

**End of Project Evaluation of the
Project for Rehabilitation of Community Infrastructure and Facilities in
the Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Province (RCIF)**



April 2013 – July 2015

**This project is funded by the Government of Japan
Implemented
by**



Evaluation Report

Commissioned by
United Nations Human Settlements Programme
National Project Office, Colombo 04

Submitted by:
Inno Consulting Service

Consultants
Ramanaish Katheravelu
Pulendran Tharmendra
Kathir Kadampaseelan
Juderaj Croos

July 20, 2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our sincere thanks go to all interlocutors of UN-Habitat at the Colombo Programme Office and the Field Offices in Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu.



CONTENTS

Acronyms	04
----------	----

Executive Summary	05
-------------------	----

SECTION ONE

1.1 Project Description	10
-------------------------	----

1.2 Evaluation Methodology Overview	10
-------------------------------------	----

SECTION TWO

2.0 Findings	14
--------------	----

2.1 Relevance	14
---------------	----

2.2 Effectiveness	17
-------------------	----

2.3 Efficiency	23
----------------	----

2.4 Sustainability	30
--------------------	----

2.5 Gender Equity and Mainstreaming	31
-------------------------------------	----

2.6 Recommendations	34
---------------------	----

2.7 Conclusions	34
-----------------	----

2.8 Good Practices and Lessons Learnt	35
---------------------------------------	----

ACRONYMS

CBO	Community Based Organizations
CC	Community Center
CMA	Community Mobilization Assistants
DS	Divisional Secretariat Division
FO	Farmer Organizations
GN	Grama Niladhari
MEA	Monitoring and Evaluation Assistants
MPH	Multipurpose Hall
RDS	Rural Development Society
WRDS	Women Rural Development Society
TA	Technical Assistance
UN-Habitat	United Nations Human Settlements Programme



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The **Project for Rehabilitation of Community Infrastructure and Facilities in the Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Province (RCIF)**, funded by **Government of Japan**, was implemented by **UN-Habitat**, between April 2013 and June 2015. A "No-Cost extension" was sought for an additional three months to complete activities that were delayed due to several external factors. The project contributes to the sustainable rehabilitation and resettlement in Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu Districts in the Northern Province, through community infrastructure construction, including 29 multipurpose halls (community centres), 22 preschools, 56 internal roads (98.324km), 03 storm water drainage systems (6.14 km), 11 rainwater harvesting systems, and a tree planting programme.

Evaluation Methodology

This evaluation, undertaken by a four-member team from **Inno Consulting Service**, was conducted between **1st and 22nd of May 2015**. The team subsequently revisited the project locations between **23rd July and 25th July 2015** to verify the activities completed after 22nd May 2015. The evaluation included a desk-based document review, key - informant interviews, mini-survey and focus group discussions. Thirty GN divisions, from the 87 GN Divisions where the RCIF project was implemented, were selected randomly for data collection in Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu districts.

Relevance

The project design was relevant, with project objectives matching beneficiary needs and priorities. The project was implemented in a manner that addressed critical issues faced by the target communities. The activities carried out under the project were in line with the National Development Priorities, and also aligned with the Policy Statement of the Northern Provincial Council, which, inter alia, prioritizes improvement of road networks, enhancement of education, and improvement of basic infrastructure facilities in rural areas.

Infrastructure interventions were selected based on the priorities of the communities. Ninety-seven point five percent (97.5 %) of the community members expressed their full satisfaction towards the consultation process and participatory approach which allowed the beneficiaries to participate in the project as its primary partners. The community driven implementation methodology does have its merits. Such an approach enhances community ownership whilst remaining cost effective due to the absence of the profit motive.

Effectiveness

The project was broadly effective. The completed community assets are being effectively utilized by the communities. At the time of evaluation, the team encountered work in progress in a number of structures which made it difficult to generalize the potential outcome of these assets. But those that were completed and accessed by communities had contributed towards improved mobility (e.g. internal roads), access to better quality and new services (e.g. preschools and multipurpose halls), new technologies and skills (e.g. trainings).

Efficiency

The project was by and large efficient. 92.5 % of the community members expressed full satisfaction over the technical guidance provided by the UN-Habitat programme team.

Alternative technologies were used by the project and community members have shown a positive attitude towards these approaches. However, in certain instances, workmanship was found to be inadequate.

Preschool and Multipurpose Hall designs have included all the recommended facilities. Foundation height, ventilation, illumination, roof height, materials used, rainwater harvesting system and toilet facilities were found to be complying with requisite technical standards. Parents of preschool children expressed their satisfaction, as their children now had access to facilities of high standards. Only in some instances, the available space for preschool students appeared to be inadequate.

In most cases, internal roads had the required width, compaction and were constructed with appropriate material. In some instances, the road width was limited due to households refusing to provide land for extension.

It was found that UN-Habitat had been actively engaged in identifying risks and adopting necessary mitigation measures. The shortage of gravel encountered during project implementation, and subsequent mitigation measures taken by UN-Habitat is a good example. The UN-Habitat Field Team liaised efficiently with all the relevant stakeholders including the Forest Department, Central Environmental Authority and District and Divisional Secretariats to mitigate the negative impact caused by the shortage of gravel on the RCIF project. UN-Habitat team systematically identified, assessed and mitigated challenges.

The community consultation and participation process was efficient in bringing together relevant and diverse groups of stakeholders. It brought together members of Community Based Organizations (CBOs) such as Rural Development Societies (RDS), Women Rural Development Societies (WRDS), Fisheries Organizations and Farmer Organizations . This process created a platform to identify key issues, propose solutions and prioritize the more

important ones. The Divisional Secretariat and relevant Government officers were also found to be actively involved in the process.

Sustainability

The evaluators found that efforts were taken by UN-Habitat and the communities to ensure the sustainability of community assets. This included establishing and maintaining linkages with the relevant government stakeholders, proper handing over of systems, provision of training on maintenance and raising awareness amongst communities.

The participation of the communities throughout the process, from identification of needs to the construction of community assets, had positively contributed towards ownership. However, it was also found that a significant number of community members failed to articulate a concrete response on how they would obtain resources to maintain the community assets.

Gender Equity and Mainstreaming

The evaluators found that UN-Habitat had taken conscious efforts to ensure gender equity and mainstream gender aspects into the project.

Men and women were given equal opportunities to identify their needs, and to prioritize and select the most suitable needs for implementation. Both Rural Development Societies (RDS) and Women Rural Development Societies (WRDS) were given equal opportunities to be implementing partners. Funds were allocated for project activities, such as preschools, multipurpose halls, internal roads, leadership training etc, that foster gender equity.

Institutional arrangements have been established, including dedicated Gender Officers and gender disaggregated data collection systems that have added value to UN-Habitat's efforts to ensure gender equity. However, the monitoring and evaluation system needs to be improved in measuring intervention outcomes in a gender disaggregated manner, such as the usage and satisfaction of facilities by men and women. The design of buildings, such as lockable rooms, in house toilet facilities, location selection, were found to be incorporating safety concerns of women.

Members of Women Rural Development Society (WRDS), engaged in implementing the project had witnessed positive changes in interacting with external stakeholders and service providers. They also observed that their capacity to implement projects had improved.

Project and Donor Visibility

The community demonstrated awareness about the source of funding, **Government of Japan**, and the role of UN-Habitat. All the project locations had visibility signboards installed and the buildings had plaques installed comprising the project title, implementing mechanism and sources of funding.

Recommendations

It is recommended to explore the use of alternative material instead of gravel for road construction. Considering aspects of long term sustainability, health hazards and future availability of gravel, exploring alternative construction material is worth the effort. Local authorities also have the least preference for gravel based road construction, unless alternative options are not available.

Alternative construction technologies such as concrete frames, precast bricks and other approaches have been popularized by the project. Highly skilled construction craftsmen and masons need to be trained to further popularize such alternative sustainable technologies.

It is recommended to explore the role that multipurpose halls (community centres) could play in the life of the community and develop a framework that encompasses diverse dimensions. Instead of the MPHs simply becoming spaces for public officials and carrying out limited social functions, the potential role of an MPH should be further explored. Best practices already exist on the ground and even among MPHs constructed under the project.

As Technical Officers attached to the Department of Education had been provided minimal information on the construction process, it is recommended to improve coordination efforts with such specific stakeholders. For example, the preschool unit at the Department of Education remains the focal institution for coordinating preschool related activities and the involvement of Technical Officers attached to the department could be more appropriate.

Preschool management is entrusted to a committee comprising parents and teachers. The system needs to be further strengthened to improve sustainability of preschools. The capacity development initiatives that are taking place in collaboration with *Save the Children Japan* in Mullaitivu needs replication in Kilinochchi district as well. Preschools could be further expanded in scope by transforming them into daycare centers as and when required, so that parents, especially those from single parent households could engage in economic activities, which is of paramount importance in the post-conflict context.

Conclusions

The end of project evaluation findings are generally positive. Overall, the evaluators found the *Project for Rehabilitation of Community Infrastructure and Facilities in the Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Province (RCIF)* to be relevant, efficient, and effective. We point out that it is yet too early to comment on the impact and sustainability aspects.

However, encouraging signs are emerging on the positive impact of the project. The internal roads have facilitated access and improved mobility, resulting in economic and social gains to communities. Multipurpose halls are beginning to serve as a location to meet and access services. Preschools are creating a conducive learning environment for children. But sufficient time is required to validate whether the initial gains will be sustained and will have a wider, long term impact on the communities.

The evaluation found mixed results in certain aspects of the project. Usage and satisfaction among communities using the assets is high. Use of sustainable alternative technologies,

design of the buildings/ structures, quality of technical advice and guidance provided were well received and appreciated by the communities. However, some of the issues noted by the evaluation team included suitability of certain kinds of materials utilized i.e. use of barbed wire fencing in preschools and plans for long-term sustainability of community assets by communities.

The community driven approach has its merits. It had created a sense of ownership within the community for the assets they had constructed.

The UN-Habitat team, in consultation with state stakeholders prioritized the needs of community members who felt a sense of ownership and expressed their satisfaction.

Community members, in some locations have begun to realize the economic impact of community infrastructure, particularly the internal roads. The newly constructed internal roads in some locations linked isolated villages, increased interaction and eased transport facilities.

SECTION ONE

1.0 Introduction

Three decades of conflict in Sri Lanka ended in May 2009, displacing more than 450,000 people. In addition to the loss of family assets and livelihoods, the displacements also forced people into poverty. Due to the prolonged conflict, infrastructure had suffered tremendously from damage and neglect, substantially affecting the living conditions of the resettled people.

1.1 Project Description

The project, Rehabilitation of Community Infrastructure and Facilities in the Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Province (RCIF), implemented by UN-Habitat and funded by the Government of Japan, was implemented between April 2013 and March 2015 with a total budget of USD 3,619,387. A *No cost extension* was sought for an additional three months to complete the activities that were delayed due to external factors such as scarcity of gravel. The project contributes to sustainable rehabilitation and resettlement in Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu Districts in the Northern Province, through community infrastructure construction including community centers, preschools, internal roads, etc. The implementation of the project will ensure a range of outcomes, as follows:

Improved living conditions of the families creating new opportunities to access community infrastructure facilities;

- Improved access to preschool education, training and skills development in the communities;

- Empowered women in leadership roles and decision making;

- Capacities built in communities and Local Authorities/Local Govt. Partners for accessing support through partnership building within the target population and Local Authorities, other stakeholders; and

- Improved environment and promoted disaster and climate resilient communities.

1.2 Evaluation Methodology Overview

This evaluation, conducted by a four member team, tasked by **Inno Consulting Service**, was undertaken between 1st and 22nd of May 2015. The team subsequently revisited the project locations between 23rd July and 25th July 2015 to verify the activities completed after 22nd May 2015.

Objective of the Evaluation

The main objective of the evaluation was to assess the overall performance of expected results stipulated in the logical framework and the proposal, as well as mainstreamed topics

such as gender, age, disability, and environmental awareness in terms of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the programme, with special emphasis on:

The social, economic and environmental impact of the Project at the ground level (Impact)

Level of satisfaction of the communities and other stakeholders (Impact)

The process and the methodology of the participatory process (Process)

The level of participation of the communities and other stakeholders including local governments (Process)

Visibility materials in the field (e.g. signboards) and publications;

Levels of awareness amongst beneficiaries regarding the contribution of the funding partner (Government of Japan)

The scope of the evaluation encompassed verification of reported results against the Full Logic model and coverage of all project components and their geographic spread.

Evaluation questions

In which ways had the quality of life improved as elaborated in Theory of Change?

Are people satisfied with the intervention/ service/ facility?

Are the infrastructures being utilized optimally?

Compared to the pre-project situation how have the services improved?

To what extent does the design of the community infrastructure meet community expectations?

How does this intervention change the role of women in decision making?

Have the awareness levels on Gender, DRR, Disability, and Environment increased?

Evaluation questions together with the sub-questions are developed and given in the Evaluation Matrix (Annex 7).

Evaluation approach and methods

The evaluation methodology is comprised of mixed methods. A combination of quantitative and qualitative methods complement each other which allowed for a more thorough analysis. The evaluation was implemented in 03 phases:

Phase 1: Briefing and desk study - During the briefing session all relevant documents and necessary clarifications were provided by UN-Habitat. Inception Reports, data collection tools were submitted for approval from UN-Habitat.

Phase 2: Field study - Evaluation Team visited the project locations in Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu between 11th May and 22nd May 2015 and revisited selected areas between 23rd and 25th July 2015.

Phase 3: Analysis and drafting report - The draft and final report, was prepared in accordance with the guidelines provided by UN-Habitat.

Sample and sample frame

Under the five outputs, number of activities ranging from construction, capacity development, and tree planting and networking were executed in approximately 150-200 villages/GN divisions in Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu in the Northern Province. According to the logical-frame, the following types of activities are considered to ensure representative sampling in the project location.

- Infrastructure development - internal access roads with culverts
- Infrastructure development - rainwater harvesting facilities
- Infrastructure development - masonry storm water drains
- Infrastructure development - multi-purpose community centers
- Gender equity and empowerment of women
- Capacity development
- Disaster Risk Reduction- tree planning

30 field locations (out of 87 GN divisions where RCIF was implemented) in total were selected using random numbers, that is 15 each in Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu districts.

Approximately 330 participants representing communities, CBOs, government officials, preschool teachers and parents participated in the focus group discussions. Approximately 159 participants participated in the mini-survey. 55% of the participants were female comprising community members, preschool teachers, parents of preschoolers, WRDS members and government officials. Composition of the different representatives are as follows.

Type of Participants in the Mini Survey	F	M	Total
Community members	46	20	66
Fisheries Organizations	0	2	2
Farmer Organizations	0	2	2
Government Officers (Excluding GN)	2	5	7
Grama Niladhari Officers	5	11	16
Parents of Preschool Children	11	3	14
RDS	0	28	28
Teachers	8	0	8
WRDS	16	0	16
Total	88	71	159

Data collection procedures and instruments

Data was collected from the mini-survey, technical compliance checklist, focus group discussions and key informant interviews and direct observation. In addition to primary data collected by the Evaluation Team, project related documents were also reviewed.

Ethical considerations

Measures were taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants and consent was obtained from the participants to utilize their photographs in the findings and report. Utmost confidentiality was ensured when conducting the mini-survey.

Limitations

UN-Habitat obtained a no-cost extension from March 2015 for three months as the project activities could not be completed due to external factors including delays for gravel permits. Although it is an end-project evaluation, the Evaluation Team observed that for some components, results could be evaluated at the output level against process indicators. Hence, effectiveness and impact criteria could not be applied separately.

Social and economic benefits of the incomplete work such as internal roads need to be assessed using choice options or perceptions of the community members. Return to invest concept was used by considering the number of people who could benefit by the community infrastructure.

Data analysis

Data collected from more than three sources was triangulated. Perception of the people on the outcome and impact of the intervention was collected using qualitative tools such as Focus Group Discussions. The discussions were recorded with the consent of the participants. After building rapport and confidence with the participants, a mini-survey was administered to quantify the perceptions. Coding and sub-coding were used to analyze the transcripts. Statistical Software, SPSS was used to analyze the mini-survey.

SECTION TWO

2.0 Findings

2.1 Relevance

Relevance according to National Policies and Provincial and District Priorities

The proposed activities under the project are in tandem with the National Development Priorities. Successive governments had identified reduction of regional disparities, increased connectivity and improved access to services and facilities in conflict affected areas as priority¹. The interventions executed under the project: construction of rural roads, preschools drainage structures, rainwater harvesting tanks, tree planting programme and multipurpose-halls contributed towards such identified priorities.

The project also aligns with the Policy statement of the Northern Provincial Council 2013, with its priorities over improving road networks, enhancing capacity in the education sector, and rehabilitating basic infrastructure needs.

Relevance to community priorities

Poverty rates are high in the former conflict affected regions, especially in the Northern Province. The three decade long conflict had disrupted livelihoods of communities and had made a large number of infrastructure facilities unusable. Although a systematic published survey is lacking, discussions with relevant government stakeholders and communities revealed the need for investing in basic infrastructure facilities. During the conflict, a significant number of infrastructure facilities including roads, community centers and preschools were either completely damaged or require substantial renovation.



¹ National documents such as the Unstoppable Sri Lanka 2020 - Vision for the future, The Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Committee (LLRC) report highlight the priorities listed.

- a. *Puthumathalan - Access road constructed facilitate fishermen access to the sea*
- b. *Tharmakerni - Road under construction- once completed will link two villages*



Strom water drainage at Kanchipuram

The perception survey which used the 05 point scale to assess the perception of the community members to the statement “Infrastructures are selected based on the priorities of the communities “

Point Scale 1-5		Frequency	Percent
Somewhat Agree	3	4	2.5
Agree	4	10	6.3
Strongly Agree	5	145	91.2
	Total	159	100.0

Ninety seven point five percent (97.5 %) of the community members expressed full satisfaction towards the consultation process and the participatory approach that gave opportunities for the beneficiaries to participate, as the primary project partners.

Relevance of the implementation methodology

CBO Driven Approach

The CBO driven method strives to bring two important benefits that the evaluation team was able to identify, ownership and cost effectiveness. The participation of community based organizations in identifying needs, prioritizing and selecting the most appropriate intervention and becoming partners in their execution had allowed for greater ownership. The absence of the profit motive makes the whole process cost effective. Given the prevailing rate for capital (taking into account lending rates from banks) the community driven approach could be minimum 08-10% cheaper than if it was given to a private contractor.

Despite the existence of the above benefits, one of the drawbacks noted was the on-time completion of projects. The community driven method received mixed reactions from government officials. DS Maritimpattu observed that entrusting civil works to CBOs might not be an efficient practice. Technical capacity, time lapses and possible room for malpractices i.e. key CBO members could influence subcontracting/ procurement decisions. Most of the CBOs do not have adequate capacity and competence for the quality of work required. It was also noted that the absence of monetary incentives for community members engaged in the implementation limits their motivation. DS Oddusuddan and DS Kandawalai commended the approach to engage CBOs in community infrastructure and valued the technical support extended by UN-Habitat in ensuring the quality aspect. Enhanced community ownership, cost effectiveness and improved community capacities were cited as benefits that could be gained through the CBO driven approach.

Initial design of one project per location

The project design of implementing one project per location allows for greater geographical spread and benefits a larger number of communities. It thus assists to meet a key prioritized need of a particular community.

However, it might not be the most cost efficient method since it extends the geographical coverage and requires an extensive monitoring and quality assurance system to be in place. It also increases the workload of Community Mobilization Assistants and Technical Officers deployed for project execution.

2.2 Effectiveness

Overall Outcome: *The quality of life of families in the conflict affected areas will be improved through the construction of small-scale infrastructure.*

Indicator: *# of families having access to fully functioning community infrastructure*

The project was broadly effective. The completed community assets are put to use by the respective communities. At the time of the evaluation, the evaluation team encountered work in progress in a number of structures which made it difficult to generalize the potential outcome of these assets. But those that had been completed and accessed by communities had promising early signs of usage. Such assets are contributing towards improved mobility (e.g. internal roads), access to better quality and new services (e.g. preschools and multipurpose halls), new technologies and skills (e.g. trainings).

Outcome: Improved access to community infrastructure facilities contributing to living conditions of the families.

Multipurpose halls: Multipurpose halls were found to be used for diverse purposes and by varying sections of the communities. The multipurpose halls were used by students (for evening classes), women (attending health clinics, conducting WRDS meetings), farmers (farmer trainings, storage of agricultural materials), services offered by Grama Niladari, Development officer, as a library and reading room etc. In one instance, it was observed that a multipurpose hall was used to house a school temporarily. Multipurpose halls were used by communities to meet and socialize, thus contributing towards greater social cohesion.

However, it was observed that the quality of use of these public spaces is not same across all the multipurpose halls built by the project. For example in Periyaparanthan, and Thaddayamalai, the quality of usage is high. Periyaparanthan the MPH was used for health clinics, distribution of farm inputs, meetings for community based organizations and cultural events. Thaddayamalai MPH offered space for a reading room (newspapers and other reading materials were in place in one of the rooms for public use), to conduct evening classes and community meetings and social events. Broadly, the multipurpose halls were designed in an inclusive manner to accommodate various segments of the society i.e. women, children, elderly, disabled, etc.

Preschools: Preschools were constructed for a very specific purpose, serving as a focal center to facilitate early childhood development. Completed preschools were found to be offering the required facilities; a safe and secure environment, spacious internal learning environment, learning corners, upgraded furniture, kitchen, wash area and bathrooms, and play areas. The standard design, varying only in size depending on the size of the target population, had allowed for the same facilities to be available in all target areas. It was also

noted that children are now much keener to attend preschool on a regular basis. The degree of satisfaction is high among parents and concern for the safety of their children had reduced with the new units.

Internal Roads: Internal roads were found to have improved the mobility of communities and facilitated access to diverse services. Previously difficult to access sandy and flood prone roads are now converted into more permanent structures. Construction of culverts along the internal roads had contributed towards flood mitigation and protection of newly constructed roads.

It was recorded that these roads facilitate people to travel and have access to public services such as those offered through the Divisional Secretariat, Agrarian Development Centers, schools, hospitals etc. To access sources of livelihoods such as the sea, paddy lands, to access markets in order to sell their produce, to transport materials for house construction, and to link with neighbouring villages and participate in social events.

The delay in completing the roads was attributable to the shortage of gravel which negatively impacted the construction process. Roads that are operational were used for multiple purposes and had benefitted the communities on multiple fronts.

In Ambalnagar village, Santhapuram GN Division, Karachchi DS Division, a resident stated that the internal road has improved accessibility for buyers from other districts. The residents are now in a position to earn more productive labour days as there is no need to travel to the market to sell their agricultural produce from home gardens. A household earns approximately Rs 5000/- to 8000/- per month from their home gardens. The villagers depend on home gardens and agricultural labour for their livelihood. “Now, we can travel without difficulties even during the rainy season, as newly built roads and culverts have significantly mitigated flooding”, observed another participant in the focus group discussion, in the Ampalnagar GN Division.

The road in Periyapalai, Pachchilappalii DS, is predominantly used by people accessing public services such as schools, government offices as well serving as a connecting road to neighbouring villages.



- a. In Periyapalai - a carefree walk, internal road linked two villages in the same GN
- b. Puthumathalan-Access road to fisheries activities

“There was a time, in Pereiyapalai village, our children had to take two sets of clothes, as they had to change their school uniforms after crossing the storm water. With the new road, such hardships of the children were addressed”, said one participant from Pariyapalai, Kilinochchi District.



- a. Punnainiravi - Flooded road in Kandavalai DS (Before)
- b . Renovated road (Now)

Outcome: Improved access to preschool education, training and skills development in the communities

Indicator: # of all eligible preschool children from the target villages attending preschools

It was observed that completed preschools were spacious, well ventilated, safe, child friendly (with play spaces constructed and disability access), illuminated, compared to the previous buildings in which the preschools functioned.

Discussions with preschool teachers and parents revealed that children had shown increased interest in attending preschool which had had been shifted to the new buildings. New and improved facilities and a conducive learning environment were cited as the primary reasons for the positive attitude of the children.

Preschools that were earlier functioning in makeshift sheds and in public buildings did not have the required facilities and children's learning was disrupted when public events were taking place or when adverse weather conditions prevailed.



- a. Kalmadu- From a makeshift preschool,
- b. Kalmadu- Towards a child friendly environment ,

Preschools in Vinayakarkudiyrippu, Kaathaliyaarsamankulam and Pulmochchnathakulam were earlier functioning in temporary makeshift structures which had cramped space, limited illumination and ventilation, including safety concerns. These buildings also lacked facilities such as play areas, toilets and a kitchen.



- a: Fully functional preschool
- b. Preschool children, Sivanagar Preschool, Odduchuddan DS

Outcome: Empowered women in leadership roles and decision making

Indicator: % of women in decision making roles in CDCs

Efforts had been taken to ensure participation of women in the decision making process as well as the project implementation process. The planning process of identifying needs, prioritizing and finalizing key interventions involved both men and women. The community settlement improvement planning workshops organized by UN-Habitat provided the space for both men and women to participate in the planning process and voice their needs and preferences.

Women were mostly represented in the process through respective WRDSs. Equal opportunity was also provided for women to participate in the implementation process as partners. The predefined selection criteria helps to avoid selection bias and at times positively influences the selection of WRDS as implementing partners.

WRDSs are generally more organized, have saving balances and greater number of beneficiaries compared with RDS or other community based organizations. Government stakeholders observed WRDSs to be more effective in mobilizing members and securing voluntary contributions from their communities for projects. However, initial difficulties of a technical capacity and establishing links with external stakeholders were considered to be key challenges.

Discussion with WRDS members revealed that they had enhanced their technical skills, and were able to articulate their needs and link up with relevant stakeholders including government officials, service providers and suppliers due to the project interventions..

Outcome: *Capacities built in communities and Local Authorities for accessing support through partnership building within the target population, Local Authorities and other stakeholders.*

Indicator 1: *% of Communities demonstrating capacity for operation and maintenance of new community assets.*

In response to the statement “Able to apply the knowledge gained for the workshops on infrastructure maintenance “, 45.3 % of the community members agree or strongly agree.

Point Scale 1-5		Frequency	Percent
Somewhat Agree	3	31	19.5
Agree	4	24	15.1
Strongly Agree	5	48	30.2
Not relevant	8	56	35.2
Total		159	100.0

The internal roads are under the inventory of the Pradeshiya Sabha, while Multipurpose Halls and Preschools are with the Divisional Secretariat. The capacity of the communities to operate these assets is high whilst plans for sustainable maintenance remains low. Community initiatives to obtain electricity and water supply was observed in some of the communities.

At the time of evaluation, a number of projects were incomplete and thus communities didn't have detailed plans for long term maintenance, related issues such as repairs and renovation, extension and additional facilities. The evaluation team observed that discussions had begun to evolve around maintenance related aspects.

It was recorded that UN-Habitat had provided advice and guidance to community based implementing partners for construction and maintenance of the assets thus created.

Indicator 2: # of youth and Preschool teachers receiving formal skills training

Discussions with preschool teachers revealed that a significant number of preschool teachers in Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu had already completed or were in the process of completing the Diploma course on preschool teaching.

The collaboration with **Save the Children Japan** in Mullaitivu had resulted in 03 preschool teachers being supported to complete the diploma courses. Additional training is provided on creative teaching methods, use of visual materials in teaching, etc. The preschool management committees are also being trained on the importance of early childhood development centers, child rights, roles and responsibility of the committees, and planning.

Indicator 3: # of Functional partnerships among the target population, Local Authorities, and other stakeholders.

Multipurpose Hall - Functional relationship exists between the communities and respective Divisional Secretariat offices for operation and maintenance of those centers.

Preschools - Functional relationship exists between the community, Divisional Secretariat offices and Department of Education. The Divisional Secretariat offices are responsible for allocating lands, providing technical guidance during construction as well advising and monitoring the activities of the implementing partners (Rural Development Societies and Women Rural Development Societies).

Internal roads: A functional relationship exists between the respective Pradeshiya Sabha and the communities. Communities have access to Technical Officers to obtain guidance on technical issues. Long term and substantial maintenance issues of roads are vested with the Pradeshiya Sabha.

Outcome: Improved environment and promoted disaster and climate resilient communities

Indicator 1: # of Community Infrastructure comply with DRR standards

Indicator 2: # of Rainwater Harvesting Tanks

UN-Habitat promoted rainwater harvesting practices through the construction of rainwater harvesting tanks in all its buildings as well by installing plastic tanks in selected facilities. Communities were also provided awareness sessions on the importance of rainwater harvesting as well as maintenance the structures. It was observed that in completed buildings, rainwater is being collected and used.



Approximately 135,000 trees were distributed amongst UN-Habitat housing beneficiaries and community infrastructure facilities such as multi-purpose halls and preschools. Trees were planted in common locations and maintained by the CBOs.

2.3 Efficiency

Meeting Deadlines

There was a time lapse in releasing the community assets to the public use as planned in some infrastructure facilities. At the time of the first data collection in May 2015, it was also observed that in a number of structures work was still in progress. Availability of raw material (gravel supply), unexpected rains and commencement of some construction activities during the rainy season were causes for the delay.

Quality of technical guidance and support

Adequate technical guidance and support was extended by UN-Habitat to implementing partners to carry out the agreed tasks. Guidance and technical advice ranged from accessing relevant stakeholders i.e. contacting government officials for approvals, initiating procurement processes, construction methods and technical compliance, book keeping and maintaining of accounts.

In response to the statement “Technical service and guidance provided by UN-Habitat are satisfactory”, 71.7% of the community members agree or strongly agree with the statement.

Point Scale		Frequency	Percent
Disagree	2	3	1.9
Somewhat Agree	3	9	5.6
Agree	4	15	9.4
Strongly Agree	5	99	62.3
	Total	126	79.2
No Response /Not Relevant to them		33	20.8
	Total	159	100.0

Community Consultation and participatory approach – In response to the statement “Community members participated in the consultation process“, 85.5 % of the community members agree or strongly agree with the statement.

Point Scale		Frequency	Percent
Disagree	2	8	5.0
Somewhat agree	3	15	9.4
Agree	4	59	37.1
Strongly Agree	5	77	48.4
	Total	159	100.0

Technical Compliance - Preschool

Government rules, design, safety, environmental and social aspects are included in the technical compliance checklist (Annex 4).

While assessing the design, following parameters were considered: foundation height, superstructure, roof, floor, door & windows, available space for usage, used materials, finishing works, lighting-illumination and user- friendly features.

Preschool designs have adhered to government rules. All the preschools have complied with the minimum requirements of height, door/floor area, window/floor area, rear space, distance between well and toilet pit, availability of rain-water harvesting system, allowable distance between road centre line and building line (street line and building line) and land area of above 6 perches. Preschool designs have included all the recommended facilities. These include water facilities, wash room, store room, kitchen, play space, disability access to the building, and in-house bathrooms and access of building from the road.

In some instances, the evaluation team found that some of the government Technical Officers were unaware of the project activities. For example, the Technical Officer attached to the Zonal Educational Department, was not involved in the design or monitoring activities of preschools despite the preschools coming under the purview of the Assistant Director, Early Childhood Development, Department of Education. However it was observed that Technical Officers from the Divisional Secretariats were involved in the preschool construction.

The initiative to save rainwater through constructed tanks is widely appreciated by communities and government stakeholders.



Parents of the preschool children expressed their satisfaction and enthusiasm, as their children now have access to facilities which matched the standards of some affluent private schools. With access to electricity, the children could also access audio visual learning facilities with minimal cost.

Availability of sufficient space compared to the pre-project situation is much appreciated by parents, teachers and children. It was also observed that in some cases, available facilities (i.e ability to partition the building) is not sufficient when conducting classes for more than two batches of children at a time. Evaluators observed that the preschool teachers need to engage one batch outdoors to avoid disturbing the other.



The evaluators observed the use of barbed wire in preschool fencing. Barbed wire use was minimal in Mullaitivu district, while in Kilinochchi district it was used as a fencing material covering three sides except the front portion.



- a. Barbed wire fence at preschool, Vinayakar Kudiyiruppu
- b. Appropriate fencing, Barathipuram

On the aspects of location, landscape, drainage, flooding condition and availability of sunlight, UN-Habitat in consultation with the communities and Technical Officers had dealt with all aspects satisfactorily. Flood prone areas were avoided and most of the buildings were constructed on a flat landscape. It is also observed that the design incorporated traditional practices such as standard sizes, ventilation as well as cultural values into the concept.

Comparing the preschools constructed by UN-Habitat at various locations, improvements were observed in the design and building materials used.

Technical Compliance - Multipurpose Hall

Similar parameters applied to assess the technical compliance of the preschools were also applied for the Multi-Purpose Halls. Overall, the multipurpose halls, built by UN-Habitat are in compliance with the minimum requirements. Locations were relatively free of flooding, centrally located, had flat landscape and were easily accessible. Foundation height had taken into consideration annual flood levels, height of frontal access road, etc.

It was observed that cooling sheets, used for roofing, are exposed to the outer environment and could be damaged by squirrels and birds. Therefore, precautions should be taken to mitigate such risks. Rain water harvesting tanks should be covered. In some locations, the workmanship of the finishing works needed to be improved. . In some MPHs, there were gaps between the roof and walls, which allowed birds to enter the building.



- a. Monkeys/ birds could go inside
- b. Roof cooling material, could be damaged by birds

In response to the statement “Design of the infrastructure is appropriate“, 89.4% of the community members agree or strongly agree with the statement.

Point Scale		Frequency	Percent
Disagree	2	2	1.3
Somewhat Agree	3	14	8.8
Agree	4	40	25.2
Strongly Agree	5	102	64.2
Not Relevant	8	1	.6
Total		159	100.0

In some cases, the door frames used in the MPHs were not up to the required standard and cracks were observed in the frames.

Technical Compliance - Internal Roads

The key parameters considered for the technical compliance were road width, shoulder width, quality of the material and application and centre line to fence-width.



- a). Access road, Santhapuram, Kilinochchi
- b). Access road, Krisnapuram, Kilinochchi

The roads were designed as gravel roads and are considered semi-permanent in nature. Alternative permanent designs such as design with concrete or DBST which could withstand wear and tear for longer periods was not adopted in order to: 1) respond to the high demand for internal roads with limited funds; and 2) as the gravel roads will be used as the foundation for the permanent structure. Compaction was found to be inadequate in some places. Instances where the roads were narrow, less than recommended width was observed due to some households declining to provide a portion of their land for road expansion. Assistance of Grama Niladhari Officers and representatives of Local Authorities were sought by UN-Habitat to resolve such issues. For example in Santhapuram GN Division in Kilinochchi district, households had contributed a portion of their lands to expand road width, while in Palai GN division in Kilinochchi district the same level of cooperation did not prevail.

Responding to the statement “Materials used for the construction are appropriate“, 86.2 % of the community members agree or strongly agree with the statement.

Point scale 1-5		Frequency	Percent
Disagree	2	8	5.0
Somewhat Agree	3	14	8.8
Agree	4	28	17.6
Strongly Agree	5	109	68.6
Total		159	100.0

Monitoring, Evaluation and Information Sharing

The evaluators found that UN-Habitat had an efficient monitoring system at activity and output level. But it was observed that when measuring results at outcome level, the system needs improvement. Comprehensive baseline data needs to be in place, to measure outcomes and longer term results of the project.

Community Mobilization Assistants (CMA), M&E Assistants (MEA) and Technical Officers (TO) of the Programme team, were involved at different phases of the activities. Field staff (CMA, MEA, and TA) efficiently complemented each other and worked with a team spirit.

Information sharing at the middle management level (District Manager, Community Mobilizing Officer) is commendable. Information flow from Head office to field level staff is not effective and there is no mechanism, i.e. for debriefing after a field mission. The sharing of mission findings, reports with the junior and middle level staff, or a comprehensive knowledge management system with easy access to project related information, is an urgent need. Field staff should have access to all relevant information such as internal reviews and field mission reports from senior management.

Risk Management

UN-Habitat's annual and biannual progress reports have documented and assessed the risks associated with the project. Selection of implementing partners, prioritization of the infrastructure needs, obtaining land for construction, limited capacity of the CBOs, flooding, obtaining permits for gravel mining are some of the issues and risks documented.

Commenting on gravel mining, the District Secretary for Mullaitivu, formerly the District Secretary for Kilinochchi, observed that challenges related to gravel mining was taken up at higher levels and special permission was sought to mitigate the delay.

UN-Habitat field team liaised efficiently with all stakeholders including the Forest Department, Central Environmental Authority and District and Divisional Secretariats to mitigate the adverse impact on the RCIF project such as possible deforestation or gravel mining.

Project and Donor Visibility

Active members of Community Based Organizations and those associated with the project activities are aware of the funding agency (Government of Japan) and the role of UN-Habitat. A number of participants recalled the ceremony graced by the representatives of the Embassy of Japan. Most of the participants identified the Japan emblem, depicted in the commemorative plaque installed by the implementing CBO and UN-Habitat. Signboards were visible in all the project locations.

2.4 Sustainability

Involvement of Relevant Government Officials Throughout the Process

The evaluation team found that throughout the process - from design to handing over, relevant government stakeholders were involved. The selection of community assets were carried out in consultation with relevant government officials such as the GS, DO and respective DSs. Procedures are in place to properly hand over the newly created assets to relevant stakeholders.

Providing spaces for government officials to operate from multipurpose halls enhances space utility and long term operational sustainability. In most of the locations visited by the evaluators, spaces were allocated for and used by GS, DO and or Samurdhi officers.

Community Ownership

Involvement of communities from the planning, design, implementation and post implementation activities had created a sense of ownership. This aspect is explicitly shown in the utilisation of spaces. For example, it was found that a section of the multipurpose halls were used as libraries and for conducting evening classes. Voluntary planting of trees, periodic cleaning of public spaces are further examples of the sense of ownership.

In response to the statement “Community has a Plan/Roadmap for building maintenance“, 47.2 % of the community members agree or strongly agree with the statement.

Point Scale		Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	8	3.8
Disagree	2	15	9.4
Somewhat Agree	3	31	19.5
Agree	4	35	22.0
Strongly Agree	5	40	25.2
	8	4	2.5
Total		127	79.9
No Response		32	20.1
Total		159	100.0

Active members promptly responded that they could collect funds from benefactors in the locality to meet the cost of maintaining the MPH. However, they do not have an idea as to how to meet the electricity charges if it is occupied and utilized by public servants.

Some community members expected the government or NGOs to support them to maintain the MPH. Most of the villagers did not provide a concrete answer as to how they meet maintenance cost of MPHs. The response to the question “Community has a Plan/Roadmap for building maintenance” confirms that communities had paid limited attention towards this aspect.

2.5 Gender Equity and Mainstreaming

The evaluators found that UN-Habitat had taken conscious efforts to ensure gender equity and mainstream gender aspects into the project. The Gender Strategy of UN-Habitat aims to ensure **visible mainstreaming of gender perspectives in all projects and programmes**. Gender mainstreaming within RCIF is assessed using the UN Habitat Sri Lanka Gender Strategy 2015-2016.

	Priorities	Evidence from the Review
1	Recognize and incorporate the interdependent and complementary roles of men and women in the project and programme design,	In RCIF Project, men and women were given equal opportunity for participating in identifying their needs, prioritizing and selecting the most suitable need for implementation. Women

	implementation, monitoring and evaluation.	Rural Development Societies were given equal opportunity as implementing partners.
2	Substantive and suitable budgeting and resource allocation for projects and programmes that foster gender equality.	Community assets that were created contribute towards promoting gender equality. Internal roads provide opportunities for both men and women to access services and facilities and enhance economic opportunities. Preschools provide opportunities for both boys and girls to gain literacy. Multipurpose halls foster social cohesion through facilitating access to public and cultural services. However, it was observed that further investment in promoting women's leadership could have been beneficial.
3	Design a gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation system, containing the formation of indicators to quantify the degree to which gender equality objectives are met and changes in gender relations achieved.	The existing monitoring system contains indicators that are gender sensitive. However, data collection and analysis needs to improve on how development initiatives are differentially impacting men and women at a higher order result level. (at outcome and impact levels)
4	Establishment of a set of institutional procedures to allow an effective gender-screening of projects, programmes, initiatives, trainings, knowledge management and communication materials.	The availability of the gender officers at the programme management unit as well at the field station who had also extended their support for the RCIF project had allowed special attention to be placed on issues related to gender.
5	Include the perspectives of women, men, girls and boys in building design, settlement planning and their implementation.	From the planning of settlement improvement plans, to design and implementation, men and women were given equal opportunities for participating, expressing their views and concerns. Women Rural Development Societies along with Rural Development Societies, Farmer Organizations and other Community Based Organizations were given an equal opportunity to participate in the planning process as well as being implementing partners.

6	Consider safety of women, men girls and boys in building design, settlement planning and implementation	The safety of women, men, girls and boys were considered in the building design. The evaluation team observed that the buildings were constructed in accessible, flood mitigated locations. Structures are in place to facilitate access for differently abled persons, both men and women, fenced and with lockable facilities for the rooms and halls. Availability of toilet facilities within the building is also a positive aspect.
---	---	---

Members of Women Rural Development Societies engaged in implementing the project, had witnessed positive changes in interacting with external stakeholders and service providers. They have also learnt the basics of project management and are able to enhance social cohesion in their respective communities through voluntary work, having learnt new skills and procedures such as bookkeeping, project management and procurement. However, it was observed that the intervention only benefitted a section of women in the community, i.e. those who are part of the executive body of the WRDS's.

There were instances, when the WRDSs were performing well, attempts were made by sections of the community to undermine or discriminate them. For example, in Periyapalai, the RDS was less appreciative of the efforts of WRDS, although both organizations were engaged in constructing internal roads.

The RCIF Project, in the initial phase, took the initiative to provide construction skills training for men and women from the locality.

“In the first phase, female participation was high in the masonry training. One third of the participants were women. The training was for technical construction skills. As the women showed keen interest, they were welcomed to the training programmes. However, traveling from long distances to the workplace was a challenge also if they are the main breadwinners, that factor also adversely affected them”, observed Gamini Herath, President of CEFENet, which coordinated and provided the masonry and carpentry training.

2.6 Recommendations

It is recommended to explore the use of alternative material instead of gravel for road construction. Considering long term sustainability, health hazards and future availability of gravel, exploring alternative construction material merits the effort. Local authorities also have the least preference for gravel based road construction unless other options do not exist.

Alternative technologies, such as concrete frames, pre-cast bricks and other approaches have been popularized by the project. However, highly skilled construction craftsmen and masons need to be trained, to further popularize alternative sustainable technologies.

It is recommended to further explore the role of multipurpose halls and develop a framework that encompasses diverse dimensions. Instead of the MPHs simply becoming spaces to house public officials and carrying out limited social functions, the potential role that an MPH could play should be further explored. Best practices already exist on the ground and even among MPHs constructed under the project, such as in MPHs of Periyaparanthan and Thaddayamalai. The best practices need to be documented and shared with other MPH units. MPHs could become a Social and Cultural center, and an entity with a self-sustaining business model. In remote places, MPHs could be linked to “VITHATHA” or “NANASALA”, which provides communication and ICT based services as well rural technology enhancement services.

As Technical Officers attached to the Department of Education had been provided with only minimal information during the process of construction, it is recommended to improve coordination efforts with these stakeholders. For example, the preschool unit at the Department of Education remains the focal institution for coordinating preschool related activities and the involvement of Technical Officers attached to the department could be more appropriate.

Preschool management is entrusted to a committee comprising parents and teachers. The system needs to be further strengthened in order to improve sustainability of preschools. The capacity development initiatives that are taking place in collaboration with Save the Children in Mullaitivu needs replication in Kilinochchi district as well. Advocacy is required to mitigate the influence of military, which also involved in appointing preschool teachers as part of their civil defense force personnel. Preschools could be further expanded in their scope by transforming it into a daycare center as and when required, so that single headed households could engage in economic activities, which is of paramount importance in the post conflict context.

2.7 Conclusions

The end of project evaluation findings are generally positive. Overall, the evaluators found the Project for Rehabilitation of Community Infrastructure and Facilities in the Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Province to be relevant, efficient, and effective while it is too early to comment and generalize on the impact and sustainability fronts.

However, encouraging signs are emerging on the positive impact the project was able to generate. The internal roads had facilitated access and improved mobility, resulting in economic and social gains to communities. Multipurpose halls are beginning to serve as a place to meet and access services. Preschools are creating a conducive learning environment. But sufficient time is required to validate whether the initial gains will be sustained and have wider impact on the communities.

The evaluation found mixed results on certain aspects of the project. Usage and satisfaction among communities using the assets is high. Use of sustainable alternative technologies,

design of the buildings/ structures, quality of technical advice and guidance provided were well received and appreciated by the communities. However, on -time completion of projects, suitability of certain materials used i.e. use of barbed wire fences in preschools and plans for long term sustainability of community assets by communities were found to be lacking and require remedial actions.

The community driven approach has its merits. It has created a sense of ownership within the community for the assets they had created. Communities were allowed to be part of the process from planning, design and implementation.

The nature of the project requires coordination with diverse set of stakeholders. Provincial, local and central structures of the government, other agencies involved in development interventions in the respective villages, community based organizations etc. Overall coordination efforts are satisfactory. Approvals, information sharing and synergies were reached where appropriate. However there is room for further improvement.

Community members, in some locations have begun to realize the economic impact of the community infrastructure, particularly the internal roads. Newly constructed internal roads in some locations linked isolated villages, increased interaction and facilitated transport.

2.8 Good Practices and Lessons Learnt

Pioneering alternative sustainable technology in common infrastructure is commendable. Active members of CBOs and some Government Officials were impressed with these methods and have expressed their interest in replicating these methods.

Compared to finishing work in the traditional construction method, the finished work of buildings that used alternative technology are not attractive owing to inefficient workmanship. Scarcity of highly skilled masons/builders required for implementing alternative technology is one of the reasons.

The Disaster Management Center (DMC) has supported the construction of wells in some of the MPHs. For example, the MPH in Soranpattu received such support. Apart from the value addition received from DMC, the potential roles MPHs could play in providing shelter and as a gathering point at a time of disaster should be recognized.

Community Action Plan: The community action planning process had facilitated participation of communities in identifying their most critical needs, prioritize their needs and select the most urgent and important needs that falls with the project's scope. The process had contributed towards retaining a sense of ownership among communities as well for securing community contribution towards projects.

Annexes

Annex 1	:	Documents Reviewed
Annex 2	:	FGD Guidelines - Community
Annex 3	:	Mini Survey- Government Technical Officers
Annex 4	:	Technical Compliance Checklist
Annex 5	:	Mini Survey - Community
Annex 6	:	Project Activity Cost
Annex 7	:	Evaluation Matrix
Annex 8	:	Community Meeting Schedule
Annex 9	:	Key Informants
Annex 10	:	TOR
Annex 11	:	Evaluation Team

**End of Project Evaluation of the
Project for Rehabilitation of Community Infrastructure and Facilities
in the Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Province (RCIF)**

April 2013 – July 2015

**This project is funded by the Government of Japan
Implemented**

by



Annexures

Evaluation Report

**Inno Consulting Service
July 2015**

Content

Annex 1	:	Documents Reviewed	03
Annex 2	:	FGD Guidelines – Community	05
Annex 3	:	Mini Survey- Government Technical Officers	11
Annex 4	:	Technical Compliance Checklist	13
Annex 5	:	Mini Survey – Community	15
Annex 6	:	Project Activity Cost	16
Annex 7	:	Evaluation Matrix	19
Annex 8	:	Community Meeting Schedule	22
Annex 9	:	Key Informants	24
Annex 10	:	TOR	25
Annex 11	:	Evaluation Team	29

Annexure 1: Documents Reviewed

	Title of document	Type of document/description
A	Proposals	
	<i>RCIF ProDoc 100315</i>	Project Proposal
B	Project Completion Report	Not Available as UN HABIAT obtained no cost extension for 3 months from March 2015. The Evaluation was done during May/June 2015.
C	Progress Reports / Mission Report	
	<i>Annual Progress Report (No 1) April 2013- March 2014</i>	Year 1 Annual Report
	<i>Biannual Progress Report(No 2) April 2014 – September 2014</i>	Biannual Report
	<i>Copy of the Infrastructure Monitoring Table RCIF</i>	Five excel sheet contain information(Road, PS, RWH, MPH, SWD, TP) Contain information only infrastructure activities in Mullaitivu and Kilinochchi
	<i>Bi-Annual Progress Report (No: 1) 1st April – September 2013</i>	
	<i>Mission Report(3 reports)</i>	Gender and Environmental Officer
D	Budget Reports	
	<i>RCIF Financial Report As of March 31st 2014</i>	Interim Financial Statement as at 31 st March 2014
	<i>Budget Revision B SRLD 1001D 377</i>	Budget revision (25 th Nov 2013), Status of Allotment Report (Nov 2013)
E	DRR, Alternative Sustainable Technology	
	<i>Alternative Technology for sustainable building by Piyal Genepola, PPT</i>	
	<i>Challenges in Introducing Alternative Technologies in Home Owner Driven Housing, Piyal Genepola, Paper</i>	
	<i>Community Canter Type I Model</i>	
	<i>Community Canter Type II Model</i>	
	<i>Community Canter Type III Model</i>	
	<i>Low Cost Design Standards for Rural Roads Projects</i>	
	<i>MAINTENANCE MANUAL FOR LOW COST RURAL ROADS IN ROMANIA</i>	
	<i>Preschool Type 1</i>	
F	Additional Documents	
	<i>Annex 2 Evaluation RCI_RCIF SCM Dec 2014</i>	Four page document

	<i>Steering Committee Meeting Minutes 4rd Dec 2014</i>	It focus on both project RCIF(April 2013-March 2015) and RCI(April 2014-March 2016)
	<i>RCIF Annex 3 1st April-31st Sep 2013</i>	List of Infrastructure Activities as of 24102013
	<i>Sample MOU with CBO</i>	MPH Puliampokkanai & MPH Kokuthoduvai
	<i>MOU with Save the Children Japan</i>	
	<i>Project Document –CEFE NET</i>	
	<i>GPP – UN Habitat Policy and Plan for gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women in urban development and Human settlement.</i>	
	<i>Sri Lanka Gender Strategy</i>	

Annexure 2: Focus Group Discussion Guidelines

Focus Group Discussion - Focus group discussion is one of the methods that will be used for the end of project evaluation. It will carry out an in-depth interview with a group of 10-12 people on a focused issue or topic, in this case the evaluation scope outlined in the TOR. Focus group discussions are intended to last approximately 45- minutes to an hour. Given the nature of the project it is proposed to divide the focus groups broadly in to two groups, one consisting of only women participants and the other being mixed member group. The exact number of mixed and women only groups are given under the sampling plan.

Guiding questions for the discussion

Relevance and Appropriateness

1. What is the characteristic of the population in need?
(Poverty levels, Livelihood activities, Vulnerability etc)
2. What are the key needs of the population?
(The question should explore urgent and important needs of the community)
3. What is the nature and magnitude of the problem addressed? What is the need for the project?
4. Why the community did wanted the following structures?
 - a. PS
 - b. MPH
 - c. Roads
 - d. SWD
 - e. RWHS
 - f. Trees

Efficiency

1. How did people participate in the project?
(were they invited for consultation, how inclusive was it)
2. What facilities or process were in place to ensure participation?
(was sufficient notice given, how were people informed)
3. How did they decide what intervention is needed? If infrastructure where to locate them?
4. Has the intervention benefit everyone? Or does it benefit only a small portion of the community? (benefit: men and women, marginalized community etc)
5. Are the intended interventions were completed and service is delivered on time?
6. Did the community have established procurement process for goods and services? Did they face any issue?
7. How was a particular community selected for carrying out identified intervention? What process was in place? (this question also applies to UN HABITAT staff as well)
8. Would alternative approaches yield equivalent benefits at a lesser cost? How does the cost of the program compare with the costs of similar programs
9. How economically are resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc) converted to outputs?
10. In what ways was the investment leveraged for maximizing results? How appropriate was the design?

11. What are the costs of administration and infrastructure relative to programming expenses?

Effectiveness

Outcome	Indicator	Question
The quality of living of the families in the conflict affected area will be improved through construction of the small-scale infrastructure	# Of families having access to fully functioning community infrastructure.	<p>To what extend</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Infrastructures fully completed b. Used regularly (Regular) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PS – daily MPH – periodically/ daily Roads - daily c. Maintained properly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cleaned periodically Repair needs identified <p>For what purposes the communities are using the infrastructure?</p> <p>In which ways quality of life had improved for communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Income b. Health c. Education (including preschool) d. Physical living environment e. Ease of access to services (public, markets, transport etc) f. Change in production, marketing, price of produces, inputs g. Local employment through construction work, cash injection, skills transfer (including alternative sustainable technologies) <p>Are people satisfied with the intervention/ service/ facility?</p> <p>Are the infrastructures are being used optimally?</p> <p>Compared to pre project situation how the services are improved?</p>

Output1: Community Infrastructure (MPH, Roads, SWD, RWHS)

Output	Indicator	Question
--------	-----------	----------

Output2: Preschool

Output	Indicator	Question
Improved access to preschool education, training and skills development in the communities	# of all eligible pre-school children from the target villages attending preschool	Are there any changes in preschool enrollment? What has changed with the construction of new preschool? What are the changes in terms of safety, security, and learning environment? Are they satisfied? What else should have been incorporated in the design? Were there any skills training conducted for pre-schools teachers? What changes had taken place after the training?

Output3: Empowered women

Output	Indicator	Question
Empowered women in leadership roles and decision making	% of women in decision making roles in CDCs	Are there any changes in the number of women in decision making bodies? How many women were previously in decision making position and how many new women had joined? How do the community reacts about this changes? What are the skills women had learnt during the project period? How did they apply those skills?

Output4: Capacities of communities

Output	Indicator	Question
Capacities built in communities and Local Authorities for accessing support through partnership building within the target population and Local Authorities, other stakeholders	% of Communities demonstrating capacity for operation and maintenance of new community assets	Did communities have the skills and capacities? What support did the communities receive from UN Habitat in enhancing their skills and capacities? Are there functional community groups responsible for maintenance? How are resources mobilized for maintenance?

	<p># of youth and Pre-school teachers receiving formal skills training</p> <p># of Functional partnerships between the among the target population, Local Authorities, and other stakeholders</p>	<p>How many of them are capable of community action planning? What is community's contribution to the project? Did community contribution materialized? What were the reasons for it to materialize or not?</p> <p>What are the skills youth and preschool teachers are equipped with? How are they using those skills? How many of them find new employment opportunities?</p> <p>Did communities have working relationship with local authorities? Did they contact local authorities in the past three months? How frequently did they contact and for what purposes? Any other partnership with other stakeholders?</p>
--	---	---

Output5: Improved environment

Output	Indicator	Question
Improved environment and promoted disaster and climate resilient communities	# of Community Infrastructure comply with DRR standards	<p>Are the buildings are flood proof? Are the buildings able to with stand strong winds? What are the mitigation measures incorporated in to the project?</p>
	# of families participating in reforestation programme	<p>How many trees were planted? Where are the trees planted? In common place/ private land? Do they have/ feel ownership of the tree planting project? What is the survival rate of trees? What are the arrangements in place for maintaining trees?</p>

Sustainability

What are the arrangements in place for maintenance of constructed structure?

What is the level of ownership among communities using it?

Are there any discussions or plans established for continued use of facilities created?

What are the additional initiatives taken by communities and government for continued use?

Does the type of material and process adopted had contributed towards sustainable sue?

What extend UN Habitat had coordinated with other development agencies working in project locations?

Visibility

To what extend people are aware that the project is funded by x donor?

Are visibility materials adequately displayed in facilities build and events conducted?

Disability

What are the measures taken for an inclusive design facilitating access for differently able people? Were they (differently able people) able use these facilities? What are the constraints they do face? What additional facilities could have further facilitated their use?

Annexure 3 : Mini Perception Survey - Target Group: Technical Staff (Government)

	Question	Tick only one box				
1	Are you satisfied with the safety and strength of the infrastructure built by RCIF Project	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree
2	To what extent the infrastructure has complied with required minimum standards?	Not at all	Not really	Undecided	Somewhat	Very much
3	To what extent the design of the MPH meet community expectations	Not at all	Not really	Undecided	Somewhat	Very much
4	Is the design of Rain Water Harvesting System appropriate?	Not at all	Not really	Undecided	Somewhat	Very much
5	How do you rate the coordination between UN Habitat and your department in this intervention	Very Poor	Poor	undecided	Moderate	Very Good
6	Community Infrastructure comply with DRR standards	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree
7	Community infrastructure (Preschool, MPH) (incorporated inclusive design facilitating access for People with disability(PWD)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree
8	How do you recognize the need for sustainable alternative technology as demonstrated in UN Habitat project under RCIF?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree
9	Do you think, preschool/ MPH are being used optimally by the community members					
10	Level of knowledge on maintenance the infrastructure amongst	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree

	the community members is increased					
--	------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Additional Questions

1	Do you aware that UN Habitat has introduced alternative sustainable technologies.	YES / NO	
1 A	If yes, What are the / best practice that you observed?	Drawback	
		Advantages	
2	Do you promote alternative sustainable technologies in your area	YES / NO	
3	Any other comments		

Annexure 4: Field Observation – Technical Compliance check list

GN division:		Village:				
Date:		Type of project:				
No	Issue	Compliance (Y/N/P) Y – Yes, fully complied N- No, not complied P – Partially complied				Remarks
		PS	MPH	Road	SWD	
1.0	Government Rules					
1.1	Minimum Height					
1.2	Door / Floor area					
1.3	Window / Floor Area					
1.4	Rear Space					
1.5	Distance between well and toilet pit					
1.6	Availability of rain water harvesting system (not compulsory)					
1.7	Allowable distance between road centre line and Building					
1.8	Land area above 6 perches					
1.9	Land / Building area					
1.10	Got approval from local authority					
2.0	Required facilities					
2.1	Water facilities / sources					
2.2	Wash room					
2.3	Store room					
2.4	Kitchen					
2.5	Play space					
2.6	Disability access in the buildings					
2.7	Access to disability in bathrooms					
2.8	Access of Building from road					
3.0	Design					
3.1	Foundation height, and other parameters					
3.2	Superstructure					
3.3	Roofing					
3.4	Floor					
3.5	Doors and windows					
3.6	Cost control					
3.7	Available space for usage					
3.8	Used Materials					
3.9	Finishing works					
3.10	Lighting - Illumination					
3.11	User friendly					
4.0	Safety					
4.1	Fencing availability					

4.2	Fencing material - suitable for children					
4.3	Water quality					
4.4	Withstand for natural disaster - normal condition					
5.0	Environment					
5.1	Location					
5.2	Landscape					
5.3	Drainage					
5.4	Flooding conditions					
5.5	Sunlight availability					
6.0	Social aspects					
6.1	Traditional sizes					
6.2	Ventilation / Vasthu					
6.3	Cultural sensitivities					
7.0	Others					

Annexure 5: Mini Perception Survey- Target Group: Community Members

District: **Location:** **Type(PS/MPH/Road/RWH/SWD):** **Ref Number:**

	Question/	Dis agr ee 1				Agree 5
1	Infrastructures are selected based on the priorities of the communities	1	2	3	4	5
2	Community members participated in the consultation process	1	2	3	4	5
3	community infrastructures are handed over to the public on time	1	2	3	4	5
4	Materials used for the constructions are appropriate	1	2	3	4	5
5	Design of the infrastructure is appropriate	1	2	3	4	5
6	Technical service and guidance provided by UN HABITAT are satisfactory	1	2	3	4	5
7	7A: This facility is being utilized for multiple purpose by the community	1	2	3	4	5
	7B: This facility(MPH) is being utilized frequently	1	2	3	4	5
	7C: People use the road frequently	1	2	3	4	5
	7D: SWD mitigate flood risk	1	2	3	4	5
8	Able to apply the knowledge gained for the workshops on infrastructure maintenance	1	2	3	4	5
0 9	I am satisfied the way the facility is being utilized by the community	1	2	3	4	5
1 0	Community has a Plan/Roadmap for building maintenance	1	2	3	4	5

Annexure 6: RCIF - Total Cost related to Community Implementation Agreements

Contract Number	CBO Name	Activity	District	Total Sum in LKR
RCIF-13-01	Ampalavanpokkanai WRDS	Road	Mullaitivu	1,799,822.39
RCIF-13-02	Ananthapuram WRDS	Road	Mullaitivu	4,359,304.55
RCIF-13-03	Mathalan WRDS	Road	Mullaitivu	1,790,392.25
RCIF-13-04	Janakapura FO	Road	Mullaitivu	2,295,709.29
RCIF-13-05	Piramanthanaru RDS	Preschool	Kilinochchi	2,812,069.63
RCIF-13-06	Tharmapuram East RDS	Preschool	Kilinochchi	2,797,610.92
RCIF-13-07	Vinayakar Kudiyiruppu RDS	Preschool	Kilinochchi	2,726,047.67
RCIF-13-08	Parathipuram RDS	Community Centre	Kilinochchi	2,713,399.47
RCIF-13-09	Ramanathapuram West RDS	Community Centre	Kilinochchi	2,679,337.24
RCIF-13-10	Thiruvaiaru RDS	Community Centre	Kilinochchi	2,891,893.65
RCIF-13-11	Navalnagar RDS	Preschool	Kilinochchi	2,722,960.92
RCIF-13-12	Karippaddamurrippu WRDS	Preschool	Mullaitivu	2,954,212.94
RCIF-13-13	Karadipilavu WRDS	Preschool	Mullaitivu	2,954,212.94
RCIF-13-14	Oddusuddan VDO	Preschool	Mullaitivu	3,463,373.24
RCIF-13-15	Karanthai RDS	Community Centre	Kilinochchi	2,670,220.16
RCIF-13-16	Valarmathy RFO	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,629,000.00
RCIF-13-17	Thevipuram South A RDS	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,597,000.00
RCIF-13-18	Theravil WRDS	Preschool	Mullaitivu	2,934,057.34
RCIF-13-19	Unionkulam RDS	Community Centre	Kilinochchi	2,004,727.16
RCIF-13-20	Manatkudiyiruppu FCS	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,629,000.00
RCIF-13-21	Kannakipuram WRDS	Community Centre	Kilinochchi	2,685,370.15
RCIF-13-22	Ponnagar North WRDS	Community Centre	Kilinochchi	2,698,603.66
RCIF-13-23	Maruthanagar West RDS	Community Centre	Kilinochchi	2,725,017.25
RCIF-13-24	Thiruvaiaru West RDS	Community Centre	Kilinochchi	2,703,026.81
RCIF-13-25	Rathnapuram WRDS	Community Centre	Kilinochchi	2,598,215.87
RCIF-13-26	Mamoolai 1 RDS	Road	Mullaitivu	3,264,500.00
RCIF-13-27	Mamoolai 2 WRDS	Road	Mullaitivu	3,328,700.00
RCIF-13-28	Manthuvil WRDS	Road	Mullaitivu	4,068,700.00
RCIF-13-29	Malayalapuram South RDS	Road	Kilinochchi	2,741,096.58
RCIF-13-30	Malayalapuram North RDS	Road	Kilinochchi	1,941,945.55
RCIF-13-31	Kaddaikadu WRDS	Preschool	Kilinochchi	2,147,653.85
RCIF-13-32	Vaddakachchi RDS	Preschool	Kilinochchi	2,095,903.85
RCIF-13-33	Periyaparanthan RDS	Community Centre	Kilinochchi	2,707,427.87
RCIF-13-34	Pulimachinathakulam WRDS	Preschool	Mullaitivu	2,895,515.06
RCIF-13-35	Sivanagar RDS	Preschool	Mullaitivu	2,943,267.24
RCIF-13-36	Katsilaimadu RDS	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,617,400.00
RCIF-13-37	PTK East WRDS	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,617,400.00
RCIF-13-38	Moonkilaru South WRDS	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,617,400.00
RCIF-13-39	Kokkuthoduvai Centre RDS	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,617,400.00

RCIF-13-40	Thimpili RDS	Road	Mullaitivu	2,558,400.00
RCIF-13-41	Kompavil RDS	Road	Mullaitivu	4,884,700.00
RCIF-13-42	Manthuvil FO	Road	Mullaitivu	3,516,654.56
RCIF-13-43	Nakenthirapuram WRDS	RWH	Kilinochchi	41,949.70
RCIF-14-44	Moonkilaru North WRDS	Road	Mullaitivu	3,662,420.00
RCIF-14-45	Vellaipallam RDS	Road	Mullaitivu	4,209,449.99
RCIF-14-46	Kokkuthoduvai North WRDS	Road	Mullaitivu	3,267,860.00
RCIF-14-47	Karnaddukeny RDS	Road	Mullaitivu	3,701,700.00
RCIF-14-48	Karnaddukeny WRDS	Road	Mullaitivu	2,188,000.00
RCIF-14-49	Kokkilai West RDS	Road	Mullaitivu	2,693,800.00
RCIF-14-50	Kumarapuram RDS	Road	Kilinochchi	4,413,996.33
RCIF-14-51	Krishnapuram RDS	Road	Kilinochchi	2,123,575.18
RCIF-14-52	Santhapuram RDS	Road	Kilinochchi	3,984,278.90
RCIF-14-53	Iranamadu FFCs	Road	Kilinochchi	1,886,006.49
RCIF-14-54	Ampal WRDS	Road	Kilinochchi	3,561,945.64
RCIF-14-55	Kokkuthoduvai North RDS	Road	Mullaitivu	3,817,800.00
RCIF-14-56	Kokkuthoduvai South WRDS	Preschool	Mullaitivu	2,896,046.72
RCIF-14-57	Manikkapuram RDS	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,703,800.00
RCIF-14-58	Vallipunam RDS	Preschool	Mullaitivu	2,973,060.00
RCIF-14-59	Janakapura FO	Road	Mullaitivu	3,843,231.96
RCIF-14-60	Malligaitheevu WRDS	Road	Mullaitivu	4,009,870.00
RCIF-14-61	Malligaitheevu RDS	Road	Mullaitivu	4,379,630.00
RCIF-14-62	Sivanagar RDS	Road	Mullaitivu	4,226,649.07
RCIF-14-63	Sivanagar FO	Road	Mullaitivu	4,282,337.78
RCIF-14-64	Kanarathnapuram RDS	Preschool	Mullaitivu	2,973,060.00
RCIF-14-65	Murasumoddai RDS	Road	Kilinochchi	2,504,491.20
RCIF-14-66	Kumarasamipuram RDS	Road	Kilinochchi	2,651,702.02
RCIF-14-67	Punnaineeravi RDS	Road	Kilinochchi	2,357,609.56
RCIF-14-68	Mavadiyamman WRDS	Preschool	Kilinochchi	3,141,478.56
RCIF-14-69	Kalaveddithidal RDS	Preschool	Kilinochchi	3,146,478.56
RCIF-14-70	Ulavanoor RDS	Road	Kilinochchi	2,540,111.04
RCIF-14-71	Murasumoddai WRDS	Road	Kilinochchi	4,789,911.33
RCIF-14-72	Ananthapuram WRDS	Road	Mullaitivu	5,018,681.77
RCIF-14-73	Visvamadu WRDS	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,921,549.20
RCIF-14-74	Thampakamam RDS	Preschool	Kilinochchi	3,314,721.52
RCIF-14-75	Paranthan RDS	SWD	Kilinochchi	3,637,279.46
RCIF-14-76	Vinayagapuram RDS	Road	Kilinochchi	4,283,117.83
RCIF-14-77	Uthayanagar East WRDS	Road	Kilinochchi	3,332,697.99
RCIF-14-78	Uthayanagar East RDS	Road	Kilinochchi	3,844,802.68
RCIF-14-79	Palampasi WRDS	Preschool	Mullaitivu	3,059,957.50
RCIF-14-80	Jeyanthinagar RDS	Road	Mullaitivu	3,360,322.91

RCIF-14-81	Jeyanthinagar WRDS	Road	Mullaitivu	3,718,213.13
RCIF-14-82	Udayarkaddu North WRDS	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,921,545.80
RCIF-14-83	Visvamaru West WRDS	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,921,545.80
RCIF-14-84	Muthaiyankaddukulam FO	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,921,545.80
RCIF-14-85	Thaddayamalai Unit 2 RDS	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,921,545.80
RCIF-14-86	Keppapilavu RDS	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,921,545.80
RCIF-14-87	Alampil North RDS	Preschool	Mullaitivu	3,059,957.50
RCIF-14-88	Kaively South RDS	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,921,545.80
RCIF-14-89	Uthikkumthisai RDS	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,921,545.80
RCIF-14-90	Vinvegananthanagar East RDS	Preschool	Kilinochchi	3,109,869.84
RCIF-14-91	Ananthapuram East RDS	Community Centre	Mullaitivu	2,898,796.75
RCIF-14-92	Kanchipuram RDS	SWD	Kilinochchi	3,991,044.55
RCIF-14-93	Umaiypuram RDS	Road	Kilinochchi	4,655,163.35
RCIF-14-94	Mathalan WRDS	Preschool	Mullaitivu	3,059,957.50
RCIF-14-95	Putharikuda RDS	Road	Mullaitivu	3,251,664.89
RCIF-14-96	Alampil South RDS	Road	Mullaitivu	5,901,300.24
RCIF-14-97	Alampil South WRDS	Road	Mullaitivu	4,110,885.67
RCIF-14-98	Mulliyawalai North WRDS	Road	Mullaitivu	5,637,366.40
RCIF-14-99	Kallappadu South WRDS	Road	Mullaitivu	4,726,314.93
RCIF-14-100	Iyakkachchi WRDS	Community Centre	Kilinochchi	2,935,093.00
RCIF-14-101	Malvil WRDS	Road	Kilinochchi	2,981,049.46
RCIF-14-102	Tharmakerny RDS	Road	Kilinochchi	2,682,447.37
RCIF-14-103	Puloppalai RDS	Road	Kilinochchi	2,024,737.04
RCIF-14-104	Puloppalai WRDS	Road	Kilinochchi	2,984,237.74
RCIF-14-105	Visvamaru West RDS	SWD	Mullaitivu	3,501,884.54
RCIF-14-106	Kumarapuram WRDS	Road	Mullaitivu	3,800,686.03
RCIF-14-107	Murippu WRDS	Road	Mullaitivu	5,219,775.11
RCIF-14-108	Tharmakerny WRDS	Road	Kilinochchi	3,202,675.02
RCIF-14-109	Tharmakerny RDS	RWH	Kilinochchi	24,919.35
RCIF-14-110	Thampakamam WRDS	RWH	Kilinochchi	23,539.35
RCIF-14-112	Periyapalai WRDS	Road	Kilinochchi	2,359,517.17
RCIF-14-113	Pallai Town RDS	Road	Kilinochchi	3,162,034.75
RCIF-14-117	Allippalai WRDS	RWH	Kilinochchi	24,229.35
RCIF-14-118	Kovilvayal RDS	RWH	Kilinochchi	47,405.30
RCIF-14-121	Chemmalai RDS	RWH	Mullaitivu	38,475.55
RCIF-14-122	Silavaththai RDS	RWH	Mullaitivu	38,320.30
RCIF-14-123	Kunchuparanthan RDS	Road	Kilinochchi	2,590,150.61
RCIF-14-124	Vithiyapuram RDS	RWH	Mullaitivu	42,400.50
RCIF-14-125	Ananthapuram RDS	RWH	Mullaitivu	61,438.75
RCIF-14-126	Sampathgama RDS	RWH	Mullaitivu	96,761.00
RCIF-14-127	Thevipuram WRDS B Division	RWH	Mullaitivu	45,741.25

Annexure 7 : Evaluation Matrix

Project's Key OUTPUTS	Indicators	Question frame
Output 1 Rehabilitated and reconstructed damaged or destroyed small community infrastructure including internal access roads, community based water supply facilities, multipurpose community centers, and construct rainwater harvesting facilities in up to 80 villages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitation of 60km of internal access roads with culverts; • Construction of 15 rainwater harvesting facilities in schools and public buildings; • Reconstruction of 14km of masonry storm water drains; • Reconstruction of 19 multi-purpose community centers; 	# of fully functioning multi-purpose community centres Baseline: zero Target: 19 multi-purpose community centres % of Improved mobility access for families in the target villages Baseline: Zero Target: 60 km of rural roads constructed or rehabilitated # of families living in flood free environment and community Baseline: Zero Target: 14 km of storm water drainage system constructed # of Rain Water Harvesting Tanks Baseline: Zero Target: 14 Rain Water Harvesting Tanks installed in public buildings	Community participation in decision making, management, Level of social inclusion (gender. Marginalized) Increased productivity of farm produces, wage & output price Employment outside farming(non-farming employment) Perception and satisfaction of the work, its sustainability
Output 2 Improved access to pre-education Construction of 19 preschools in remote villages	# of All eligible pre-school children from the target villages attending preschools Baseline: Zero Target: 19 pre-schools established	Enrolment to preschool Environment and safety of the preschool Sustainability of the preschool
Output 3 Empowered women in leadership roles and	% of women in decision making roles in CDCs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in number of women in decision making role • Changes in women participation in decision making meetings

decision making	<p>Baseline : 30%</p> <p>Targets : 40% of decision making positions held by women</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Types of decision made • Changes (increase/ decrease) in number of initiatives occurred • Quality and adequacy of training / capacity building events carried out • Interaction level with stakeholders • What changes ate personal level had occurred
<p>Output 4</p> <p>Capacities built in communities and Local Authorities for accessing support through partnership building within the target population and Local Authorities, other stakeholders</p>	<p>% of Communities demonstrating capacity for operation and maintenance of new community assets</p> <p>Baseline : 10%</p> <p>Targets: 9 capacity building trainings completed</p> <p># of youth and Pre-school teachers receiving formal skills training</p> <p>Baseline: NA</p> <p>Targets: 45 youth and pre-school teachers received skill training</p> <p># of Functional partnerships between the among the target population, Local Authorities, and other stakeholders</p> <p>Baseline: 40%</p> <p>Target: All CDCs registered with the local administration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality and relevance of training provided • Quality of network/ linkages created with stakeholders • Incidents of maintenance/ repair related initiatives by communities themselves • Level of volunteerism and ownership • Quality and acceptance of training provided to preschool teachers • Performance changes in students • Perceptions of parents • Changes in adopting new and innovative teaching methods • # of interaction that had taken place between the community and stakeholders • Level of willingness and interest of stakeholders to support the community • Awareness of local authorities on issues faced by concerned communities • # of collaborative initiatives taken place

<p>Output 5</p> <p>Improved environment and promoted disaster and climate resilient communities</p>	<p># of Community Infrastructure comply with DRR standards</p> <p>Baseline:10%</p> <p>Target: 19 Community Centers, 19 Pre-schools, 60km of rural roads and 14km of storm water drainage will be constructed complying with DRR standards.</p> <p># of families participating in reforestation programme</p> <p>Baseline: NA</p> <p>Target: 127,600 trees planted.</p> <p>14 Rain Water Harvesting Tanks installed in public buildings</p> <p>Indicators of water and sanitation</p> <p># of Rain Water Harvesting Tanks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of community infrastructures incorporating DRR measures • Avoidance / reduction in potential disasters • Perceptions of the community on the usefulness of DRR measures • Awareness of community on the need to have DRR measures • Survival rate of trees planted • Ownership and level of willingness among communities for maintenance • Suitability of tree seedlings supplied • Protective and sustainability measures adopted • % of rainwater harvesting tanks in use • Level of communities awareness on the benefits of rainwater harvesting structures • Ownership and interest in maintenance of these structures • Level of knowledge on maintenance and quality of training proved <p>Perception of RWH structures and usefulness by communities</p>
---	--	--

Annexure 8: Community Meeting

Date	Dist	DS	Village	Activity	CBO	Time	Total
11/05/15	Kili	Pachchilappalai	Periya Palai / Palai Town	Road	WRDS & RDS, Palai Town	10.00 Am - 11.30 Pm	13
11/06/15	Kili	Pachchilai palli	Thampakamam	Pre School	RDS, Thampakamam	2.00 Pm - 3.30 Pm	13
11/07/15	Kili	Pachchilai palli	Soranpattu	MPH	RDS, Karainthai	4.00 Pm - 5.30Pm	22
12/08/15	Kili	Karaichchi	Ampalnagar	Road	RDS, Fisheries society Shanthapuram , WRDS Ampalnagar	8.30 - 10.00 Am	11
12/09/15	Kili	Karaichchi	Skanthapuram	Pre School	RDS, Vinayakarkudiyiruppu	11.00 Am - 12.30 Pm	10
12/10/15	Kili	Karaichchi	Ponnagr	MPH	WRDS, Ponnagar North	2.00 Pm - 3.30Pm	13
12/11/15	Kili	Karaichchi	Periyaparanthan	MPH	RDS, Periyaparanthan	4.00 Pm - 5.00 Pm	13
14/05/15	Kili	Karaichchi	Ramathapuram	MPH	RDS, Ramanathapuram West	8.30 Am - 10.30 Pm	33
14/05/15	Kili	Karaichchi	Vadakachchi	Pre School	RDS, Vaddakachchi	11.00 Am - 12.30 Pm	21
14/05/15	Kili	Karaichchi	Ratnapuram	MPH	WRDS, Ratnapuram	2.00 Am - 03.30 Pm	5
14/05/15	Kili	Karaichchi	Vivekanandana gar	Pre School	RDS, Vivekandanagar East	4.00Pm - 5.30 Pm	14
15/05/15	Kili	Kandawal ai	Kumarapuram	Road	RDS, Kumarapuram	8.30 - 10.00 Am	8
15/05/15	Kili	Kandawal ai	Punnaineeravi	Road	RDS, Punnaineeravi	10.30 Am - 12.00 Pm	15
15/05/15	Kili	Kandawal ai	Kalmadunagar	Pre School	RDS, Navalnagar	2.00 Pm - 3.30 Pm	
15/05/15	Kili	Pachchilappalai	Tharmakkeni	Road	WRDS & RDS, Tharmakerny	8.00 Am- 9.30 Am	24
21/05/15	Mul	Maritimepattu	Ampalavanpokkanai	Feeder Road	WRDS, Ampalavanpokkanai	10.30 am - 11.30 am	
21/05/15	Mul	Maritimepattu	Mamoolai II	Feeder Road	WRDS, Mamoolai II	12.00 pm - 1.00 pm	11
21/05/15	Mul	Puthukudiyiruppu	Manthuvil	Feeder Road	WRDS, Manthuvil	9.00 am - 10.00 am	
19/05/15	Mul	Puthukudiyiruppu	Mallikaithivu	Feeder Road	RDS, Mallikaithivu	4.30 pm - 5.30 pm	12
19/05/15	Mul	Oddusuddan	Kathaliyarsaman kulam	Preschool	RDS, Sivanagar	11.00 Am - 12.00 Pm	
22/05/15	Mul	Oddusuddan	Ampakamam	Preschool	WRDS, Pulumachchinathakulam	9.30 am - 10.30 am	6
19/05/15	Mul	Puthukudiyiruppu	Theravil	Preschool	WRDS or Parent and Teachers Association	10.15 am - 11.15 am	13

19/05/15	Mul	Puthukudi yiruppu	Vallipunam	Preschool	RDS, Vallipunam	3.15 pm - 4.15 pm	
21/05/15	Mul	Maritimepattu	Kokkuthoduvai South	Preschool	WRDS, Kokkuthoduvai South	2.30 pm - 3.30 pm	
18/05/15	Mul	Puthukudi yiruppu	Udayarkaddu South	MPH	WRDS, Moonkilaru South	1.45 pm - 2.45 pm	
18/05/15	Mul	Puthukudi yiruppu	Manikkapuram	MPH	RDS, Manikkapuram	11.30 am - 12.30 pm	9
18/05/15	Mul	Puthukudi yiruppu	Visvamadhu West	MPH	WRDS, Visvamadhu West	9.00 am to 10.00 am	
22/05/15	Mul	Oddusuddan	Muthaiyankaddukulam	MPH	FO, Muthaiyankaddukulam	1.30 pm - 2.30 pm	9
22/05/15	Mul	Oddusuddan	Thaddayamalai	MPH	RDS, Thaddayamalai	2.45 pm - 3.45 pm	8
22/05/15	Mul	Oddusuddan	Sivanagar, Samanankulam	Preschool	RDS		9

Annexure 9: Key Informants

District	Position	Department	Date
Kili	DS, Pachchilaipalli	DS Office, Pachcilaipalli	11th of May
Kili	RDO. Pachilaipalli	DS Office, Pachcilaipalli	11th of May
Kili	RDO. Karaichchi	DS Office, Karichchi	13th of May
Kili	DS, Kandawalai	DS Office, Kandawalai	15th of May
Kili	RDO. Kandawalai	DS Office, Kandawalai	15th of May
Kili	ADE - Early Child hood Development	Zonal Education Office , Kili	13th of May
Kili	Secretry / TO	PS- Karachchi	13th of May
Mull	Secretary	Piradeshiya Sabha, PTK	20th of May
Mull	DS, PTK	DS Office, PTK	20th of May
Mull	RDO. PTK	DS Office, PTK	20th of May
Mull	DS, Maritimpattu	DS Office, Maritimpattu	21st of May
Mull	RDO. Maritimpattu	DS Office, Maritimpattu	21st of May
Mull	DS, Oddusuddan	GA Office, Mullaitivu	21st of May
Mull	Secretary	Piradeshiya Sabha, Maritimpattu	21st of May
Mull	GA, Mullaitivu	GA Office, Mullaitivu	21st of May
Mull	Save the Children	Mullaitivu	19th of May
Colombo	CEFE NetMr Gamini Herath	Colombo	26th of May

Annexure 10: Terms of Reference, End-of-Project Evaluation

Project for Rehabilitation of Community Infrastructure and Facilities in the Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Province

1. Project

1.1 Background

The Project for “Rehabilitation of Community Infrastructure and Facilities in the Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Province, Sri Lanka (RCIF)” is to contribute to the sustainable rehabilitation and reconstruction of conflict affected people in the Northern Province of Sri Lanka and to overcome the on-going hardships of the returned and resettled Internally Displaced People (IDPs) due to lack of basic services.

The initiatives under the project are built on the needs identified in the “Community Action Plans” prepared through Community Action Planning (CAP) workshops at the village level in the conflict affected areas combined with UN-Habitat’s comprehensive understanding of the needs of the affected communities, after 36 months of working with more than 250 post-conflict villages. The RCIF also builds upon the experiences of UN-Habitat Tsunami Recovery Programmes and other community development initiatives in the country.

1.2 Objective and outcome

The specific objective of the project is to address the reintegration needs of the communities in the Northern Province through sustainable rehabilitation and reconstruction assistance and the improvement of basic services. The implementation of the project will ensure a range of outcomes as follows:

- Improved living conditions of the families creating new opportunities to access community infrastructure facilities;
- Improved access to preschool education, training and skills development in the communities;
- Empowered women in leadership roles and decision making;
- Capacities built in communities and Local Authorities/Local Govt. Partners for accessing support through partnership building within the target population and Local Authorities, other stakeholders; and
- Improved environment and promoted disaster and climate resilient communities.

1.3 Output

Output 1: Rehabilitated and reconstructed damaged or destroyed small community infrastructure including internal access roads, community based water supply facilities,

multipurpose community centers, and construct rainwater harvesting facilities in up to 80 villages

- Rehabilitation of 60km of internal access roads with culverts;
- Construction of 15 rainwater harvesting facilities in schools and public buildings;
- Reconstruction of 14km of masonry storm water drains;
- Reconstruction of 19 multi-purpose community centers;

Output 2: Improved access to pre-education

- Construction of 19 preschools in remote villages

Output 3: Empowered women in leadership roles and decision making

- Promoting women participation in decision making;
- Promoting women leadership and recognition through project activities

Output 4: Enhanced capacities within communities and Government Partners for improved service delivery

- Training community leaders on Community Action Planning and capacity building;
- Training of youth and communities in construction techniques and maintenance of infrastructure facilities;
- Training of stakeholders on management and sustainability;
- Linking communities and local governments through government field extension networks

Output 5: Improved environment and promoted disaster and climate resilient communities

- All project activities will be planned with sensitivity to adverse environmental impacts and will take deliberate measures to mitigate them in the implementation;
- Community green cover increased through tree planting (127,600 trees);
- Disaster risk reduction (DRR) features to be incorporated into the construction of community infrastructure

2. Evaluation

The Evaluator will conduct Financial and Operational evaluation of the Project.

2.1 Financial evaluation

For the financial evaluation, the Evaluator will

- Review the budget and expenditure of the Project

2.2 Operational evaluation

The operational aspects will be assessed as per the project log frame (Annex 1). In addition, the Evaluator should provide the overall analysis and recommendation on the key factors below.

Impact

- Assess the social, economic and environmental impact of the Project at the ground level;
- Analyse the level of satisfaction of the communities and other stakeholders

Process and methodology

- Review the process and the methodology of the participatory process;
- Assess the level of participation of the communities and other stakeholders including local governments;

Crosscutting issues

- Assess the Project on the factors, such as gender, age, and disabilities

Visibility

- Review the visibility materials in the field (signboards etc) and the publications;
- Assess the levels of awareness amongst beneficiaries regarding the contribution of the funding partner (Government of Japan)

2.3 Evaluation criteria

The Evaluator will evaluate the Project based on the criteria below:

- Relevance;
- Appropriateness;
- Efficiency;
- Effectiveness; and
- Sustainability

3. Tentative timeframe for evaluation and reporting

Activity	Time Frame
1. Signing of Contract:	Sign on 31 Mar 2015
2. Discussion and desk review:	Complete on 15 May 2015
3. Inception report:	Submit on 30 May 2015
4. Field work:	Complete on 15 June 2015
5. Data analysis:	Complete on 30 June 2015
6. Draft report:	Submit on 15 July 2015

7. Final report:	Submit on 30 July 2015
Total Timeframe	04 months

4. Payment schedule

The Evaluator will enter into a contract with UN-Habitat and will be paid for the services as outlined below:

- 1st Instalment: 25% upon clearance of Inception Report;
- 2nd Instalment: 50% upon clearance of Draft Report; and
- 3rd/ Final instalment: 25% on clearance of Final Report

5. Requirements

The Evaluator is requested to submit a detailed proposal as follows:

1. Proposed evaluation methodology;
2. Detailed evaluation plan with timeframe, including resource plan (availability and utilization of human resources against the timeframe);
3. Profile of the institution/ team including detailed Curriculum Vitae supported with previous experience on similar assignments; and
4. Detailed budget

Annexure 11 : Evaluation Team , INNO CONSULTING SERVICE

Inno Consulting Service is registered business entity in Sri Lanka and provides consultancy and research services to the development and corporate sectors.

- **RAMANAISH KATHERAVELU, Consultant and Team Lead**

Ramanaish Katheravelu has been engaged in the development, early recovery and humanitarian sectors since 2005 ; his extensive experience includes programme management , M&E , General Management, procurement management, Statistics, Strategic Management and Public Policy. He has wide-ranging national and international work experience having worked for UNDP, UNICEF, British Red Cross and GTZ (FLICT). He has participated and managed many evaluations and researches.

- **PULENDRAN THARMENDRA, Consultant**

Tharmendra had been a development practitioner for the past 09 years. He had performed as a Programme administrator, M&E Specialist, and Community development trainer. He holds post graduate qualifications in Development Economics and Urban Development. He has international experience in the development and humanitarian sectors. He has worked with national and international organization including UNDP, ZOA, USAID and CHA.

- **Eng. K.KADAMPASEELAN, Consultant Engineer**

Kadampaseelan is an Engineer by profession and have been working in development and corporate sector having more than 12 years of experience in construction field in development and corporate environment. He has worked for UNDP Sri Lanka as filed engineer. He also served as Project Manager and handled multimillion projects. Worked as Engineer and Project Engineer, completed 12 minor tanks rehabilitation projects, involving from initial levelling, estimation and implementation of projects through Farmers organization and contractors.

- **JUDERAJ CROOS, Consultant/DRR**

Juderaj Croos draws extensive program/project Management experiences with the different donor funds and program coordination experience with the good field teams in a Natural disaster conflicted / post conflicted situations. Had experience in CBDRM through DRR projects and in an integrated approach with Community and schools especially implementing a DRR project as coordinator in North Sri Lanka, Experience in integration of DRR into Education, Permanent housing, community Social infrastructures, Livelihood especially rural livelihood, Micro enterprises, environment and other cross cutting themes.