



International
Labour
Organization

► Evaluation Office



i-eval Discovery



Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation (SURAR) through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace Project

DC Symbol: LKA/19/03/USA

Type of Evaluation: Project

Evaluation timing: Final

Evaluation nature: Independent

Project countries: Sri Lanka

P&B Outcome(s):

SDG(s): Goal 8 and 16

Date when the evaluation was completed by the evaluator: 24 September 2021

Date when evaluation was approved by EVAL: 28 September 2021

ILO Administrative Office: ILO Colombo

ILO Technical Office(s): COOP

Joint evaluation agencies: N/A

Project duration:

Donor and budget: United States- Department of State (US DOS), USD 543,210

Name of consultant(s): Dr. Udan Fernando and Ms. Hasini Haputhanthri

Name of Evaluation Manager: Ms. Aye Pearl Hlaing

Evaluation Office oversight: Craig Russon

Evaluation budget:

Key Words:

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO's evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited, but has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Office.

Table of contents

Acronyms	
1. Executive Summary	4
2. Background of the project	10
3. Purpose, Scope and Clients of the Evaluation	11
4. Evaluation criteria and questions	12
5. Methodology and Limitations	15
6. Main Findings	16
7. Conclusions	45
8. Recommendations	47
9. Lessons Learned and Good Practices	49
10. Annexes	52
Annex 1: Terms of Reference	51
Annex 2: Tables with status achieved of project indicators targets	71
Annex 3: List of People Consulted in Interviews and Focus Group Discussions	74
Annex 4: Schedule of the field work	77
Annex 5: List of documents reviewed	78
Annex 6: Lessons Learned and Good Practices	79
Annex 7: Customer experience checklist for language audit	88
Annex 8: SURAR project's strategy on inclusion of women and Person with Disabilities	94

Acronyms

CBO	Community Based Organization
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DFS	Dry Fisheries Society
DoCD	Department of Cooperative Development
DS	Divisional Secretary
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
EVAL	Evaluation office
FHH	Female Headed Households
FOC	Farmer Organization Chemmalai
GN	Grama Niladhari (Village Head)
HQ	Headquarters
ILO	International Labour Organization
JDCSUF	Jaffna District Cooperative Society Union Federation
JPP	Joint Programme for Peace
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MGPCS	Maritimepattu Groundnut Producer Cooperative Society
NLEAP	National Language Equality Advancement Project
OECD/DAC	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/ Development Assistance Committee
OLC	Official Languages Commission
OLP	Official Languages Policy
P&B	Programme and budget
PAPSCS	Palali Agriculture Producers Sales Cooperative Society
PMPCS	Palai Multi Purpose Cooperative Society
PPP	Peacebuilding Priority Plan
PwD	Persons with Disabilities
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SURAR	Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UN RCO	United Nations Resident Coordinator Office
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNHRC	United Nations Human Rights Council
US DOS	United States – Department of State
USD	United States dollar
NPC	National Project Officer
LEED	Local Empowerment Through Economic Development
LEED+	Local Empowerment Through Economic Development and Reconciliation

1. Executive Summary

Introduction: The final independent evaluation of the Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace (SURAR) project was undertaken in line with the funding agreement between UN and ILO and in accordance with the ILO evaluation policy. The Independent Final Evaluation assessed overall project progress against the intended objective/outcomes, validity of the theory of change as the project's key challenges, lessons learnt and provide recommendations for improved delivery of quality works in similar future ILO and other related projects.

The evaluation was carried out by an independent evaluator (comprised of a Team Leader and Team Member) in close consultation with the project and key stakeholders in Sri Lanka. Responsibility for management of the evaluation was with the ILO's Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, Entrepreneurship and MSME support/SCORE project, based at the ILO Liaison Office in Myanmar who had no prior involvement in the project, with oversight provided by Regional Evaluation Officer and the ILO Evaluation Office. The evaluation was carried out from 9 July 2021 to 30 September 2021.

The project: Under the framework of the UN's Joint Programme for Peace (JPP), the project aimed to provide timely and strategically focused assistance towards two peacebuilding priorities that tackle core grievances of the minority Tamil community. The interventions were designed to contribute towards securing and sustaining the peacebuilding process, through helping to build trust and confidence amongst the Tamil community in the direction in which the country is moving. The JPP was a new and innovative initiative, launched in April 2019 by the Government of Sri Lanka and the UN. Within the time frame of eighteen months, the UN looked to deliver high impact results by supporting the two interventions i) Scaling-up ongoing livelihood support through engaging cooperatives and the private sector, as part of a holistic package of resettlement assistance designed to enable dignified and sustainable returns for lands released by the military; and ii) Kick starting the process of working in a joined-up way on reconciliation, through the introduction of an innovative service tracking tool to monitor and incentivise improvements in ability of front-line institutions to deliver public services in the Tamil language.

Under the resettlement and social cohesion pillars of the JPP, ILO Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace Project (SURAR) funded by United States- Department of State (US DOS) is aimed to help advance the resettlement of returned Tamils through livelihood support and support reconciliation efforts through improving the delivery of services in Tamil language by front-line institutions targeted 900 conflict-affected and resettled households with high vulnerability, including female-headed households, conflict-affected youth, and persons with disabilities in Tellipalai in Jaffna district, Pachchilaipalli (Palai) in Kilinochchi, and Maritimpattu in Mullaitivu. ILO intends to draw on its extensive experience working with cooperatives and the private sector to promote sustainable economic opportunities for resettling families in three of these target locations.

The overall objective, outcomes and outputs of the project: The Overall project outcome statement: Contributing to sustainable peace in Sri Lanka by harnessing support from multiple partners for strategic, coherent and sustainable support to fast-track the advancement of priority transitional justice and confidence building measures, guided by the PPP. Under the above two outcomes were expected to be realized through the project: **Outcome 1:** The State prioritizes sustainable return, resettlement and/or local integration of conflict-displaced persons (IDPs, IDP returnees, and refugee returnees) in a safe and dignified manner to rebuild lives and communities (Output: The UN in Sri Lanka provides strategic, coherent, timely and targeted support towards the resettlement process in the Northern Province with an emphasis on ensuring durable solutions and promoting confidence in the process) and **Outcome 2** Positive

relationships and mutual understanding between and among different groups, and between groups and the state, contribute to peaceful co-existence and a sense of belonging in Sri Lanka (Output: The UN in Sri Lanka provides strategic, coherent, timely and targeted support to strengthen reconciliation and social cohesion).

Methodology: Overall, a method of appreciative inquiry was used for the evaluation, especially in the context of COVID 19 pandemic and its repercussions as well as the change of governments (with different policy approaches on peace building) at the very start of the project. The evaluation had to be guided by these context factors in proposing a feasible methodology and carry out the evaluation in accordance with the safety guidelines in place. It was clear that due to the COVID 19, some methodologies such as field visits with extensive discussions with beneficiaries were not feasible. Hence the resorting to online platforms and telephone for communication. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with stakeholders at beneficiary levels, cooperatives, government agencies, partnering private companies, consultants, ILO and UN RCO / UNDP staff were carried out in addition to review of project documents.

Key Findings

The implementation of the project was severely impeded by the lockdowns and travel restrictions relating to three waves of Covid 19 and adverse climatic and weather conditions. Hence the project performance should be interpreted taking into account of the above significant constraints. As some of the operations of the project are not yet completed it is premature to make a comprehensive conclusion. However, the following findings can be made taking into account the activities, outputs and results that can be observed as of 30 June 2021. It should be noted that certain aspects below related to Outcome 2 cannot be commented on as the work is yet to be completed.

- a. **Relevance:** The project had been well positioned within the broader policies of the Sri Lankan government (on peace, reconciliation and resettlement), broader policies and programmatic priorities of the ILO as well as the UN, including SDG 8 and 16. As such, the project intervention had proved to be relevant, timely and strategically catering to the needs and priorities of Sri Lanka as well as the two agencies that collaborated.
- b. **Coherence:** The indicators in Outcome 1 level are coherent and captures gender disaggregated data and data pertaining to vulnerable communities successfully. In Outcome 2, outcome level indicators are derived directly from the original Monitoring Plan¹, and needs to be adapted better to capture the improvisation after the change of government policy on peace and SURAR contributions. SURAR had successfully built past ILO experiences of LEED, LEED+ and Empower Project drawing from their networks and lessons learned. It creates satisfactory synergies with other UN bodies and counterpart government institutions and compliments the overall ongoing work of these organisations.
- c. **Effectiveness:** As far as effectiveness is concerned the activities carried out under Outcome 1 have reached the targeted areas and numbers (also with due emphasis on vulnerabilities such as FHH, PwD and the poor), generating the targeted value chains to generate livelihoods (except Coir which is to be launched shortly), while establishing and strengthening cooperatives (as per target) with collaborations with the private sector (as per target) for market linkages and under the

¹ Annex 4: Project Monitoring Plan, June 2019, Result Framework for the JPP (draft)

ownership of the DoCD. At an attribution level, the livelihood support by ILO is considered significant by the government officials as well as beneficiaries as the support from others have been on infrastructure. It is premature to assess effectiveness of Outcome 2 since activities are still under way. From what has been achieved it has created good rapport with stakeholders and has effectively complemented their work by developing a simplified tracking tool. Capacities in the ministry for consultative processes have somewhat enhanced. There is a considerable attribution gap between the potential results of outcome 2 activities and the overall goal of reconciliation and improved relationships between groups.

- d. **Efficiency:** From an efficiency point of view, the project had performed well in utilizing limited financial and human resources to achieve target objectives. Given the challenges brought about by COVID, the project has managed time effectively as well. Considerable savings have been made and are being re-channeled to replicate activities among beneficiary communities. Resource management is excellent.
- e. **Impact:** Two value chains, Ground Nut and Dry Fish, have recorded positive results with income where 63% and 100% (target was 50%) of the beneficiaries have earned beyond the targeted income levels. Banana harvest and sales is expected in August onwards. Coir production is yet to be launched. In regard to Outcome 1, a reasonable probability to generate further impact can be expected given the market linkages established. On outcome 2, it is premature to assess impact as the activities have not been completed.
- f. **Sustainability:** Three out of four value chains (except coir) are rolling out well with supportive market linkages. The coir production is due but the market linkage is established. The DoCD asserts its role as the overall custodian of the project after the withdrawal and assured its' nurturing role of cooperatives. As such, the initiatives under Outcome 1 shows a high level of sustainability. However, a comprehensive exit plan, taking into account the remaining work of the project needs to be formulated as a basis for handover of responsibilities to the DoCD and private sector companies. Outcome 2 needs clear exit strategies to ensure the results of the completed survey are properly disseminated, used effectively in advocacy strategies and stakeholders follow up and build on the intervention.
- g. **Special aspects:** Cross cutting themes (gender, disability and vulnerability) have been successfully addressed by employing simple clear and transparent methodologies such as the scoring system. The project demonstrates high sensitivity mainstreaming gender issues and the inclusion of marginalized groups within its target communities. It collects gender disaggregated data systematically and use them properly for project activities. Overall the project shows a remarkable degree of integration of human rights, inclusion of vulnerable groups and gender.

Conclusions

It can be concluded that SURAR has contributed well towards the Outcome 1 with some limited pending work to be completed. Outcome 2 has been substantially affected by the COVID induced delays and restrictions (primarily the complete or partial closures and work from arrangements in government offices to be surveyed throughout the implementation period) and only the pilot survey has been completed. Therefore, it is difficult to assess the degree of contribution towards its outcome, which is set at a higher level, directly derived from PPP indicator. Even if the activities are completed, it may not be possible to

attribute the impacts clearly due to attribution gap. Furthermore, outcome 2 geared towards contributing to PPP. Although the SURAR contributes 15% of its resources to outcome 2, these activities are complemented by other activities conducted by RCO and UNDP. A more accurate assessment of outcome 2 activities will have to be evaluated in relation to these other activities, which is beyond the scope of SURAR evaluation. Overall, the project could have benefited from interaction between the two outcomes by capitalizing on synergies and opportunities to create dialogue platforms between state and conflict affected communities as well as North South dialogue of farming communities, cooperative and market linkages. Further, models for mainstreaming dialogue into economic and livelihood activities could have been explored, had the project been more long term.

The overall outcome of SURAR is “Contributing to sustainable peace in Sri Lanka by harnessing support from multiple partners for strategic, coherent and sustainable support to fast-track the advancement of priority transitional justice and confidence building measures, guided by the PPP”. Creating sustainable peace after protracted conflict requires addressing deep-rooted attitudinal, relational and structural causes of conflict within a multi-cultural society. It requires a long-term holistic approach that recognizes the need to adapt set strategies for varying context changes to play an accompanying role to communities in their way to recovery and state structures attempting to be more inclusive. Given its limitations of time and resources, and the unexpected challenges of political change and pandemic, it has taken steady steps towards achieving some of its objectives. A more long-term concentrated effort is required to achieve the said objectives to a satisfactory degree.

Recommendations

As mentioned before, the completion of project cycles of different sub-components of the project is at different levels. The extended project period is till end of September 2021. With a yet another wave of Covid-19 is being on the rise it is doubtful if the remaining project work can be duly completed by end September 2021.

Recommendation 1(Main Recommendation): For the donors and ILO and UNDP/UN RCO to explore another extension of the project for a period of three to six months from October 2021 to carry out the particular incomplete tasks. (RCO has indicated that it can only provide technical support which is now complete, as the RCO is not an implementing body. The implementation aspect has shifted from ILO to UNDP upon signing of a UN to UN agreement between the ILO and UNDP.²)

Recommendation 2(Outcome 1): *Banana Cultivation*: Consolidate the work at the harvest period (taking place in August 2021 onwards) and coordinate / monitor the marketing linkage taking place between the farmers / cooperative and Keels (JKMS). Introduce corrective action if the market linkage is not taking place as expected. A final phasing out plan is made between ILO, cooperative concerned and the DoCD to ensure continuity and sustainability.

Recommendation 3(Outcome 1): *Ground Nut Cultivation*: David Gram wishes to organize the demonstrations in the Maha Season (from October 2021 to Jan/Feb 2021) as a crucial component of their technical advice to the farmers. This activity should be coordinated between David Gram and the farmers / cooperative. In addition, the completion of the Processing Center in Mulaitivu needs to be monitored and

² Feedback, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, 07.09.2021

coordinated. A final phasing out plan is made between ILO, cooperative concerned, David Gram and the DoCD to ensure continuity and sustainability.

Recommendation 4(Outcome 1) : Coir Processing: The production process is to be launched, coordinated and monitored. A final phasing out plan is made between ILO, cooperative concerned, Tropicair and the DoCD to ensure continuity and sustainability.

Recommendation 5(Outcome 1): Dry Fish: The dry fish project had taken off the ground well. But it needs a further round of monitoring to assess the success of the first round is an exceptional one and that can be sustained. Accordingly, effect corrective measures. A final phasing out plan is made between ILO, cooperative concerned, JDCSUF and the DoCD to ensure continuity and sustainability.

Recommendation 6(Outcome 1): Peacebuilding and Social Cohesion: Create spaces for activities that lead to improvements of relationships between different group through market linkages with the South and also by linking with cooperatives, farmer groups from the South.

Recommendation 7(Main recommendation): For ILO, RCO and UNDP, create a proper exit strategy for language related activities where the achievements are taken over by other stakeholders in the event there is no continuation of the project activities. (RCO has indicated that exit strategy is dependent on the commitment of to continue funding beyond the scope of the project through its SDG 16 governance portfolio.³)

Recommendation 8(Outcome 2): Service delivery tracking system: For donors, given the delays and restrictions caused by COVID 19, no cost extension to complete the survey and effectively disseminate results to stakeholders.

Recommendation 9(Outcome 2): Advocacy strategy: Use results of the survey effectively in advocating for language inclusion and raising awareness as well as increasing the number of Tamil speaking state officials, or practical solutions such as outsourcing language and translation services and clear and measurable incentives for bilingual officers. An award scheme may not be realistic given the contextual challenges.

Lessons Learned and Good Practices

It is still premature to identify the lessons learned and good practices from the project. However, the following lessons learned (LLs) and good practices (GPs) are discerned from the work carried out so far.

LL 1: Sound efforts of identifying and targeting of the most significant need/s of the beneficiaries – Livelihoods -- have brought about positive results of successful outreach of the beneficiaries who required the livelihood support most.

LL 2: Sound efforts of identifying and targeting of the most significant areas and locations for the project have brought about positive results of successful outreach of the beneficiaries who required the livelihood support most.

³ Feedback, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, 07.09.2021

LL3: Economic activity per se may not lead to social cohesion unless inclusive processes that facilitate community change and spaces for inter-community dialogue are not created, built in to the activities. Economic empowerment does not necessarily lead to trust, improved relationships or attitudinal change.

LL4: Recognizing the attribution gap between outputs and outcomes in peacebuilding projects, difference between resettlement and reconciliation not being clearly defined

LL5: Short term projects (less than 3-4 years) may not be able to address deep-rooted attitudinal, relational and structural issues related to peacebuilding, social cohesion, involving trust-building, improving relationships and institutionalizing inclusive strategies to a satisfactory degree.

GP 1: SURAR project's deliberate efforts of identifying and targeting of the most significant need/s of the beneficiaries – Livelihoods -- have brought about positive results of successful outreach.

GP 2: SURAR project's deliberate efforts of identifying and targeting of the most significant areas where resettlement process takes place with a long history of spells of displacement have taken place have brought about positive results of successful outreach.

GP3: SURAR project's focus on a restorative approach than a retributive approach by addressing the need for economic stability of resettling communities is a successful approach to stay engaged and contribute positively in a volatile political context which may not be conducive to addressing other peacebuilding issues related to transitional justice, reparation and reconciliation.

GP4: The Scoring System developed by defining clear criteria and scores in the selection of beneficiaries (women in cultivation/women in decision making bodies) has given a simple, clear and a precise methodology to mainstream gender issues effectively.

1. Background of the project

Introduction

The final independent evaluation of the Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace (SURAR) project was undertaken in line with the funding agreement between UN and ILO and in accordance with the ILO evaluation policy. The Independent Final Evaluation assessed overall project progress against the intended objective/outcomes, validity of the theory of change in the project document. It also addressed the project's key challenges, lessons learnt and provided recommendations for improved delivery of quality works in similar future ILO and other related projects. As the total budget of the project SURAR is USD 543,210, the ILO evaluation policy requires that it go through an independent final evaluation, managed by the ILO.

The evaluation was carried out by an independent evaluator (comprised of a Team Leader and Team Member) in close consultation with the project and key stakeholders in Sri Lanka. Responsibility for management of the evaluation was with the ILO's Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, Entrepreneurship and MSME support/SCORE project, based at the ILO Liaison Office in Myanmar who had no prior involvement in the project, with oversight provided by the ILO Evaluation Office.

The evaluation was to be carried out from 9 July 2021 to 30 September 2021. At the outset of the it was agreed that the evaluation process will follow Sri Lanka's COVID-19 restrictions and guidelines. The evaluation was conducted in compliance with the principles, norms and standards for project evaluation set forth in the ILO policy guidelines for evaluation.

An Inception Report was written upon a round of review of project documents and preliminary consultations with ILO staff in Colombo and Field and UN-RCO staff prior to commencement of the evaluation proper (See list of people consulted for the details of ILO and UN-RCO staff consulted)

Background

Under the framework of the UN's Joint Programme for Peace (JPP), the project aims to provide timely and strategically focused assistance towards two peacebuilding priorities that tackle core grievances of the minority Tamil community. The interventions contribute towards securing and sustaining the peacebuilding process, through helping to build trust and confidence amongst the Tamil community in the direction in which the country is moving.

The JPP was a new and innovative initiative, launched in April 2019 by the Government of Sri Lanka and the UN. Within the time frame of eighteen months, the UN look to deliver high impact results by supporting the two interventions i) Scaling-up ongoing livelihood support through engaging cooperatives and the private sector, as part of a holistic package of resettlement assistance designed to enable dignified and sustainable returns for lands released by the military; and ii) Kick starting the process of working in a joined-up way on reconciliation, through the introduction of an innovative service tracking tool to monitor and incentivise improvements in ability of front-line institutions to deliver public services in the Tamil language.

Under the resettlement and social cohesion pillars of the JPP, ILO Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace Project (SURAR) funded by United States- Department of State (US DOS) is aimed to help advance the resettlement of returned Tamils

through livelihood support and support reconciliation efforts through improving the delivery of services in Tamil language by front-line institutions targeted 900 conflict-affected and resettled households with high vulnerability, including female-headed households, conflict-affected youth, and persons with disabilities in Tellipalai in Jaffna district, Pachchilaipalli (Palai) in Kilinochchi, and Maritimpattu in Mullaitivu. ILO intends to draw on its extensive experience working with cooperatives and the private sector to promote sustainable economic opportunities for resettling families in three of these target locations.

The overall objective, outcomes and outputs of the project:

Overall project outcome statement: Contributing to sustainable peace in Sri Lanka by harnessing support from multiple partners for strategic, coherent and sustainable support to fast-track the advancement of priority transitional justice and confidence building measures, guided by the PPP.

Outcome 1 (aligned to the Resettlement outcome in the JPP and PPP): The State prioritizes sustainable return, resettlement and/or local integration of conflict-displaced persons (IDPs, IDP returnees, and refugee returnees) in a safe and dignified manner to rebuild lives and communities (Output: The UN in Sri Lanka provides strategic, coherent, timely and targeted support towards the resettlement process in the Northern Province with an emphasis on ensuring durable solutions and promoting confidence in the process.)

Outcome 2 (aligned to the social cohesion outcome in the JPP and PPP): Positive relationships and mutual understanding between and among different groups, and between groups and the state, contribute to peaceful co-existence and a sense of belonging in Sri Lanka (Output: The UN in Sri Lanka provides strategic, coherent, timely and targeted support to strengthen reconciliation and social cohesion.)

3. Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation

Purpose

The main purpose of the final independent evaluation was to promote accountability to key stakeholders and donor, and to enhance learning within the ILO and key stakeholders. The findings will be used to improve design and implementation of future relevant projects/programs. The results will also feed into the review of JPP.

The project's performance was reviewed with strict regard to six evaluation criteria: 1) relevance and strategic fit, 2) coherence (validity of the design), 3) effectiveness, 4) efficiency, 5) impact orientation and 6) sustainability. An additional criterion was used to capture cross cutting themes such as gender and vulnerability with special reference to disability. The relevant tripartite constituents and key stakeholders were consulted and their inputs were taken into consideration throughout the evaluation process.

The evaluation was expected to:

- I. Independently assess project progress against the results framework;
- II. Inform the ILO and UN on how the current project strategy is working, and provide recommendations on what could be changed to increase the likelihood that the project reaches its objectives;
- III. List the project's key challenges through independent organizational and operational arrangements by in-country partners and how these challenges can be addressed;

- IV. Inform the ILO and UN on feasibility of sustainability strategy of SURAR in Sri Lanka; and,
- V. Identify good practices and lessons learned that would contribute to learning and knowledge development of the ILO and project stakeholders.

Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation covered work carried out in three Northern Districts of Jaffna, Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu (on Outcome 1) and at national level (Outcome 2). The project period covered in the evaluation is from the inception (September 2019) to June 30 2021 (as far as records and reports are concerned) and 31st July 2021 (as far as comments on activities received from primary stakeholders, i.e. the six cooperatives, beneficiaries and private sector partners). This cut-off point was necessary given the continuation of some project activities till September 2021. The evaluation covered expected (i.e. planned) and unexpected results in terms of non-planned outputs and outcomes (i.e. side effects or externalities). Some of these unexpected changes were relevant as the ones planned. Therefore, the evaluation reflected on them for learning purposes.

The clients of the evaluation were:

- I. Key stakeholders involved in the project including government stakeholders in Sri Lanka;
- II. ILO backstopping Unit and other relevant entities at HQ; and the donors
- III. Project staff, ILO Country Office and UNDP/UN RCO in Colombo.

1. Evaluation criteria and questions

The following evaluation criteria (A-G) were used with the respective questions under each criteria given in italics below:

A. *Relevance and strategic fit*

- 1. How is the project effort for sustaining project activities i) aligned with the ILO's framework on (Recommendation No. 205 on Employment and Decent Work for Peace and Resilience), UN joint statements/policy papers: ILO-PBSO-UNDP-WB (2016), Joint Statement on Employment programmes for peace and PPP ii) responding to needs of constituents and iii) consistent with donors' priorities – at country and global levels?*
- 2. How does the project align with and support overall strategies (the UN peacebuilding fund, the Government of Sri Lanka's national development and employment policies and its Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP), the relevant ILO priorities and policy, DWCP, gender mainstreaming, Strategic Programme Framework and relevant SDG targets)?*
- 3. Does the project design (priorities, outcomes, outputs and activities) address the stakeholder needs that were identified? Is the intervention strategy appropriate for achieving the stated project purpose and what are the lessons learned in the design and implementation of the project?*
- 4. What is the perception of local people with regard to the relationship of the activity to peacebuilding?*
- 5. How responsive are the project results to the Sri Lanka Peacebuilding sector's current and future? This should include assessment of relevance pre-COVID 19 and during COVID 19.*

B. *Coherence*

- 1. How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project document in addressing the project's progress? Do the indicators measure the contribution to peace? Are the indicators gender sensitive? Are the means of verification for the indicators appropriate?*
- 2. Does the project synergies and interlinkages with other interventions carried out by ILO Colombo.*

3. Does the project outcomes and outputs have consistent, harmonies and coordination with UN and other actors' interventions in Sri Lanka.

C Effectiveness

1. How far have the objectives of the project as a whole as well as for the six components and their linked or joined activities been achieved? Will the project be likely to achieve its planned objectives upon completion? How effective is the project in achieving results for: i) strengthen the cooperatives departments to expand their memberships ii) support cooperatives to increase productive capacity of their members and increase the effectiveness of services iii) promote increased market opportunities in target areas by engaging private sector partners to link with cooperatives and establish backward supply links iv) institutionalize a tool to track delivery of public services in Sinhala and Tamil by key front-line institutions and in bilingual regional areas
2. What are the main constraints, problems and areas in need of further attention?
3. To what extent is the progress towards expected results attributable to the project? What alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives (if any)?
4. Have capacities of the Government Counterparts, private sector and other relevant stakeholders been strengthened through the Project interventions?

D Efficiency

1. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) been allocated strategically and used efficiently?
2. Are management capacities adequate and facilitate good results and efficient delivery? Is there a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved? Does the project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national implementing partners? How is communication between the project team and the national implementing partners? How does the project management monitor project performance and results?
3. Is the project on track in its timeline of activities and achievement of end-of-project targets for sustainable beneficiaries (socio-economic integration)?
4. How cost-effective is the utilization of project resources in implementing strategies and activities to deliver project outputs and outcomes for sustaining beneficiaries in the implementation and results?

E Impact orientation by the project set up and impacts achieved vis a vis defined objectives and outcomes

1. How far did the activity contribute to peacebuilding outcomes e.g. improved relationships between and among different groups, increased economic opportunities and reduced grievances among particularly marginalized members of society?
2. How far did the resettlement and social cohesion activities impact on peaceful norms and behaviour (on the sustainable socio-economic and public services integration) of final beneficiaries?

F Sustainability

1. Are there any indicators (emerging evidence) that show that the outcomes of the project will be sustained (e.g. systems, financial returns, capacities and structures)?
2. Has a meaningful exit strategy been developed
3. How well has the project developed the exit and sustainability strategy with local partners enable them to continue self-sustaining and non-reliant on project funds?
4. What are the prospects and risks for post-project sustainability of beneficiaries
5. Which institutional models for building sustainability as planned and/or introduced by the project, would likely lead to more sustainable and independent support services?
6. What follow-up value-adding interventions, beyond the current project phase, could be strategic and critical in sustaining beneficiaries and local partners for Sri Lanka Peace building sector? Are the results of the project likely to be replicated or up-scaled in Sri Lanka? What sustainability mechanisms are in place and what measures already exist and what measures can be recommended for promoting long-term sustainability of the SURAR Sri Lanka project?

G Cross-cutting and special aspects

To what extent the work has contributed toward promoting ILO's mandate on social dialogue, international labour standard, as well as the ILO's goal of gender equality, disability inclusion, non-discrimination, and social cohesion in the target community? What were the facilitating and limiting factors in project's contribution to these cross cutting issues?

5. Methodology and limitations

Overall, a method of appreciative inquiry was used for the evaluation, especially in the context of COVID 19 pandemic and its repercussions as well as the change of governments (with different policy approaches on peace building) at the very start of the project. Both the project and its evaluation was defined by this experience: On one hand, the project itself is limited in terms of scope, resources and implementation period, and has been substantially affected by the pandemic and political changes. Secondly, there were some limitations in visits to project areas and conducting extensive Focus Group Discussions (FDGs) with stakeholders and primary societies due to travel, health and safety restrictions. The preliminary consultation with the Chief Technical Advisor and the National Project Coordinator emphasized that some of the project implementation areas are inaccessible at that stage due to isolation guidelines. The situation remained unpredictable as the spread of the Delta variant of the virus was reported⁴. The evaluation had to be guided by these context factors in proposing a feasible methodology and carry out the evaluation in accordance with the safety guidelines in place. this evaluation was complied with UN Evaluation norms and standards and adhered to evaluation ethical safeguards

It was clear that due to the COVID 19, some methodologies such as field visits with extensive discussions with beneficiaries were not feasible. Hence the resorting to online platforms and telephone for communication. Nevertheless, priority was given to obtaining more qualitative information where possible which will be helpful for the project staff in making strategic choices in implementation for the remaining period. ILO field staff (who themselves were not able to travel to the project areas as they reside in other Districts away from project areas) made the best of efforts to organize small gatherings of cooperative office-bearers, community mobilizers and beneficiaries to communicate with the evaluators.

Under these circumstances, the main methods and tools for used for data gathering were:

Method	Adaptation to COVID 19 guidelines
Desk review of project documentation, progress reports and commissioned studies highlighting recommendations and lessons learnt captured thus far	Not affected
Key informants' interviews with project staff, relevant ILO / UN specialists and technical support units, Donors, GoSL, civil society organizations and other stakeholders and partners.	Telephone or Online platforms were used
Discussion with Project Staff Kilinochchi, namely NPC and FO	Online platforms were used
FGDs with stakeholders, primary societies	Online platforms were used

⁴ Delta variant of Covid 19 virus spreading fast in Sri Lanka, Times of India, 19th July 2021.
<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/south-asia/delta-variant-of-covid-19-spreading-fast-in-sri-lanka/articleshow/84546297.cms>. (Accessed on 31st July 2021)

Report writing, formulation of recommendations and lessons learnt	Not affected
Presentation of key findings to project staff and key stakeholders for feedback	Online platforms were used
Final report and presentation with project staff and key stakeholders	Online platforms were used

Semi structured questions for KII/ FDG were guided by the main six (+1) evaluation criteria set by the TOR. Cross-cutting issues such as Gender were considered in formulating the questionnaires for KII and FGDs in addition to the above. The evaluation team ensured that opinions and perceptions of women are equally reflected in the interviews and as such that gender-specific questions were included.

Five FGDs were conducted with beneficiaries and local cooperative officials and staff (with a total of 22 persons) in the three Districts. KIIs were conducted with Government officials including Provincial Council, Divisional Secretariat and Department of Cooperative Development (total of 11 persons), Private Sector Companies (4 persons), Independent Consultants (3 persons), and ILO and UN RCO Staff (11 Persons). Extensive interactions (email correspondence followed by clarifications via telephone) were held with the core staff of ILO and UN RCO responsible for the SURAR project.

Two validation workshops were held on 27th and 30th August with 1) Stakeholders in the North and 2) Stakeholders at National level including ILO CO, project team and UN RCO staff, respectively, to present the preliminary findings of the evaluation. The feedback from the two workshops is being incorporated in this report. A final debriefing was convened by the ILO Colombo office on the 23rd September with the participation of representatives of the donor together with the relevant ILO and UN staff the ILO regional staff from Myanmar and Thailand who were managing the evaluation.

Limitations

The continuing uncertainty and volatility over the Covid19 pandemic was a major challenge in visiting the field and having face-to-face interactions with stakeholders. Methodology was hence adapted and improvised through joint discussion and agreement with the ILO as mentioned in the section on Methodology. However, the familiarity of the broader ILO projects in the North by the evaluators was useful. All the five Districts of the North where ILO work was carried out have been visited by the Team Leader in 2016 (as the Team Leader of Evaluation of LEED) and Team Leader and Team Member in September 2020 (as Evaluators for LEED+). The rapport already established with ILO staff both at Colombo and field levels as well as the familiarity of the private sector partners (except Keels) and cooperatives minimized the limitation of not being able to visit the project areas.

6.Main Findings

6.1 Review of project results

A brief overview of the project context and operational conditions

Two significant context-related issues coincided with the project period which was from September 2019 to March 2021 (with a no cost extension till September 2021) First, the change of guard at the government in November 2019 and how this affected the implementation of the project since the policy of the new government on post-war showed significant changes. Second, the repercussions of the COVID pandemic and its effect on the project activities and beneficiary communities. At a project management level, it may be relevant to look into how the Human Rights related issues at an international level (e.g. Sri Lanka withdrawing from the joint resolution at the UNHRC in 2020 and a major onslaught on Sri Lanka at the UNHRC sessions in 2020 that shifted the government further from certain post-war processes) have had any impact at the national level steering of the project. The project made a delayed start in early October 2019. Staff hiring was commenced towards the end of 2019. A Field Coordinator was hired but the appointment of a National Project Coordinator (NPC) took place only in June 2020 due to the disruption of first wave of Covid 19 from March-June 2020. In spite of the delays ILO had all its networks intact in the North (inter alia, two prominent post war projects implemented by ILO, namely LEED and LEED+ since 2011 in all the five districts in the North with the cooperatives and other governmental and private sector collaborations) so that operations could be expedited from June 2020. In November there was another lockdown due to the second wave. January –March 2021 went undisrupted until the third wave constrained the work in April and May⁵. Both field staff contracted Covid 19 had to be sent for Quarantine during this period. Project office was closed and staff continued on teleworking mode during lockdown periods. Key staff in charge of fieldwork were residing in other Districts and Provinces far away from the field operational areas. Hence, the teleworking mode had its own limitations in field operations. Government offices, cooperatives and private sector organizations that were part of the project went through similar spells of disruptions and slowing down of work. The Burevi cyclone that hit the Northern and Eastern areas of the country in end Nov / early Dec 2020, following that there were floods in January 2021, also to some extent impacted the project. The yield data revealed that, the ground nut yield was affected negatively. As the project functioned under exceptional conditions. The resettlement lands were released by the governmental agencies to the people have been living elsewhere. They had to clear the new land plots given and gradually get themselves settled; basically start from scratch. It is under these circumstances and backdrop the SURAR project was carried out.

Progress of activities implemented and results achieved

The following sections give details of different activities carried out and the results achieved against the respective outcomes and outputs.

Outcome 1 Aligned to the Resettlement outcome in the JPP and PPP): The State prioritizes sustainable return, resettlement and/or local integration of conflict-displaced persons (IDPs, IDP returnees, and refugee returnees) in a safe and dignified manner to rebuild lives and communities.

Output: The UN in Sri Lanka provides strategic, coherent, timely and targeted support towards the resettlement process in the Northern Province with an emphasis on ensuring durable solutions and promoting confidence in the process.

Activities and Results

The mapping exercise on resources was carried out by a consultant (AMTE Developments) as an initial activity that gave inputs on economic resource mapping and needs assessment to be considered by the relevant project stakeholders. Based on which Coir, Banana, Groundnut and fishing were selected as

⁵ Official Website of the Government on Covid 19 Response, <https://covid19.gov.lk/directory.html> (accessed on 18th July 2021) and Preliminary Consultation with Dr. Thomas Kring, CTA, ILO, Colombo on 13th July 2021.

potential value chains (2nd half 2020) upon conducting a study (by AMTE Consultants) that used a set of criteria including the geographical, profitability and marketability factors as criteria.

The project partnered with four existing cooperatives in the Mullaitivu (Maritimepattu Division), Jaffna (Tellippalai Division), and Kilinochchi (Palai Division) Districts and facilitated formation of two new cooperatives. The table below gives an overview of these cooperatives and their spread over the three districts.

Table 1: Overview of Partnering Cooperatives

Jaffna (Tellippalai Division)	Mullaitivu (Maritimepattu Division)	Kilinochchi (Palai Division)
Jaffna District Cooperative Society Union Federation (JDCSUF)	Farmer Organization – Chemmalai- (FOC) [newly formed]	Palai Multi Purpose Cooperative Society (PMCS)
Palali Agriculture Producers Sales Cooperative Society (PAPSCS)	Maritimepattu Groundnut Producer Cooperative Society (MGPCS)	
Dry Fisheries Society (DFS) [newly formed] (exclusively female)		

(Source: SURAR Progress Reports, Interviews with M&E Officer, NPC)

With the support of the Department of Cooperative Development (DoCD), the newly resettled communities were able to gain membership as well as be elected to the executive board of the cooperatives in Tellipalai and Maritimepattu Divisional Secretariat (DS) divisions. One thousand, one hundred and thirty-six (1136) newly resettled persons (M556:F580) including 148 Female Heads of Households (FHH) and 26 Persons with Disabilities (M15:F11) received new membership in cooperatives as a result of the awareness initiatives carried out by the DoCD through the project. The table below gives the new members of the different cooperatives in the three districts.

Table 2: New membership of Cooperatives

Name of coop	No of members at 2019			As at 2021 June			New members					
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male (A)	Female (B)	FHH	Disable Male	Disable Female	Total (A+B)
PMPCs	1851	1195	3046	1966	1307	3273	115	112	10			227
PAPSCS	142	11	153	323	76	399	181	65	16		3	246
FOC	220	14	234	384	107	491	164	93	47	4	1	257
JDFCSUF	14500	1500	17000	14516	1600	17116	16	100	14			116

DFS –new				NA	107	107	0	107	14			107
MGPCS- new				80	103	183	80	103	47	11	7	183
Total	2213	1220	3433	2769	1800	4569	556	580	148	15	11	1136

(Source: SURAR Progress Reports, Interviews with M&E Officer, NPC)

The project strategy was to directly work with cooperatives to support newly resettled families to engage in economic activities and improve interactions with the host communities to facilitate reintegration. In that regard, it had been essential for newly resettled families to obtain membership and representation in the participating cooperatives. Two cooperatives in Thellipalai and Maritimé pattu had a constitutional limitation on resettled communities from non-covering areas to join. In collaboration with the DoCD, the project facilitated amendments to the constitutions of these two cooperatives. It facilitated the inclusion of women and youth from the newly resettled communities into the executive boards. This strategic change proved to be an important step towards reintegrating newly resettled communities in Thellipalai and Maritimé pattu.

As part of the project activities, the DoCD's existing training modules have been updated to build management, book keeping, accounting, and governance capacities. A consultant was hired to carry out a capacity assessment and develop training content on business development and marketing, for cooperatives. The consultant completed training modules on business development, marketing and skills development – one Training of Trainers (ToT) was completed for Cooperative Development Officers (20) – following the ToT, a plan was prepared to rollout the trainings among the cooperatives. Details of training and capacity building are given in the following Table.

Table 3: Training activities and number of people trained

Type of training	Jaffna	Kilinochchi	Mullativu	Total
Mobilization workshop	208	256	104	568
Accounting / Book keeping	31	39	24	94
Inclusive approach/ Governance	26	39	32	97
Cultivation practice and methods			194	194
Use of Farm Machinery and Post- Harvest Technology in Ground nut			182	182
ToT for DoCD staff (CDO) – business development , marketing and skill development.	14	3	3	20
Dry fish preservative method	36			36
Post harvesting techniques & cultivation practice of banana	93			93

(Source: SURAR Progress Reports, Interviews with M&E Officer, NPC)

A committee was formed consisting of the President, and Secretary of the Coop, Manager, and ILO to identify the most vulnerable members of the resettled community, with priority being given to PwDs, FHH, and elderly persons. The selected vulnerable people will be provided with extra support to carry out the livelihood activities, as well as address/overcome any constraints that prevent them from engaging in such

activities, to ensure the commitment to 'leave no one behind'. As a follow-up to the recommendations by the committee, the project has selected 26 PwDs (Male 15, Female 11) and 87 FHH families for receiving additional support towards encouraging them to engage in Banana (19 persons) and Groundnut (68 persons) cultivations. The nature of the additional support will be assessed individually so as to ensure inclusiveness when engaging in economic activities.

A strategy consisting of two approaches has been developed and is ready for implementation. The two components are: a) establishing a technical working group for cooperatives; and b) a capacity development plan for selected cooperatives to improve governance and market-related capabilities. Under the Commissioner of Cooperative Development's chairmanship, a Technical Working Group consisting of key personnel from the selected cooperatives, extension officers, and District Cooperative Department from the targeted districts was formed to provide technical support to cooperative members in a more cohesive, and coordinated manner across relevant departments. Furthermore, the committee will liaise with private companies as required. The committee has also appointed a Development Officer from the Cooperative Department to take meeting minutes in order to ensure follow up actions. The committee's first strategic decision was allowing designated officers from any of the department in the committee to visit cooperatives and oversee issues related to their mandate, and provide timely support for the Coop members. Prior to this, as a standard practice, other Departments were not allowed to directly participate in Coop related issues, as the Coops were entities that were registered with the DoCD. The technical working group conducted its first meeting during the end of December 2020. The DoCD completed the cooperative capacity assessment with the technical support of the project during the reporting period. The assessment indicated significant gaps in business development, value addition, market access and skill development of the targeted cooperatives. In response to this, a host of training programs were formulated and implemented on accounts, book keeping, gender, governance having developed training modules on business development, value addition and market linkages by the DoCD, for both project target groups as well as non-targeted cooperatives. The project also provided technical support on wage-setting for cooperative employees based on evidence and labor market trends, in alignment with the Government of Sri Lanka's national development policy. However, it should be noted that the project is unable to effect wage-setting for co-operative employees as there is another entity called the Co-operative Employees Commission (CEC) which is mandated with fixing salaries. But the project or DoCD can suggest an incentive scheme apart from the structured salaries to co-operative employees by CEC.

Livelihood activities total/cumulative data from start of the project till 30 June 2021

Four hundred and seventy families have cultivated approximately 478 acres of Groundnut and Banana with the provision of good quality seeds/seedlings by the project in the Mullaitivu and Jaffna districts. In parallel, the project provided support to initiate a Groundnut Producers Cooperative Society in Maritimpattu to promote groundnut cultivation in addition to providing market and other input services for cultivators.

Table 4: Overview of Livelihood Activities in three Districts and Number of Beneficiaries

Activity	Location	Target	Male	Female	Disabled	FHH	Total reached
Banana Cultivation	Jaffna	170	124	46	3	17	171
	Mullaitivu	None					
	Kilinochchi	None					

Groundnut Cultivation	Jaffna	None					
	Mullaitivu	300	141	159	18	48	301
	Kilinochchi	None					
Dry Fish	Jaffna	100		100		14	100
	Mullaitivu	None					
	Kilinochchi	None					
Deep Sea Fishing	Jaffna	9	9				9
	Mullaitivu	None					
	Kilinochchi	None					
Coir	Jaffna	None				10	
	Mullaitivu	None					
	Kilinochchi	50	2	43			45
Banana Leaf Production	Jaffna	3		3	0		3
	Mullaitivu	None					
	Kilinochchi	None					
			276	351	21*	89*	629

(Source: SURAR Progress Reports, Interviews with M&E Officer, NPC)

*These figures are different from the total of PwDs and FHH on Table 2 which represents the total new members of cooperatives. Here, the amount is the out of the new members who have received livelihood support from SURAR.

Details of progress and results of livelihood activities in terms of yield/production and revenue earned

Banana Cultivation

Total number of Acres cultivated: 32.5 acres. Approximate profit per Acre: harvest not yet received. How many seasons cultivated: this is one-time cultivation crop and harvest can be done three times per year. The first harvest is yet to receive.

Ground Nut Cultivation

Total number of Acres cultivated: 426.75 acres. Out of the 300 farmers, the average net profit per person: Rs. 9,746 (2020 Maha)⁶. Normally, two seasons are cultivated per Three (300) hundred groundnut farmers who were supported last year have completed Maha seasonal harvest in 2020. Sixty-seven percentage (67%) of farmers earned an income more than the cost of production, with the provided farming input. The average profit of groundnut cultivation is 36,000.00 but, due to last Burevi cyclone and floods the average profit has down to 9,746⁷.

⁶ ILO, SURAR, M&E Data Base.

⁷ KII with NPC and FGD with Farmer Organization – Chemmalai- (FOC), 27th July 2021

Dry Fish

Out of the 53 persons who did the production during the month of June 2021, the profit per person was: 156,307⁸. Number of rounds of production / sales: averagely 10 – 15 days per month. Hundred women (57 new and 43 existing members) started dry fish production. Fifty-three (53) of them supported during May were able to produce 813 Kg/month during June. It was a 338 kg increment compared to the project interventions. A producer could get an average net income of around Rs.156, 307 during the same month. This significant income increment is mainly attributed to the existing higher demand for dry fish due to made damages to the fresh fish industry with the exploding of the X-press Pearl ship on the West coast in Sri Lanka⁹.

Coir

Production is not yet started. Coco chips production center will be run by the cooperative. The resettled women will work in this production unit as employees. The salary will be given based on salary revision made by DoCD (yet to take place) and Coop with the support of the Project. 45 persons (women) have been identified, and the necessary training are to be given on occupation safety and health measures, basic production calculation, and industrial safety.

Infrastructure and construction

In order to enhance the production/cultivation conditions and facilitate transportation and easy market access, the project has been able to complete the following infrastructure work, given in the table below, that benefited both project beneficiaries as well as some others in the area.

Table 5: Construction work and number of people benefitted

Type of construction	Jaffna	Kilinochchi	Mullativu
Agro well construction			51
Well Renovation			66
Road Renovation - 50m			350
Fish drying yard	100		

(Source: SURAR Progress Reports, Interviews with M&E Officer, NPC)

Partnering with the private sector to facilitate Market Linkages

Upon the positive results of the previous ILO projects in the North as well as based on market leadership and reputation, the project has established partnerships – based on formalized Agreements -- with 4 companies; Tropicoir (Coir), John Keels Marketing Services, better known as Keels (Banana), David Gram (Ground Nut) and JDFCSUF - Jaffna District Cooperative Society Union Federation (dry Fish). The progress of the partnership with the companies are summarized below.

Tropicoir has a processing centre in Palai, in Kilinochchi District for the last four years. This has the capacity to process a larger volume of coir. This processing centre was set up by Tropicoir with its own investment. Tropicoir is providing technical advice on establishing a coir processing center for production of coco chips in Kilinochchi. ILO signed a contract with PMPCS (cooperative) for establishing of coco chip production unit (machinery and infrastructure). Tropicoir is providing their technical know-how in setting up a factory, installation of machinery, and market access for production – coco chips – technical advice.

⁸ ILO, SURAR, M&E Data Base.

⁹ KII with NPC and FGD with Jaffna District Cooperative Society Union Federation (JDCSUF) 29th July 2021

ILO supported machinery to Palai MPCSC (cooperative) to establish the coir processing Centre with technical collaboration of PMPCS – PMPCS has provided employment opportunities for resettled communities. (45 women)¹⁰. The agreement was finalized, later on, however. With amendments. Due to Tropicair's priorities and COVID travel restriction, some construction work (drying yard) was transferred to the cooperative. However, Tropicair remains committed to provide technical advisory services to cooperatives in establishing the processing center, machinery installation, and market access¹¹.

Keels has established a collection Centre in Kopai Jaffna for fruits and vegetable on their own. In collaboration with the project, Keels established a collection center in the project area, Palali, for the convenience of the farmers. 50 Banana cultivators are currently registered by Keels and upon the progress of the project, others will also be registered. The first harvest is yet to be supplied¹².

David Gram has collaborated with the groundnut producer's cooperative society to construct a processing centre in Mullaitivu district for groundnut. It is still under construction and there is a delay due to lockdown disruptions. The allocation by ILO for that was Rs. 4 Million. This might not be adequate as the prices have escalated due to slow down of the economy. David Gram have invested about 11 Million for machinery and equipment which is yet to be imported from India. The construction work will take up until December 2021 and therefore will not be able to wrap things up by the end of the project period in September¹³. A discussion between ILO, David Gram and Cooperative was arranged to expedite the construction work. As a result, the cooperative has taken the responsibility for constructing the building as David Gram staff were not able to travel the project location. Further, cooperative has agreed to contribute some money in order to overcome the additional cost due to price escalation, However, David Gram and Cooperative has ensured the completion of this work before the project period¹⁴.

JDCSUF has established sales out let in the Jaffna district for dry fish. They have also obtained Sri Lanka Standards (SLS) certification to assure quality of the product that enhances the customer confidence and thereby increasing the demand for dry fish produced by the cooperative members, the majority is women. JDCSUF is a strong Federation with 30 cooperatives in Jaffna District and has been very active in both operations as well as advocacy work to safeguard the rights and well-being of nearly 23,000 fishers in Jaffna District¹⁵.

Table 6: Summary of results and achievements of Outcome 1

Outcome 1 (aligned to the Resettlement outcome in the JPP and PPP): The State prioritizes sustainable return, resettlement and/or local integration of conflict-displaced persons (IDPs, IDP returnees, and refugee returnees) in a safe and dignified manner to rebuild lives and communities.

Output: The UN in Sri Lanka provides strategic, coherent, timely and targeted support towards the resettlement process in the Northern Province with an emphasis on ensuring durable solutions and promoting confidence in the process.

Indicator	Target	Achievement as of June 21	Remarks n achievement or
Outcome 1			

¹⁰ KII, Lesley de Silva, Tropicair, 23rd July 2021. The email correspondence of NPC with evaluators on 9th August 2021 confirmed that by now (9th August) the agreement of finalized.

¹¹ Email correspondence by NPC, 8th August 2021, with Evaluators

¹² KII, Nirmal Hettiarachchi, JKMS, 23rd July 2021.

¹³ KII, K. Raja, David Gram, 24th July 2021.

¹⁴ Email correspondence from NPC, 8th August 2021, with the Evaluators.

¹⁵ KII, T. Annarasa, President JDCSUF, 29th July 2021.

% of targeted population reporting that their income increased (base line income Rs. 30,769)	50% targeted population for LLH interventions(50% of total reached out (627*) <u>Total reached out</u> Ground nut 300 Dry Fish 100 Coir 45 Banana 170 Banana Leaf 3 Deep Sea 9 Total: 627*	400 persons have (141 M: 259 F) have produced groundnut and dry fish. Of 300 ground nut farmers, 67% increased their income. Of 100 Dry fish producers 53 recorded higher monthly incom100 % compared to the baseline. Income from Banana and Coir are yet to realize as the production is incomplete.	63 % reaching targeted population for LLH = 63% (400/627 x 100) Ground Nut: Average net income for Maha Season 2020 was Rs. 9,746 Dry Fish: Average net income of June 2021 is Rs. 156,307.
Output			
Number of cooperatives strengthened/established (Baseline ILO had already supported Thelipplai and Maritim Pattu Coops)	A minimum of 3	6 coops were strengthened. 1. Dry Fisheries Society (Jaffna) 2. Palali Agriculture Producers Sales Cooperative Society PAPSCS (Jaffna) 3. Maritim Pattu Groundnut Producer Sales Society (Mullativu) 4. Farmer Organization – Chemmalai- FCO 5. Palai Multi Purpose Cooperative Society (MPCS) (Kilinochchi) 6. Jaffna Distract Cooperative Society Union Federation (JDCSUF) Around 1,032 members of resettled communities mobilized around these six cooperatives with a view of better integration to the locality.	Two of them are newly established to promote groundnut (Mullativu) and dry fish producers (Jaffna), 191 (63 M 128F), incl. 5 disabled cooperative executive members, had greater knowledge of bookkeeping, accounting, management, and cooperative governance. The cooperatives enhanced their network and coordination with different government technical departments (Agriculture, fisheries, Coconut Development Board) and the relevant DS office. The newly formed groundnut producers' cooperative co-finances the groundnut processing center by David gram.
Number of members mobilized through cooperative system to increase their productive capacity	900 (300 per target area), including at least 50% representation of women	582 (274M:308F) groundnut, banana and dry fish producers including 21 disabled persons(xx) have been supported .	64% success Coir production is yet to commence with 45 persons.

Number of partnerships established with private sector companies to establish backward linkages, strengthen supply chains and aid marketing of produce.	3	3 private sector and 1 Coop (Tropicoir, David Gram, JK Marketing Services)	Jaffna Cooperative Union (JDFCSUF)	Distinct Society Federation
---	---	--	------------------------------------	-----------------------------

(Source: Project Monitoring Plan, Progress Reports, Data Base maintained by M&E Officer, KIIs with NPC M&E and validated at the FGDs with cooperatives and beneficiaries)

Outcome 2: Key Results under project outputs

As per Annex 3: Time Line of Activities 2019 of SURAR proposal, three main activities contribute to outcome 2 on reconciliation, which is aligned to the social cohesion outcome in JPP and PPP. Namely, these are,

- 2.a. Extend technical support to embed and institutionalise the service delivery tracking tool within the Ministry
- 2.b. Support the Ministry to undertake the 2019 and 2020 annual service delivery tracking exercise
- And 2.c. Design an advocacy strategy for effectively using the results from the tracking tool to drive improvements in service delivery in Tamil

The overall results of these activities cannot be assessed at the moment as activities b. and c. have not yet been implemented. However, considerable progress was made in establishing a consultative and collaborative approach with stakeholders.

During the project period UN RCO provided technical guidance and support to the Ministry of National Languages and its successor Ministry of Public Administration to supervise, monitor and implement Official Languages Policy (OLP) in collaboration with the Official Languages Commission (OLC). United Nations (UN) under SURAR completed a survey to examine OLP Implementation in public service orientated three (03) government institutions¹⁶,

- Department of Registration of persons
- Department of Registrar Generals
- Department of Immigration and Emigration

This step was deemed necessary since, despite significant amount of resources been invested in supporting the OLP by various donors, there was no effective, simple and practical methodology that was easy to replicate, given the resource restrictions faced by state authorities.¹⁷ Thus the project focused on simplifying the monitoring and tracking process, where 10 key indicators for assessment of service delivery were identified and tested through the pilot survey. (Kindly refer to Annex 7 for the Customer experience checklist for language audit).

¹⁶ KII, Ms. Gnanie Wikramasinghe, Ministry of Public Administration, telephone communication and written report on activities submitted on 07.08.2021

¹⁷ KII, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, zoom interview, 16.07.2021

Pilot survey was carried out with fair amount of success, despite restrictions and limitations imposed by the COVID 19 pandemic in Department of Immigration and Emigration, Department of Registration of Births and Department of Registration of Persons. These are key public institutions that attract a heavy traffic of public to obtain services. Key officials from Ministry and Languages Commission attended and participated in most aspects of pilot survey design and implementation in collaboration with implementing partner MARGA Institute.

The results of the pilot phase and audit report indicate, apart from the fairly well established fact of gaps in service delivery in Tamil and English languages, that some of these services could be rectified by simple solutions, such as outsourcing.¹⁸ The important value addition of this process seems to be the simplification of the implementation of OLP into practical steps and monitoring mechanisms. It has supported the stakeholders to refocus on getting the basics right in service delivery in key institutions. Another outstanding tool developed is the 'mystery customer' survey, which proved to be very effective in highlighting gaps and getting the OLC and relevant authorities to take immediate remedial actions.¹⁹

Overall, the pilot phase of the project has managed to make a meaningful contribution in supporting key government stakeholders to co-create a simple tracking tool to monitor gaps and take remedial actions. UNDP/UN RCO conducted a series of detailed discussions with the Ministry and OLC in terms of developing the framework in respect to the survey. This process, though time consuming and difficult due to COVID restrictions, ensured that all the stakeholders were consulted and included, paving the way to come up with a consensual process, which is especially highlighted and appreciated by the government stakeholders. According to ministry officials, this consultative process made it possible that all activities under SURAR were relevant to the context and was addressing the needs and 04 key areas identified by ministry for OLP implementation

In addition, the work supported by SURAR project seem to compliment some of the ongoing language support activities conducted under Canadian supported National Language Equality Advancement Project (NLEAP) for instance, which has conducted a survey of 32 institutions island wide in Jaffna, Trinco, Colombo, Kandy, Matara etc., to help formulate language strategy, with interviews with 500 public staff through structured questionnaires.²⁰ NLEAP utilized and adapted using the survey tool developed by SURAR pilot 9 of 10 indicators further aiding institutionalization of the tool which was a key deliverable.²¹ Complementing such efforts, SURAR though modest in its scope, has supported the key government stakeholders to focus on key central government institutions, where sometimes language issues manifest differently from that of regional institutions. Thus, the pilot phase seemed to have laid a strong foundation for further collaboration on institutionalizing quality assurance and monitoring processes for OLP.

The phase 1 (pilot) survey was completed in 2020. The activities that have not been completed by the time of the evaluation are the phase 2 of the survey, aimed to be implemented in July/August 2021. Since the activities are not yet conducted, the results cannot be assessed. It will only be possible to confirm the change (positive or negative) of the three phase 1 institutions after phase is completed in the coming days²². The main reasons for these delays are twofold: 1) Situation induced by COVID 19 pandemic with multiple lockdowns, 2) Organizational procedures with regard to contracting within UN. Though the

¹⁸ Official Languages Services Delivery (Draft) 20019 by Marga Institute.

¹⁹ KII, Amar Goonetilake, Marga Institute, recorded zoom interview, 29.07.2021

²⁰ KII, Amar Goonetilake, Marga Institute, recorded zoom interview, 29.07.2021

²¹ Feedback, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, 07.09.2021

²² Email communication, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, 20.08.2021

project was initially conceptualized under the former government, the political change has not impeded the activities²³.

Phase two survey (which was initially meant to be done 12-15 months after phase one) has not been abandoned, though it was severely delayed due to COVID-19 and the inability to assess government offices that were (until August 2021) largely running at limited capacity. The survey is meant to cover both the 3 institutions of phase one and approximately 30 institutions overall, putting in place the findings to introduce an award scheme. Having an actual award and ceremony has been postponed indefinitely, but there's still agreement to introduce one after phase two findings are complete. This can be considered an important agreement reached between Ministry/OLC/UN.

Table 7: Summary progress of Activities and Outputs under Outcome 2

Outcome 2 (aligned to the social cohesion outcome in the JPP and PPP): Positive relationships and mutual understanding between and among different groups, and between groups and the state, contribute to peaceful co-existence and a sense of belonging in Sri Lanka.

Output: The UN in Sri Lanka provides strategic, coherent, timely and targeted support to strengthen reconciliation and social cohesion

Activity	Progress achieved by June 30 2021	Outputs created
2.a-Extend technical support to embed and institutionalise the service delivery tracking tool within the Ministry	Discussions held between the National Language Equality Advancement Project (NLEAP) at the advice of OLC and the Ministry and discussed complementarities. NLEAP has expressed interest to adopt the proposed methodology into their surveys. NLEAP works closely with OLC and the Ministry counterparts to assess service delivery in local languages, as well as conduct trainings for staff through third party service providers to be able to better implement these policies at public institutions.	Findings of the pilot testing of language audit presented to Public Services, Provincial Councils and Local Government
Activity 2.b-Support the Ministry to undertake the 2019 and 2020 annual service delivery tracking exercise	Methodology changes and questionnaire finalized. Survey fielding delayed by onset of COVID-19 third wave and travel restrictions resulting in no survey being permissible under prevailing restrictions. New survey fielding dates set for August for final phase (phase 2) tracking.	Methodology agreed on based on pilot survey. Phase 2 survey to be completed. With the survey seriously delayed and only underway now, it will not be possible to assess the final results on 2.2 (any improvement or decline) cannot be verified till around the end of the month ²⁴ .

²³ KII, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, zoom interview, 16.07.2021

²⁴ Email communication, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, 13.08.2021

Activity 2.c- Design an advocacy strategy for effectively using the results from the tracking tool to drive improvements in service delivery in Tamil	N/A. Discussions have commenced on the nature of the strategy and the awarding system for the rankings with OLC and Ministry and have now extended to a possible partnership with NLEAP. Award for Best Performing Institution postponed by Ministry due to COVID-19 indefinitely²⁵.	Integrate survey findings into NLEAP advocacy with partner institutions. With the survey seriously delayed and only underway now, it will not be possible to assess the final results on 2.2 (any improvement or decline) cannot be verified till around the end of the month²⁶.
---	---	---

(Source: Project Progress Report July to December 2020, January to June 2021, KII and Email communication with relevant officers, 13.08.2021)

Table 8: Summary of results and achievements of Outcome 2

Outcome 2 (aligned to the social cohesion outcome in the JPP and PPP): Positive relationships and mutual understanding between and among different groups, and between groups and the state, contribute to peaceful co-existence and a sense of belonging in Sri Lanka.

Output: The UN in Sri Lanka provides strategic, coherent, timely and targeted support to strengthen reconciliation and social cohesion

Indicator	Target	Achievement as of June 21	Remarks on achievement or progress
Outcome level indicator:			
Positive relationships and mutual understanding between and among different groups, and between groups and the state, contribute to peaceful co-existence and a sense of belonging in Sri Lanka Baseline: 48% (2018 Strategic Context Assessment)	Increase to above 50% (over half) by 2020	Not available on progress reports, as this was not meant to be monitored by the project.	'Outcome Indicator' 2 is not a SURAR project outcome. It is the PPP country level outcome²⁷. This indicator was not meant to be tracked by the project. It was not tracked in 2020 through the national face-to-face survey in which it is usually tracked since the survey for 2020 was cancelled due to COVID-19 restrictions²⁸.
Output level indicator:			
Number of institutions seeing improved ratings in the annual tracker of service	50% of the institutions that took part in the tracking exercise see improved Tamil language service delivery	Not possible to assess as the survey is not complete.	Due to COVID and organizational reasons only 2.a. activity has been implemented to a satisfactory level. 2.b and

²⁵ KII, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, zoom interview, 16.07.2021

²⁶ ibid

²⁷ Annex 4: Project Monitoring Plan, June 2019, Result Framework for the JPP (draft)

²⁸ Email communication, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, 13.08.2021

delivery capability in Tamil. Baseline: not available. The first survey will be 2019			2.c. are being implemented currently under volatile circumstances arising from the pandemic.
Activity level indicators:			
2.a. – Service tracking tool and related advocacy strategy finalized. Baseline: N/A, no service tracking tool at present.	Tracking exercise repeated (2020)	Tracking tool developed and finalized after pilot survey. Phase two survey to be conducted in August 2021.	Pilot survey has developed methodology for a simplified and easy to replicate tracking tool, with fairly successful tools such as 'mystery customer survey' despite the pandemic induced delays.
2.b. – Level of increase in capacity of Ministry of National Integration, Official Languages, Social Progress and Hindu Religious Affairs, to monitor Sinhala and Tamil language service delivery. Baseline: to be established	Established Ministry capacity enables system of ranking public authorities by service delivery based on language to Public Services, Provincial Councils and Local Government	Ministry and Languages Commission officials attended and participated in all aspects of pilot survey design and implementation	Baseline to be established. On OLC participation included the chairman, 3 senior OLC officials and one ministry official as a part of the team that reviewed and amended the survey tool. 8 OLC staff were among those who participated in the phase one survey ²⁹ . Meeting with OLC was not conducted to verify data.
2.c. – Extent of progress made in institutionalizing positive incentive measures for better service delivery within the state system in both languages. Baseline: to be established	Incentive scheme established	Agreement reached to introduce award for best performing institution reached by December 2020 with government counterparts	The institutionalization of the survey tool was completed with NLEAP/Marga and the OLC using the same survey for their 35 partner institutions, though one of the 10 indicators, indicator of filing RTI applications was dropped due to COVID-19 limitations. Further institutionalization beyond the scope of the original project has happened through the co-funding of the UNDP SDG 16 portfolio which will see roll out to the 40+ partner local authorities of the CDLG project, with

²⁹ Email communication, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, 20.08.2021

			plans to repeat annually. This will see institutionalization within the state system beyond the OLC ³⁰ .
--	--	--	---

(Source: Project Progress Report July to December 2020, January to June 2021, Annex 4: Project Monitoring Plan, June 2019, Result Framework for the JPP (draft), KII and Email communication with relevant officers)

Overall, progress under outcome 2 has been affected by the disruptions created by the pandemic as well as time taken for internal coordination between collaborating UN agencies. Together this has led to a situation where a project with only 18 months of implementation struggled to proceed beyond the pilot phase. The planned activities are scheduled to be completed in the coming months. Assessment of results however, is premature at this stage.

6.2 Findings (by evaluation criteria)

Relevance and strategic fit

Alignment with the ILO's framework

The core strategy of ILO work in Sri Lanka as well as globally is to provide decent work for its target communities, by creating employment and preventing exploitation as well as promoting more market based approaches, linking suppliers and buyers in domestic and export markets to ensure long term sustainability. ILO SURAR activities aligned well with ILO's framework on (Recommendation No. 205 on Employment and Decent Work for Peace and Resilience) through its focus on creating decent work opportunities for the resettling communities in the North, who struggled to re-establish their livelihoods after protracted and multiple displacements due to three decades of armed conflict.

Alignment with UN joint statements/policy papers: Joint Statement on Employment programmes for peace and PPP

SURAR fits amidst the overall ILO and UN portfolios supported by the multi-party trust fund with 8 participating UN organizations³¹. It is a modest yet highly effective contribution to peacebuilding in general, and aligning well with Recommendation No. 205 on Employment and Decent Work for Peace and Resilience as well as the UN Joint Statements and PPP (Resolution 30/1). While other projects approached the subject from a more decent work approach, SURAR focused on addressing the livelihood needs of resettling communities, enhancing and contributing the 'resilience pillar' of the ILO framework in particular and complimenting the overall ILO activities in the North of Sri Lanka in general.³²

Alignment with Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

The two pillars, represented by the two outcomes, of SURAR are designed in a way that they subscribe to two key SDGs. The first is the SDG Goal 8, Decent Work and Economic Growth. It entails 'promoting inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work for all'. Outcome One's key

³⁰ Email communication, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, 20.08.2021

³¹ KII, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, zoom interview, 16.07.2021

³² KII, Ms. Simrin Singh, Country Director, ILO, recorded zoom interview, 05.08.2021

emphasis is Economic growth and employment creation. Project had taken measures to proactively introduce the principles and compliance on Decent Work. Workshops have been conducted on this to raise awareness. The second is the SDG Goal 16 which is on Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions. Specifically, it entails 'promoting peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels'. Outcome 2 activities contribute to setting up accountable and inclusive institutions at national level by supporting key central government institutions to track their implementation of official language policy. The pilot survey conducted with the Official Languages Department and the Ministry of Public Administration highlights gaps in central government bodies such as the Department of Immigration, Department of Registration of Persons, Department of Registering Births and Deaths in terms of inclusive language practices and is aimed at institutionalizing regular surveys and tracking tools to increase accountability in terms of service delivery to the public.

Overall Strategy

Although at a surface level SURAR may appear to be insufficiently linked with UN joint statements/policy papers: ILO-PBSO-UNDP-WB (2016), Joint Statement on Employment programmes for peace and PPP, as do not highlight the economic pillar per se, immediate resonance was found when the change of guard took place in the government. Compared to other projects that exclusively addressed peacebuilding elements such as transitional justice and reparations, SURAR approach was met with no resistance and other donors also came to see the value addition in this approach³³.

Perception of local communities

This element is better understood when speaking to the local communities, who feel that their lives have improved tangibly as a result of SURAR activities. The project has not only created livelihood opportunities, but supported the communities to network to address common issues, recognize specific needs of less privileged communities and to ensure inclusion.³⁴ When speaking to the beneficiaries, it was clearly indicated that SURAR activities, especially under outcome 1, supported a community in transition, from prolonged periods of displacement and disrupted livelihoods to normalcy. However, it was not possible to assess if the project activities have led to a change of perceptions in local communities with regard to the others, from a peacebuilding perspective. The target communities of SURAR are those directly affected by the war in the northern parts of the island, where majority are Tamil speaking people from Hindu and Christian backgrounds. The project activities have not sufficiently brought them in to contact with other communities in the island from different ethnoreligious backgrounds through market linkages. Therefore, though SURAR has definitely contributed to restoring a sense of resilience and dignity by supporting livelihoods, it is difficult to suggest that it has led to changes of perception with regards to social cohesion and peace.

Project intervention design and strategy

By dividing its focus on local communities in the North in outcome one and central government authorities in outcome 2, SURAR has contributed modestly yet effectively in addressing two levels of peacebuilding needs present. While this two pronged approach can be successful in principal, in the actual

³³ KII, Ms. Simrin Singh, Country Director, ILO, 05.08.2021

³⁴ FDG s with beneficiaries of five cooperatives, cooperative members and officials on 27-29 July 2021 in Mullaitivu, Jaffna and Kilinichchi Districts.

implementation, this cannot be substantiated adequately. The main reason is that though the project intervention design and strategy is sound, there seem to be inadequate coordination between local level and national level activities. Outcome 1 has been implemented by ILO field staff in Kilinochchi and Colombo Office and Outcome 2 has been implemented by RCO and UNDP and there have been no coordination meetings between the different implementing bodies according to project staff³⁵. The two outcomes do not necessarily compliment or contribute or build on each other. Overall the outcome 2 has 10% of resource allocation³⁶, which highlights the overriding importance of activities under outcome 1. Overall, the concept is sound but implementation strategy is ‘a rather unusual arrangement’³⁷ divided between ILO, RCO and UNDP.

Impact of COVID 19

The COVID situation has impacted the relatively short implementation period of SURAR. For instance, some of the more promising activities planned with counterpart ministries has been put on hold, while activities in communities have continued amidst many challenges. Given the extreme challenges faced by SURAR, given the limitation of implementation time and resources, it has worked effectively in adapting and finding solutions to stay engaged, relevant and meaningful to the stakeholders and local communities it served as well as being aligned with donor priorities.

Coherence

Appropriateness and usefulness of indicators

The indicators relating to Outcome 1 are clearly defined. They are useful and appropriate to track the project progress. The indicators are gender-sensitive and means of verification are clear and objective. At the community level, the indicators are only geared towards capturing improvements in livelihood activities and additionally, inclusion of FHH and PwD at various levels, i.e., beneficiaries and office bearers in the cooperatives. At this level, SURAR does not, (and perhaps given the resource limitations, cannot) integrate other elements of peacebuilding into key interventions. In Outcome 2 indicators are defined to track inclusiveness in terms of languages in delivery of state services. There are 2 indicators at outcome level and three indicators in output level. At output level, the indicators are clear and well defined and are well suited to capture project progress. However, while at the outcome level, the indicators are defined ambitiously, i.e. Positive relationships and mutual understanding between and among different groups, and between groups and the state, contribute to peaceful co-existence and a sense of belonging in Sri Lanka. The second outcome level indicator is ‘Number of institutions seeing improved ratings in the annual tracker of service delivery capability in Tamil’, which is a more measurable outcome. These indicators are derived directly from Annex 4: Project Monitoring Plan, June 2019, Result Framework for the JPP (draft), and needs to be adapted better to capture SURAR contributions, which is a modest 18-month project. In this example, a baseline exists indicated at 48% according to a Strategic Context Assessment used in the JPP Result Framework. However, a similar comprehensive study may be required to substantiate any progress the project has made in this regard. While all the activities in outcome 2 are specific to supporting the implementation of OLP, the outcome level indicator is geared at positive relationships between groups etc. Here, the attribution gap between the activities of SURAR and the overall outcome has not been captured properly.

³⁵ KII, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, 16.07.2021

³⁶ KII, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, 16.07.2021

³⁷ Ibid.

The project has been successful in capturing gender disaggregated data as well as other data on special needs groups (PwDs, FHH), and the data furnished give a clear picture of inclusion at community level.

Project synergies and linkages with ILO Colombo

Decent Work Country Program of ILO Colombo office has four elements: 1) Decent Employment, 2) Sustainable and Inclusive Livelihoods, 3) Labour market governance – rights at work and 4) Data. SURAR was positioned within the component of Sustainable and Inclusive Livelihoods which is a key area of engagement of ILO Colombo office. ILO's engagement in the North since 2009 is substantial. Two key projects on livelihoods for resettling persons (LEEDS and LEEDS+) have been very successful. Hence SURAR banked on the experience, networks and lessons learned from ILO's previous engagements³⁸.

SURAR also complemented earlier project interventions by ILO such as the Empower Project which focused on creating employment opportunities for female x-combatants, building on the lessons learnt, and continuing to balance peace building requirements in the immediate aftermath of the conflict and resettling communities with that of the dire need for livelihood opportunities. Similarly, SURAR is coherent with ILO LEED program under jobs for peace and resilience programme, where the focus on creating links with private sector and market linkages, were immediately introduced to resettling communities.

Harmony of project outputs/outcomes with UN and other actors in Sri Lanka

The main UN framework is set by UN joint statements/policy papers: ILO-PBSO-UNDP-WB (2016), Joint Statement on Employment programmes for peace JPP, Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP) and SGD 16 framework, all of which clearly identify social cohesion and resettlement as an important pillar. As a part of JPP UNDP contributes to Pillar 1: Independent Commission, Parliamentary processes (UNDP SG16 framework), and the interventions related to OLP are implemented by UNDP under this umbrella. Thus SURAR harmonizes ILO/RCO and UNDP mandates together in implementing SURAR.³⁹

The key stakeholders such as the Ministry of National Languages and Social Integration and its successor Ministry of Public Administration, Official Languages Commission recognized the importance of the consultative process facilitated by SURAR, which has been key in addressing some of the stakeholder needs⁴⁰.

SURAR project also compliment some of the ongoing language support activities conducted under Canadian supported NLEAP project for instance, which has conducted a survey of 32 institutions island wide in Jaffna, Trinco, Colombo, Kandy, Matara etc., to help formulate language strategy, with interviews with 500 public staff through structured questionnaires.⁴¹

Due to its focus on supporting decent work opportunities in the resettling communities, an activity which is now recognized as adding value to the peacebuilding process, other UN bodies and donor organizations have found resonance with it and acknowledge the adaptability of the approach to changing political contexts⁴².

³⁸ KII, Mr. Asmi Musthafa, Program Officer, ILO – Back Stopping Responsibility for SURAR, 29th July 2021.

³⁹ KII, Mr. Priyan Senevirathne, Technical Specialist, Peace Building and Reconciliation, UNDP, telephone interview, 28/7/2021

⁴⁰ KII, Ms. Gnanie Wikramasinghe, Ministry of Public Administration, telephone communication and written report on activities submitted on 07.08.2021

⁴¹ KII, Amar Goonetilake, Marga Institute, recorded zoom interview, 29.07.2021

⁴² KII, Ms. Simrin Singh, Country Director, ILO, recorded zoom interview, 05.08.2021

Effectiveness

The degree of achievement of project objectives, results and activities

As summarized in Table 6, with details and calculations, the following are the cumulative degree of achievement of different components of the project in relation to Outcome 1:

- At the outcome level, out of the target of 627, 400 persons have (141 M: 259 F) have produced groundnut and dry fish. Of 300 ground nut farmers, 67% increased their income. Of 100 Dry fish producers 53 recorded higher monthly income 100 % compared to the baseline. Overall this is a 63% achievement. Income from Banana and Coir are yet to realize as the production is incomplete.
- Out of the target of 3, 6 coops were strengthened. 1,032 members of resettled communities mobilized around these six cooperatives with a view of better integration to the locality. Two of them are newly established to promote groundnut (Mullativu) and dry fish producers (Jaffna), 191 (63 M 128F), incl. 5 disabled cooperative executive members, had greater knowledge of bookkeeping, accounting, management, and cooperative governance. The coops enhanced their network and coordination with different government technical departments (Agriculture, fisheries, Coconut Development Board) and the relevant DS office.
- In relation to, the number of members mobilized through cooperative system to increase their productive capacity, the target was 900 (300 per target area), including at least 50% representation of women. The project by 30 June, 2021, was able to reach 582 (274M:308F) groundnut, banana and dry fish producers including 21 disabled persons. Overall it is a 64% progress. The target of having 50% women have well been achieved. The coir production is yet to commence with 45 persons. This would further enhance the results.
- The target of output of the number of partnerships established with private sector companies to establish backward linkages, strengthen supply chains and aid marketing of produce was three (3). As of 30 June, 2021 SURAR has established 3 private sector partnerships (Tropicoir, David Gram, JK Marketing Services) and 1 Cooperative (JDCSUF). The overall progress is more than the expected number.

In regard to Outcome 2, as summarized in Table 8, Outcome 2 has had relatively slow implementation success. The project has been affected by the pandemic so the initial activities had to be adapted. The pilot phase of the survey was successfully completed. While technical support has been extended and recognized by the ministry, the second phase of the survey is yet to be implemented. Therefore, it is not fully possible to assess the success of activities.

Constraints

The key constraint of the project is obvious – the entirely unexpected as well as overwhelming effect of the Covid 19 situation that exerted significant obstacles in carrying out the work not only in the field level but also at office levels. There were three spells of lockdowns that the staff were compelled to work on a telework mode, far away from the project areas, as reported before. The production and cultivation work had serious disruptions as a result. In addition, the coir production value chain did not take off the ground in a proper manner (even up to 30th June as per reports and 31st July, as per interviews with relevant stakeholders) due to constraints of infrastructure (the right level of voltage of electricity required for

machinery) and a prevalence of a certain level of lethargy on the part of the beneficiaries as opined by Tropicoir. In relation to the delay of the construction of the ground nut processing center, the import sanctions imposed by the Sri Lankan government, is delaying the import of machinery needed, as mentioned by David Gram. The delay of launching the banana cultivation was due to adverse weather conditions of floods and heavy rains. The adverse weather affected the quality and quantity of ground nut harvest as reported in the FGDs.

With regard to Outcome 2, the main constraints have been the situation created by the COVID-19 pandemic where state authorities were not fully functional due to lockdowns⁴³. Some of the interventions have to be done in close coordination with the OLC and ministry, where the project has no direct control of the ultimate decisions made. Further to the COVID 19 situation, some lapses have been created due to the complexity of implementation agreements between ILO, RCO and UNDP and delays resulting from organizational procedures.⁴⁴

Attribution

As per the KIIs with government officials as well as the beneficiaries, it was clear that the Outcome 1 results show a very high attribution degree with the project interventions. During the resettlement process, the main actor has been the government represented by the District Secretariats, Divisional Secretariats and relevant Ministries of the Central Government and the Northern Provincial Council. Their contribution has been on infrastructure – clearing the jungle / debris, construction of roads, provision of water and electricity and support for housing. However, livelihood means have not been provided by the governmental agencies. The non-governmental inputs have been from the UNDP but well before the start of SURAR project. Therefore, as far as facilitation of livelihood means are concerned, SURAR's contribution appears quite significant, based on the two value chains implemented (dry fish and ground nut) and the potential of the work to be completed (coir and banana).

The attribution level with regard to Outcome 2, cannot be assessed at the moment, especially at an outcome level since the project intervention is very small and also incomplete, while the outcome indicator is broad and ambitious. It is clear that the pilot survey has highlighted the gaps in service delivery in three government institutions, which can be specifically linked to the project activities. However, these findings are not necessarily groundbreaking and have been highlighted by previous studies conducted by civil society organizations and government bodies.⁴⁵ Furthermore, it is not clear how exactly the ministry and OLC will act upon these findings⁴⁶. State officials highlighted the need to address the broader issues such as attitudinal changes and willingness to work on social cohesion issues which is imperative to tackling the weak implementation of OLP⁴⁷. Naturally, SURAR is not geared to tackle these wide ranging issues

⁴³ <https://graphics.reuters.com/world-coronavirus-tracker-and-maps/countries-and-territories/sri-lanka/> accessed on 10.08.2021

⁴⁴ KII, Ms. Simrin Singh, Country Director, ILO, recorded zoom interview, 05.08.2021, KII, Janeen Fernando Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, zoom interview, 16.07.2021, KII, Mr. Priyan Senevirathne, Technical Specialist, Peace Building and Reconciliation, UNDP, telephone interview, 28/7/2021

⁴⁵ For example, See Summery Report on the Survey on the Implementation of Official Languages Policy at Ministerial Level in Sri Lanka – 2017 accessed on 11.08.2021 on <https://www.cpalanka.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Language-Survey-Summary-Report-2017E.pdf>

⁴⁶ Ministry of Public Administration has mentioned possible follow up action which may or may not materialize depending on availability of resources and COVID situation in written report on activities submitted on 07.08.2021

⁴⁷ KII, Ms. Gnanie Wikramasinghe, Ministry of Public Administration, telephone communication on 28.07.2021

given the limited time and resources. SURAR could have adopted a different strategy than language audits to highlight the gaps and instead focused on identifying most suitable remedial actions and following them up, for example, setting up translation services, advocating for more Tamil officials in state sector jobs, or technological solutions based on apps etc. For the moment it is focused on simplifying language audit and tracking tools, on the basis that the existing templates for language audits and tracking mechanisms being too expensive and cumbersome. The intervention can be rationalized since this may be true. However, the attribution of project activities to tangible improvements in the implementation of OLP will be weak or lead to high attribution gap. On the other hand, given existing allocation of resources this maybe beyond the scope of the project, and has to be evaluated with other activities carried out by implementing partners to better understand the overall impact. What becomes apparent is that SURAR's contribution, modest as it is, has been a catalyst for future work that can take place under SDG 16⁴⁸.

Capacities of stakeholders

Regarding outcome 1, the most successful feature of the project is the capacity building of the cooperatives. Six cooperatives have played a key role in implementing the project. Out of them, two were newly created as a direct and exclusive result of SURAR. It is pertinent to note that from the newly created cooperatives, one is exclusively for women. This is very crucial given the high incidence of FHH in project areas. The membership numbers of cooperatives have increased as presented in Table 2. The cooperatives have been able to launch memberships drives to include women. The capacity of the respective cooperatives had been increased as a result of the training and other capacity interventions listed in Table 3. It commendable that SURAR has been able to enable cooperatives to amend bylaws to accommodate some resettled persons who do not meet certain strict qualifications of cooperative membership requirements. This should not be underestimated as the law pertaining to cooperatives in Sri Lanka is quite archaic, conventional and static. The capacity development of the private sector partners is at another level as they are well established companies in Sri Lanka, with a long history as well as maintaining a significant market positioning. David Gram started building a processing center in Mullativu in collaboration with SURAR. This enhanced its capacity to service a larger clientele of farmers, also beyond SURAR-related farmers. JKMS's capacity was also enhanced as SURAR provided a collection center in Palali. If not for this JKMS had only one collection center in the North, in Kopai, which is far away from the project area. JDCSUF, while being a cooperative, acted as a large-scale buyer, that is akin to the private sector companies, of Dry Fish. Their capacity was significantly developed through project activity. As a result, they were able to obtain the Sri Lanka Standards (SLS) certification which is a major achievement as a large-scale trader that can excel well in the market. The government-owned Cooperative Development Department and the institutes under the Department have institutionalized the training courses promoted and sponsored by SURAR during the project period⁴⁹.

In relation to Outcome 2, it is only possible to assess the capacities of the ministry. We were only able to interview one state official from the Ministry of Public Administration. Here, what is observed is that the state officer was appreciative of the consultative approach taken during the pilot phase of the project. Due to the technical inputs given by SURAR, it was acknowledged that the ministry 'was successful in

⁴⁸ Feedback, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, 07.09.2021

⁴⁹ However, it is claimed that these trainings did not bring any significant changes (Response to the Draft Report, ILO-CO, conveyed with the feedback collated by the Evaluation Manager dated 14th September 2021).

finalizing a comprehensive questionnaire which would meet expected results'⁵⁰. RCO could not facilitate a meeting with an officer from OLC, hence it is difficult to assess capacity development for OLC⁵¹.

Efficiency

Strategic allocation and utilization of resources

The allocation of resources proves to be extremely strategic in terms of managing the project activities and providing adequate human resources for a smooth implementation. Overall, the only factor that has led to delays in financial management has resulted from the pandemic related issues. Originally expected to end by March 2021, the project sought extension till 30th September 2021. According to the Finance Officer, the progress indicates that financially the final payments are to be released between July and September and the financial activities are foreseen to be successfully completed by the said date.

Overall, over 62% of financial resources have been allocated for direct activities, operational, monitoring and evaluation costs. Nearly 48% of the total budget has been allocated for activities conducted under outcome 1, with a majority of resources reaching beneficiaries through the cooperative societies. In the awarding of contracts, cooperatives were selected on the basis of criteria such as gender inclusion, targeting of vulnerable populations such as FHH and PwDs.

Due to proper financial management, the project was able to make considerable savings in staff and operational costs which is in the process of being reallocated to outcome 1 activities. Budget amendments necessary to facilitate this process transferring approximately USD 30, 000 to outcome 1 related activities is currently underway⁵².

This indicates that the ILO staff has been astute in financial management and cost effectiveness. Strategic allocation of financial, human resources as well as time management, given the challenging context is highly commendable.

Management capacities

In relation to the Outcome 1, ILO had recruited four dedicated staff, including two field staff (National Project Coordinator and Field Coordinator, stationed at the ILO field office in Kilinochchi). The ILO Colombo office staff comprised two International staff (CTA and private Sector Development Specialist) and a National M&E officer who managed central level coordination reporting for the project and another Administrative/Finance assistant. For Outcome 2, two officers from UN RCO (Advisor and Data Analyst) and a UNV initiated the designing of survey, and the Technical Specialist from UNDP for Peacebuilding (managing the implementation) comprised the team.

There had been a clear level of understanding of roles and responsibilities of the two teams responsible for two outcomes. The staff concerned possess the optimum levels of knowledge, experience and skills required for the project. The project received adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national implementing partners in relation to Outcome 1 but not so much to Outcome 2 due to change of policy and reorganization of ministries on peace building related work. The communication within the two project team and the national implementing partners have been at an optimum level.

⁵⁰ KII, Ms. Gnanie Wikramasinghe, Ministry of Public Administration, written report on activities submitted on 07.08.2021

⁵¹ Request for interview on phone and written reminders by evaluator on 28.07.2021, 03.08.2021 and 06.08.2021

⁵² KII, Sinnathamby Kalaiventhan, Finance Officer, ILO SURAR on 03.08.2021

However, the coordination between the two teams had not been at a satisfactory level. The project management monitor project performance and results have been carried out independently by the two teams. The access of the details of monitoring frameworks, tools and information was limited in relation to Outcome 2. Probably, this is due to the fact that a crucial stage of implementation is yet to take place as well as UNDP, is yet to develop its frameworks.

Project timeline

On Outcome 1, the key components to be implemented under Value Chains are Banana and Coir-related work. Banana harvesting and marketing is expected from the month of August 2021. The coir production project is yet to be launched. The ground nut and dry fish value chain work has taken place as well as capacity building work of the cooperatives. David Gram's processing center construction is not completed as of June 30 report period and interviews as of 30th July 2021. It is anticipated to complete in October 2021. On Outcome 2, implementations have been affected by the COVID pandemic lockdowns, as the surveys planned needed to be adapted to adhere to the safety protocols in place. While the pilot survey has been completed, the second survey is yet to be implemented. Some activities such as the award scheme for incentivizing state authorities that perform well in inclusive language practices have been postponed indefinitely by counterpart ministry.

Cost-effectiveness

The overall cost-effectiveness of the project indicates high levels of appropriate budget management during the pandemic period. Substantial financial resources have been saved, for example, 30,000 USD have been saved from staff and operational costs and re-allocated to project activities.

Cost effectiveness has been practiced in day-to-day financial management, for instance quotation procedures followed in obtaining services, where best prices were re-negotiated with contractors due to the pandemic situation. Overall, the project has been cost-effective and has maximized opportunities resulting from the context changes.

Impact orientation by the project set up and impacts achieved vis a vis defined objectives and outcomes

In short, the overall impact orientation and strategy of the project can be summed up, as 'SURAR is not just about livelihoods. Not just about peace. But more wider'⁵³ The project was set up to contribute to peace and stability in post conflict Sri Lanka, by addressing basic needs of resettling communities in the North through creating livelihood and work opportunities on one hand and the support given to implementation of OLP and integration of public service delivery at a national level on the other. The success of the project lies in the identification of economic revival as a pre-requisite to peacebuilding in post-conflict communities and addressing this to a satisfactory degree amidst many contextual setbacks.

Increased economic opportunities

The main impact orientation of ILO work is on providing decent work opportunities for the resettled communities. Under outcome 1, four value chains (ground nut, banana, dry fish and coir) have been launched to generate livelihood opportunities for the resettled persons. 400 persons have (141 M: 259 F) have produced groundnut and dry fish. Of 300 ground nut farmers, 67% increased their income. Of 100

⁵³ KII, Ms. Simrin Singh, Country Director, ILO, recorded zoom interview, 05.08.2021

Dry fish producers 53 recorded higher monthly income 100 % compared to the baseline. Income from Banana (170 persons) and Coir (45 persons) are yet to realize as the production is incomplete⁵⁴. The continuity and sustainability of these economic opportunities are strengthened by establishing four market linkages involving three reputed and stable private sector companies and a District-based cooperative.

Inclusion of marginalized members of communities

SURAR has achieved considerable impact in providing decent work opportunities to marginalized members of the communities vis-à-vis the defined objectives and outcomes. For instance, as evident in the case of Jaffna District Fishermen Cooperative Society Union's Federation SURAR has had considerable impact on social norms: though women do not traditionally find employment in fisheries sector, the project has been able to include women headed households through dry fish business. It was reported that FHH were able to secure a monthly income of 35,000 LKR to 45,000 LKR through the dry fish business, and during the special condition created by the Express Pearl tragedy which increased the demand for dry fish, the women secured a monthly income between LKR 45,000 to LKR 156,000/-.

Sense of empowerment created through working with DwPs is evident of the case of 35-year-old Archchunan Vanitha, a recent returnee who lost her hands during the war⁵⁵. The support provided by SURAR has directly impacted the lives of many such returnees and facilitated the complex process of re-integration to normal civilian life after protracted displacement, loss of loved ones, belongings and trauma.

Improved relationships between and among different groups

Although the project was designed to address relationship between different groups at an outcome level, the implementation strategy does not directly contribute to this outcome. Under outcome 1 there is increased networking through their cooperatives among the communities which is an observable impact. So the project may have contributed indirectly to strengthening of intra-community relationships through its work on cooperatives. However, the set of activities implemented under outcome 1 and 2 do not directly address relationship building or trust building per se. The implementation strategy does not include modalities for such as inter-religious or inter community activities, north-south dialogue, exposure activities, social events which in a way may also not be feasible given the COVID situation. The pandemic itself renders most common modalities unfeasible and pressures these to be adapted to more technologically innovative formats. Overall, by design and by default context the project does not make a very strong contribution to improved relationships between communities.

Impact of peaceful norms and behavior

The project has resettlement activities but these are not necessarily social cohesion activities. The observable impact created through the project is that it has made a crucial contribution to the extremely complex, transitional process of resettlement. What the beneficiaries have clearly acknowledged is the importance of the support received to restart their economic activities and transition to normal life.⁵⁶ This can be interpreted as an important contribution to rebuilding the social fabric and may have led to

⁵⁴ Source: Table 6, Summary of Results and Achievements of Outcome 1.

⁵⁵ Human interest story accessed at https://www.ilo.org/colombo/info/pub/pr/WCMS_796645/lang--en/index.htm

⁵⁶ FDGs with Farmer Organization – Chemmalai- FCO, Maritimpeattu Groundnut Producer Sales Society, Palai MPCs, PAPSCS, JDFCSUF and Dry fisheries society on 27, 28, 29.07.2021

decreased community tensions and improved peaceful behavior. The indicators developed are not geared towards capturing these impacts, but it is a safe assumption to make. Activities related to outcome two cannot be assessed yet at an impact level due to its limited scope, level of implementation and state of progress.

Sustainability

Emerging evidence of the sustainability of outcomes

On Outcome 1, there is a 63% progress as mentioned in the section on effectiveness. The outcome indicator is defined as “% of targeted population reporting that their income increased (base line income Rs.30,769). The target for this has been “50% targeted population for livelihood interventions is reached out. The total reached out figure had been 627 (Ground nut 300, Dry Fish 100, Coir 45, Banana 170, Banana Leaf 3, Deep Sea 9). The income flows from ground nut and dry fish have just begun. Therefore, even on those two crops, the sustainability of income patterns cannot be anticipated with a certain level of consistency. It is still too premature to do so. The Income from Banana and Coir are yet to realize as the production is incomplete. Hence, there is no base of evidence available at this stage, even to form a vague idea of the anticipated revenue flows. Usually, in agricultural practice it requires at least four seasons to ascertain the yield pattern and sales revenue. SURAR project activities have not gone through that number of cycles. Hence the forecast of results is difficult at this early stage of the cultivation/production cycles. The views expressed by Agriculture Department staff, leadership of the private companies (coir, banana, ground nut and dry fish) as well as the independent consultant (carried out the initial assessment) suggest the prospects and demand for the respective products/crops. Particularly, at an environment where imports are restricted or banned (for instance, ground nut is banned as an imported item). The retention ability and substance of institutional capacities, systems and structures developed by the cooperatives as a result of the projects, shows a reasonable probability of continuation. This is due to the fact that cooperatives are stable and formal institutions that are driven by systems.

On Outcome 2, the counterpart ministry identifies the following as some of the next steps they have planned:

- Conduct OLP survey in key institutions especially in bilingual areas
- Establishment of a performance ranking system in relation to OLP service delivery
- Incorporate and institutionalize the proposed system with the National Strategy Framework developed under the Ministry as a mean of assessing Accountability on OLP service delivery.

All the above initiatives were to be considered tentative in their design and to be adapted to Covid mitigation strategies due to the volatile situation created by the pandemic. However, this indicates that the ministry has recognized few follow up steps which are crucial in building on the contributions made by SURAR. Another factor in ensuring follow up would be availability of resources.

Overall, in outcome 2, the ‘performance ranking system’ and the ‘award of excellence’ are identified as two prominent mechanisms to ensure long term sustainability of work initiated by SURAR⁵⁷.

Exit strategy and sustainability

⁵⁷ KII, Ms. Gnanie Wikramasinghe, Ministry of Public Administration, telephone communication and written report on activities submitted on 07.08.2021

The fact that SURAR project is to be phased out in September 2021 is being effectively communicated to all the stakeholders (cooperatives, beneficiaries, private companies and government agencies). The awareness creation on the exit is well established. Formulation of a comprehensive exit strategy at a time when most project activities are still being implemented with different degrees of progress is not an easy task. The pressure to wrap-up activities is evident. However, the construction delays, re-scheduling of cultivation due to weather and Covid 19 disruptions cannot be expedited. Though the awareness of the exit is there among stakeholders, the expectation of continuation clearly came up in the FGDs with cooperatives and beneficiaries as well as in the KIIs with private sector companies. David Gram mentioned that they need another season (i.e. early next year) to properly execute the farmer demonstrations on harvesting⁵⁸. Tropicair mentioned that they need time to sort many aspects of the agreement and then launch the part of the work they are supposed to do⁵⁹. The cooperatives as organizations are in a capacity to continue after the exit period. This is due the fact that they are embedded in a strong institutional environment with a proven track record of performance and backed up by a key government agency which is the Department of Cooperative Development. This is well reflected in the following instance: In Mullaitivu, where a storage and processing center is constructed by David Gram with its' investment of Rs. 11 Million⁶⁰ and SURAR's Rs. 4 Million, there was a shortfall of funds. The government's loan of Rs. 3.5 million came through Commissioner of Cooperatives⁶¹. The Provincial Council that functions as the apex body of DoCD, had made a request for ILO to establish a working arrangement with the latter to clearly spell out the exit strategy, taking into account of the first Memorandum of Understanding with ILO-SURAR so that it will strengthen the intended idea of the project i.e. continuity and sustainability by DoCD⁶².

It is not clear if there is an exit strategy for outcome 2 related work as yet, since the project activities are incomplete. However, the implementation of OLP is well accepted and well supported area of intervention, and in the best case scenario, there may be ample opportunities for other UN organizations such as RCO, UNDP, if not ILO directly to continue and build on this work.

Prospects and risks after the project exit

In regard to Outcome 1, there is a key risk that concerns agricultural activity. That is the current move by the government to ban chemical fertilizer and pesticides⁶³. The two value chains that will run a significant risk as a result of this policy will be banana and ground nut. The productivity of both banana and ground nut cultivation is expected to erode substantially if the chemical fertilizer and pesticides are not available⁶⁴. As emphasized very strongly in the KIIs referred to above, the seeds and the soil conditions for both the crops are dependent on chemical fertilizer and pesticides for optimum yields. If this policy is implemented from the next season of cultivation, the results will be unprecedented and would cause a major risk to the economic feasibility and viability of the two value chains. The general demand for ground nut has come down since the Covid 19 period due to the collapse of the tourism industry as hotels are the major buyer⁶⁵.

⁵⁸ KII, K. Raja, David Gram, 24th July 2021.

⁵⁹ KII, Lesley de Silva, Tropicair, 23rd July 2021.

⁶⁰ KII, K. Raja, David Gram, 24th July 2021.

⁶¹ FGD, Maritimipattu Groundnut Producer Sales Society 28th July 2021.

⁶² Mr. P. Vageshan, Deputy Chief Secretary, Northern Province. Mentioned in the Validation Workshop held on 27th August 2021, Reiterated in the feedback to the first draft of this Report, conveyed through the Evaluation Manager in her communications / documentation to Evaluators on 14th September 2021.

⁶³ Presidential Secretariat, Sri Lanka. May 2021. <https://www.presidentsoffice.gov.lk/index.php/2021/04/22/importation-of-chemical-fertilizers-will-be-stopped-completely/> (accessed on 30th July 2021)

⁶⁴ KII, Nirmal Hettiarachchi, JKMS 23rd July 2021, K. Raja, David Gram, 24th July 2021.

⁶⁵ KII, K. Raja, David Gram, 24th July 2021.

This too would cause a risk for the ground nut farmers as the demand will be less due to the above adjustment in the industry if the tourism industry is not revived.

With regard to Outcome 2, the most serious risk in completing the projected activities and prospective follow up work is the pandemic situation aggravated by broader contextual issues governed by political and economic conditions in Sri Lanka. As emphasized strongly in the KII with counterpart ministry official, the will to implement OLP and address social cohesion issues in general is crucial to the success of the work done thus far⁶⁶. The emerging economic, political and environmental conditions may not necessarily support peace related causes, socially as well as politically.

Institutional models for sustainability

Two significant innovations can be found in the project in terms of promoting new systems and mechanisms. One was a mechanism that plays a deliberate role to assure inclusion of the most of vulnerable groups in cooperative activities. As explained in Section on Review of Project Results, a committee was formed consisting of the President, and Secretary of the Coop, Manager, and ILO to identify the most vulnerable members of the resettled community, with priority being given to PwDs, FHH, and elderly persons. The selected vulnerable people were provided with extra support to carry out the livelihood activities, as well as address/overcome any constraints that prevent them from engaging in such activities, to ensure the commitment to 'leave no one behind'⁶⁷. The other example was setting up a Technical Working Group, under the Commissioner of Cooperative Development's chairmanship, a consisting of key personnel from the selected cooperatives, extension officers, and District Cooperative Department from the targeted districts to provide technical support to cooperative members in a more cohesive, and coordinated manner across relevant departments. Furthermore, the committee will liaise with private companies as required. The committee has also appointed a Development Officer from the Cooperative Department to take meeting minutes in order to ensure follow up actions. These mechanisms will continue after the project period as the ownership is vested with the cooperative structures.

With regard to outcome 2 the institutional modalities are clear and well established in the form of the Ministry and OLC. However, the political changes affect the prominence and strength of these institutional mechanisms to a great extent. For instance, the mandates of language and social integration tend to be passed over from ministry to ministry as seen as the changes of the ministries over time (Ministry of Constitutional Affairs, Ministry of National Languages and Social Integration, Ministry of National Dialog, Ministry of Public Administration etc.). On a positive note, the OLC has been an enduring institution and has championed the language rights and OLP and can be expected to provide safe and sustainable institutional anchor.

Value-additions, replication and up-scale and long term sustainability

The project cycle and the project period had been too short to deliver / generate a substantive scale and volume of work and results. The scope had been further reduced due to unprecedented level of disruptions caused by Covid 19 and adverse weather conditions. Hence, it is premature to conclude on the

⁶⁶ KII, Ms. Gnanie Wikramasinghe, Ministry of Public Administration, telephone communication 28.07.2021

⁶⁷ . As a follow-up to the recommendations by the committee, the project has selected 87 PwDs and FHH families for receiving additional support towards encouraging them to engage in Banana (19 persons) and Groundnut (68 persons) cultivations.

value additions, replications and up-scaling of the work and results generated by the project in relation to Outcome 1.

On Outcome 2, though the activities are incomplete, the simplified language audit is highlighted as something that can be easily replicated and up-scaled in bi-lingual divisions for instance, and as seen in the intentions expressed by state officials, has sufficient support and sense of ownership by the ministry to be continued, subject to the availability of resources and the pandemic situation.

Cross-cutting and special aspects

Inclusion of Gender and Disability

The project had a clear focus from conceptualizing stage on issues of gender equality, disability inclusion and non-discrimination in the target community. Gender and disability inclusion is successfully mainstreamed into different layers of implementation as well, such as in the selection of target beneficiaries, selection of cooperative partners, selection of beneficiaries, training and capacity development content, monitoring and evaluation in the form of collecting gender disaggregated data.

In the selection of locations for implementation the project has ensured targeting of most vulnerable communities under both outcomes. In Outcome 1, it has directly worked with resettled communities with a high number of FHH and PwDs in Tellipalai in Jaffna district, Pachchilaipalli (Palai) in Kilinochchi, and Maritimpattu in Mullaitivu. In the selection of cooperative partners and beneficiaries a scoring system was introduced which weighted criteria for being selected for support. The cooperative partners were also encouraged to include women in their administrative and governance board, and some cooperatives amended their constitutions to accommodate these changes to effectively integrate the resettled communities. Collection of data disaggregated by gender, disability and household status given below give a clear indication that even in sectors where women do not traditionally find employment such as fisheries, the project has been able to include women headed households through dry fish business. It was reported that FHH were able to secure a monthly income of 35,000 LKR to 45,000 LKR through the dry fish business, and during the special condition created by the Express Pearl tragedy which increased the demand for dry fish, the women secured a monthly income between LKR 45,000 to LKR 75,000/-.

Table 9: Mobilization of Vulnerable Sections from Resettled Persons

Society	Sector	FHH	Disable		Total	Total
			Male	Female	Male	Female
PAPSCS	Banana Cultivation	17	3		124	47
FOC	Groundnut	48	11	7	141	160
PMPCS	Coir	10	0	0	2	43
JDFCSUF	Dry Fish & Deep sea Fishing	14	0	0	9	100
		89	14	7	276	350

Source: Data provided at the KII, Field Coordinator, Ms. Thanapalasubramaniam Theepavathana on 03.08.2021

Inclusion of Human Rights and International Labour Standards

SURAR has managed to set up processes that are inclusive in recognizing the rights of all persons, including all vulnerable groups to livelihood, access to services etc. It has successful mainstreamed strategies for gender sensitivity and inclusion of DwP and FHH in the project design, implementation and evaluation of results. Clear processes exist for collecting data with clear gender-specific indicators, and data on DwPs⁶⁸.

Project has facilitated a process of inclusion in the governance of cooperatives, selection of beneficiaries and has created a fair amount of opportunities for individuals to network and raise issues that affect them. The Jaffna District Fishermen Cooperative Society Unions' Federation is evidence of how the facilitation of platforms for networking has enabled the community to voice their concerns, rights to highest authorities in the country.⁶⁹

Social Dialogue and Social Cohesion

While the project has certainly improved the reception of ILO labour standards, value of networking, mainstreaming gender and disability and ensuring the specific needs of vulnerable groups are addressed it is not clear how the project has contributed to a dialogue on social cohesion and peace. It has certainly created awareness on gender and disability to a satisfactory degree. The target communities, with a few exceptions, tend to be from the same ethnic, religious, linguistic and economic bracket. It is not clear as to how the project has brought different communities together through its interventions. This is a result of the geographical focus of the outcome 1 and a lack of coordination between outcome 1 and 2.

At outcome 2 level, again the activities focus on the language issue. Though a greater possibility to address social dialogue and social cohesion exists at this level, the selected activities did not reflect integration of social cohesion to a satisfactory level. Simultaneously, two KIIs highlighted the need to work on attitudinal changes and deep rooted issues of social cohesion.

At outcome 1 level, opportunities exist, especially in the area of market linkages to establish North-South dialogues and connections. Outcome 2 can include mainstreaming attitudes and perceptions related to social cohesion in to audits and surveys that may result in fine tuning and understanding the context at a deeper level. If continued, the project needs to introduce clear modalities to establish platforms for social dialogue and people to people (P2P) connections.

Facilitating and Limiting factors

One of the key success factors in the mainstreaming the above topics in practice can be directly attributed to the key persons involved in project management, especially the National Project Coordinator (NPC) and Field Coordinator (FC). They both display a high degree of sensitivity to the needs of the target communities they work in, including the special vulnerabilities of specific social groups such as agricultural and fishing communities and a genuine respect and need for inclusion and human rights. This has ensured that these concepts were not limited and were actually translated into practice. The M&E Officer, has maintained a clear focus on collecting gender disaggregated data, helping the project to stay on track on mainstreaming these issues.

The Scoring System developed by the team in the selection of beneficiaries has been extremely effective in mainstreaming gender across different activities, such as women in cultivation, women in decision-making bodies. This has created a simple, objective and transparent system for selection of beneficiaries

⁶⁸ KII, Field Coordinator, Ms. Thanapalasubramaniam Theepavathana on 03.08.2021

⁶⁹ FDG with Jaffna District Fishermen Cooperative Society Union's Federation, recorded zoom interview, 29.07.2021

and has ensured Do No Harm within the communities the project has worked in. Please see Annex 8 for more information on the scoring system.

In terms of limiting factors, one can highlight COVID induced situation as well as the adverse weather conditions and the change of political climate (on peace and reconciliation) due to change of government impeding implementation of project activities in both outcome 1 and 2. The other limiting factor seems to be disconnect between activities under outcome 1 and 2 which is a design issue at the stage of conceptualization of the project.

7. Conclusions

As mentioned before, the implementation of the project was severely impeded by the lockdowns and travel restrictions relating to three waves of Covid 19 and adverse climatic and weather conditions. Hence the project performance should be interpreted taking into account of above significant constraint. As some of the operations of the project are not yet completed it is premature to make a comprehensive conclusion. However, the following tentative conclusions can be made taking into account the activities, outputs and results that can be observed as of 30 June 2021:

The project had been well positioned within the broader policies of the Sri Lankan government (on peace, reconciliation and resettlement), broader policies and programmatic priorities of the ILO as well as the UN, including SDGs. As such, the project intervention had proved to be relevant, timely and strategically catering to the needs and priorities of Sri Lanka as well as the two agencies that collaborated.

The indicators in Outcome 1 level are coherent and captures gender disaggregated data and data pertaining to vulnerable communities successfully. In Outcome 2, outcome level indicators are derived directly from the original Monitoring Plan⁷⁰, and needs to be adapted better to capture the improvisation after the change of government policy on peace and SURAR contributions. SURAR had successfully built past ILO experiences of LEED, LEED+ and Empower Project drawing from their networks and lessons learned. It creates satisfactory synergies with other UN bodies and counterpart government institutions and compliments the overall ongoing work of these organisations.

As far as effectiveness is concerned the activities carried out under Outcome 1 have reached the targeted areas and numbers (also with due emphasis on vulnerabilities such as FHH, PwD and the poor), generating the targeted value chains to generate livelihoods (except Coir which is to be launched shortly), while establishing and strengthening cooperatives (as per target) with collaborations with the private sector (as per target) for market linkages and under the ownership of the DoCD. At an attribution level, the livelihood support by ILO is considered significant by the government officials as well as beneficiaries as the support from others have been on infrastructure. It is premature to assess effectiveness of Outcome 2 since activities are still under way. From what has been achieved it has created good rapport with stakeholders and has effectively complemented their work by developing a simplified tracking tool. Capacities in the ministry for consultative processes have somewhat enhanced. There is a considerable attribution gap between the potential results of outcome 2 activities and the overall goal of reconciliation and improved relationships between groups.

From an efficiency point of view, the project had performed well in utilizing limited financial and human resources to achieve target objectives. Given the challenges brought about by COVID, the project has managed time effectively as well. Considerable savings have been made and are being re-channeled to replicate activities among beneficiary communities. Resource management is excellent.

Two value chains, Ground Nut and Dry Fish, have recorded positive results with income where 63% and 100% (target was 50%) of the beneficiaries have earned beyond the targeted income levels. Banana harvest and sales is expected in August onwards. Coir production is yet to be launched. In regard to Outcome 1, a reasonable probability to generate further impact can be expected given the market linkages established. On outcome 2, it is premature to assess impact as the activities have not been completed.

⁷⁰ Annex 4: Project Monitoring Plan, June 2019, Result Framework for the JPP (draft)

Three out of four value chains (except coir) are rolling out well with supportive market linkages. The coir production is due but the market linkage is established. The DoCD asserts its role as the overall custodian of the project after the withdrawal and assured its' nurturing role of cooperatives. As such, the initiatives under Outcome 1 shows a high level of sustainability. However, a comprehensive exit plan, taking into account the remaining work of the project needs to be formulated as a basis for handover of responsibilities to the DoCD and private sector companies. Outcome 2 needs clear exit strategies to ensure the results of the completed survey are properly disseminated, used effectively in advocacy strategies and stakeholders follow up and build on the intervention.

Cross cutting themes (gender, disability and vulnerability) have been successfully addressed by employing simple clear and transparent methodologies such as the scoring system. The project demonstrates high sensitivity mainstreaming gender issues and the inclusion of marginalized groups within its target communities. It collects gender disaggregated data systematically and use them properly for project activities. Overall the project shows a remarkable degree of integration of human rights, inclusion of vulnerable groups and gender.

Reflecting on the Theory of Change, PPP, results and emerging impacts

To sum up, SURAR was aimed to help advance the resettlement of returned Tamil people through livelihood support and support reconciliation efforts through improving the delivery of services in Tamil language by front-line institutions targeting 900 conflict-affected and resettled households with high vulnerability, including female-headed households, conflict-affected youth, and persons with disabilities in Tellipalai in Jaffna district, Pachchilaipalli (Palai) in Kilinochchi, and Maritimpattu in Mullaitivu. The overall, outcomes of SURAR was "Contributing to sustainable peace in Sri Lanka by harnessing support from multiple partners for strategic, coherent and sustainable support to fast-track the advancement of priority transitional justice and confidence building measures, guided by the PPP." Under this there were two outcomes

Outcome 1: The State prioritizes sustainable return, resettlement and/or local integration of conflict-displaced persons (IDPs, IDP returnees, and refugee returnees) in a safe and dignified manner to rebuild lives and communities (**Output:** The UN in Sri Lanka provides strategic, coherent, timely and targeted support towards the resettlement process in the Northern Province with an emphasis on ensuring durable solutions and promoting confidence in the process).

Outcome 2: Positive relationships and mutual understanding between and among different groups, and between groups and the state, contribute to peaceful co-existence and a sense of belonging in Sri Lanka (**Output:** The UN in Sri Lanka provides strategic, coherent, timely and targeted support to strengthen reconciliation and social cohesion).

The PPP outlines four key areas, Transitional Justice, Reconciliation, Good Governance, and durable solutions for Resettlement as key intervention areas in post-conflict Sri Lanka. SURAR aimed to contribute to peacebuilding through making a modest contribution to resettlement efforts of the conflict affected communities to further resettlement on one hand and working on structural issues underlying conflict such as language barrier by supporting government institutions to track their performances in implementing an inclusive language barrier to further reconciliation. The two outcomes were meant to address two stages and levels of peacebuilding needs, also contributing to the two major pillars of resettlement and reconciliation outlines in PPP. In theory, if resettling communities achieve stability through sustainable livelihoods and if key government institutions are inclusive in terms of language in

service delivery, considerable contributions can be made to peace and reconciliation. However, in practice, economic development does not by default change perception of war-affected communities towards other groups/former conflicting parties or vice versa. Ensuring inclusive language use in service delivery can contribute to reduction of grievances; however, a survey by itself is inadequate in making a significant contribution to the reduction of grievances. There is a considerable attribution gap between both outcomes and its ultimate objective of resettlement and reconciliation. This is further exacerbated by the weak connection between the activities under two outcomes. Possible synergies, opportunities for reflection may have been missed. While it is possible to remain positive on the projects contribution to resettlement, it is difficult to assess its contribution to reconciliation due to several reasons: certain shortcomings in terms of project design and indicators and well as disruptions in implementation due to the COVID 19 pandemic hinder emerging results. The key short coming in terms of the project design is that the project inadequately facilitates spaces, opportunities and modalities for social cohesion and reconciliation in both its outcomes.

With the analysis above, it can be concluded that SURAR has contributed well towards the Outcome 1 with some limited pending work to be completed. Outcome 2 has been substantially affected by the COVID induced delays and restrictions and only the pilot survey has been completed. Therefore, it is difficult to assess the degree of contribution towards its outcome, which is set at a higher level, directly derived from PPP indicator. Even if the activities are completed, it may not be possible to attribute the impacts clearly due to attribution gap. Overall, the project has concentrated on implementing a set of activities under the 2 outcomes parallel without much coordination, interaction and synergies, thereby missing an opportunity to create dialogue platforms between state and conflict affected communities as well as North South dialogue of farming communities, cooperative and market linkages. Further, models for mainstreaming dialogue into economic and livelihood activities could have been explored, had the project been more long term.

The overall outcome of SURAR is “Contributing to sustainable peace in Sri Lanka by harnessing support from multiple partners for strategic, coherent and sustainable support to fast-track the advancement of priority transitional justice and confidence building measures, guided by the PPP”. Creating sustainable peace after protracted conflict requires addressing deep-rooted attitudinal, relational and structural causes of conflict within a multi-cultural society. It requires a long-term holistic approach that recognizes the need to adapt set strategies for varying context changes to play an accompanying role to communities in their way to recovery and state structures attempting to be more inclusive. Given its limitations of time and resources, and the unexpected challenges of political change and pandemic, it has taken steady steps towards achieving some of its objectives. A more long-term concentrated effort is required to achieve the said objectives to a satisfactory degree.

8. Recommendations

As mentioned before, the completion of project cycles of different sub-components of the project is at different levels. The extended project period is till end of September 2021. With a yet another wave of Covid-19 is being on the rise (as of August 2021, when this report is being written), particularly with a spread of the Delta-variant and alarming death rates and hospitals being challenged with their capacity to cater to the rising cases, it is doubtful if remaining project work can be duly completed by end September.

Recommendation 1(Main Recommendation): For the donors and ILO and UN RCO to explore a way out for another extension of the project for a period of three to six months from October 2021 to carry out the particular incomplete tasks.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implications	Resource Implications
Donors and ILO and UN RCO	High	After the Final Independent Evaluation	Staff Time for Field Work (part time and phased out basis)

Recommendation 2(Outcome1): *Banana Cultivation*: Consolidate the work at the harvest period (taking place in August 2021 onwards) and coordinate / monitor the marketing linkage taking place between the farmers / cooperative and Keels (JKMS). Introduce corrective action if the market linkage is not taking place as expected. A final phasing out plan is made between ILO, cooperative concerned and the DoCD to ensure continuity and sustainability.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implications	Resource Implications
ILO	Medium	After the Final Independent Evaluation	Staff Time for Field Work (part time and phased out basis)

Recommendation 3(Outcome1): *Ground Nut Cultivation*: David Gram wishes to organize the demonstrations in the Maha Season (from October 2021 to Jan/Feb 2021) as a crucial component of their technical advice to the farmers. This activity should be coordinated between David Gram and the farmers / cooperative. In addition, the completion of the Processing Center in Mulaitivu needs to be monitored and coordinated. A final phasing out plan is made between ILO, cooperative concerned, David Gram and the DoCD to ensure continuity and sustainability.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implications	Resource Implications
ILO	Medium	After the Final Independent Evaluation	Staff Time for Field Work (part time and phased out basis)

Recommendation 4(Outcome 1): *Coir Processing*: The production process is to be launched, coordinated and monitored. A final phasing out plan is made between ILO, cooperative concerned, Tropicair and the DoCD to ensure continuity and sustainability.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implications	Resource Implications
ILO	High	After the Final Independent Evaluation	Staff Time for Field Work (part time and phased out basis)

Recommendation 5(Outcome 1): *Dry Fish*: The dry fish project had taken off the ground well. But it needs a further round of monitoring to assess the success of the first round is an exceptional one and that can be sustained. Accordingly, effect corrective measures. A final phasing out plan is made between ILO, cooperative concerned, JDCSUF and the DoCD to ensure continuity and sustainability.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implications	Resource Implications
ILO	Low	After the Final Independent Evaluation	Staff Time for Field Work (part time and phased out basis)

Recommendation 6(Outcome 1): *Peacebuilding and Social Cohesion*: Create spaces for activities that lead to improvements of relationships between different group through market linkages with the South and also by linking with cooperatives, farmer groups from the South.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implications	Resource Implications
ILO	Low	Wrap up phase and after the Final Independent Evaluation	Staff Time for Field Work (part time and phased out basis)

Recommendation 7(Main Recommendation): For ILO, RCO and UNDP, create a proper exit strategy for language related activities where the achievements are taken over by other stakeholders in the event there is no continuation of the project activities.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implications	Resource Implications
ILO / RCO / UNDP	Low	Wrap up phase and after the Final Independent Evaluation	Staff Time for Field Work (part time and phased out basis)

Recommendation 8(Outcome 2): Service delivery tracking system : For donors, given the delays and restrictions caused by COVID 19, no cost extension to complete the survey and effectively disseminate results to stakeholders.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implications	Resource Implications
Donor	Low	After the Final Independent Evaluation	Staff Time for Field Work (part time and phased out basis)

Recommendation 9(Outcome 2): Advocacy strategy: Use results of the survey effectively in advocating for language inclusion and raising awareness as well as increasing the number of Tamil speaking state officials, or practical solutions such as outsourcing language and translation services and clear and measurable incentives for bilingual officers. An award scheme may not be realistic given the contextual challenges.

Responsible Unit(s)	Priority	Time Implications	Resource Implications
ILO / RCO / UNDP	Low	After the Final Independent Evaluation	Staff Time for Field Work (part time and phased out basis)

9. Lessons learnt and potential good practices

Given the original short project period (18 months) and further shortened due to at least three spells of disruptions, the actual and effective project implementation period was very limited. As an ILO staffer remarked in an KII with the evaluators, they (ILO) had only about six months (cumulatively) to do every things as the disruptions from lockdowns and restrictions due to Covid 19 as well as adverse weather conditions prevented a process of continuous implementation of the project. As a result, the trajectories or cycles of different components of the project are at different stages of completion. The full project cycle as planned has not taken place due to the reasons mentioned above. As such, it is still premature to identify the lessons learned and good practices from the project. However, the following lessons and good practices are discerned from the work carried out so far. These lessons learned and good practices are presented in the required ILO templates under Annexes with the same reference given below.

Lessons Learned

LL 1: Sound efforts of identifying and targeting of the most significant need/s of the beneficiaries – Livelihoods -- have brought about positive results of successful outreach of the beneficiaries who required the livelihood support most.

LL 2: Sound efforts of identifying and targeting of the most significant areas and locations for the project have brought about positive results of successful outreach of the beneficiaries who required the livelihood support most.

LL3: Economic activity per se may not lead to social cohesion unless inclusive processes that facilitate community change and spaces for inter-community dialogue are not created, built in to the activities. Economic empowerment does not necessarily lead to trust, improved relationships or attitudinal change.

LL4: Recognizing the attribution gap between outputs and outcomes in peacebuilding projects, difference between resettlement and reconciliation not being clearly defined

LL5: Short term projects (less than 3-4 years) may not be able to address deep-rooted attitudinal, relational and structural issues related to peacebuilding, social cohesion, involving trust-building, improving relationships and institutionalizing inclusive strategies to a satisfactory degree.

Good Practices

GP 1: SURAR project's deliberate efforts of identifying and targeting of the most significant need/s of the beneficiaries – Livelihoods -- have brought about positive results of successful outreach.

GP 2: SURAR project's deliberate efforts of identifying and targeting of the most significant areas where resettlement process takes place with a long history of spells of displacement have taken place have brought about positive results of successful outreach.

GP3: SURAR project's focus on a restorative approach than a retributive approach by addressing the need for economic stability of resettling communities is a successful approach to stay engaged and contribute positively in a volatile political context which may not be conducive to addressing other peacebuilding issues related to transitional justice, reparation and reconciliation.

GP4: The Scoring System developed by defining clear criteria and scores in the selection of beneficiaries (women in cultivation/women in decision making bodies) has given a simple, clear and a precise methodology to mainstream gender issues effectively.

10. Annexes

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

International Labour Organization

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation (SURAR) through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace Project

Independent Final Evaluation

Key facts

Title:	Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation(SURAR) through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace
DC Code:	LKA/19/03/USA
Administrative Unit in charge of the project	CO-Colombo
Backstopping unit	COOP
Type of evaluation	Independent Final Evaluation
Total project budget	USD 543,210
Project Duration	25 September 2019 to 25 March 2021 (with no cost extension until 30 September 2021)
Donors	United States- Department of State (US DOS)
P&B outcome (s) under evaluation	Outcome 3
SDG under evaluation	SDG 8 - Decent work and economic growth SDG 16 – Peace Justice and Strong Institutions
Evaluation Manager	Aye Pearl Hlaing, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, Entrepreneurship and MSME support/SCORE Project, ILO Myanmar

Table of contents

List of Acronyms	3
Introduction.....	4
Background of the project.....	5
Purpose and scope and clients.....	8
Evaluation scope	9
Evaluation criteria and questions	9
Methodology to be followed	12
Deliverables	14
Management arrangements and tentative time frame	16
Application requirements.....	17
Compliance with UN norms and standards for evaluation	18
Annexes.....	19

List of Acronyms

CBO	Community Based Organization
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
DoCD	Department of Cooperative Development
EVAL	Evaluation office
HQ	Headquarters
ILO	International Labour Organization
JPP	Joint Programme for Peace
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
OECD/DAC	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/ Development Assistance Committee
P&B	Programme and budget
PPP	Peacebuilding Priority Plan
PwD	Persons with Disabilities
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SURAR	Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation
ToR	Terms of Reference
US DOS	United States – Department of State
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UN	United Nations
USD	United States dollar
UNHRC	United Nations Human Rights Council
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UN RCO	United Nations Resident Coordinator Office

Introduction

Under the framework of the UN's Joint Programme for Peace (JPP), the project aims to provide timely and strategically focused assistance towards two peacebuilding priorities that tackle core grievances of the minority Tamil community. The interventions contribute towards securing and sustaining the peacebuilding process, through helping to build trust and confidence amongst the Tamil community in the direction in which the country is moving.

The JPP is a new and innovative initiative, launched in April 2019 by the Government of Sri Lanka and the UN. Within the time frame of eighteen months, the UN look to deliver high impact results by supporting the two interventions i) Scaling-up ongoing livelihood support through engaging cooperatives and the private sector, as part of a holistic package of resettlement assistance designed to enable dignified and sustainable returns for lands released by the military; and ii) Kick starting the process of working in a joined-up way on reconciliation, through the introduction of an innovative service tracking tool to monitor and incentivise improvements in ability of front-line institutions to deliver public services in the Tamil language.

Under the resettlement and social cohesion pillars of the JPP, ILO Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace Project (SURAR) funded by United States- Department of State (US DOS) is aimed to help advance the resettlement of returned Tamils through livelihood support and support reconciliation efforts through improving the delivery of services in Tamil language by front-line institutions targeted 900 conflict-affected and resettled households with high vulnerability, including female-headed households, conflict-affected youth, and persons with disabilities in Tellipalai in Jaffna district, Pachchilaipalli (Palai) in Kilinochchi, and Maritimé pattu in Mullaitivu. ILO intends to draw on its extensive experience working with cooperatives and the private sector to promote sustainable economic opportunities for resettling families in three of these target locations.

The final independent evaluation of the project is undertaken in line with the funding agreement between UN and ILO and in accordance with the ILO evaluation policy. The proposed Independent Final Evaluation seeks to assess overall project progress against the intended objective/outcomes, validity of the theory of change in the project document. In turn, it addresses the project's key challenges, lessons learnt and provide recommendations for improved delivery of quality works in similar future ILO and other related projects.

This document describes the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the independent final evaluation to be undertaken, adhering to ILO's policies and procedures on evaluations (see Annex 2). More concretely, the evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the resettlement and reconciliation as well as assess the contribution towards promoting ILO's mandates and goals to help ILO constituents and staff members support decent work and social justice. It will be carried out by an external independent evaluator in close consultation with the project and key stakeholders in Sri Lanka. Responsibility for management of the evaluation is with the ILO's Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, based at the ILO Regional office- Bangkok who has no prior involvement in the project with oversight provided by the ILO Evaluation Office.

The evaluation will be from 7 July 2021 to 30 September 2021 (with field work and interviews ideally conducted during 12-22 August 2021, will follow on country's COVID-19 restrictions and guidelines. Will adapt based on COVID-19 updated). It will be conducted in compliance with the principles, norms and standards for project evaluation set forth in the ILO policy guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 3rd edition (2021) and the ILO Handbook on "How to design, monitor and evaluate peacebuilding results in employment

for peace and resilience programmes”(Annex 12).

Background of the project

The Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP) which support directly to the Resolution, developed by the President of Sri Lanka and the UN Secretary General in 2016 and it is the base document through which the different stakeholders align their interventions towards resettlement and reconciliation in the country. It is developed through a wide range of discussions and consultations with multi-stakeholders, including that of CBOs, NGOs, Development Partners and local government entities and the plan identifies strategic peacebuilding priorities broadly in line with commitments under the UNHRC Resolution, organized according to four pillars, namely: transitional justice, reconciliation, good governance, and resettlement and durable solutions.

Under the framework of the PPP(2016), the UN has delivered programmes amounting to \$37million, with \$17million funded by the UN Peacebuilding Fund. These have been designed to complement the national investment which was estimated at US\$87million. With many of the initial financial partnerships under the PPP having ended or nearing completion, the Government and the UN recognise a pressing need for longer-term financing to provide continuity and sustainability for the delivery of the Government’s commitments. Key amongst the needs is support towards resettlement and reconciliation.

Resettlement of Tamil communities displaced during the conflict has been a gradually ongoing process for the last ten years. However, it is now at a critical juncture, where sustained support is urgently required for durably resettling the remaining caseload of 8,3993 IDP families and addressing pending socio-economic needs on the ground as land is released by the military. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the lead agency providing livelihood and resettlement assistance, has conducted needs assessments together with communities and community based organisations (CBOs) for the selected resettlement areas in the Northern and Eastern Provinces that includes the areas in Jaffna, Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu.

These assessments highlight the resettlement community’s economic and livelihood needs. Without a comprehensive ‘last-mile approach’, there is a risk that hard-won gains in terms of trust and confidence amongst the Tamil community will be eroded. The resettlement process is also being closely watched as an indication of whether the Government’s commitments to peace and reconciliation are credible. A slowing down or slippage in the process could fuel Tamil hard line elements and potentially risk de-stabilising the overall peacebuilding process.

Linkage to specific SDG and related targets and indicator

The overall project goal to support Resettlement and Reconciliation (SURAR) is strategically focused assistance towards two peacebuilding priorities that tackle core grievances of the Tamil community, under the framework of the UN’s Joint Programme for Peace (JPP). Formed part of the specific targets for SDG Goal number 8 - Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all and SDG Goal number 16.6.2 satisfaction with public services.

The project is designed to address the ILO’s priority themes for gender equality, peacebuilding, environmental sustainability, social dialogue and inclusive development outcomes in Sri Lanka by realizing economic empowerment, social integration, and resilience towards social mobilisation efforts to empower female heads of households, persons with disability and other vulnerable groups including people from ethnic minority groups to join and access the opportunities.

Under the resettlement pillar of the JPP, the UN in partnership with the government is supporting communities returning to land recently released by the military, and those earlier resettlement communities facing barriers to sustainable resettlement. In 2019, the UN in partnership with the government has identified seven Divisional Secretariat Divisions (DSDs) in the Northern Province as priorities for resettlement assistance, including the areas released by Government during the early part of the year. These include, three DSDs in Jaffna District, two in Kilinochchi and two in Mullaitivu.

Under the social cohesion pillar of the JPP, the UN support the Government to put in place measures that promote increased accessibility to key public services in the Tamil language. It will do this through a tripartite partnership with the Ministry of Public Administration and the Official Languages Commission, that aims to introduce and fully institutionalise a simple tool to track service delivery in Sinhala and Tamil. It is anticipated that by using the information generated by the tool strategically, the Government will be able to incentivise, catalyse and drive change across front-line institutions.

The project draws on the ILO's extensive experience working with cooperatives and the private sector to promote sustainable economic opportunities for resettling families in three of these target locations had been determined in close consultation with local Government partners, based on criteria including: i) opportunity to reach a large segment of the vulnerable return population, ii) presence of functioning cooperatives, iii) growth potential of economic sectors, and iv) potential to engage large private sector firms. The project interventions in these areas (Tellipalai in Jaffna district, Pachchilaipalli (Palai) in Kilinochchi, and Maritimipattu in Mullaitivu) directly complement the ongoing work of UNDP which is focusing on provision of basic inputs, rehabilitation of social infrastructure and promotion of innovative and diversified income generation opportunities. Project support the social cohesion components to promote positive relationships and mutual understanding between and among different groups, and between groups and the state, contribute to peaceful co-existence and a sense of belonging in Sri Lanka.

ILO adopt a strategic two-pronged approach:

- 1) *As a first step, working with the Cooperatives Department, ILO will capitalise on existing engagement with local cooperatives to scale up and extend fast and effective livelihood interventions that materialise rapidly and help member households establish economically viable livelihoods.*
- 2) *As a second, parallel and complementary step, ILO will focus on facilitating market access and widening market opportunities through engaging private sector partners interested in establishing backward supply chain linkages. Specifically, ILO will draw on its local knowledge to promote opportunities for companies to invest, supporting them to work through cooperatives as a bridging mechanism for cost-effectively reaching local producers/suppliers at the necessary scale.*

The overall objective, outcomes and outputs of the project:

Overall project outcome statement: Contributing to sustainable peace in Sri Lanka by harnessing support from multiple partners for strategic, coherent and sustainable support to fast-track the advancement of priority transitional justice and confidence building measures, guided by the PPP.

Outcome 1 (aligned to the Resettlement outcome in the JPP and PPP): The State prioritizes sustainable return, resettlement and/or local integration of conflict-displaced persons (IDPs, IDP returnees, and refugee returnees) in a safe and dignified manner to rebuild lives and communities.

Output: The UN in Sri Lanka provides strategic, coherent, timely and targeted support towards the resettlement process in the Northern Province with an emphasis on ensuring durable solutions and promoting confidence in the process.

Key Results under project output (as of December 2020):

- *The project entered into collaboration with four cooperatives during the reporting period. The Department of Cooperative Development's (DoCD) existing training modules have been updated to build management, book keeping, accounting, and governance capacities. A consultant has been hired to carry out a capacity assessment and develop training content on business development and marketing, for cooperatives*
- *Four hundred and seventy one families have cultivated around 478 acres of Groundnut and Banana with the provision of good quality seeds / seedlings by the project in the Mullaitivu and Jaffna districts*
- *Six hundred and twenty two newly resettled persons (M324:F298) including 37 Female Heads of Households (FHH) and 11 Persons with Disabilities (PwD) received new membership in the selected four cooperatives as a result of the awareness initiatives carried out by the DoCD through the project. As part of the market systems approach, the project has initiated a discussion with David Gram, a local market leader in the groundnut sector, to secure access to a larger market and other services and input.*

Outcome 2 (aligned to the social cohesion outcome in the JPP and PPP): Positive relationships and mutual understanding between and among different groups, and between groups and the state, contribute to peaceful co-existence and a sense of belonging in Sri Lanka.

Output: The UN in Sri Lanka provides strategic, coherent, timely and targeted support to strengthen reconciliation and social cohesion

Key Results under project output (as of December 2020):

- *Service Tracking tool developed and finalized after pilot survey. Phase two survey to be conducted in 2020.*
- *Ministry and Languages Commission officials attended and participated in all aspects of pilot survey design and implementation*
- *Agreement reached to introduce award for best performing institution reached with government counterparts*

Theory of Change

The overall theory of change for the JPP is outlined below:

IF the Government has access to strategically targeted, harmonized and sustainable international assistance,

***THEN** it will be better able to move forward on its commitments towards peacebuilding through processes that adhere to international standards and address the legacy of past violations and abuses in a comprehensive, principled, rights-based, and victim-centred manner; thus enabling Sri Lankan society to consider that justice is being done and restoring a sense of confidence in State institutions, thereby preventing violations and abuses from happening again and contributing to long term peace.*

The following two are Theory of Change of SURAR under JPP

1) Resettlement:

***IF** Government leads participatory, inclusive and rights-based partnerships and processes to achieve durable solutions*

***THEN** it will demonstrate its commitment to resolving longstanding grievances of the conflict-displaced population.*

2) Reconciliation:

***IF** individuals from different groups (ethno-religious, socio-economic and gender) interact on a levelplaying field*

***THEN** they will increase levels of mutual understanding, improve/strengthen their relationship and find common ground.*

Project Management Set up

The JPP was initially guided at the strategic level by the Peacebuilding Board and governed at the operational level by outcome level Advisory Committees. Since the political transition and absence of a high level board, the JPP has been re-framed to adjust to the new context with project level government counterparts.

ILO had four dedicated staff, which include two field staff including National Project Coordinator, stationed at the ILO field office in Kilinochchi. The ILO Colombo office sits the International staff (CTA and private Sector Development Specialist) and national M&E officer who manages central level coordination reporting for the project and another administrative/finance assistant. For the social cohesion activities, two officers from UN RCO and a UNV initiated the designing of survey, and the technical specialist from UNDP for Peacebuilding is managing the implementation.

Purpose, Scope and Clients

As the total budget of the project “(SURAR) Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace” is USD 543,210, the ILO evaluation policy requires that it go through an independent final evaluation, managed by the ILO.

The main purposes of the final independent evaluation is to promote accountability to key stakeholders and donor, and to enhance learning within the ILO and key stakeholders. The findings

will be used to improve design and implementation of future relevant projects/programs. The results will also feed into the review of JPP.

The project's performance will be reviewed with strict regard to six evaluation criteria: relevance and strategic fit, coherence (validity of the design), effectiveness, efficiency, impact orientation and sustainability and to document lessons learnt and possible good practices. The relevant tripartite constituents and key stakeholders will be consulted and their inputs will be taken into consideration throughout the evaluation process.

The evaluation is expected to:

1. Independently assess project progress against the results framework;
2. Inform the ILO and UN on how the current project strategy is working, and provide recommendations on what could be changed to increase the likelihood that the project reaches its objectives;
3. List the project's key challenges through independent organizational and operational arrangements by in-country partners and how these challenges can be addressed;
4. Inform the ILO and UN on feasibility of sustainability strategy of SURAR in Sri Lanka; and,
5. Identify good practices and lessons learned that would contribute to learning and knowledge development of the ILO and project stakeholders.

The clients of the evaluation are:

1. Key stakeholders involved in the project including government stakeholders in Sri Lanka;
2. ILO backstopping Unit and other relevant entities at HQ; and the donors
3. Project staff, ILO Country Office and UN RCO in Colombo.

Evaluation scope

The evaluation will cover three areas Jaffna, Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu period from 28 June 2021 to 8 September 2021, to assessing the validity of the theory of change. It also should clearly identify learning (i.e. what worked, what did not, what should have been done differently) related to promoting the positive relationships and mutual understanding between and among different groups, provision of basic inputs, access to services, rehabilitation of social infrastructure and promotion of innovative and diversified income generation opportunities through the empower female heads of households, persons with disability and other vulnerable groups including people from ethnic minority groups to join and access the opportunities in northern Sri Lanka, which will be useful for informing future peace building projects in Sri Lanka.

The evaluation should cover expected (i.e. planned) and unexpected results in terms of non-planned outputs and outcomes (i.e. side effects or externalities). Some of these unexpected changes could be as relevant as the ones planned. Therefore, the evaluator should reflect on them for learning purposes.

Evaluation criteria and questions

The evaluation should be carried out in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy, the ILO Guideline, the UN System Evaluation Standards and Norms, and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard.

The evaluation will examine the project (all 6 components) along the following evaluation criteria and key evaluation questions (in line with ILO evaluation policy guidelines Annex 1):

Relevance and strategic fit

1. How is the project effort for sustaining project activities i) aligned with the ILO's framework on (Recommendation No. 205 on Employment and Decent Work for Peace and Resilience), UN joint statements/policy papers: ILO-PBSO-UNDP-WB (2016), Joint Statement on Employment programmes for peace and PPP ii) responding to needs of constituents and iii) consistent with donors' priorities – at country and global levels?
2. How does the project align with and support overall strategies (the UN peacebuilding fund, the Government of Sri Lanka's national development and employment policies and its Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP), the relevant ILO priorities and policy, DWCP, gender mainstreaming, Strategic Programme Framework and relevant SDG targets)?
3. Does the project design (priorities, outcomes, outputs and activities) address the stakeholder needs that were identified? Is the intervention strategy appropriate for achieving the stated project purpose and what are the lessons learned in the design and implementation of the project?
4. What is the perception of local people with regard to the relationship of the activity to peacebuilding?
5. How responsive are the project results to the Sri Lanka Peacebuilding sector's current and future? This should include assessment of relevance pre-COVID 19 and during COVID 19.

Coherence

1. How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project document in addressing the project's progress? Do the indicators measure the contribution to peace? Are the indicators gender sensitive? Are the means of verification for the indicators appropriate?
2. Does the project synergies and interlinkages with other interventions carried out by ILO Colombo.
3. Does the project outcomes and outputs have consistent, harmonies and coordination with UN and other actors' interventions in Sri Lanka.

Effectiveness

1. How far have the objectives of the project as a whole as well as for the six components and their linked or joined activities been achieved? Will the project be likely to achieve its planned objectives upon completion? How effective is the project in achieving results for:
i) strengthen the cooperatives departments to expand their

memberships ii) support cooperatives to increase productive capacity of their members and increase the effectiveness of services iii) promote increased market opportunities in target areas by engaging private sector partners to link with cooperatives and establish backward supply links iv) institutionalize a tool to track delivery of public services in Sinhala and Tamil by keyfront-line institutions and in bilingual regional areas

2. What are the main constraints, problems and areas in need of further attention?
3. To what extent is the progress towards expected results attributable to the project? What alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives (if any)?
4. Have capacities of the Government Counterparts, private sector and other relevant stakeholders been strengthened through the Project interventions?

Efficiency

1. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) been allocated strategically and used efficiently?
2. Are management capacities adequate and facilitate good results and efficient delivery? Is there a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved? Does the project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national implementing partners? How is communication between the project team and the national implementing partners? How does the project management monitor project performance and results?
3. Is the project on track in its timeline of activities and achievement of end-of-project targets for sustainable beneficiaries (socio-economic integration)?
4. How cost-effective is the utilization of project resources in implementing strategies and activities to deliver project outputs and outcomes for sustaining beneficiaries in the implementation and results?

Impact orientation by the project set up and impacts achieved vis a vis defined objectives and outcomes

1. How far did the activity contribute to peacebuilding outcomes e.g. improved relationships between and among different groups, increased economic opportunities and reduced grievances among particularly marginalized members of society?
2. How far did the resettlement and social cohesion activities impact on peaceful norms and behaviour (on the sustainable socio-economic and public services integration) of final beneficiaries?

Sustainability

1. Are there any indicators (emerging evidence) that show that the outcomes of the project will be sustained (e.g. systems, financial returns, capacities and structures)?
2. Has a meaningful exit strategy been developed
3. How well has the project developed the exit and sustainability strategy with local partners

enable them to continue self-sustaining and non-reliant on project funds?

4. What are the prospects and risks for post-project sustainability of beneficiaries
5. Which institutional models for building sustainability as planned and/or introduced by the project, would likely lead to more sustainable and independent support services?
6. What follow-up value-adding interventions, beyond the current project phase, could be strategic and critical in sustaining beneficiaries and local partners for Sri Lanka Peace building sector? Are the results of the project likely to be replicated or up-scaled in Sri Lanka? What sustainability mechanisms are in place and what measures already exist and what measures can be recommended for promoting long-term sustainability of the SURAR Sri Lanka project?
7. Special aspect to be considered

To what extent the work has contributed toward promoting ILO's mandate on social dialogue, international labour standard, as well as the ILO's goal of gender equality, disability inclusion, non-discrimination, and social cohesion in the target community? What were the facilitating and limiting factors in project's contribution to these cross cutting issues?

A more detailed analytical framework of questions and sub-questions will be developed by the evaluator as part of the inception report and in agreement with the Evaluation Manager.

Cross cutting issues

Apart from addressing the question set in the section above "7. Special aspect to be considered", the evaluation shall follow a human-rights-based approach by promoting and protecting human rights. 9 Including the HR perspective in evaluation means (i) addressing the process to people, (ii) setting tools and approaches appropriate for collecting data from them; (iii) set-up processes of broader involvement of stakeholders, and (iv) enhance access of the evaluation results to all stakeholders.

Furthermore, the evaluation must be conducted with gender equality as a mainstreamed approach and concern. This implies (i) applying gender analysis by involving both men and women in consultation and evaluation's analysis, (ii) inclusion of data disaggregated by sex and gender in the analysis and justification of project documents; (iii) the formulation of gender-sensitive strategies and objectives and gender-specific indicators; (iv) inclusion of qualitative methods and use of mix of methodologies, (v) forming a gender-balanced team, and (vi) assessing outcomes to improve lives of women and men. Thus, analysis of gender-related concerns will be based on the ILO Guidelines on Considering Gender in Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects (September, 2007). The evaluation will be conducted following UN evaluation standards and norms⁵ and the Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management developed by the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC).

Methodology to be followed

The methodology should include examining the intervention's Theory of Change. The evaluation will apply a set of mixed-methods, analysing both quantitative and qualitative data, and will integrate gender equality other non-discrimination issues as a cross-cutting ILO concern throughout its methodology and all deliverables, including the final report. The evaluation will

follow guidance note 4 on integrating gender, as well as the guidance note on norms and standards. See Annex section.

The evaluator may adapt the methodology, especially in light of Covid-19 restrictions in the country, subject to the agreement with the evaluation manager, and reflected in the inception report. The following data collection techniques will be used during the evaluation:

1. Desk review
 - i. Project document, Annual review reports, DWCP country reports to tripartite advisory group, donor reports on technical and financial progress.
 - ii. Other relevant documents e.g. Mission, meeting, workshop and training reports, Project budgets – planned and actual- expenditures, results framework, quantitative and qualitative surveys, Monitoring and Evaluation data and plan.
 - iii. ILO Handbook on “How to design, monitor and evaluate results in employment for peace and resilience programmes” that provides guidance on design the results framework of resettlement and reconciliation programme
2. Key informant (individual/small-group) interviews (virtual/by phone/email) and survey:
 - i. Project team (staff, consultants/service providers)
 - ii. ILO internal stakeholders (country office and HQ)
 - iii. Donors
 - iv. In-country stakeholders (relevant government entities, private sector, non-government entities and ILO constituencies)
 - v. Implementing partners (Cooperatives Departments and others)
 - vi. Representatives from beneficiaries (*with an aim of equal numbers of women and men among interviewees*)
 - vii. Questionnaires developed in support of interviews/surveys that will be filled up (by phone/virtual) by key informants, especially in cases where travel would not be possible due to COVID-19 restrictions.

The evaluator will develop systematic data collection tools (i.e. checklists, guides and/or questionnaires as part of the inception report to guide the interviews, capture qualitative and quantitative data and ensure objectivity and consistency in interviews. This will also help the evaluator identify knowledge gaps that need to be verified and validated through the interviews.

The evaluator will ensure that opinions and perceptions of women are equally reflected in the interviews and that gender-specific questions are included.

On the final day of data collection, the evaluator will present preliminary findings to the project team and relevant ILO staff in Sri Lanka and at HQ. Upon completion of the report the evaluator will take part in a teleconference to provide a debriefing to donors and the ILO on the evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations as well as the evaluation process.

Limitations:

The limitations of the proposed evaluation methodology are acknowledged:

- The continuing uncertainty and volatility over the Covid19 pandemic present major challenges in data collection, particularly for field level and face-to-face interactions with data sources. Methodology may be necessarily adapted and/or improvised by the evaluator, through joint discussion and agreement with the ILO.

Security and Covid-19 restrictions and guidance:

- ILO EVAL has provided guidance on Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO that should be consulted and followed by the national consultant: http://www.ilo.ch/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_744068.pdf
- The national consultant is required to fully comply by the advisories issued by the local government and the UN regarding domestic travels and social distancing.
- The national consultants are also required to sign the Code of Conduct Agreement (https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_649148.pdf) together with the contract document.
- All UN personnel, including consultants, are expected to complete the UNDSS BSAFE (security awareness training course) and, if travel is required, are obliged to provide the Security Clearance.
- External collaborators benefit from the security arrangements and protection provided by the United Nations Security Management Network (UNSMN) at duty stations which are either not under a security level or up to security level four (4).
- No external collaboration contracts may be issued for work that entails travel to a location at security level five (5) or higher.
- If external collaborators for whom travel has been paid by the ILO find themselves at a location where security level five (5) or six (6) is declared during their presence there, immediate arrangements must be made in liaison with SECURITY to ensure that they leave the duty station as soon as possible.
- In the light of the COVID-19 pandemic, if the situation in the sub-region changes, appropriate actions will be taken amongst the following options:
- Suspending the implementation of the contract until further notice or until a specific time when it can be reviewed further in the face of new developments;
- Reducing the contract activities/scope/services (partial suspension); or
- Terminating the contract if it appears unfeasible that the desired deliverables will be received/achieved.

Deliverables

The evaluator expects the following deliverables:

Outputs	Responsible Person	Description	Approx. length	Tentative timeframe for the output	Number of Days
0. Contracting	Evaluator	Signature of contract and code of conduct for evaluators are finalized		9 July 2021	
1. Desk review and inception Report	Evaluator	During the desk review, the evaluator is expected to review key documents related to the project and submit an inception report (10 pages maximum + annexes) outlining the evaluation approach and methods, a final work plan and questionnaire (refer to Annex 3 Checklist: Writing the Inception Report).	10 pages maximum + annexes	20 July 2021	5
2. Key informant interviews' progress report	Evaluator	Upon approval of the inception report, the evaluator will conduct remote/virtual interviews with the project team assisting to contact and arrange with target informants. Progress report summarizes the list of key informants interviewed, and key data collected as well as gaps.	5 pages maximum + annexes	12 August 2021	10
3. Supplementary fieldwork progress report	Evaluator (logistical support by the project)	In-country fieldwork to visit and interview implementing partners and beneficiaries (list of cases to be proposed by evaluator and endorsed by the ILO - To be discussed and adapted as relevant in light of travel restrictions or possibility of working with a local consultant.) Progress report summarizes the list of partners and clients visited, and key data collected.	5 pages maximum + annexes	22 August 2021	5
4. Debriefing of preliminary findings	Evaluator	The evaluator will present preliminary findings to the project team and relevant ILO staff in Sri Lanka and at HQ.	½ day	29 August 2021	

	Evaluator	The draft evaluation report describes the findings and recommendations (See Annex 5: Preparing the evaluation report); The report will follow EVAL format template, including a title page (Refer to Annex 6: Filling in the evaluation title page), lessons learned and good practices (following the relevant template). The quality of the report will be determined based on conforming to the EVAL quality standards (See Annex 7: Rating the quality of evaluation reports).	30 pages + Annexes	7 September 2021	5
5. Draft evaluation report	Evaluation Manager	Circulate draft report to key stakeholders (Stakeholders provide comments and consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to team leader)			
6. Final evaluation report	Evaluator	A final evaluation report with evaluation summary is to be submitted within one week after receiving final comments on the draft report. The final evaluation report is subject to approval by the Regional/Evaluation Office. (refer to Annex 6 Writing the evaluation report summary).	34 pages + Annexes	22 September 2021	3
7. Debriefing	Evaluator	A debriefing is to be provided by the evaluator (at the discretion of the ILO country director) and to donors and the ILO at the end of the evaluation process.	½ day	24 September 2021	
8. Review the revised final report	Evaluation Manager	Review the revised report and submit it to EVAL for final approval		By 30 September 2021	
	Total number of working days for Evaluator				28

Specifications:

- Gender equality issues shall be explicitly addressed throughout the evaluation activities of the consultant and all outputs including final reports or events need to be gender mainstreamed as well as included in the evaluation summary.
- All deliverables must be prepared in English, using Microsoft Word, and delivered electronically to ILO. ILO will have ownership and copyright of all deliverables.
- Deliverables will be regarded as delivered when they have been received electronically by the Evaluation Manager and approved by the Evaluation Office.
- All drafts and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible for Word for Windows. Findings and results should follow logically from the analysis, be credible and clearly presented together with analyses of achievements and gaps.

- The draft reports will be circulated to key stakeholders and partners of the project, relevant tripartite constituents, and ILO staff (i.e. project management, ILO Office in Colombo, ILO Regional office in Bangkok) for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated by the Evaluation Manager and will be sent to the evaluation consultant to incorporate them into the revised evaluation report. The evaluation report will be considered final only when it gets final approval by ILO Evaluation Office. The quality of the report will be assessed against the relevant EVAL Checklists. (See Checklist in Annex 10: Rating the quality of evaluation report).
- Acceptance will be acknowledged only if the deliverable(s) concerned are judged to be in accordance with the requirements set out in the contract, to reflect agreements reached and plans submitted during the contract process, and incorporate or reflect consideration of amendments proposed by ILO.

The Contractor will be responsible for:

- The design, planning and implementation of the evaluation and the write-up of the evaluation report (the total length of the report should be a maximum of 30 pages for the main report, excluding annexes; additional annexes can provide background and details on specific components of the project evaluated. The report should be sent as one complete document), using an approach agreed with ILO, and for delivering in accordance with the ILO's specifications and timeline;
- Consulting and liaising, as required, with ILO and any partners to ensure satisfactory delivery of all deliverables;
- Making themselves available, if required, to take part in briefings and discussions, online or, if necessary, at the ILO Office or other venues, on mutually agreed dates, in line with the work outlined in these ToRs.

Management arrangements and tentative time frame

Management Arrangements

The duration of this contract is for 28 working days between 7 July 2021 and 30 September 2021. The mission in Sri Lanka is expected during 12– 22 August 2021 (with travel and some meetings on weekend days- To be discussed and adapted as relevant in light of travel restrictions or possibility of working with a local consultant).

The final independent evaluation will be conducted by an independent evaluator. The evaluator can constitute his/her team as he/she sees fit. A local consultant (Team member is needed as part of the team to ensure communication in local language especially in Tamil and Sinhalese unless it is provided by the lead evaluator or another team member of the evaluation team). All members of the evaluation team (including the additional staff) shall thus fall under his/her supervision and responsibility.

The independent evaluator is responsible for conducting the evaluation according to the terms of reference (ToRs).

On the ILO's side, the evaluation will be supervised by the Evaluation Manager. The Evaluation Manager will:

- Ensure meeting schedules are set up;

- Assist the evaluator in data collection from the project team;
- Assist in the implementation of the evaluation methodology, as appropriate (i.e., participate in interviews, observe committee meetings) and in such a way as to minimize bias in evaluation findings;
- Review and provide comments on the evaluation report;
- Ensure that the evaluation is conducted in accordance with terms of references, for the preparation of the draft report of the evaluation, discussing it with the evaluator, beneficiaries and stakeholders;
- Liaise with project staff wherever their engagement is needed to fulfill the requirements above.

Application requirements

Selection of the contractor will be done by the ILO based on their technical and commercial proposals. Proposals to undertake any work under these ToRs will be submitted in English and must contain the following information and documents:

1. Technical Proposal

6. A short summary of profile and capacity of the Contractor to conduct an evaluation related on Peacebuilding, Livelihoods, Value Chain and Social Economic Development, and Gender project, including a record of relevant work executed in the past five years.
7. A proposal on how the contractor intends to complete the work described in the ToRs, including any suggestions for improving/modifying ToRs;
8. The CV(s) of the Evaluator (a team consisting of at least 2 members, either from a firm or jointly by individuals) that will undertake the work, with general description of tasks assigned for each team member;
9. A timeline with proposed dates for contract start and end dates.
10. Two examples of previous related work. Names and details of two references.

2. Commercial Proposal

1. A proposal setting out the cost for the evaluation including a daily fee (or daily fees in case several team members will be involved in the evaluation), number of work days per staff, and tentative travel costs per mission. (**Note: Travel plan will be adapted based on country's COVID-19 restrictions**)

Requirements of the evaluator

1. Lead evaluator (Based in Sri Lanka would be advantage)

- Knowledge, skills and experience (at least ten years) in the area of M&E and evaluation of development programmes/projects.
- Knowledge and experience (at least five years) related to planning, implementing, institutionalizing and/or sustaining economic development for conflict-affected, high vulnerability female-headed households and persons with disabilities in developing countries. Preference for experience in market access development.
- Experience as a project manager/team leader in peacebuilding, resettlement and resilience

(at least three years).

- Relevant country experience in Sri Lanka and/or Southeast Asia is an advantage.
- Experience in systemic approaches to private sector development and partnership with CSO/CBO/Cooperatives would be an advantage.
- Excellent written and oral communication skills in English (level C2).

2. Evaluation team member/s

- Knowledge, skills, and experience (at least five years) in the area of M&E and evaluation of development programmes/projects.
- Knowledge and experience (at least five years) of livelihood support through the CBO/CSO/Cooperatives including the private-sector engagement.
- Knowledge and Experience in peacebuilding including resettlement and resilience for conflict-affected areas.
- Relevant country experience in Sri Lanka.
- In line with COVID travel restrictions, preferably s/he needs to be locally based in the country.
- Excellent written and oral communication skills in English (level C2). Proficiency in local language especially in Tamil and Sinhalese are required unless it is provided by the lead evaluator or another team member of the evaluation team.

Reporting lines

The evaluator will report to the *Evaluation Manager, Aye Pearl Hlaing* (hlaingap@ilo.org, **Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, ILO Myanmar**). 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 and evaluation summary to make sure it has complied with the quality checklist of ILO evaluation report.

Regional Evaluation Officer, ROAP will do quality assurance of the report and EVAL, Geneva will give approval of the final evaluation report.

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, virtual meeting/workshop and to ensure that all relevant documentations are up to date and easily accessible by the evaluator.

Roles of other key stakeholders: All stakeholders, particularly the relevant ILO staff in the Sri Lanka office, the UN RCO staff, the donor, and the relevant government agencies 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 evaluation report prior to finalization.

Compliance with UN norms and standards for evaluation

This evaluation will comply with UN norms and standards for evaluation and ensure that ethical

safeguards concerning the independence of the evaluation will be followed. Please refer to the UNEG ethical guidelines: <http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>

To ensure compliance with ILO/UN rules safeguarding the independence of the evaluation, the contractor will not be eligible for technical work on the project for the next 12 months.

Annexes

- Annex 1: [Code of conduct form](#) (To be signed by the evaluator) Annex 2: [ILO Evaluation policy guidelines](#)
- Annex 3: [Writing the inception](#) report
- Annex 4: [Guidance note 4: integrating gender into evaluation](#)
- Annex 5: [Adapting evaluation methods to the ILO's normative and tripartite mandate - Guidance note](#) Annex 6A: [Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices](#)
- Annex 6B: [Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices](#)
- Annex 7: [Guidance note 7 Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation](#)
- Annex 8: [Preparing the evaluation report](#)
- Annex 9: [Filling in the evaluation title page](#)
- Annex 10: [Rating the quality of evaluation reports](#)
- Annex 11: [Writing the evaluation report summary](#)
- Annex 12: [ILO Handbook on "How to design, monitor and evaluate peacebuilding results in employment for peace and resilience programmes"](#)

Annex 2: Tables with status achieved of project indicators targets

Summary of results and achievements of Outcome 1

Outcome 1 (aligned to the Resettlement outcome in the JPP and PPP): The State prioritizes sustainable return, resettlement and/or local integration of conflict-displaced persons (IDPs, IDP returnees, and refugee returnees) in a safe and dignified manner to rebuild lives and communities.

Output: The UN in Sri Lanka provides strategic, coherent, timely and targeted support towards the resettlement process in the Northern Province with an emphasis on ensuring durable solutions and promoting confidence in the process.

Indicator	Target	Achievement as of June 21	Remarks n achievement or
Outcome 1			
% of targeted population reporting that their income increased (base line income Rs. 30,769)	50% targeted population for LLH interventions(50% of total reached out (627*) <u>Total reached out</u> Ground nut 300 Dry Fish 100 Coir 45 Banana 170 Banana Leaf 3 Deep Sea 9 Total: 627*	400 persons have (141 M: 259 F) have produced groundnut and dry fish. Of 300 ground nut farmers, 67% increased their income. Of 100 Dry fish producers 53 recorded higher monthly incom100 % compared to the baseline. Income from Banana and Coir are yet to realize as the production is incomplete.	63 % reaching targeted population for LLH = 63% (400/627 x 100) Ground Nut: Average net income for Maha Season 2020 was Rs. 9,746 Dry Fish: Average net income of June 2021 is Rs. 156,307.
Output			
Number of cooperatives strengthened/established (Baseline ILO had already supported Thelipplai and Maritimpeattu Coops)	A minimum of 3	6 coops were strengthened. 1. Dry Fisheries Society (Jaffna) 2. Palali Agriculture Producers Sales Cooperative Society PAPSCS (Jaffna) 3. Maritimpeattu Groundnut Producer Sales Society (Mulaitivu) 4. Farmer Organization – Chemmalai- FCO	Two of them are newly established to promote groundnut (Mullativu) and dry fish producers (Jaffna), 191 (63 M 128F), incl. 5 disabled cooperative executive members, had greater knowledge of bookkeeping, accounting, management, and cooperative governance. The coops enhanced their network and

		5. Palai Multi Purpose Cooperative Society (MPCS) (Kilinochchi) 6. Jaffna Distract Cooperative Society Union Federation (JDCSUF) Around 1,032 members of resettled communities mobilized around these six cooperatives with a view of better integration to the locality.	coordination with different government technical departments (Agriculture, fisheries, Coconut Development Board) and the relevant DS office. The newly formed groundnut producers' cooperative co-finances the groundnut processing center by David gram.
Number of members mobilized through cooperative system to increase their productive capacity	900 (300 per target area), including at least 50% representation of women	582 (274M:308F) groundnut, banana and dry fish producers including 21 disabled persons have been supported .	64% success Coir production is yet to commence with 45 persons.
Number of partnerships established with private sector companies to establish backward linkages, strengthen supply chains and aid marketing of produce.	3	3 private sector and 1 Coop (Tropicoir, David Gram, JK Marketing Services)	Jaffna Distract Cooperative Society Union Federation (JDCSUF)

(Source: Project Monitoring Plan, Progress Reports, Data Base maintained by M&E Officer, KIIs with NPC M&E and validated at the FGDs with cooperatives and beneficiaries)

Summary of results and achievements of Outcome 2

Outcome 2 (aligned to the social cohesion outcome in the JPP and PPP): Positive relationships and mutual understanding between and among different groups, and between groups and the state, contribute to peaceful co-existence and a sense of belonging in Sri Lanka.

Output: The UN in Sri Lanka provides strategic, coherent, timely and targeted support to strengthen reconciliation and social cohesion

Indicator	Target	Achievement as of June 21	Remarks on achievement or progress
Outcome level indicator:			
Positive relationships and mutual understanding between and among different groups, and between groups and the state, contribute to	Increase to above 50% (over half) by 2020	Not available on progress reports, as this was not meant to be monitored by the project.	'Outcome Indicator' 2 is not a SURAR project outcome. It is the PPP country level outcome⁷¹. This indicator was not meant to be tracked by the project. It was not tracked in 2020 through the

⁷¹ Annex 4: Project Monitoring Plan, June 2019, Result Framework for the JPP (draft)

peaceful co-existence and a sense of belonging in Sri Lanka Baseline: 48% (2018 Strategic Context Assessment)			national face-to-face survey in which it is usually tracked since the survey for 2020 was cancelled due to COVID-19 restrictions ⁷² .
Output level indicator:			
Number of institutions seeing improved ratings in the annual tracker of service delivery capability in Tamil. Baseline: not available. The first survey will be 2019	50% of the institutions that took part in the tracking exercise see improved Tamil language service delivery	Not possible to assess as the survey is not complete.	Due to COVID and organizational reasons only 2.a. activity has been implemented to a satisfactory level. 2.b and 2.c. are being implemented currently under volatile circumstances arising from the pandemic.
Activity level indicators:			
2.a. – Service tracking tool and related advocacy strategy finalized. Baseline: N/A, no service tracking tool at present.	Tracking exercise repeated (2020)	Tracking tool developed and finalized after pilot survey. Phase two survey to be conducted in August 2021.	Pilot survey has developed methodology for a simplified and easy to replicate tracking tool, with fairly successful tools such as ‘mystery customer survey’ despite the pandemic induced delays.
2.b. – Level of increase in capacity of Ministry of National Integration, Official Languages, Social Progress and Hindu Religious Affairs, to monitor Sinhala and Tamil language service delivery. Baseline: to be established	Established Ministry capacity enables system of ranking public authorities by service delivery based on language to Public Services, Provincial Councils and Local Government	Ministry and Languages Commission officials attended and participated in all aspects of pilot survey design and implementation	Baseline to be established. On OLC participation included the chairman, 3 senior OLC officials and one ministry official as a part of the team that reviewed and amended the survey tool. 8 OLC staff were among those who participated in the phase one survey ⁷³ . Meeting with OLC was not conducted to verify data.
2.c. – Extent of progress made in institutionalizing positive incentive measures for better service delivery within the state system in both languages. Baseline: to be established	Incentive scheme established	Agreement reached to introduce award for best performing institution reached by December 2020 with government counterparts	The institutionalization of the survey tool was completed with NLEAP/Marga and the OLC using the same survey for their 35 partner institutions, though one of the 10 indicators, indicator of filing RTI applications was dropped due to COVID-19 limitations. Further institutionalization beyond the scope of the original project has

⁷² Email communication, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, 13.08.2021

⁷³ Email communication, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, 20.08.2021

			happened through the co-funding of the UNDP SDG 16 portfolio which will see roll out to the 40+ partner local authorities of the CDLG project, with plans to repeat annually. This will see institutionalization within the state system beyond the OLC ⁷⁴ .
--	--	--	---

(Source: Project Progress Report July to December 2020, January to June 2021, Annex 4: Project Monitoring Plan, June 2019, Result Framework for the JPP (draft), KII and Email communication with relevant officers)

Annex 3: List of People Consulted in Interviews and Focus Group Discussions

Title and the organization	Name	Date
GOVERNMENT		
Deputy Chief Secretary, Northern Province	Mr. P. Vaheeshan	22 nd July
Commissioner of Cooperative Development	Mr.M.Nanthagopalan	18 th August
The Director Provincial training institute of Cooperative Development, NP.	Mr.G.Chandrasegaran	2 nd August
Assistant Commissioner of Cooperative Development , Mullative	Mr. Sivakumar	2 nd August
Assistant Commissioner of Cooperative Development , Jaffna	Mrs.S.Shiyamala	Reached out. Declined to be interviewed as she is retired from service now.
Assistant Commissioner of Cooperative Development , Kilinochchi	Mr.S.M.Subair	12 th August
The external Consultant – Capacity assessment of Cooperatives and assisting for revise / develop modules for Capacity development plan for Coop , University of Jaffna	Dr. Siveshan	5 th August
Divisional Secretary Thellipalai	Mr. Shanmugarasa Sivasri	20 July
Agriculture Instructor, Kepapulavu	Ms.Mehala	2 nd August
Divisional Secretary, Pachchilaipalai	Mrs.P.Jeyarani	Delegated to ADP and ADS (below)
Assistant Director of Planning – Pachchilaipalli	Ms,Malathy	2 nd August
Assistant Divisional Secretary – Pachchilaipalli	Ms.Kunaja	2 nd August
PRIVATE SECTOR		

⁷⁴ Email communication, Janeen Fernando, Reconciliation and Development Analyst, RCO, 20.08.2021

External Consultant – Economic resource mapping	Dushan.L . R AMTE	3 rd August
DAVID GRAM STORES	Mr. Raja	24 th July
Jekay Marketting Services , KEELS	Mr. Nirmal Hettiarachchi	23 rd July
TROPICOIR LANKA (PVT) LTD	Mr. Leslie De Silva (General Manager)	23 rd July
JDFCSUF	Mr. Annarasa(President)	29 th July
COOPERATIVES		
Farmer Organization – Chemmalai- FCO	Mr. V. Ramalingam, Chair) Ms. J. Dwaarka, , Secretary [beneficiary] Mr. M.Sakthithas, Community Mobilizer Mr. S. Rasaratnam [beneficiary]	27 th July
Maritimepattu Groundnut Producer Sales Society	Mr. T.Rasarathinam, secretry Mr. Thavarajah, President Mr.M.Sakthithas, Field officer	28 th July
Palai MPCs .	Mr.S.Vathanarasa, President Mrs.Y.Sathiyaleela, General Manager Mrs.V.Utharsiny Field Officer Ms. Vijitha [beneficiary] Ms. Y. Sabojitha [beneficiary] Mr. D. Jeyaranjan [beneficiary]	28 th July
PAPSCS	Mr. V Mahenthiraja, President Mr. Ushanthan, Field officer Mr. S. Rasinthan, Treasurer [beneficiary] Ms. J. Jeyavathani [beneficiary]	27 th July
JDFCSUF and Dry fisheries society	Mr.Annarasa(President) Mr. Mahesan (Treasurer) Mr. Thuraisingham (beneficiary) Ms.Kamaliny, (beneficiary) Ms.Maylarasi, Field officer	29 th July
ILO		
Directorn-ILO Country Office for Sri Lanka and the Maldives	Ms. Simrin C. Singh	5 th August
Chief Technical Advisor Jobs for Peace and Resilience Programme ILO Country Office for Sri Lanka and the Maldives	Thomas Kring, PhD	5 th August
Programme Associate , PIU , Back stopping officer	Mr. Asmi Musthaf	29 th July
Private Sector Specialist, ILO Country office , Sri Lanka	Mr. Islam, Mohamed	Was not available due to leave for two weeks.

Monitoring and Evaluation officer, ILO – Country office.	Ms. Palliyeguruge, Dilki	13, 26 July 8,9 Aug
Communication officer – ILO ,Country Office – Sri Lanka	Ms. Kathireson, Kaushalya	28 th July
National Project Coordinator – SURAR Project , ILO – Kilinochchi, Sri Lanka	Mr. Nadarajah Nishanthan	16,19, 20, July 8,9 Aug
Field coordinator SURAR Project – ILO , Kilinochchi	Ms. Thanapalasubramaniam, Theepavathana	3 rd August
Admin and Finance assistant – SURAR project – ILO country office	Mr. Sinnathamby Kalaiventhan	3 rd , 4 th August
UN		
Reconciliation and Development Analyst, Office of the Resident Coordinator	Mr. Janeen Fernando	16 th July 28 th July 10 th August
Data Analyst- Office of the Resident Coordinator	Mr. Tharinda De Silva	16 th July 29 th July
Technical Specialist- Peacebuilding and Reconciliation- UNDP	Mr. Priyan Senevirathna	28 th July
Chief Executive Officer- Marga Institute	Mr. Amar Gunatilleke	29 th July
Focal point from Ministry of Public Administration	Ms. Gnanie Wickramasinghe	29 th July 7 th August
Focal point from Official Language Commission	Mr. Ganesh Abeykoon	RCO official informed that he is not contactable. Follow up emails to RCO official on 3 rd and 6 th August with no response.

Annex 4: Schedule of the field work

PRIVATE SECTOR		
External Consultant – Economic resource mapping	Dushan.L . R AMTE	3 rd August
DAVID GRAM STORES	Mr. Raja	24 th July
Jekay Marketting Services , KEELS	Mr. Nirmal Hettiarachchi	23 rd July
TROPICOIR LANKA (PVT) LTD	Mr. Leslie De Silva (General Manager)	23 rd July
JDFCSUF	Mr. Annarasa(President)	29 th July
COOPERATIVES		
Farmer Organization – Chemmalai- FCO	Mr. V. Ramalingam, Chair) Ms. J. Dwaarka, , Secretary [beneficiary] Mr. M.Sakthithas, Community Mobilizer Mr. S. Rasaratnam [beneficiary]	27 th July
Maritimepattu Groundnut Producer Sales Society	Mr. T.Rasarathinam, secretry Mr. Thavarajah, President Mr.M.Sakthithas, Field officer	28 th July
Palai MPCs .	Mr.S.Vathanarasa, President Mrs.Y.Sathiyaleela, General Manager Mrs.V.Utharsiny Field Officer Ms. Vijitha [beneficiary] Ms. Y. Sabojitha [beneficiary] Mr. D. Jeyaranjan [beneficiary]	28 th July
PAPSCS	Mr. V Mahenthiraja, President Mr. Ushanthan, Field officer Mr. S. Rasinthan, Treasurer [beneficiary] Ms. J. Jeyavathani [beneficiary]	27 th July
JDFCSUF and Dry fisheries society	Mr.Annarasa(President) Mr. Mahesan (Treasurer) Mr. Thuraisingham (beneficiary) Ms.Kamaliny, (beneficiary) Ms.Maylarasi, Field officer	29 th July

Annex 5: List of documents reviewed

Proposal: SURAR for US Department of State, June 2019 [US DoS Proposal FINAL 30 August 2019-1]

Project Monitoring Plan, June 2019 [Annex 4 -JPP RRF 28 June 2019 FINAL-1]

Timeline of Activities, June 2019 [Annex 3 Activities and Timeline_28 June 2019 FINAL-1]

Roles and Responsibilities along with the names of key personnel, June 2019 [Annex 2_Roles and Responsibilities 28 June 2019 FINAL-1]

Budget Narrative June 2019 [Annex 5b - Budget Narrative_5 August 2019 FINAL Formatted-1]

SURAR, Progress Report September 2019 - December 2019, ILO

SURAR, Progress Report January 2020 - June 2020, ILO

SURAR, Progress Report July 2020 - December 2020, ILO

SURAR, Progress Report, March-May 2021 (Submission Date: 12/07/2021)

List of key stakeholders – SURAR (both internal ILO and external) with email address (July-Sept 2021)

SURAR, Overall reach-out Data and information SURAR Project [updated on 14th of July 2021]

SURAR, Executive Summary - Language Audit-DRAFT-1

SURAR, Language Audit, List of questions_2019.09.10_FINAL

AMTE Consultants, Mapping and Needs Assessment for Livelihood Strategies for Economically Vulnerable Communities. Resettled Areas in North, 2020 (Commissioned by SURAR, ILO)

Marga Institute, Official Languages Service Delivery, Draft, September 2019 (Commissioned by SURAR, UN RCO)

Annex 6: Lessons Learned and Good Practices

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation (SURAR) through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace Project

Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/19/03/USA

Name of Evaluator: Dr. Udan Fernando | Ms. Hasini Haputhanthri

Date: 7 Sept 2021

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	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	LL 1: Sound efforts of identifying and targeting of the most significant need/s of the beneficiaries – Livelihoods -- have brought about positive results of successful outreach of the beneficiaries who required the livelihood support most.
Context and any related preconditions	The selection process of beneficiaries of SURAR's livelihood support is being carried out in a meticulous manner with many levels of validation and consultations with different stakeholders. The project made an innovation of setting up a committee consisting of the President, and Secretary of the Coop, Manager, and ILO to identify the most vulnerable members of the resettled community, with priority being given to PwDs, FHH, and elderly persons. The selected vulnerable people were provided with extra support to carry out the livelihood activities, as well as address/overcome any constraints that prevent them from engaging in such activities.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	As a follow-up to the recommendations by the committee, the project has selected 26 PwDs (Male 15, Female 11) and 148 FHH families for receiving additional support towards encouraging them to engage in Banana (19 persons) and Groundnut (68 persons) cultivations.
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	None
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	The success was the assurance of 'leave no one behind' principle ILO followed as per SDG framework. Setting up a dedicated mechanism (the committee) and the meticulous search for the most needy persons was the causal connection.
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	None.

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation (SURAR) through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace Project

Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/19/03/USA

Name of Evaluator: Dr. Udan Fernando | Ms. Hasini Haputhanthri

Date: 7 Sept 2021

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	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	LL 2 : Sound efforts of identifying and targeting of the most significant areas and locations for the project have brought about positive results of successful outreach of the beneficiaries who required the livelihood support most.
Context and any related preconditions	The three areas selected for the project represent the areas that have been severely affected by the war from the early stages and hence the people who were forced to leave have experienced multiple displacements over a period of about 25 years, according to the KIIS with government officials and research data cited in the initial assessment report (Amte Consultants).
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	The total of 1,136 persons (M556, F580) joined the cooperatives as new members from the three areas. These persons together with their respective families have been displaced for about 25 districts. The places where they were resettled have been severely destroyed as a result of the war.
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	None
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	The targeting of the three areas was based on a meticulous and time consuming exercise the project had undertaken to duly study the situation, issues and areas prior to making the final choice.
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	None.

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation (SURAR) through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace Project

Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/19/03/USA

Name of Evaluator: Dr. Udan Fernando | Ms. Hasini Haputhanthri

Date: 7 Sept 2021

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	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	LL3: Economic activity per se may not lead to social cohesion unless inclusive processes that facilitate community change and spaces for inter-community dialogue are not created, built in to the activities. Economic empowerment does not necessarily lead to trust, improved relationships or attitudinal change.
Context and any related preconditions	The regions selected for support under outcome 1 is largely focused on resettling communities in the North who come from a similar ethno-religious background. Outcome 2 focuses on language issues at a national level. These two have no connection or overlap. Unless special attention is paid to create links with the South and communities from different ethno religious background, economic empowerment may not lead to peacebuilding and trust building. It may lead to economic stability of resettling communities.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	The total of 1,136 persons (M556, F580) joined the cooperatives as new members from the three areas. These persons together with their respective families have been displaced for about 25 years. If linked with communities from the South, there is a possibility for sharing of experiences, which can lead to an attitudinal change in both communities.
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	Economic empowerment without proper trust building between different communities may lead to competition. Peace cannot be built by supporting one group.
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	The target communities have immense potential to create empathy in different communities, if there are safe spaces for sharing their experiences, and their resilience.
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	The project design does not support adequate connection between outcome 1 and 2, namely resettlement and reconciliation. Implementation of project by different UN entities

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation (SURAR) through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace Project

Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/19/03/USA

Name of Evaluator: Dr. Udan Fernando | Ms. Hasini Haputhanthri

Date: 7 Sept 2021

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	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	LL4: Recognizing the attribution gap between outputs and outcomes in peacebuilding projects, difference between resettlement and reconciliation not being clearly defined
Context and any related preconditions	The needs of resettlement and reconciliation do not exclude each other and go hand in hand.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	Project designers
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	By separating outcome 1 for resettlement and outcome 2 for reconciliation, the project has missed an opportunity to see the opportunities in reconciliation in the resettlement process. Setting indicators with an attribution gap makes it difficult to assess.
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	The target communities have immense potential to create empathy in different communities, if there are safe spaces for sharing their experiences, and their resilience.
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Attribution gap to be considered in designing indicators

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation (SURAR) through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace Project

Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/19/03/USA

Name of Evaluator: Dr. Udan Fernando | Ms. Hasini Haputhanthri

Date: 7 Sept 2021

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	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	LL5: Short term projects (less than 3-4 years) may not be able to address deep-rooted attitudinal, relational and structural issues related to peacebuilding, social cohesion, involving trust-building, improving relationships and institutionalizing inclusive strategies to a satisfactory degree.
Context and any related preconditions	Conflict arises from deep rooted attitudinal, relational and structural issues that have deteriorated over a significant period of time. Reversing these broken relationships requires fairly concentrated efforts over a long period of time.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	Project designers and donors
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	Contemporary development practices and project management cycles
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	Capacity for internal organizational change and practices
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Short term project management approach, especially for issues that require long term solutions

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation (SURAR) through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace Project

Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/19/03/USA

Name of Evaluator: Dr. Udan Fernando | Ms. Hasini Haputhanthri

Date: 7 Sept 2021

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.

GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	GP 1: SURAR project's deliberate efforts of identifying and targeting of the most significant need/s of the beneficiaries – Livelihoods -- have brought about positive results of successful outreach.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	In a resettlement context, such as in the North, the initial inputs such as land clearance, infrastructure – housing, roads, water / electricity -- are well provided by the government and other agencies. However, the livelihood aspect is often ignored as it is an activity that needs to be nurtured over a period of time. SURAR has exactly filled this gap in the resettlement context in the selected project areas.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	The stakeholders at the level of government officials in charge of the resettlement process admitted that livelihood was the bottleneck and gap that they (government) could not address in a sustainable manner and other agencies too were not willing to engage in it because it is a relatively a long term commitment that requires expertise, financial resources and sustained project management.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	The FGDs with the cooperatives and beneficiaries at the divisional level where project work had been implemented revealed the successful levels of outreach of the beneficiaries and different forms of livelihood measures introduced that are feasible in such areas.
Potential for replication and by whom	ILO itself, other UN agencies such as the UNDP, UNOPS. INGOs and NGOs.
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	A key country programme of ILO's Colombo office is Decent Work Country Program. Among the four elements program, is Sustainable and Inclusive Livelihoods. The well-targeted Livelihood work under SURAR directly contributes to the broader country program of ILO. -

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation (SURAR) through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace Project

Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/19/03/USA

Name of Evaluator: Dr. Udan Fernando | Ms. Hasini Haputhanthri

Date: 7 Sept 2021

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.

GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	GP 2: SURAR project's deliberate efforts of identifying and targeting of the most significant areas where resettlement process takes place with a long history of spells of displacement have taken place have brought about positive results of successful outreach.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	The three areas selected for the project represent the areas that have been severely affected by the war from the early stages and hence the people who were forced to leave have experienced multiple displacements over a period of about 25 years, according to the KIIS with government officials and research data cited in the initial assessment report (Amte Consultants).
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	The targeting of the three areas was based on a meticulous and time consuming exercise the project had undertaken to duly study the situation, issues and areas prior to making the final choice.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	The FGDs with the cooperatives and beneficiaries at the divisional level where project work had been implemented revealed the successful levels of outreach of the beneficiaries and different forms of livelihood measures introduced that are feasible in such areas. The process of identification of the target area has included consultations with multiple stakeholders in addition to desk studies. Hence a sound basis was laid for determination of the areas for intervention where the most affected persons were to resettle.
Potential for replication and by whom	ILO itself, other UN agencies such as the UNDP, UNOPS. INGOs and NGOs.
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	A key country programme of ILO's Colombo office is Decent Work Country Program. Among the four elements program, is Sustainable and Inclusive Livelihoods. The well-targeted Livelihood work under SURAR directly contributes to the broader country program of ILO.

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation (SURAR) through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace Project

Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/19/03/USA

Name of Evaluator: Dr. Udan Fernando | Ms. Hasini Haputhanthri

Date: 7 Sept 2021

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.

GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	GP 3: SURAR project's focus on a restorative approach than a retributive approach by addressing the need for economic stability of resettling communities is a successful approach to stay engaged and contribute positively in a volatile political context which may not be conducive to addressing other peacebuilding issues related to transitional justice, reparation and reconciliation.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	Relevant to contexts where peacebuilding, human rights and transitional justice projects are met with hostility due to political and cultural reasons
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	SURAR has not been affected by the political changes at national level and has been able to complete its activities. The only changes are due to pandemic and weather related conditions.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	Support from government counterparts , willingness to continue project, institutionalizing outputs created by project
Potential for replication and by whom	Peacebuilding projects in similar political and cultural conditions, such as ethno-nationalist regimes and communities
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	Joint Statement on Employment programmes for peace JPP, Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP) and UNDP SGD 16 framework

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Support to Resettlement and Reconciliation (SURAR) through the United Nations Joint Programme for Peace Project

Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/19/03/USA

Name of Evaluator: Dr. Udan Fernando | Ms. Hasini Haputhanthri

Date: 7 Sept 2021

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.

GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	GP4: The Scoring System developed by defining clear criteria and scores in the selection of beneficiaries (women in cultivation/women in decision making bodies) has given a simple, clear and a precise methodology to mainstream gender issues effectively.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	Relevant to resettlement context, where there are multiple lines of marginality such as ethnicity, class, caste, gender as well as repercussions of war on these different groups such as FHH and disability.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	The scoring system has established clear and transparent process for selection of beneficiaries that received support in the resettlement process. Without this transparency, the project would have created tensions within communities receiving support.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	Gender well mainstreamed in the project as seen in gender disaggregated data. Vulnerable groups well represented among beneficiaries.
Potential for replication and by whom	ILO itself, other UN agencies such as the UNDP, UNOPS. INGOs and NGOs.
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	Decent Work Country Program

Annex 7: Customer experience checklist for language audit

Name of Public Organization: -

Section 1 – About the official website

1. Content of important sections such as home page is available in following languages

a. Sinhala ☐ Content is clear..... Somewhat clear..... Not Clear

b. Tamil ☐ Content is clear Somewhat clear Not clear

c. English ☐ Content is clear..... somewhat clear Not clear

2. Availability of downloadable application forms in the website (Only if relevant)

a. Sinhala ☐ Content is clear..... Somewhat clear..... Not Clear

b. Tamil ☐ Content is clear Somewhat clear Not clear

c. English ☐ Content is clear..... somewhat clear Not clear

Any other comments

.....
.....

3. Information/instructions concerning services provided are available in following languages

a. Sinhala ☐ Content is clear..... Somewhat clear..... Not Clear

b. Tamil ☐ Content is clear Somewhat clear Not clear

c. English ☐ Content is clear..... somewhat clear Not clear

4. Comments as to whether content in all three languages state the same thing

a) Yes

b) No (Please comment)

.....
.....

5. Time to respond to queries on the website

a. Sinhalese – time that is taken (If the option is available) (Hours)

Option not available

b. Tamil – time that is taken (If the option is available) (Hours)

Option not available

c. English – time that is taken (Hours)

Option not available

6. Contact information and address is available in the following languages in the website

a. Sinhala ☐ Content is clear..... Somewhat clear..... Not Clear

b. Tamil ☐ Content is clear Somewhat clear Not clear

c. English ☐ Content is clear..... somewhat clear Not clear

Any **other** **comments**

.....
.....

Section 2 – About the Institution (On site experience)

Part 1 –Access to the Institution/ Sign Boards

Date of visit..... Code of Mystery Customer: (SA/
SGC/J/A.....

7. Was it easy to find the location of the Public Institution?

Yes ☐ No ☐

8. External direction boards to the Public Institution from the nearest bus stand or main road were available in the following languages

a. Sinhala ☐ Content is clear..... Somewhat clear..... Not Clear

b. Tamil ☐ Content is clear Somewhat clear Not clear

c. English ☐ Content is clear..... somewhat clear Not clear

Any	other	comments
.....		
.....		

9. Internal Name/ Direction Boards that were relevant to the public were available in following languages (those only in the “customer service” area)

- a. Sinhala ☐ Content is clear..... Somewhat clear..... Not Clear
- b. Tamil ☐ Content is clear Somewhat clear Not clear
- c. English ☐ Content is clear..... somewhat clear Not clear

10. Was the order of the Languages of Administration correct? (Tamil, Sinhala and in English in the Northern and Eastern Provinces and Sinhala, Tamil and in English in the other 07 provinces)

Yes ☐ No ☐

Part 3- Notice Boards

11. Notice Boards are available in following languages (make a note to expand notice boards to include digital boards where necessary)

- a. Sinhala ☐ Content is clear..... Somewhat clear..... Not Clear
- b. Tamil ☐ Content is clear Somewhat clear Not clear
- c. English ☐ Content is clear..... somewhat clear Not clear

Part 4 - PA system (Only if relevant)

12. Announcements through the PA system were made in the following languages in all three languages? (Please comment regarding any difference in meaning and clarity)

- a. Sinhala ☐ Content is clear..... Somewhat clear..... Not Clear
- b. Tamil ☐ Content is clear Somewhat clear Not clear
- c. English ☐ Content is clear..... somewhat clear Not clear

13. Comparison of clarity of the message and pronunciation over the PA system

.....

Any	other	comments
.....		
.....		

Part 5 –Service at the Reception

(Please inquire about something from the reception/request for applications/)

14. There were **personnel at the Reception who were conversant in following languages**

- a. Sinhala ☐ Able to assist..... helped partly..... Unable to help
- b. Tamil ☐ Able to assist..... helped partly..... Unable to help
- c. English ☐ Able to assist..... helped partly..... Unable to help

Did you observe any other person struggling to get things done because of a language issue?
(Please note that this is not a scorable question)

Yes ☐ No ☐

Comments

.....

Part 6 – Availability of Application Forms at the premises

15. **Application Forms are available in following languages**

- a. Sinhala ☐ Content is clear..... Somewhat clear..... Not Clear
- b. Tamil ☐ Content is clear Somewhat clear Not clear
- c. English ☐ Content is clear..... somewhat clear Not clear

Any	other	comments
.....		
.....		

16. Were the languages presented in the correct order?

- a. Yes ☐
- b. No ☐ (Comments)

17. Font sizes are the same for all three languages

- a. Yes ☐
- b. No ☐ (Comments)

Part 7 – RTI Forms

18. General Office -Accepted RTI application in following language

- a. Sinhala ☐ Comments
.....
- b. Tamil ☐ Comments
.....
- c. English ☐ Comments
.....

19. Any other comments
.....
.....
.....

Part 8 – Assistance/ Facilities

20. Ability to obtain advice/ assistance from a COLIO/OLIO in the following language

- a. Sinhala Was able..... Somewhat able Unable
- b. Tamil ☐ Was able..... Somewhat able Unable
- c. English ☐ Was able..... Somewhat able Unable
- d. No COLIO/ OLIO present ☐
- e. Other official able to provide assistance in the language required ☐

21. (If applicable) Ability to obtain service at the canteen, photo copy service or other auxiliary/third-party service offered within the public authority's premises by speaking to them in your own language?

- a) Sinhala ☐ Able to assist..... Helped partly..... Unable to help.....
- b) Tamil ☐ Able to assist..... Helped partly..... Unable to help.....
- c) English ☐ Able to assist..... Helped partly..... Unable to help.....

Comments

Section 3 – Experience of the phone call

1. Automated trilingual phone answering service is available-

- a. Sinhala ☐ Content is clear..... Somewhat clear..... Not Clear
- b. Tamil ☐ Content is clear Somewhat clear Not clear
- c. English ☐ Content is clear..... somewhat clear Not clear
- d. Automated answering service not available ☐

2. Availability of a person who could speak the following language

- a. Sinhala ☐ Able to assist..... Helped partly..... Unable to help.....
- b. Tamil ☐ Able to assist..... Helped partly..... Unable to help.....
- c. English ☐ Able to assist..... Helped partly..... Unable to help.....

Comments:

.....

.....

Annex 8: SURAR project's strategy on inclusion of women and Person with Disabilities

One of the key objectives of the SURAR Project is to mainstream at least 50 % of Women and PWDs into the project, as they are an extremely vulnerable category. At the community level, the attitude of people/cooperatives seems positive in regard to this, but, actually, it was not happening at the implementation level. Moreover, considering the existing membership, few cooperatives seems limited female members / zero level contribution of them.

Therefore, Project adopted different strategic interventions to mainstream gender and PwDs into Project. Selection criteria were developed with a special focus on offering a scoring system, particularly regarding gender and PwDs aspects. It was applied to encourage women's contribution particularly both in decision making and livelihood support.

This was a set of criteria to apply in the selection process combined with several other factors and this was automatically allowed the cooperatives to accommodate more women in the project. Kindly refer to the translated document consist selection criteria of Well construction.

In the scoring system, points were distributed into different dimensions as mention below.

- For Disable female member 5 points
- Each women headed house hold in the group -10 points
- Women cultivators in a group – 5 points
- Women with special needs (Elders, Pregnant and lactating mothers. Etc.)- 5 points per each
- Certification of GSO , DSO & Agriculture instructor – 10 points

Application of scoring system is to mainstream women in cultivation / decision making activities where male led dominant role in existing structure. Prior to implement it, we have discussed with respective cooperative and through their consent, it could easy to implement in filed level. Rather than advising /giving voice on behalf of them, this particular application motivating women and other vulnerable categories take part in the decision-making / livelihood assistance process. As it went through with a transparent process, there is no conflict among communities. In order to getting score community male members voluntarily stimulate women members in their group assistance.

Selection process for Shred agro wells.

No	Selection factors	Score									
		Location 1	Location 2	Location 3	Location 4	Location 5	Location 6	Location 7	Location 8	Location 9	Location 10
1	location Type - Common land 30 & individual 10 marks										
2	consent for shred well- 10 marks										
3	Number of beneficiaries for well - Above 3 -10 marks , below 3 - 5 marks										
4	extend of acreage- 5 marks for each acre										
5	Disable member in the group - 5 marks for each member										
6	WWH in a group - 10 marks for each										
7	Women cultivtors in a group - 5 marks for each woman										
8	Person with specil needs in agroup - 5 for each										
9	Number of season intrested to cultivate (Jala- 3 marks, Maha - 3 marks & Interim - 3marks)										
10	GS certification - 10 marks										
11	Agriculture instructor certification -10 marks										
12	Farmer organization certification 10 marks										
Total											
Rank											