanka by the cooperative sector, ILO, government and private sector partners. It is also replicable in other vulnerable or conflict-affected communities internationally
<b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)</b>	The capacity development of the cooperative societies supports the application of ILO Recommendation 2002 (No. 193) on the promotion of cooperatives. It also supports the Sri Lanka DWCP 2018-2022 outcomes
<b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>	Not applicable

## ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

**Project Title: Employment Generation and Livelihoods through Reconciliation in Sri Lanka**

**Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/16/02/NOR**

**Name of Evaluator: Ruth Bowen and Rachel Perera**

**Date: 19 November, 2018**

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

GP Element	2. Sea cucumber aquaculture model
<b>Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)</b>	<p>As part of the expansion of livelihoods in the Northern Province the project capitalized on the lucrative export market for processed sea cucumber to enhance community livelihoods.</p> <p>The project provided the inputs to start the farms and set up teams of small-scale sea cucumber farmers organized by fishing cooperatives in several targeted communities. The benefits are equally shared and the market is secured through linkage with a key exporter. This form of aquaculture is environmentally sustainable and provides an additional source of income to wild catch fishing which is seasonal. Jobs are also generated in local processing of the product.</p>
<b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>	<p>The sea cucumber model is highly suited to the sea and salinity conditions along the Kilinochchi and Jaffna coast in the Northern Province. Women, who are generally excluded from wild catch fishing, can readily be involved in sea cucumber farming provided that they are well represented in the farmer groups.</p>
<b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b>	<p>Contributes to livelihood opportunities and brings higher incomes to households in coastal communities/</p>
<b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>	<p>Measurable impact on household incomes among fishing communities including women and men.</p>
<b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>	<p>The specific approach of farming in small teams can be replicated by the ILO under the new LEED Plus project and by the local branch of the National Aquaculture Development Authority under the government's fisheries improvement project in the Northern Province.</p>
<b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals)</b>	<p>Contributes to the objectives of the Sri Lanka DWCP 2018-2022</p>
<b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>	<p>Not applicable</p>

## ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

**Project Title: Employment Generation and Livelihoods through Reconciliation (EGLR) in Sri Lanka**

**Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/16/0/NOR**

**Name of Evaluator: Ruth Bowen and Rachel Perera**

**Date: 19 November, 2018**

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

GP Element	<b>3. Supporting women’s producer associations as a vehicle for empowerment of conflict-affected women</b>
<b>Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)</b>	<p>The formation of a producers cooperative society among women who suffered enormous losses as a result of the civil conflict has proven to be a highly successful model for women’s social and economic empowerment.</p> <p>Beginning under the LEED project the ILO helped an informal group of 15 women in Puthukudyiruppu, Mullaitivu, Northern Province to expand and become registered as a cooperative. The PTK Women Entrepreneurs’ Cooperative has supported its members to successfully produce various fruit and vegetables for export as well as various MSME ventures. EGLR continued to provide material inputs to vulnerable women members of the cooperative as well as training. The cooperative is now functioning very efficiently as a commercial enterprise and its membership has grown to 1,500 women.</p>
<b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>	<p>The success of this practice was due in part to the character of the women leaders involved, including their dynamism and commitment to improving their livelihoods and overcoming the great challenges they faced in the aftermath of the civil war. It has also depended on continuous nurturing by the ILO over an extended period. However, there is a risk that the cooperative size will become difficult for the board of management to manage if numbers are not limited.</p>
<b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b>	<p>The women’s cooperative society made a significant contribution to its members’ incomes, reducing vulnerability and contributing to the wider Northern economy.</p>
<b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>	<p><i>Targeted Beneficiaries:</i> Women and especially sole income earners and women with disabilities who live in communities faced with loss of livelihoods and family members in the aftermath of civil conflict.</p> <p><i>Measurable impact:</i> The impact of inclusion of families with children engaged in child labor in CCT programs on child labor rates has not yet determined. It could be the subject of outcomes or impact research regarding the effectiveness of CCT programs for reduction of child labor.</p>

<b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>	<p>The women's entrepreneur cooperative model has strong potential for replication elsewhere in Sri Lanka, especially in conflict affected areas, but also more widely. The model could be replicated by the ILO or other development partners and local government partners.</p>
<b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)</b>	<p>Contributes to the ILO Sri Lanka DWCP 2018-2022 for enhanced livelihoods for vulnerable and marginalized groups.</p>
<b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>	<p>Not applicable</p>

## ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

**Project Title: Employment Generation and Livelihoods through Reconciliation (EGLR) in Sri Lanka**

**Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/16/0/NOR**

**Name of Evaluator: Ruth Bowen and Rachel Perera**

**Date: 19 November, 2018**

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

GP Element	<b>4. Fostering support for north-south business linkages for disadvantaged communities through engagement with the National Chamber of Exporters</b>
<b>Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)</b>	<p><b>Background:</b> The development of mutually beneficial business partnerships between Northern province agricultural and fisheries producers and southern exporters and domestic buyers was the key project objective towards economic development in the north. To achieve these partnerships the project fostered practical engagement and support from the National Chamber of Exporters (NCE) to introduce their exporter members to targeted producers of fruit and vegetables and fisheries in the Northern province.</p> <p>The NCE collaborated with ILO to present export awards to the high performing producer associations, with multiple benefits - for producer motivation and recognition, additional export contracts and improvement of relationships between people of the north and south of the country.</p>
<b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>	<p>Success is dependent on long term engagement by ILO with the private sector peak body such as the NCE to establish understanding of the potential benefits to their members. The ILO's aims also aligned with the NCE's appreciation of the untapped export products in the Northern province.</p>
<b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b>	<p>The tangible support of the NCE continues to be pivotal in introducing new buyers to the Northern communities and supporting the key objectives of the project.</p>
<b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>	<p><i>Targeted Beneficiaries:</i> Producer cooperative societies and their members in the Northern Province.  <i>Measurable impact:</i> Increased export-related earnings of US\$2 million per sector over 2 years.</p>
<b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>	<p>Ongoing expansion of north-south business partnerships by the NCE and its members.</p>

<b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)</b>	Contributes to the ILO Sri Lanka DWCP
<b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>	Sri Lanka National Chamber of Exporters publications

## ILO Lesson Learned Template

**Project Title: Employment Generation and Livelihoods through Reconciliation(EGLR) in Sri Lanka**

**Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/16/02/NOR**

**Name of Evaluator: Ruth Bowen and Rachel Perera**

**Date: 19 November, 2018**

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	1. Effective monitoring and evaluation system
<b>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</b>	One of the lessons of the implementation of the project is the importance of allocating sufficient time, expertise and resources for the development of a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system to enable project managers to capture changes clearly and reliably to serve accountability, learning and implementation decisions. The project did not dedicate sufficient time and expertise to develop a sound results framework and did not establish baselines for its performance indicators to contribute to the assessment of impact. In addition, the framework established was under-utilized in reporting and decision-making. The lack of a dedicated M&E officer in the project team was also a contributing factor.
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	Appropriate expertise is required for the development of an evaluable results framework and corresponding indicators and milestone targets. The development of the system and data collection process would ideally be supported by a dedicated M&E Officer on the staff.
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Target users/beneficiaries:</b> Project management, ILO Country Office, donor, stakeholders.
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	As above, the lack of clarity in the results framework and lack of baseline values for key indicators contributed to weakness in assessing the changes brought about by the project.
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	
<b>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</b>	This lesson has implications for the project design, M&E staffing and financial resourcing for monitoring and evaluation.

## ILO Lesson Learned Template

**Project Title: Employment Generation and Livelihoods through Reconciliation (EGLR) in Sri Lanka**

**Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/16/02/NOR**

**Name of Evaluator: Ruth Bowen and Rachel Perera**

**Date: 19 November, 2018**

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

Lesson Learned Element	<b>2. Optimal duration of capacity building for producer cooperative societies</b>
<b>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</b>	The experience of the EGLR project and the preceding Local Empowerment and Economic Development (LEED) project in the Northern Province of Sri Lanka demonstrated that producer cooperative societies can reach optimal levels of commercial and organizational sustainability if capacity development support is provided over several years. Building the organizational capacity to run as a viable commercial enterprise is a long-term endeavour, especially with newly created cooperatives. The newly formed cooperatives supported only during EGLR over a period of less than 2 years have not reached commercial sustainability covering operational running costs
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	<b>Context:</b> Agricultural and fishery production through cooperative society organization. <b>Related pre-conditions:</b> Donor funding is required for an optimal period of around 4-5 years
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	Project designers, managers and implementing field staff
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	The newly formed cooperatives supported only during EGLR over a period of less than 2 years have not yet reached commercial sustainability in terms of the business model, including income from export and domestic sales and expenditure on management staff and other operational running costs.
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	As above – extended provision of technical and material support is required to build the viability of the cooperative society.
<b>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</b>	The technical support to cooperative societies' capacity development requires ILO project staff who are well-versed in the principles of cooperative management and operation. Excellent support available from Coop unit, Geneva



## ILO Lesson Learned Template

**Project Title: Employment Generation and Livelihoods through Reconciliation (EGLR) in Sri Lanka**

**Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/16/02/NOR**

**Name of Evaluator: Ruth Bowen and Rachel Perera**

**Date: 19 November, 2018**

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

<b>Lesson Learned Element</b>	<b>3. Governance and institutional coordination</b>
<b>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</b>	The project faced challenges in maintaining a sense of ownership and practical involvement among the wide range of relevant government administrative and technical agencies. It is important to establish a practical system for communications and feedback regarding the project interventions and progress. Related to this, going beyond information exchange it is essential to establish the support and ongoing roles of the relevant agencies in sustaining the approaches beyond the project.
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	<b>Context:</b> Support to livelihood development in the agriculture and fisheries sectors where there are multiple line agencies (fisheries, agriculture) and multiple administrative levels involved: Province, district, Divisional Secretariat, Grama Nilidhari (village level).
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	Project managers and implementing field staff
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	Limited satisfaction regarding project liaison with the administrative and line agencies brings the risk of poor engagement and ownership of local government officials and can undermine their role in sustaining the interventions.
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	The project did engage consistently with the local administrative government and technical line agencies in selecting beneficiaries and ensuring the technical innovations were in line with policy for the fisheries and agriculture sectors.
<b>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</b>	Improved governance and engagement with local government entities can be addressed through existing government coordination structures. It is not necessarily effective to establish a project-specific steering or advisory committee.

## ANNEX G: Stakeholder Workshop Discussion Outputs

### GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS GROUP - PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES

#### 1. What are the key achievements of EGLR from your perspective?

- Empowered & strengthened producers
  - Training
  - Marketing
  - Social empowerment
  - Financial support
  - Exposure visits and training classes
- Aquaculture
  - New technique implemented
- Agriculture
  - Women empowered
  - Bargaining capacity
- Coop
  - Auditing )
  - Society registration ) Financial security
  - Advices )

100% successful project

ILO staff good leadership, very good PR

But,

- Departments were neglected after obtaining success
- Could not coordinate when projects commenced
- SMO (Horticulture)
- Not selecting beneficiaries jointly with department
- Work/project done without technical support
- Some organizations have taken the success as their credit
- They leave the backlogs and constraints with the government sector

2. What could have been done better? (See above responses)

3. What needs to be done to improve and sustain the results and who should be responsible?

## COOPERATIVE SOCIETY BOARD MEMBERS AND OFFICERS GROUP

### 1. What improvements have been made in the operation of the cooperatives with project support?

#### Business:

- The project has enhanced unity amongst the cooperatives
- Increased the participation of women and people with different abilities
- Cooperatives which were weak have been strengthened
- Gender equality
- Trainings (leadership etc.)
- Healthy foods (nutritious and organic production)
- Employment for members
- Job creation
- Economic advancement
- Members' increase of profit

### 2. How have services to members improved as a result of participating in EGLR?

- Loan facilities
- Valued inputs
- Market facilities
- Advisory services

### 3. What are the challenges for your cooperatives/federations and what are your recommendations to move forward?

	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
1	Natural disaster	Insurance
2	Redeeming members from clutches of middlemen	Price for redemption, marketing linkages
3	Language	Learning
4	Management	Lengthen training
5	Being affected by diseases	Medical advice
6	Food processing	Produce value added foods

## AGRICULTURE BENEFICIARIES GROUP

### 1. What changes came about with the help of the EGLR project? (You may think about economic & social changes)

- Increase of produce (fruits & vegetables)
- Infrastructure assistance (purchasing centres, packaging centres and processing centres)
- Prioritizing women headed households
- Increase of income (streamlined purchasing)
- Development of cooperatives (beneficiaries, cooperatives, Department of cooperatives & Exporters)
- Increase in women's membership/leadership
- Leadership development
- Gender equality
- Better communication
- Educational attainments increased
- Certificates and recognition

### 2. What did you like most about the support of EGLR?

- Processing and marketing assistance provided
- Trainings
- Increase of income

### 3. What can be done to improve your situation further?

- Value addition for agriculture
- Latest technology in agriculture (trainings and exposure visits)
- Drip irrigation facilities (to combat diseases and drought)
- Using technology to seek new markets
- Direct export
- Agriculture inputs, harvest, post-harvest technical trainings
- Certification

## AGRICULTURE BENEFICIARIES GROUP 2

### 1. Benefits of EGLR

#### Direct:

- Learnt new practices in agriculture
- Increased harvest
- Able to manage increasing costs
- Able to harvest organic fruits

- Standard of life of differently abled people became better

Indirect:

- Able to protect from non-communicable diseases
- Was able to control costs
- Soil fertility was protected
- Able to get the raw materials for the preparation of organic fertilizer from our own areas
- Differently abled persons were able to work independently
- Children's nutritional requirements were met

**2. What did they like about the project?**

- Agriculture related training
- Awareness programme related to agriculture

**3. What should be done to further develop this project?**

- Owing to drought conditions setting in, irrigation facilities should be increased
- Increase marketing facilities to sell produce
- Improved trainings in new agriculture technology
- Awareness on new methods of controlling disease, establish contacts with organizations to produce organic fertilizer

**FISHERIES BENEFICIARIES GROUP**

**1. What changes came about with the help of the EGLR project? (You may think about economic & social changes)**

Economic changes:

- Redeemed from the clutches of the middlemen
- Was able to get good prices for the fish
- Was introduced to growing sea cucumbers and better income
- Markets were linked and outside linkages increased
- Boats were given for individuals to engage in fishing
- Employment increased (youth)
- Women's income increased (jobs, sea cucumber farms)

Social changes:

- Infrastructure
- Changes in leadership and gender status

- Women getting into management functions
- Changes in education, religion and culture
- Jobs targeting women and increasing employment opportunities
- Exposure visits
- Loans and other financial assistance enhanced
- Increase of savings
- Social welfare activities strengthened
- Modern facilities

**2. What did you like most about the support of EGLR?**

- The societies redeeming the members from middlemen and helping them to engage in selling their catch for a better price.
- Helping members to engage in sea cucumber farms
- Increase of job opportunities at village level

**3. What can be done to improve your situation further?**

- Direct export & certifications
- Value addition (processing centres) for sea foods
- Strengthen cooperatives in financial management & Cooperative related activities
- Loan facilities / banking facilities
- Modern facilities for sea related work / training
- Increase of aquaculture farms – sea cucumber, seaweed

## ANNEX H: Independent Final Evaluation Terms of Reference

### FINAL Terms of Reference

#### Independent Final Evaluation

#### Economic Generation through Livelihood and Reconciliation Project in Sri Lanka

<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Economic Generation through Livelihood and Reconciliation Project in Sri Lanka</b>
<b>ILO Project Code</b>	LKA/16/02/NOR
<b>ILO IRIS Code</b>	105986
<b>Project dates</b>	1 November 2016 – 31 October 2018
<b>Administrative Unit in charge of the project</b>	CO-Colombo
<b>Unit in charge of backstopping</b>	DEVINVEST
<b>Timing of evaluation</b>	Final
<b>Type of Evaluation</b>	Independent
<b>Donor</b>	The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
<b>Budget</b>	US\$ 1,309,368
<b>Evaluation mission dates</b>	a/o 17 September – 5 October 2018
<b>Evaluation Manager</b>	Jittima Srisuknam, CO Bangkok

#### Table of Contents

<a href="#">I. Introduction</a> .....	85
<a href="#">II. Background and Description of the Project</a> .....	85
<a href="#">III. Purpose and objectives of the evaluation</a> .....	87
<a href="#">IV. Evaluation Scope</a> .....	4
<a href="#">V. Evaluation Criteria and Questions</a> .....	88
<a href="#">VI. Methodology</a> .....	91
<a href="#">VII. Main Deliverables</a> .....	92
<a href="#">VIII. Management Arrangements and Timeframe</a> .....	93
<a href="#">IX. Required Qualifications</a> .....	95
<a href="#">X. Legal and Ethical Matters</a> .....	96
<a href="#">Annex 1: Progress to date of the Project</a> .....	97
<a href="#">Annex 2: ILO Evaluation Guidelines and Standard Templates</a> .....	99
<a href="#">Annex 3: National Consultant ToR</a> .....	100

## I. Introduction

This terms of reference (TORs) concerns the independent final evaluation of the “Economic Generation through Livelihood and Reconciliation Project in Sri Lanka (EGLR)” funded by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

In line with the ILO evaluation policy, an independent final evaluation of project is being organized. The evaluation is being carried out for the purposes of accountability and organizational learning. As per ILO evaluation guidelines, the evaluation will assess the project against the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability and will also identify lessons learned and good practices.

The independent final evaluation will be conducted by independent evaluators and will be managed by the ILO Evaluation Manager based in the ILO Country Office for Thailand, Cambodia and Lao PDR, Bangkok. The evaluation will be funded by evaluation provision of the project and will comply with United Nations Evaluation Guidelines (UNEG) Norms and Standards and the ethical safeguards will be followed.

## II. Background and Description of the Project

### *ILO’s Local Empowerment through Economic Development in post conflict setting in Sri Lanka*

1. The International Labour Organization (ILO) has been working on Local Empowerment through Economic Development since early 90’s. The Local Economic Recovery approach, a time bound process, maximizes the creation of employment opportunities on the basis of recovery, reconstruction and peacebuilding investments, provides effective and immediate peace dividends, creates better opportunities to reintegrate conflict affected groups, reinforces social cohesion and contributes to peace consolidation and reconciliation.
2. After the end of the 26-year civil war in the north and east of Sri Lanka in May 2009, agriculture has remained the basis of the northern economy, with crops, livestock and fisheries as pivotal sub-sectors, but upgrades are badly needed to create more jobs. The industrial sector in Northern provinces still remains underdeveloped, owing to the impact of the civil war on its economy. Since 2011, the ILO has been implementing the Local Empowerment through Economic Development (LEED) project in the Northern Province with focus on contributing to a more inclusive and equitable post conflict recovery and development.
3. From 2010-2016, the ILO implemented the \$6.2 million-LEED project funded by the Department of Foreign affairs and Trade (DFAT) of the Government of Australia. The project was considered to have been successful on a number of levels. At a national level it built awareness of the north-south development gap and created examples and avenues through which responsible investment partnerships could be created between the private sector and primary producer communities. An impact study conducted by Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA) in Sri Lanka on the LEED project has found that project contributed significantly in terms of addressing economic and social vulnerabilities of the people and generating employment opportunities for the poor and vulnerable. It also highlighted the power of collective bargaining that enabled the



co-operatives to enter into trade agreements with a number of buyers ensuring a ready market and fair pricing for their members.

4. Built on the success of the LEED project, the Economic Generation through Livelihood and Reconsolidation (EGLR) project has continued to scale up on the activities in the Fruit & Vegetable and Fishery sectors and continue to contribute to a more inclusive and equitable post conflict recovery and development.

#### *Description of the EGLR Project*

5. The EGLR project focuses specifically on scaling up the activities in the fruits and vegetable and the fishery sectors targeting the vulnerable communities, with a specific focus on women and Female Headed Households (FHHs) and strategically focusing on the north-south development gap and the perception of inequality between the two main communities that was at the heart of the protracted conflict. The EGLR project uses the networks that the ILO has already built among the government and private sector key organizations to execute the project. The project operates in the four districts of the Northern Province: Vavuniya, Mullativu, Kilinochchi and Jaffna, including resettled areas like Palali & Mylity.
6. At the impact level, the EGLR project aims to contribute to sustainable peace and conflict transformation by reducing conflict-related economic inequalities and promoting and enabling more equitable and inclusive economic development in the economic recovery and reconciliation process in Sri Lanka. The goal of the project is to promote an enabling environment for competitive, sustainable enterprise development and creation of 2,000 decent and productive employment opportunities among the vulnerable people including women in the conflict affected Northern region in Sri Lanka by June 2018.
7. The EGLR project has set three intended outcomes to achieve the said project goal: 1) improved export earnings through mutually beneficial business partnerships in fruits and vegetables sector; 2) developed/improved mutually beneficial partnerships in fishery sector; and 3) Improved gender responsive development interventions.
8. The main target groups of the project are the resettled small farmers and fishers and their communities in the Northern Province. The producer organizations such as cooperatives which are the key players in empowering farming and fishing communities will be the main point of contact between the communities and the project. Please see progress to date of the project in Annex 1.

#### *The EGLR project management*

9. From November 2016 to 2017, the EGLR project managed by a National Project Coordinator (NPC) with a field team which comprised one Finance and Administrative Officer, two Field Coordinator and one Driver. The composition of the project management has been changed since April 2017, the NPC has still managed the EGLR project with the field team whilst having two additional Field Coordinators and one Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to join the project team. At the country level, there is a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) coordinates this EGLR project with the other project. The ILO's Country Director and the project focal point have provided supported from Colombo.

10. For implementation of the activities under each outputs and outcomes, at the national level the EGLR project continues to work with Ministry of Labour and Trade Union Relations; respective line ministries and technical departments, e.g. Department of Agriculture, Department of Fisheries, Department of Cooperative development; the National Chamber of Exporters; the Employers Federation of Ceylon; and various trade unions representatives.
11. At the provincial level, the project has been closely working with the Provincial Department of Cooperative Development (DoCD) and Provincial Department of Agriculture (DoA) in order to get their support and technical input. At the local and district levels, the EGLR project continues to work with the Divisional Secretariats as well as the District Secretary's offices.
12. The project has used its M&E system and database to track the progress of the project outputs and outcomes and reports the project progress to the Provincial Coordinating Committee at the provincial level and to Decent Work Country Programme meetings at national level.

### III. Purpose and objectives of the evaluation

13. The two main purposes of the independent final evaluation are for promoting accountability and enhancing learning within the ILO, the donor, constituents and other key stakeholders. Although the EGLR project is entering its final year, it is expected that the project will continue to the next phase and that the results of this independent final evaluation can also be taken into account going forward.
14. The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:
  - i) Assess the relevance of the intervention objectives and approaches, particularly in promoting and strengthening of sustainable competitive enterprises and productive and sustainable employment in the Northern Province;
  - ii) Assess the project implementation effectiveness including the progress in achieving its expected outcomes (including positive & negative and intended and unintended results); effectiveness of gender mainstreaming throughout all interventions (not just outcome 3); effectiveness of increasing sustainable employment and enterprise development opportunities for vulnerable people including women in the Northern Province; effectiveness of narrowing disparities in the capacities, power structures, cultural gaps and subsequent terms of trade between Northern and Southern businesses and producers; and effectiveness of management arrangements;
  - iii) Assess efficiency of resource use;
  - iv) Identify factors that influenced (positively or negatively) the sustainability of the EGLR project interventions;
  - v) Identify good practices at the project level that can and should be replicated; and
  - vi) Identify lessons learned that could be useful to strengthen the next phase of the project.

### IV. Evaluation Scope

15. The independent final evaluation is due per the ILO evaluation policy guidelines for result-based evaluation which states that all projects over US\$ 1 million and/or lasting more than 30 months must undergo at least one independent evaluation.
16. The evaluation will cover all interventions the ILO has implemented under the EGLR project from the start until the time of final evaluation. The evaluation will cover all geographic coverage of the EGLR project. Gender equality and non-discrimination, promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes and constituent capacity development should also be considered in this evaluation.
17. The final evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations will be primarily addressed to the primary clients of this evaluation as follows: small farmers and fishers and their communities, the producer organizations, cooperatives and business associations, the EGLR project, CO-Colombo, DWT-New Delhi and the donor. Secondary clients are PAC, social partners, relevant provincial departments, divisional secretariats and district secretary's offices.

## V. Evaluation Criteria and Questions

18. The evaluation should address the following ILO evaluation criteria: relevance, intervention progress and effectiveness, efficiency of resource use, effectiveness of management arrangements, and impact orientation and sustainability of the intervention; as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 3rd ed. (Aug. 2017) (Annex 2).
19. The core ILO cross-cutting priorities, such as gender equality and non-discrimination, promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes, and constituent capacity development should be considered in this evaluation. In particular, gender dimension will be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. To the extent possible, data collection and analysis should be disaggregated by sex as described in the ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines and relevant Guidance Notes (Annex 2).
20. It is expected that the evaluation address all of the questions detailed below to the extent possible. The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions, but any fundamental changes should be agreed upon between the ILO Evaluation Manager and the evaluators. The evaluation instruments (to be presented in the inception report) should specify methodologies the evaluators will utilize for each group of stakeholders and each evaluation question and other evaluation questions as the evaluators deem necessary.
21. Suggested evaluation criteria and evaluation questions are summarized below:

### **Relevance**

- To what extent do the project interventions promote and strengthen sustainable competitive enterprises and productive and sustainable employment in the Northern Province.
- Has EGLR project been able to adapt its approaches to the changing context to address priority needs of the people, district and province?

- To what extent is this project aligned with ILOs' mandate as envisage in the DWCP 2013 -2017 and 2018 to 2022.
- Has EGLR interventions been relevant to women, disabled and other marginalized and disadvantaged groups and their needs.
- The extent to which outcome are in line with provincial, districts and peoples' priorities.
- Learnings and following up the recommendations of the previous evaluations of the LEED Project: There had been independent evaluations done of the Australian funded LEED Project. During this evaluation, it may be important to identify the applicability of relevant recommendations from previous evaluations for improvement. How best this has been done in the EGLR Project?

### **Effectiveness of Interventions**

- To what extent has the EGLR project achieved its expected outcomes (including positive & negative and intended and unintended results). Particularly the empowerment activity efforts – assess whether its approach is effective. Have the quantity and quality of the outputs produced been satisfactory? Did the benefits accrue taking into account those different needs of men and women? What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended project outcomes?
- How effectively have the project interventions mainstreamed gender throughout all interventions (not just outcome 3)?
- How effectively has the project increased sustainable employment and enterprise development opportunities for vulnerable people including women in the Northern Province?
- How effectively have the project interventions narrowed disparities in the capacities, power structures, cultural gaps and subsequent terms of trade between Northern and Southern businesses and producers?
- Has project partnership approach been appropriate and effective in contributing to the outcomes?
- Reconciliation aspect of the Project; the EGLR project aims to contribute to peace and reconciliation: How has the reconciliation aspects been addressed through the project?
- What effect do the interventions have on people with regard to sustaining peace and reconciliation?
- Has there been any effort to achieve Reconciliation through the project or is it expected that the eventual reconciliation will emerge from the project activities?
- New Initiatives planned for the Project: Have the original plans for new things taken place? Eg: Blue swimming crab hatcheries
- Has planning being sufficient for new initiatives? What were the obstacles? Has project been limited to the continuation of the same activities which LEED Project did for several years?

### **Effectiveness of Management Arrangements**

- To what extent do project management capacities and arrangements put in place support the achievement of the planned results?
- To what extent have stakeholders, particularly employers' organizations and trade unions been involved in project implementation?
- To what extent are the main target groups of the project and the project key stakeholders satisfied with technical assistance and support provided by the EGLR project team and the ILO specialists?
- Has the project received adequate administrative, technical and if needed, political support from concerned ILO offices (CO-Colombo, HQ technical departments and DWT-New Delhi, if relevant)? If not why?
- How effectively has the project management and ILO monitored project performance and results?
  - a) Is a monitoring and evaluation system in place and how effective has it been?
  - b) Are appropriate means of verification for tracking progress, performance and achievement of indicator values defined?
  - c) Are relevant information and data systematically collected? Is reporting satisfactory? Is data disaggregated by sex (and by other characteristics, if relevant)?
  - d) Is information regularly analysed to feed into management decisions?

**Efficiency (a measure of how economically resources/inputs i.e. funds, expertise, time etc. are converted to result)**

- Have resources (funds, human resources, time, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve results (outputs and outcomes)?
- Have resources allocated to integrate gender equality, disability in the designing, implementation and monitoring Have they been used efficiently? And have they been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the factors that have hindered timely delivery of outputs? Any measures that has been put in place?
- Has there been a coherent implementation approaches among the project partners?
- The extent to which the project resources have been leveraged with other related projects or programmes to maximise impact, if any?
- Have the results been achieved at an acceptable cost, compared with alternative approaches with the same objectives? If so, which types of interventions have been proven to be more cost-effective?
- New Risks and mitigation measures: Has there been focus on identifying new risks and mitigation measures? Similar programme has been implemented for number of years. Several things have been continued over the years (Eg: cultivation of Papaya and crab processing). What could be the Risks of the continuation of the same work? Has optimum levels been assessed? What are the market trends? Does project staff has that capacity to do regular assessments?
- Differentiate between districts: Has there been differences of outcomes / Results among the districts the project implemented? Focus on identifying the differences and

the need of different approaches in implementation? Eg. Mullativu compared to Vavuniya or Resettled areas compare to Killinochchi

- Improved gender responsive development interventions: How to assure that there has been improved interventions? What will be the baseline?
- There may be trends in Sri Lanka and the region (i.e. in Myanmar) that cooperatives in Sri Lanka and the region that cooperatives are no longer the preferred model from the National authorities and the Government of Sri Lanka is seeking some academic inputs in this regard. This may be a point to be verified (in an appropriate way) with relevant National authorities during stake holder meetings. This may needs to be taken into account in the sustainability planning.

#### **Impact Orientation and Sustainability**

- The extent to which the results of the intervention are likely to be durable and can be maintained or even scaled up and replicated by intervention partners after major assistance has been completed
- What strategies have the EGLR project put in place to ensure continuation of mechanisms/tools/practices provided, if the support from the EGLR Project ends? To what extent are there strategies likely to be effective?
- How effective has the programme been in establishing national/local ownership?
- Is there a clear exit strategy at project level factoring in environmental, operational and financial sustainability beyond the project interventions

## **VI. Methodology**

22. The evaluation will comply with evaluation norms, standards and follow ethical safeguards, as specified in the ILO's evaluation procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations system of evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.
23. A mix-method (both qualitative and quantitative evaluation approaches) should be considered for this evaluation. The evaluation fieldwork will be qualitative and participatory in nature. Qualitative information will be obtained through field visits, key informant interviews and focus group discussions as appropriate. Opinions coming from stakeholders will improve and clarify the quantitative data obtained from project documents. The participatory nature of the evaluation will contribute to the sense of ownership among stakeholders. Quantitative data will be drawn from project documents including the project document (PRODOC) Technical Progress Reports (TPRs) and the project' monitoring and evaluation framework, the project's database. A combination of sound quantitative and qualitative research methods (e.g. surveys, case studies, interview and focused group discussion with appropriate quantitative data analysis methods for each type of data collected) should be developed for each evaluation question as deemed appropriate. However, different evaluation questions may be combined in one tool/method for specific targeted groups as appropriate. Attempts should be made to collect data from different sources by different methods for each evaluation question and findings be triangulated to draw valid and reliable conclusions. Data shall be disaggregated by sex where possible and appropriate.

24. A detailed methodology will be elaborated by the independent evaluators on the basis of this ToR. The detailed methodology should include key and sub-question(s), detailed methods, data collection instruments and data analysis plans to be presented as a key element in the inception report.
25. The methodology for collection of evidences should be implemented in three phases: An inception phase based on a review of existing documents to produce inception report. The independent evaluators will review the project documents, technical progress reports, M&E framework, meeting minutes, training manuals, tools, technical guidelines, other publications used or developed by the EGLR project, national policies on economic recovery and reconciliation process in the Northern Province, and national policies on Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises development in Sri Lanka. The evaluation team will conduct skype calls with the EGLR project team to get the briefing on the project.

A fieldwork phase to collect and analyze primary data. Once the inception report is approved, the independent evaluators will travel to Colombo and the four districts in the Northern Province (Vavuniya, Mullativu, Kilinochchi and Jaffna) to conduct a field mission to interview the following key stakeholders but not limited to: the ILO Country Director, the EGLR's CTA, NPC, Field Coordinators, M&E officer, representatives of Norwegian Embassy (the donor), other relevant government counterparts at national level, employers' organizations, trade unions, relevant officials at provincial and district levels, selected cooperatives, selected beneficiaries, particularly FHHs. In addition, the independent evaluators will conduct interviews (via Skype calls or emails) with relevant DWT specialists in New Delhi. The independent evaluators will conduct a national stakeholder workshop to validate information and data collected through various methods and to share the preliminary findings with key stakeholders in Colombo. The independent evaluators will separately debrief the donor and CO-Colombo on preliminary findings from the field mission before departing Colombo.

A data analysis and reporting phase to produce the final evaluation report. Based on data collected during inception phase and the inputs from the key stakeholders' discussions/interviews during the field mission and virtual interviews, the independent evaluators will draft the final evaluation report and directly send it to the evaluation manager. The evaluation manager will forward the report to stakeholders, including the EGLR project team, CO-Colombo, relevant ILO specialists, the donor and tripartite constituents, for their inputs/comments to the report. The evaluation manager will consolidate the comments and forward them to the independent evaluators for consideration in finalizing the draft report. The independent evaluators will finalize the report, taking into consideration the stakeholder comments.

26. The gender dimension should be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation.

## VII. Main Deliverables

27. The evaluators will provide the following deliverables and tasks:

Deliverable 1: inception report. Upon the review of available documents and an initial discussion with the project management. The evaluators will prepare an inception report as per the ILO Checklist 3: Writing the inception report (Annex 2). The inception report will

- describe the conceptual framework that will be used to undertake the evaluation;
- set out in some detail the approach for data collection, the evaluation methodology, i.e. how evaluation questions will be answered by way of data collection methods, data sources, sampling and selection criteria, and indicators;
- set out the detailed work plan for the evaluation, which indicates the phases in the evaluation, their key deliverables;
- set out the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed

Deliverable 2: Stakeholder workshop. The evaluators will conduct a stakeholder workshop in Colombo to validate information and data collected through various methods and to share the preliminary findings with the ILO and local stakeholders at the end of evaluation mission. The stakeholder workshop will be organized by the EGLR project team with assistance from the ILO Country Office - Colombo. The evaluators will prepare PowerPoint presentations to present preliminary findings at the stakeholder workshop. Evaluation findings should be based on facts, evidence and data. This precludes relying exclusively upon anecdotes, hearsay and unverified opinions. Findings should be specific, concise and supported by triangulation of quantitative and qualitative information derived from various sources to ensure reliability, validity and generalizability.

Deliverable 3: First draft evaluation report. Evaluation report should include action-oriented, practical and specific recommendations assigning or designating audiences/implementers/users. The draft evaluation report should be prepared as per the ILO Checklist 5: Preparing the Evaluation Report (please see Annex 1). The first draft evaluation report will be improved by incorporating evaluation manager's comments and inputs.

Deliverable 4: Final evaluation report with evaluation summary. The evaluators will incorporate comments received from ILO and other key stakeholders into the final report. The report should be finalized as per the ILO Checklist 5: Preparing the Evaluation Report (please see Annex 2). The quality of the report and evaluation summary will be assessed against the ILO Checklists 5, 6, 7, and 8 (please see Annex 2).

28. The reports and all other outputs of the evaluation must be produced in English. All draft and final reports including other supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with WORD for windows. Ownership of the data from the evaluation rests jointly between ILO and ILO consultants. The copy rights of the evaluation report rests exclusively with the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

## VIII. Management Arrangements and Timeframe

29. The evaluators will report to the *Evaluation Manager*, Ms. Jittima Srisuknam ([jittima@ilo.org](mailto:jittima@ilo.org)), Programme Officer for Thailand and Lao PDR in ILO's CO-Bangkok. The evaluation manager takes the responsibility in drafting TOR in consultation with all concerned and will manage the whole evaluation process and will review evaluation report to make sure it has complied with the quality checklist of ILO evaluation report.



30. ILO CO Colombo and the ILO project management team will provide administrative and logistical support during the evaluation mission. The project management team will also assist in organizing a detailed evaluation mission agenda, and to ensure that all relevant documentations are up to date and easily accessible by the evaluator.
31. Roles of other key stakeholders: All stakeholders, particularly the relevant ILO staff, the donor, tripartite constituents, relevant government agencies, NGOs and other key partners will be consulted throughout the process and will be engaged at different stages during the process. They will have the opportunities to provide inputs to the TOR and to the draft final evaluation report.
32. The evaluation team will compose of two person, an international and a national consultants. The international consultant will be the team lead and will be selected through a competitive process from qualified international consultants. The consultant will lead the evaluation and will be responsible for delivering the above evaluation deliverables using a combination of methods as mentioned above. The national consultant will be sourced to be a team member of this evaluation and to support the international evaluator in meetings and interviews where it is required. The national consultant may also requested to contribute to the report writing. TOR of the national consultant is in Annex 3.
33. Indicative time frame and responsibilities

The duration of this contract is for 30 working days, from 27 August – 9 November 2018. The mission in Sri Lanka is expected during 17 September – 5 October 2018.

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks	Proposed timeline	Number of days
Preparation	Evaluation Manager and Regional M&E Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Preparation, sharing with relevant ILO official and key stakeholders and finalization of the TOR.</li> <li>○ Approval of the TOR</li> </ul>	2-20 July 2018	
	Evaluation Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Issuance of EOI, advertisement of consultants, and selection of consultants</li> </ul>	8 – 17 August 2018	
	EGLR Project team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Issuance of contracts</li> </ul>	24 August 2018	
Inception	Evaluators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Desk Review of project related documents</li> <li>○ Telephone briefing with the evaluation manager, and project CTA, NPC and Field Coordinators</li> <li>○ Preparation of the inception report and submit inception report to evaluation manager</li> </ul>	3 – 7 September August 2018	5
	Evaluation Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Share the draft inception report with all concerned stakeholders for comments for 7 days</li> <li>○ Approve Inception Report by 4</li> </ul>	8 – 17 September 2018	

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks	Proposed timeline	Number of days
		September 2018		
Fieldwork	Evaluators (logistical support by the project)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Field visit (to ILO Office in Sri Lanka and to the four districts in Northern provinces) to Interview/discuss with project staff and other relevant stakeholders, including the project target groups</li> <li>○ Conduct the national stakeholder workshop in Colombo</li> <li>○ Debrief the EGLR project team, the donor and CO- Colombo</li> </ul>	17 September - 5 October 2018	15
Data analysis and reporting	Evaluator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Analysis of data based on desk review, field visit, interviews/questionnaires with stakeholders</li> <li>○ Draft report</li> </ul>	Draft report to be submitted to Evaluation Manager by 17 October 2018	7
Data analysis and reporting	Evaluation Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Circulate draft report to key stakeholders for comments for 10 days</li> <li>○ Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to evaluation team lead</li> </ul>	By 31 October 2018	
Data analysis and reporting	Evaluator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Finalize the report including explanations on why comments were not included</li> </ul>	By 6 November 2018	3
Data analysis and reporting	Evaluation Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Review the revised report and submit it to EVAL for final approval</li> </ul>	9 November 2018	
		Total No. of working days for the Lead Evaluator		30

## IX. Required Qualifications

34. An international consultant with the relevant experience and qualifications are being sought.

Desired skills and competencies:

- No previous involvement/engagement in the design and delivery of the EGLR project;
- A minimum of 5 years of experiences as lead evaluator in programme/project evaluation;
- Proven experiences with qualitative, quantitative data collection and analysis;
- University Degree with minimum eight years of experience at the national level or five years of experience at the international level in business/enterprise training and skills development programme implementation;
- Ability and proven experiences to bring gender dimensions and other equity issues in to the evaluation including data collection and analysis;

- Knowledge on local economic development in post-conflict settings or creation of employment opportunities, particularly in agricultural sector, on the basis of recovery, reconstruction and peacebuilding;
- Knowledge of ILO's roles and mandate and its tripartite structure as well as UN evaluation norms and its programming;
- Excellent analytical skills and communication skills;
- Strong interpersonal skills and ability work with different people from different background to deliver quality product within shorter period of time;
- Demonstrated excellent report writing skills in English; and
- Working experience in Sri Lanka will be an advantage.

## X. Legal and Ethical Matters

35. The evaluation will comply with UN Norms and Standards. The ToR is accompanied by the code of conduct for carrying out the evaluation. UNEG ethical guidelines will be followed. It is important that the evaluator has no links to project management or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of evaluation<sup>33</sup>.

---

<sup>33</sup> <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

## Annex 1: Progress to date of the Project

### **Outcome 1: Improved export earnings through mutually beneficial business partnerships in fruits and vegetables sector**

**Output 1.1: Mutually beneficial partnerships developed between producers in the target population and the exporters** The project continues to strengthen the partnerships already being developed and continues to establish new partnerships together with the exporters and processors based at regional and national levels. Accordingly the project together with the National Chamber of Exporters was able to attract three new exporters in the areas of conventional product exports. Already 5 partnership in the fruit and vegetables sector established. Another 4 such partnerships in both sectors are at discussion levels and moving forwards positively.

**Output 1.2: Producers in the target population linked to supply chains through cooperatives** In partnership with the key producer cooperatives in these districts the project was able to support around 1600 families and link with the supply chains. In addition to the above support, the project also facilitated in establishing supply networks as it is essential in collecting fresh fruits from the farm un-harmed and delivering the same to the pack house in a timely manner.

**Output 1.3: Cooperative organizations re-organized/revitalized** Already project has implemented an awareness raising programmes and organising the members in the five new cooperatives. Several capacity development programs such as managing cooperatives, developing new services and strengthening existing services, managing fiancé and marketing being carried out. Project also supported new cooperatives to establish basic systems such as finance, marketing, HR and management. Facilitated to link government and private sector BDS organisations. Supported to develop new demand driven services such as credit, input, marketing etc.

**Outputs 1.4: Business Development Services (BDS) including Fair Trade (FT) certifications received by the targeted cooperatives** Selected beneficiaries, around 1,600, of these cooperatives were provided with necessary inputs, production technology and trainings with the support from the Department of the Agriculture and the department of Cooperative development. Then these producers were later linked with some national and international level buyers. Most of these producers were also provided with training on grading and post-harvest handling in order to minimise the waste. All the cooperative, including the new ones, have been linked with government and private sector BDS providers in order to make them more sustainable in the production and marketing. Project decided not to carry out FT activities in the fruit and vegetables sector as demands for such products in the EU market is limited.

### **Outcome 2 Developed/improved mutually beneficial partnerships in fishery sector**

**Output 2.1: Mutually beneficial partnerships developed between producers in the target population and the exporters** The project has already facilitated to establish 4 partnerships together with the existing and new national and international level exporters. The Cooperatives are all engaged in this process of negotiations overs prices, quality and other aspects. All these cooperatives who have been already supported via enterprise support have buy back systems. As

such six new buy back systems are in place to date. These systems are continuously being monitored and technical support is being provided where needed, in order to strengthen and solve some emerging issues.

**Output 2.2: Producers in the target population linked to supply chains through cooperatives** The EGLR project was designed to support local fishing communities and their organizations so that they can regain ownership of their local fisheries, improving their capacity to compete, negotiate and partner with other parties in the fish value chains so as they can improve incomes, retain funds through local processing, improved supply chains and adopt policies and practices to ensure the sustainability of the fishery resource. In total the project has been able to support around poor families as direct beneficiaries through different initiatives.

### **2.2.1 Development of Aquaculture sector**

**Sea Cucumber Farming** The EGLR project has been supporting pen-culturing of sea cucumbers farming in Irananithivu Island in Poonakary division of Kilinochchi district and the district of Jaffna with the intention of supporting 200 vulnerable people through various cooperatives and technical support from the National Aquaculture Development Authority (NAQDA). This initiative has provided an alternative livelihood to women headed households, youths and fishermen in the area, which not only brings in income but also reduces pressure on wild fish population. In addition women in the area will also be employed at processing centers where these sea cucumbers are salted, boiled, dried and packaged.

**Mud Crab farming** Project has supported one cooperative to set-up a pilot project on Mud crab and upon success it is now being expanded while adding more members. Altogether 15 families started the project.

### **2.2.2 Improve the cooperative societies' purchasing capacities and marketing.**

The EGLR project provided a financial allocation in the form of a working capital ten cooperative Societies to be used to establish an enterprise which helps them to purchase the catch of the members and engage in collective marketing. Altogether 340 fishermen already benefitted from the programme.

### **Outputs 2.3: Cooperative organizations re-organized/revitalized**

**2.3.1 Training and development** In the fishery sector project has been involved in developing 20 cooperatives. This assistance include setting up value added enterprises, developing supply chains, developing services capacities of cooperatives such as credit, purchasing and inputs. Project also support them with necessary economic infrastructure support in order to establish essential economic infrastructures such as processing centers, storage facilities, establishing aquaculture farms etc.

In order to strengthen these cooperatives further, project also supported them with necessary training such as record keeping, marketing and supply chain management. Project is now conducting assessment among these cooperatives in order to assess their training and capacity development needs further.

**2.3.2 Setting up of Value Added enterprises:** Establish a Primary Crab processing plant: Project has already supported five processing centers in the fishery sector. Altogether 650 young people are working as and as a result of access to improved market another 1800 farmers were benefited.

**Output 2.4: Business Development services including Fair Trade certifications received by the targeted cooperatives** FLOCERT already engaged in the process and developing the code of conduct together with the support from the Export Development Board and the department of fisheries.

### **Outcome 3 Improved gender responsive development initiative**

**Output 3.1: increased production- and marketing capacities among female producers in the target population** In the fruit and vegetables sector out of 1,600 supported 760 are women. In the fishery sector the project tries its, best to maintain the balance. In the fishery sector out of 1100 already supported 750 are women.

**Output 3.2: Women's participation enhanced at membership and board level** At cooperative membership level, now there is an increasing trend in women membership at board levels. Women are also key partners in the decision making process in some of the key cooperatives in both the sectors. In some of the cooperative around 30-40 % at membership levels are women and at the board level their participation being increased by 20-30%.

**Output 3.3: Men and women enhanced knowledge and changed attitudes towards gender equality concerns** 32 discussion forum held and three training programmes for leadership conducted. Women were groomed to take roles such as marketing, technical, management and managing cooperatives.

## **Annex 2: ILO Evaluation Guidelines and Standard Templates**

- ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation, 2017  
[http://www.ilo.ch/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS\\_571339/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.ch/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm)
- Code of conduct form )To be signed by the evaluators(  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_206205/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206205/lang--en/index.htm)
- Checklist No.3 Writing the inception report  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165972/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165972/lang--en/index.htm)
- Checklist 5 preparing the evaluation report  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165967/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang--en/index.htm)
- Checklist 6 rating the quality of evaluation report  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165968/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang--en/index.htm)
- Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_206158/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206158/lang--en/index.htm)  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_206159/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206159/lang--en/index.htm)
- Guidance note 7 Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165986/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm)
- Guidance note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E of projects

[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165986/lang-en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang-en/index.htm)

- Template for evaluation title page  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_166357/lang-en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166357/lang-en/index.htm)
- Template for evaluation summary  
<http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/edmas/eval/template-summary-en.doc>

### Annex 3: National Consultant ToR

National Consultant ToR: Responsibilities, Contract dates and the cost

The reference must be made to the main evaluation TOR above. The outputs mentioned above are joint key deliverables. The national consultant will assist the International consultant (team leader) to facilitate group meeting/discussions with all stakeholders i.e. internal ILO staff, consortium partners, other key stakeholders including relevant ministries, UN agencies and donor, beneficiaries, other implementing partners). Specifically, the national consultant will be responsible for

- collecting background information and to conduct a desk review of relevant project documents;
- being pro-actively provide relevant local knowledge and insights to the international consultant;
- taking part in the interviews with key stakeholders in Colombo and the four districts in the Northern Province, and to make notes during interviews, and to write brief reports during the interview on main observations and conclusions;
- contributing to the main report to be responsible by the international consultant (team leader).

The national consultant may be requested to write certain sections in the draft and final report as requested by the Team Leader (International Consultant);

- participating and jointly facilitating the stakeholders workshop; and
- providing interpretation.

*Qualification of the team member:*

- No previous involvement/engagement in the design and delivery of the EGLR project;
- Sri Lankan nationality with relevant qualifications in Economics and Social sciences, and/or Development studies;
- Knowledge of local context and of target areas where the project operates;
- Knowledge of other related local programmes/projects, and of associated local institutions and government structures will be a great asset;
- Can speak local languages, both Tamil and Sinhala;
- Has 3 years of experience in conducting evaluation and/or expertise in peace building, community empowerment, employment, medium and small enterprise development, local economic development; and
- Experience in working with the UN agencies will be an advantage.

*Management*

- The national consultant will report to the international evaluator and also to ILO evaluation manager.

*Contract dates and period*

- The contract is for a total of 17 work days during the period of 14 September – 10 October 2018. The national consultant must be available to join the team leader’s review mission in Sri Lanka during 17 September – 5 October 2018.