

# Final Project Performance Evaluation

## “Sustainable Intervention in Livelihoods in Kilinochchi” (SILK)

(USAID Cooperative Agreement No. AID-383-A-14-00001)



**Final Project Performance Evaluation**  
**“Sustainable Intervention in Livelihoods in Kilinochchi” (SILK)**  
**(USAID Cooperative Agreement No. AID-383-A-14-00001)**

**Commissioned by and Submitted to:**  
**SLCDF Secretariat**

**Evaluation Team:**

**D. E. Brownell, Evaluation Team Leader**  
**A. Negendren, Agricultural Specialist**  
**R. Jayasundra (PHD), Gender Advisor**

**April, 2017**

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction and Background</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Evaluation Objectives</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Evaluation Methodology</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Findings, Lessons Learned and Conclusions</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>CORRELATION TO Performance Management Plan (PMP)</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Persons Interviewed</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Term of Reference</b>	<b>16</b>

## **Introduction and Background**

This report presents the findings, lessons learned and recommendations for the final evaluation of the USAID funded “Sustainable Intervention in Livelihoods in Kilinochchi (SILK)” project which was designed and implemented by the Sri Lanka Centre for Development Facilitation (SLCDF) in Kilinochchi District of the Northern Province of Sri Lanka between October 2013 and April 2017.

May 2009 saw the end of the near three decade armed conflict in Sri Lanka; leaving the Northern and Eastern Provinces with massive physical and social infrastructure damage, loss of livelihoods, and over one million of the population internally displaced. Against this backdrop, and to support the resettlement process, SLCDF designed the SILK project, with financial assistance from the USAID Development Grants Program funding envelope. The primary goal of the LKR 113Million three and a half year project was to help rebuild the lives of 1002 re-settled families, with a focus on women-headed households. The project was implemented in 42 marginalized villages in 4 divisions within the district of Kilinochchi. The project incorporated an integrated livelihood approach involving training, start-up costs and technical support in dairy and conservation farming. The project also included minor infrastructure components and innovative sustainability strategies, and was implemented in partnership with local civil society and Government of Sri Lanka Agencies.

### **Evaluation Objectives:**

SLCDF commissioned an end-of-project performance evaluation conducted by Donald E. Brownell and Associates between the months of December 2016 and March 2017. The overall objective of the final project evaluation was to assess whether the project had achieved the expected results, assess the appropriateness of project design, document important lessons learned and provide relevant recommendations for improving future SLCDF programming in similar activities. Specifically, the Evaluation Team looked to answer four basic questions.

Question 1 (Relevancy): To what extent did the project address the needs of the targeted beneficiaries? Secondly, to what extent were the project objectives aligned with GoSL district/divisional development plans?

Question 2 (Effectiveness): To what extent were the stated project objectives (outputs, outcomes and impact) achieved?

Question 3 (Efficiency): How efficient was the management structure adopted by SLCDF in terms of monitoring results and mitigating implementation challenges? And, in general, cost-effectiveness of program expenditures?

Question 4 (Sustainability): What are the prospects for the sustainability of the results produced by the project?

## **Evaluation Methodology:**

The evaluation employed a multi-level, mixed methods approach with a focus on qualitative data collection and analysis. Data collection methods included: a desk review; 25 key informant interviews (KII's); 10 Focus Group Discussions (FGD's); and site visits. Due to time and financial constraints, sampling was done on a purposive basis. Field work was conducted between late December 2016 and February 2017. A total of 112 respondents were interviewed. Note: the evaluation questions were aligned to conform to the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria.

## **Findings, Lessons Learned and Conclusions:**

**Question 1 Relevancy;** *To what extent did the project address the needs of the targeted beneficiaries? Secondly, to what extent were the project objectives aligned with GoSL district/divisional development plans?*

### **Findings**

- The SILK Project clearly met the stated need of the targeted beneficiaries through providing a viable home based livelihood opportunity – this was strongly expressed in all focus group discussions and site visit interviews. The ability to engage in home based livelihood ventures such as dairy and conservation farming provided income while allowing the beneficiaries to pursue other priorities on the home front.
- The Silk project was clearly aligned with and supported two GoSL development plans – first, it provided livelihood assistance to re-settled IDP's which was a priority for the Kilinochchi District Plan, and second, the project contributed to the Department of Animal Health and Production's (DAHP) goal of re-stocking dairy cattle and re-establishing the dairy sector as an important economic and (nutritional supplement) activity in Kilinochchi.
- The SILK Project was aligned with and supported SLCDF's corporate vision and mission statements (including poverty alleviation, empowerment of women and food security) and was a good fit for their 5 year planning cycle.

### **Lessons Learned**

- Although time consuming and labour intensive, the extensive consultations in the project design stage with government agencies and civil society in Kilinochchi paid dividends in gaining support and establishing excellent working relationships with government while minimalizing duplication of efforts with respect to other livelihood ventures in the district – and in many cases, such as Artificial Insemination (AI) training, complimented and supported existing programming from other agencies.

### **Conclusions**

- The SILK Project was a well-designed initiative which drew upon SLCDF's past programming experience and strengths and specifically addressed the immediate needs of the Project Beneficiaries while being aligned and supporting district and national government plans.

**Question 2 Effectiveness;** *To what extent were the stated project objectives (outputs, outcomes and impact) achieved?*

#### **Findings**

The Project has fully achieved all the targets set at the output and outcome levels, but the full Project Impact will need more time to properly assess the degree of attributable results of the Project intervention. However, the goal set for the establishment of 1002 micro-enterprises (dairy and conservation farming) within the time-frame of the Project implementation period has been met.

- **At the Output level**, training targets were met with 1002 (women) beneficiaries receiving Cornerstones and Dairy Technical training, 480 women receiving training in Conservation Farming, 123 participants received Valued Added training in yogurt and curd production, 149 participants received Marketing training and 27 participants received advanced training in Artificial Insemination. The quality and utility of the training components were clearly communicated by beneficiaries and GoSL officials during interviews. With respect to infrastructure components, targets of 67 rainwater harvesting tanks were constructed (with maintenance training), 5 small tanks were rehabilitated and two Milk Collection Centres with chilling equipment were established at Karaichchi and Kandawalai Livestock Breeders Cooperative Societies (LIBCOs). Capacity building targets of 40 Farmers Groups (with 948 women) were established and linked to divisional LIBCOs, 10 training programmes for 248 WRDS participants (including financial management, social mobilization, documentation and proposal writing) were conducted, and 52 interface meetings were held between GoSL and Civil Society (WRDS/SILK participants).
- **At the Outcome level**, 522 dairy and 480 conservation farming enterprises were established with home-based income generation capabilities. Excluding home consumption use, the majority of dairy incomes (70%) were in the LKR 5-10,000 range per month with 20% above LKR 10,000 and for conservation farming approximately 42% of participants were in the LKR 5-10,000 range (50% below LKR5,000). As confirmed by personnel at the DAHP, the technical training provided to SILK participants has yielded improved management practices in both dairy and conservation farming in the district. Based upon latest data from the DAHP (December 2016), the SILK Project has significantly contributed to the re-establishment of the dairy industry in Kilinochchi with the addition of 1030 improved/hybrid cattle which now accounts for 17% of the annual milk production (665,280 of 3.9 Million litres). In addition, the DAHP has also credited the SILK Project for the dramatic increase and efficiency of AI in the district – from 120 per month with minimal success rate to 600 (or 320 based upon the year 2016?) per month with above 50% success rate. Out of 522 dairy farmers around 20% can already be classed into the enterprising category.

- ***At the Impact level***, the establishment of 1002 micro-enterprises in the district of Kilinochchi has been achieved within the time frame of the SILK project implementation. However, the full value of these enterprises will not be known until the full cycle of the calf pass-on is realized and all 1002 beneficiaries are fully engaged in dairy farming. The trends noted by the Evaluation Team are very encouraging in that the pass-on philosophy is working (from the original 480 cattle purchased 248 calves have already been passed-on) and that incomes from the dairy enterprises are continuing to trend upwards over time. This leads us to predict the enterprises established will continue to grow in strength and value, and continue to enhance and contribute to the re-establishment of the dairy industry in the Kilinochchi District.

### **Gender as a Cross-Cutting Theme**

- The project was implemented within a framework of integrating gender but focused on promoting women's equality. This empowerment process was initiated with awareness raising on the women's human rights and strengthened with promoting women's leadership and engaging women in a reflection process on the power within themselves.
- In implementation, as in conceptualization, the project was mindful of the risks of focusing only on women but it was effective. The relevancy (of design) rated extremely high by all stakeholders. The women who participated in the project were consistent in their reasons for joining the project, that they wanted to engage in an income generating initiative which they could do from a home base) and sustainability of the project is rated high.
- The strength and confidence exhibited by the women involved in the project was impressive. Even though some are still in need of "counselling" for some closure issues, (as IDPs they have gone through severe hardships over the past 20 plus years), the women formed an impressive group of people that had used the project inputs wisely and accomplished a remarkable amount.

### **Lessons Learned**

- The Evaluation Team has noted that a key to the success of the Project with meeting targets has been the quality of partnerships forged by the dedicated and skilled SLCDF staff with Civil Society (WRDS, NGOs) and GoSL agencies at the district and divisional level along with the Department of Animal Health and Production.

**Question 3 Efficiency;** *How efficient was the management structure adopted by SLCDF in terms of monitoring results and mitigating implementation challenges? And, in general, cost-effectiveness of program expenditures?*

### **Findings**

- The project management plan (with clear indicators) that was developed by SLCDF provided an effective base for monitoring and generating timely information for compliance reporting and dealing with any necessary adjustments during the course of project implementation. The monitoring system that that was deployed involved a participatory multi-levelled approach; involving SLCDF Head Office, Field Office, WRDS partners and GoSL at both district and divisional levels. Project beneficiaries were very complimentary about the availability and response of project staff for any difficulties encountered. It was also noted that beneficiaries and GoSL were very appreciative of the strong field presence of the USAID project interlocutor for SILK.
- As confirmed through interviews with USAID, a very good working relationship was established between SLCDF and USAID with compliance reports being of good quality and submitted on time. It was noted that there was one major project contract amendment which extended the project implementation period from October 2016 to April 2017 and added 42 additional participants/beneficiaries.
- Project expenditures for training programmes (all coordinated and implemented by NGO Management Development Centre) were deemed extremely cost-effective with two day programmes at LKR 8-10,000 all inclusive per participant, and a five day programme at LKR 22,000 all inclusive per participant. Expenditures for hardware/equipment followed procurement rules and all purchases were well within market values.

### **Lessons Learned**

- There is a need to build inflationary compensation into the budget for annual or recurring expenditures; this was particularly noted for cattle purchases whereby the price from year one to year three had significantly increased.

**Question 4 Sustainability;** *What are the prospects for the sustainability of the results produced by the project?*

### **Findings**

- The Evaluation Team has noted that the Cornerstones Training and the subsequent promotion and reinforcement of the unique and ethical practice of giving and sharing among communities provided a strong foundation for the sustainability strategy included in the SILK project. With the initial input of 522 cows, over 200 female calves have already been passed on to the 480 project participants that started the project

with conservation farming. In addition, the revolving loan funds established with the WRDSs have commenced repayments in March of 2015 and as of December 2016 total over LKR 1.5M in repayments by the dairy participants. In extrapolating from current trends, the full cycle should be concluded within another two years whereby all 1002 beneficiaries will have established and productive dairy farms and the WRDSs will have an ample RLF base to continue the process with new participants. Perhaps the most lucid comment on SILK sustainability was relayed by numerous GoSL officials who, although professing scepticism at the beginning, are now keen to promote this strategy for replication within the dairy sector of Kilinochchi.

- 
- The AI inputs have been fully incorporated into the DAHP and significant results continue to expand with numbers of AI per month by now around 500 AI<sup>s</sup> per month and a 50% or better success rate being achieved. With respect to the establishment of the two Milk Collection Centres at the Kandawalai and Karaichchi LIBCOs, the difficulties with supply of milk has been addressed through the promotion and practice of evening milking.
- Empowerment: This concept too was ensured from the inception of the project by motivating the Societies to take responsibility to make decisions and negotiate with the main stakeholders such as the GOSL institutions, DAPH, DSD, ACCD, Provincial Authorities, etc. and the private sector companies such as Cargills, Nestle, MILCO etc., SLCDF took the responsibility of facilitating the process of empowerment and showed them the way.
- The project was also ensure asset building (savings, cattle) by families through the continuity of their livelihoods. Also, strengthening and capacity building of farmer organizations, WRDSs, RDSs and LIBCOs helped in building social capital of the communities to sustain their wellbeing.
- Scaling up and expanding the project was done through the revolving loan funds (RLFs) owned and operated by the communities. In the dairy farming project, each family involved gift their first born female calf to the trained recipient family while also transferring their relevant knowledge and skills on dairy management along with process of mentoring.
- From the first phase of the project, such chain effect was further strengthened social capital and help in scaling up the project. Formation of Farmer Organizations, linking them with LIBCOs, private sector (MILCO & Nestle) and other development agencies including Government, and supply chain of milk been owned and managed by Farmer Societies helped sustain the project beyond the life of the award

## **Partnership**

SLCDF had overall responsibility for the implementation of the programme, monitoring, evaluation and annual audit. SLCDF was responsible for all reporting to USAID and was responsible for all financial disbursements. SLCDF established a Field Office in Kilinochchi with a Field Manager, 4 Field Coordinators and a Programme Assistant. Field office was overall responsible for the implementation of programme. SLCDF was closely working with WRDSs, LIBCOs, Provincial Department of Animal Production & Health, RDSs and Farmer Organizations. Under the supervision and guidance of SLCDF, the WRDSs played a central role in the implementation of the project. RDSs and Farmer organizations provided a supportive role to WRDSs to implement the programme. Beneficiary selection was done by the WRDSs in consultation with Grama Niladaris and SLCDF Field Office in accordance with a framework established by the project. Inputs for livelihood support was channeled through the village WRDSs. The SLCDF closely guided, monitored the provision of inputs and beneficiary repayments to the WRDSs.

NGO MDC was tasked to design and deliver training programmes to relevant CBOs, Government officers, SLCDF staff and Local Government representatives involved in this programme. NGOMDC had agreed to assign Resource Persons and perform Training and Capacity building services as set forth in the Terms of Reference with the standard of professional care and professional services. NGOMDC was responsible for preparing and submission of each of the training modules, reports and a final report. The reports included an assessment of success of the programme in achieving its objectives.

There were 4 Veterinary Surgeons and an Assistant Director in charge of the Provincial Department of Animal Production and Health (D/AP&H) in the Kilinochchi District. The D/AP&H provided technical training for the dairy farming along with NGO-MDC. The Veterinary Surgeons visited the respective villages as agreed with SLCDF and partners, to inspect the cattle and check on needed support on a regular basis. SLCDF has already consulted the Assistant Director of (D/AP&H) in this regard, where an agreement has been reached with them on extending their fullest support to the project.

Throughout the project period SILK had been coordinating with several private and state sector partners to make the project a success. This coordination and partnership with the alliance partners, stakeholders, and the MPGs with significant activities continued till the end of the project and contributed for the successful implementation of the project. It is expected that the linkages that were established with these institutions will be continued after the completion of the project. This coordination has been described under two headings, Private Sector Partners and State Sector Partners.

Cargills, Nestle, MILCO – These 3 companies were mainly involved in the milk collection. SILK project maintained a friendly relationship with Cargills, Nestle and other milk buyers such as Milco. At the initial stage of the project when SILK motivated the LIBCOs to get involved in the collection of milk. Due to the capacity issues of the LIBCOs, LIBCOs in partnership with Cargills operated the 2 Milk collection centres. Some villages Nestle, MILCO directly collected the milk from the farmers. They had established milk collection

points at the village level. Evening milk collection was done by the LIBCOs. CIC Agri Business Institute in Hingurakgoda - They have provided training for 123 participants on dairy farming value addition training programme (Dairy processing as a Cottage Industry -Yoghourt and Curd).

As the subject of Livestock Development is being handled by more than one ministry and several government institutions, it was to be handled carefully without harming the relationship with any of them. At the field level, there were institutions that represented the Central Government and the Northern Provincial Council. SILK had to do a tight rope walking with all of them to implement the project without any obstacles.

District Secretaries and Related Officials: District Secretaries were the central governmental representatives based in the district. It is very important to obtain their approval to implement any projects in the district. SLCDF met with the District Secretaries from Kilinochchi and kept them informed about the project and got their advice on this matter. The District Secretary for Kilinochchi called all the relevant stakeholders in the district and facilitated the process of implementation. It was possible for us to obtain the much needed support of the Divisional Secretaries whose support was crucial in implementing projects at grassroots level as the Secretariat comprise of officials representing majority of GOSL administrative machineries.

Northern Provincial Ministry of Agriculture: As the Livestock Development is a devolved subject, the Authority to deal with the subject matter came under the purview of this ministry. The Secretary and the Director of Planning of the Ministry took a keen interest in facilitating the implementation of SILK project in the Kilinochchi district. As they were in a unique position to coordinate with the other relevant departments in the Province, it became much easier for SILK to obtain the support of other governmental institutions in the province. Provincial Director for the Department of Animal Production and Health (DAPH): This subject is devolved to the Provincial Councils and at district level we had to deal with the District Veterinary Surgeon who is the District Head of the DAPH. As they have Veterinary Surgeons and Livestock Development Officers at the DSD level, their cooperation was crucial for the implementation of the project. We received the fullest cooperation of these officials in this project. They supported SILK to conduct the Dairy Technical Training programs and shared much needed information and data on livestock development. They extended their fullest cooperation in conducting the AI administration and agreed to continue this work after SILK phased out.

Provincial / Assistant Commissioner for Cooperative Development: SILK needed the support of this Department as it had to register the Livestock Breeders' Cooperatives Societies with it. Under the his/her guidance the ACCD extended her fullest cooperation in solving the problems that were faced by LIBCOs. They provided the much needed advisory services to the farmers in matters pertaining to the Cooperatives. We received the support of the ACCD in Kilinochchi district. Assistant Commissioner for Agrarian Services: SLCDF closely worked with them for the small tank rehabilitation. They cooperated and provided all the necessary approval and technical support.

## **Recommendations;**

- The SILK project would have benefited from at least an 18 month implementation extension. It is recommended for the future to look at a 5 year project cycle for similar initiatives in order to complete the pass-on cycle and allowing appropriate time for making linkages with banks or other financial institutions to provide credit for expanding cattle numbers to enhance the profitability of the dairy ventures.
- SLCDF has demonstrated the ability to bridge local CBOs and their needs with government and their services. It is recommended that for future programming SLCDF investigate playing a more active role in policy review and advocacy. As an example, within the SILK project, the participants involved with conservation farming producing chemical free produce did not fully meet the national requirements for “organic” produce, however, could there have been a new category developed and recognized by GoSL that would allow a more appropriate and fair price?
- SLCDF should include inflationary mitigation measures within future project budgets for recurring or annual purchases – this was a clearly identified problem within the SILK project and the steadily increase in cattle costs each year.
- If following the same design for future projects, SLCDF should increase the start-up allocation for conservation farming in order for participants to achieve a more appropriate income return in the short and medium term.
- If following the same design for future projects, SLCDF should have a clear and succinct strategy that is communicated to participants to deal with passing-on strategy and male calves.

## CORRELATION TO Performance Management Plan (PMP)

Performance Indicator & Definition	Unit	Disaggregation	Baseline		Results Year 1, 2, 3 & 4	Total Target for 4 years
			Year	Value		
IR 2.1 Number of micro enterprises supported by USG enterprise assistance		Gender /WHH/ Disable	2013/2014	0	1,002	1002
Component 1 - 960 families have taken up integrated livelihood projects (Dairy farming combined with conservation farming) as a sustainable livelihood by end of 2016						
1.1 Number of vulnerable families selected	Number	Gender / WHH/ Disable	2013/2014		1002	1002
1.2 Number of participants trained on Cornerstones	Number	Gender	2013/2014	0	1,002	1002
Number of participants trained on dairy farming technical training	Number	Gender	2013/2014	10%	1,002	1002
Number of participants trained on artificial insemination	Number	Gender	2013/2014	30%	27	24
Number of families involved in dairy farming	Number	Gender	2013/2014	30%	515	522
Number of pass on participants constructed the cattle shed	Number	Gender	2013/2014	0	480	480
Number of families commenced fodder cultivation / live fencing in their homestead	Number	Gender	2013/2014	10%	522	522
Number of participants trained on conservation farming	Number	Gender	2013/2014	10%	480	480
Number of farmers practicing conservation farming using new technical knowhow	Number	Gender	2013/2014	10%	472	480
Number of wells cleared for drinking purposes						
Number of Rain water harvesting tanks constructed	Number		2013/2014		67	67
Number of tanks rehabilitated	Number		2013/2014		5	5
Component 2 - 40 Farmer groups have been strengthened and linked up with 4 divisional LIBCOs and district LIBCO for marketing and technical support						
Number of FOs formed / reformed	Number		2013/2014	30%	40	40
Number farmers specially women in the farmer organization / LIBCOs	Number	Gender	2013/2014	5%	948	1002
Component 3 - Value added technical knowhow provided to 275 farmer families for dairy based products. Two Milk collecting centers well equipped with refrigeration facilities owned and operated by Farmer organizations that provide better services to dairy farmers						
3.1 Number of participants trained on marketing and linking markets / cooperatives	Number	Gender	2013/2014	0	149	150
3.2 Number of marketing centres established with community participation	Number		2013/2014	2	2	2
3.3 Number of participants trained on dairy products, quality control and packaging	Number	Gender	2013/2014	0	123	125
Component 4 -Strengthening the existing WRDSs, RDSs, Farmer Organizations and LIBCOs by capacity building and empowerment programmes						
4.1 No. of WRDS / RDS/ FOs/LIBCOs strengthened	Number				132	129
4.2 Membership of WRDS/RDS/FOs increased	Number	Gender	2013/2014		70%	50%
4.3 Number of interface meetings at divisional level with various actors and number of people participated at the meetings	Number		2013/2014		52	48
4.4 Number of women in LIBCOs/FOs	Number	Gender	2013/2014		468	522
4.5 Number of issues identified each WRDSs and actions taken	Number	Gender	2013/2014		26	10

## **Annex 1 Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions**

### **Name list of the SILK Evaluation**

#### **1st Day**

##### **Discussion with SILK Field Staff**

**Mr.S.Ariharan - Field Manager**

**Mr.M.Thurkadevi - Field Officer**

**Ms.S.Pratheepa - Pratheeba**

##### **2 Focus Group Discussion with Piramantharu village Participants**

- **Dairy**
- **Conservation farming**

##### **Key Informant Interview**

**Mr.Saravanabavan Mohanabavan**  
**Director Planning**

**Mr.Amarasingam Ketheeswaran**  
**Assistant Director of Planning - District**

#### **2nd Day**

##### **Key Informant Interview**

**Mr. Suntharam Arumainayagam**  
**District Secretary/Government Agent**

**Mr.S.Thirumaran**  
**Development Officer - NGO Secretariay**

##### **2 Focus Group Discussion with Mahashkthy Participants covering 5 - 5 villages**

- **Dairy Participants**
- **Conservation farming participants**

##### **Key Informant Interview**

**Dr.Gowry Thilagan**  
**Assistant Director**  
**Department of Animal Production & Health**

**Mr.S.Kajaranjan**  
**Vetrinary Surgeons**

##### **Discussion with Field Staff**

### **3rd Day**

#### **Key Informant Interview**

**Mr.S. Suresh**  
**Rural Development Officer**

**Mr. S.Sathiyathan**  
**Vaddakachchi Grama Niladari**

**Mr.S.Pratheeban**  
**World Vision**

### **4th Day**

#### **2 Focus Group Discussion with Nathan Scheme WRDS**

- **Dairy Participants**
- **Conservation farming participants**

**Discussion with Nathan Scheme WRDS office bearers**

#### **Key Informant Interview**

**Mr.K.Arul**  
**Development Officer - Piramanthanaru**

**Mr.P. Raj Vinoth**  
**Assistant Director - Planning**

### **5th day**

#### **2 Focus Group Discussion with Mulankavil WRDS**

- **Dairy Participants**
- **Conservation farming participants**

#### **Key Informant Interview**

**Mr.T. Naguleswaran**  
**Mulankavil**

**Observation visit to Rainwater Harvesting sites in Ganimadam**

**Discussion with SILK Field Staff**

### **6th Day**

#### **2 Focus Group Discussion with Pannankandy WRDS**

- **Dairy Participants**
- **Conservation farming participants**

**Letter of Contract**  
22<sup>nd</sup> November, 2016

**1. Local Consultancy Contract**

Between

Sri Lanka Centre for Development Facilitation, 28/5 De Fonseka Road, Colombo - 5  
**hereinafter referred to as SLCDF**

And

Mr. Donald E. Brownell, No. 83 A, Ferry Road, Ethul Kotte, Kotte **hereinafter referred to as Subscriber**

---

**Scope of Work**

Subscriber agrees to conduct the Final Evaluation of USAID funded project “Sustainable Intervention in Livelihoods in Kilinochchi” (SILK) as set forth in this agreement and the attached Terms of Reference with the standard of professional care and professional services. SLCDF agrees to pay Subscriber for such amounts as specified in this agreement with the terms and conditions.

**Services to be Provided**

The Terms of Reference for the services to be provided are attached as Annex A.

**Term**

The services to be provided under this agreement shall commence on 23rd November, 2016 and to be completed by 30th April, 2017.

**Fees and Expenses**

The total amount to be paid to Subscriber by SLCDF under this agreement shall not exceed Rs.610,000.

As an independent contractor, Subscriber is responsible for paying any and all income and other related local taxes to the proper taxing authorities. As this is a short term contract, SLCDF will not make any statutory payments on behalf of Subscriber.

**Non-Disclosure**

Subscriber agrees that except as directed by SLCDF, he will not disclose any information or provide copies of any documents belonging to SLCDF or prepared under this agreement to anyone or anybody outside of the SLCDF, both during and after the duration of this contract.

**Copyrights**

The SLCDF has proprietary rights to all documents, materials and work-products developed during the performance of the services of this contract.

**Termination**

This contract shall be in effect for the term specified in this contract so long as the SLCDF’s agreement with USAID funded SILK programme is in effect or until performance is completed

pursuant to the Scope of Work. In the event of exigency the parties may mutually agree to terminate this contract.

By written notice to Subscriber the SLCDF may terminate this agreement for any of the following reasons:-

- Termination of the SILK Project
- Subscriber fails in the performance of his obligations and provision of services under this agreement
- Subscriber undertakes acts of professional misconduct that could adversely affect SLCDF's SILK programme funded by USAID.

In the event of termination of this contract, SLCDF will pay Subscriber for services performed up to the effective date of the termination.

If the Subscriber requires any additional information or clarification regarding the technical or financial conditions and requirements prescribed in this letter of contract, SLCDF will be pleased to advise the Subscriber.

It is the practice of SLCDF to state its purposes and the provisions of its grants / contracts in informal letters of this kind. If the foregoing represents our mutual understanding and agreement, please so indicate by signing and dating the original and copy of this letter. The signed copy should be returned to the SLCDF office, while the original may be retained for Subscriber's files.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

T. L. Wijetunga  
Executive Director  
Sri Lanka Centre for Development Facilitation

Agreed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Mr. Donald E. Brownell  
Consultant

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Sri Lanka Centre for Development Facilitation

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

**External Consultancy to conduct the Final Evaluation of USAID funded project  
“Sustainable Intervention in Livelihoods in Kilinochchi” (SILK)****1. Project Description****Background**

In support of USAID, the Sri Lanka Centre for Development Facilitation (SLCDF) is implementing Sustainable Intervention in Livelihoods in Kilinochchi (SILK) project in the Northern Province in Sri Lanka. The district of Kilinochchi was severely affected by the war that lasted for three decades. The local civil society organizations are just emerging and are not as vibrant as CBOs and NGOs in other parts of the country. Therefore they need to be strengthened to support the communities they are working with.

The SILK project intends to rebuild the lives of re-settled families in 40 marginalized villages in 4 divisions in the district of Kilinochchi. Number of families targeted by the project is 960. They are selected, trained, given support for integrated livelihood projects for engaging in conservation farming and dairy farming. This will help sustain their livelihood projects.

The project uses participatory methods (e.g. participatory rural appraisal, focus group discussion, participatory self-monitoring and participatory evaluation) in all stages such as planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of implementation to ensure accountability and transparency to all stakeholders and works in partnership with existing CBOs and NGOs in the respective locations. They are Women Rural Development Societies (WRDSs), Rural Development Societies (RDSs), Farmer Organizations and Livestock Breeders’ Cooperative Societies (LIBCOs) in the District. On the other hand, the project works in close collaboration with Divisional Secretaries in the respective Divisions, District Secretary and respective Departments related to agriculture, animal husbandry and environment.

The project takes extra measures to support female headed households and differently abled as they are the more vulnerable. Some infrastructure development activities such as rehabilitation of small irrigation tanks and construction of rainwater harvesting tanks are expected with community involvement to help sustain family farms and provide safe drinking water. Also, the project supports for the construction of refrigerated milk collecting centres and farmer families trained in making dairy based home made products such as curd, yoghurt and ghee. SLCDF facilitates The capacity building program and networking would pave the way for the empowered local CBOs to continue the process subsequent to the completion of the project. The project is executed by SLCDF in partnership with Government, Private sector, NGOs and CBOs as mentioned above.

The outcomes of all these activities will be as follows:-

- 960 families have taken up integrated livelihood projects (Dairy farming combined with conservation farming) as a sustainable livelihood by end of 2016.
- 40 farmer groups have been formed into clusters and strengthened to link up with 4 divisional LIBCOs and district LIBCO, Nestle, Milco, Lucky Lanka Milk, retailers and local processors for marketing and technical support.
- Technical know-how for value addition provided to 275 farmer families for dairy based products. Two milk collecting centres well equipped with refrigeration facilities owned and operated by Farmer Organizations that provide better services to dairy farmers.
- Strengthening the existing WRDSs, RDSs, Farmer Organizations and LIBCOs by capacity building and empowerment programs and promote networking among these organizations.

The project is executed by SLCDF in partnership with Government, Private sector, NGOs and CBOs as mentioned above.

## **2. Purpose of the Final Evaluation**

The objective of the final evaluation is to assess whether the program has achieved the expected results as outlined in the results framework. Specifically, the evaluation will assess the impact of the SILK Project on the productivity and income of targeted households and enterprises. The Evaluation will in addition assess program design, implementation, management, lessons learned and replicability and will be expected to establish plausible links between program inputs and outcomes/impacts, and draw lessons for improvement of future programs or similar activities.

The evaluation will examine the following key questions:

- To what extent has the program met the needs of the beneficiaries and is aligned with Sri Lanka's Dairy Development strategy
- How well the program attained its overall goal and strategic objectives, and the extent to which the intervention contributed to the expected result. Was progress towards the agreement's planned results positive or negative?
- What were lessons learned and recommendations for any future programmes
- What are the prospects for the sustainability of the end results produced by this project?

The consultant will be required to refine the list of evaluation questions and share with the SLCDF for approval.

## **3. Methodology**

The selected firm / consultants will implement the following general steps proposed for conducting the final evaluation:

- Literature Review; Undertake review of the program documents and other relevant documents including, but not limited to the following:
  - Approved agreements, Progress reports, Performance Management Plan (PMP), Activity work plans, Mid Term Evaluation Report, Any other program documents to get acquainted with the program activities and indicators
- Sampling - A comprehensive sampling technique is expected to be applied to include various target groups falling under a sampling frame based on various project interventions.
- Data Collection - Collect the data as per the sample and techniques (using appropriate data collection methods e.g. surveys, interviews, focus group discussions, discussions

with key informants), consolidate analysis and recommendations of the results and provide gender reflections where appropriate.

- Analysis and Reporting - During this stage, the evaluator will complete the following critical tasks:
  - o Synthesize, analyse, and interpret data from both the quantitative surveys, if any, and the qualitative study.
  - o Prepare Final evaluation report addressing the evaluation questions outlined in this Scope of Work, including feedback from the presentation and recommendations on the overall SILK Project
  - o Develop a Power Point presentation of evaluation findings, presenting it and submit to SLCDF / USAID
  - o Fully address the concerns, comments, and issues raised during the presentation of the Final Evaluation report.
  - o Submission of Final Evaluation Report and Relevant Documents/Data (Hard and electronic copy)

#### 4. Expected Deliverables

- **Final Work Plan** with milestone dates, time guidelines and logistical arrangements.
- **Methodology Plan:** A written methodology plan (Final version of Data collection tools evaluation design/operational work plan) will be prepared and discussed with SLCDF prior to implementation.
- **Discussion of Preliminary Draft Evaluation Report:** The team will submit a rough draft of the report to the SLCDF / USAID, who will provide preliminary comments prior to final debriefing.
- **Debriefing with SLCDF / USAID:** The team will present the major findings of the evaluation to SLCDF / USAID through a PowerPoint presentation after submission of the draft. The debriefing will include a discussion of achievements and issues as well as any recommendations the team has for possible modifications to project approaches, results, or activities. The team will consider SLCDF/ USAID comments and revise the draft report accordingly, as appropriate.
- **Draft Evaluation Report:** A draft report of the findings and recommendations should be submitted to the SLCDF/USAID. The written report should clearly describe findings, conclusions, and recommendations. SLCDF / USAID will provide comments on the draft report within two weeks of submission.
- Electronic version of all qualitative notes format, including quotes that summarize the impact of SILK Project. High Quality pictures of process and some survey participants (electronic form)
- **Final Evaluation Report: Not exceeding more than 20 pages excluding the executive summary.** The team will submit a final report that incorporates the team response to comments and suggestions, no later than ten days.

## 5. Tentative Program

What	Who	When
Circulate the SOW	SLCDF	November 2016
Proposals from Evaluation Firm / Consultants	Firm / Consultants	November 2016
Finalize TOR for the Consultants / Firm	SLCDF	November 2016
Select Consultants / Firm	SLCDF	November 2016
Negotiate with the Consultant (about project, SOW, time frame, fees, logistics)	SLCDF	November 2016
Provide related project information to Consultants / Firm	SLCDF	November 2016
Propose detailed methodology and work plan	Firm / Consultants	November 2016
Organize necessary field visits, etc. in Kilinochchi	SLCDF	December 2016 - January 2017
Conduct the Final Evaluation in Kilinochchi	Firm / Consultants	December 2016 - January 2017
Present findings and recommendations / final draft report	Firm / Consultants	February 2017
Submit final Final Evaluation report	Firm / Consultants	March 2016

## 6. Logistics

- SLCDF will make necessary institutional and administrative arrangements;
- Provide the Bidder with specific and detailed relevant information concerning the study;
- Provide all information and access to project personnel;
- Print and photocopy all relevant survey tools upon finalization;
- Appoint relevant staff who shall arrange any access to its information and staff as required by Bidder for its performance under the contract, if agreed and required.

## 7. Report format

The format for the evaluation report is as follows: The final version of the evaluation report not exceeding 20 pages excluding the executive summary will be submitted to SLCDF in hard copy as well as electronically.

1. **Introduction**—purpose, audience, and synopsis of task
2. **Background**—brief overview of SILK project and activities implemented in response to the problem, brief description of the purpose of the evaluation
3. **Methodology**—describe evaluation methods, including constraints and gaps
4. **Findings/Conclusions/Recommendations**—for each objective area; and also include data quality and reporting system that should present verification of spot checks, issues, and outcomes
5. **Challenges**—provide a list of key technical and/or administrative, if any
6. **Achievements and Lessons Learned**
7. **References** (including bibliographical documentation, meetings, interviews and focus group discussions)
8. **Annexes**—annexes that document the evaluation methods, schedules, interview lists and tables— should be succinct, pertinent and readable.

## 8. Budget –

Rs.610,000 (Consultant Fees, Transport, Food & Accommodation & stationery)

- Payment Schedule:
- (i) 40% - Signing of Agreement - Rs.244,000
  - (ii) 35% - On submission of Draft Report - Rs.213,500
  - (iii) 25% - On submission of Final Report - Rs.152,500