1. INTRODUCTION AND RATIONAL FOR THE FINAL EVALUATION OF LED PROJECTS IN SRI LANKA

This Terms of Reference covers the final independent evaluation of two projects implemented by ILO and funded by the Government of Australia represented by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT).

The two projects to be evaluated are part of the Australian Community Rehabilitation Program Phase 3 (ACRP3), a five-year, AUD$50 million program which tackles issues that entrench poverty and conflict in war-affected and lagging areas of Sri Lanka. The overarching goal of ACRP3 is: “to increase the number of conflict affected communities across Sri Lanka benefitting from and living a sustainable, secure and productive life.”

The purpose of the final independent evaluation is to strengthen social cohesion by increasing the levels of trust, awareness, capacity and confidence on the part of men, women and children from different ethnical and religious groups to initiate and participate in activities that improve their economic and social opportunity in a manner that reduces the factors that have contributed to conflict.”

ACRP3 is designed around three end-of-program-outcomes relating to improved local governance, strengthened communities and civil society and economic development, and supports six partners (ILO, IOM, Oxfam, The Asia Foundation, World Vision and ZOA) to deliver a range of programs activities. Partnership and pro poor, gender and socially inclusive development are key values which underpin ACRP3 and all of its supported programs.

The two projects to be jointly evaluated are administered by the ILO Country Office for Sri Lanka and the Maldives. They are as follows:

1. Local Empowerment through Economic Development Project:
2. Local Economic Development Through Tourism

The final independent evaluation is a mandatory exercise for all ILO projects with a budget of more than USD 1 million. This is in line with ILO Evaluation policy. The donor for the two projects has specifically requested that the evaluation be designed to provide information on programme performance using the OECD-DAC criteria as the reporting standard but with specific attention to measuring the impacts of the intervention/approach.

This process will look at what ILO did differently from other development partners to achieve the projects results and/or successes and what would have been the effect of not implementing the two interventions.

The joint final independent evaluation will be conducted by an international consultant. The evaluation process will be participatory and will involve ILO tripartite constituents, stakeholders and beneficiaries.
throughout the process. The final evaluation aims at examining the extent to which the project objectives have been achieved and at assessing the impact of the project particularly on the direct and indirect beneficiaries. The final evaluation will also report on the lessons learnt and possible good practices. The final evaluation findings, recommendations and lessons learnt will provide valuable information regarding ILO response to livelihoods and income generation interventions through its local economic development strategies in Sri Lanka and in other countries.

2.) PROJECTS TO BE EVALUATED

The ILO Local Economic Development interventions were designed to contribute towards achieving, result area 2 of the Australian Community Rehabilitation Program (ACRP) Phase 3 (2010 – 2015) i.e. *Increased economic and social development opportunities for vulnerable, lagging and conflict-affected target communities delivered*. Under this, there were two projects were implemented which will be evaluated jointly:

1. Local Empowerment through Economic Development (LEED)
2. Local Economic Development through Tourism

2.1 Local Economic Development through Economic Development Project

- **Duration:** (2010 June -2016 June )
- **Geographical coverage:** Northern and Eastern Province, Sri Lanka
- **Direct beneficiaries:** Direct beneficiaries 10,000 conflict-affected households with high vulnerability including female-headed households, ex-combatants, conflict-affected youth and persons with disabilities and entrepreneurs
- **Indirect Beneficiaries:** More than 25,000 micro and small entrepreneurs in the targeted conflict-affected communities, service providers and local government
- **Key Collaborators/Implementing Partners:** Ministry of Labour and Trade Union Relations, Employers Federation of Ceylon, and Private Sector
- **Donor contribution:** AUD 6,900,000 for both projects
- **ILO Technical Units:** DEVINVEST/EMPLOYMENT DWT New Delhi

Mid Term Evaluation undertaken in late 2012.

The project focussed on developing local building suppliers so as to optimize the use of local resources and create employment opportunities through networks and pooled resources in order to obtain better prices for construction materials from southern building suppliers, that they can then pass on to house builders. The project also examined the means by which vulnerable families could obtain wage employment while still addressing their own housing needs so as to ease the burden and accelerate the construction of the permanent houses.

- **Development Objective**
  To contribute to sustainable peace and conflict transformation in Sri Lanka by reducing conflict related economic inequalities and promoting and enabling more equitable and inclusive economic development in the ongoing process of economic recovery in three districts in the NP.

**Immediate Outcomes**

Economic Infrastructure Development-EID (A): To facilitate inclusive and equitable participation of northern producers and businesses in the economic recovery now taking place throughout the NP

Business Development Services-BDS (B): local businesses (MSME and Coops) become more competitive through an expansion of local and national market linkages and by adopting
implementing decent work practices and ‘pro poor’ policies.

The ILO project performance framework is reflected in the project proposal and attached as Annex 2 which provides detailed information about project objectives, outputs, performance indicators, and targets.

- **Management Arrangements**

  **Project Management Arrangements:** At the provincial, district and local level the ILO’s project is managed by an expatriate Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) and implemented by a team of six national staff officers based in the ILO’s Field Offices in the Northern and Eastern Provinces. The CTA and the national staff collectively constitute ILO’s Project Field Management Team.

  National Programme Coordinator will take over management of the project from the CTA from the second quarter of the Phase II. The Project Field Management Team is responsible for all day to day project activities; dialogue and coordination with all sub project partners at the local, district and provincial level; for process and performance monitoring and reporting and for all matters pertaining to sub project administration and finance. The ILO’s Project Field Management Team will continue to participate in district, divisional and provincial monthly coordination meetings and submit short quarterly progress reports to the relevant government Agent (GA), Divisional Secretary (DS), OoG NP, in their respective formats, during the second phase of the project. In response to concerns raised by ILO’s own Independent Mid Term Evaluation and the recommendations of AusAID’s Mid Term Review of ILO’s contribution to the Australian Community Rehabilitation Program (ACRP3), the ILO plans to use consultants/ specialists to address monitoring and evaluation, as well as gender and equality issues to technically support the ILO’s Project Field Management Team in ILO’s Field Office in the NP.

  **Project Location:** During the first phase of the project, ILO’s Project Field Management Team was located in ILO’s Field Office in Vavuniya. In June 2013, ILO’s Field Office and Project Implementation Team will relocate to Kilinochchi. This move is intended to enhance the implementation of the second phase of the project, which will focus more intensively on sub project implementation in Kilinochchi District and in Mullaitivu District, between July 2013 and June 2015.

  **Overall Responsibility:** At the national level the project is managed and administered by the ILO’s Country Director based in the ILO’s Country Office (CO) in Colombo. The ILO’s Country Director is supported by ILO’s Senior Programme Coordinator and a Programme Assistant and receives financial and administrative assistance from the ILO CO’s Finance / Administration Officer. The ILO’s Country Director is responsible for the overall organisation, administration and financial management of the project; for all communications between ILO and AusAID; for the submission of all reports and for all communications between ILO and the Ministry of Labour and Labour Relations (MoL&LR), the ILO’s government partner for the project. The Senior Secretary (Foreign Affairs) has been assigned as the focal point in the MoL&LR for all communication with the ILO’s Country Director regarding the project.

  **Oversight and Accountability:** At the national level the project receives guidance, insight, opinion, recommendations and approval for all sub project interventions from the Project Advisory Committee (PAC), which is chaired by the Secretary to the MoL&LR. The constituent members of the PAC include individuals representing other GoSL ministries and departments that have jurisdiction over employment, small industries and business development, as well as individuals representing ILO’s other tripartite partners such as employers’ organizations and trade unions. The project also receives technical assistance, management and administrative support, guidance, insight, opinion and recommendations from ILO’s Regional Office for the Asia Pacific in Bangkok; ILO’s Decent Work Team based in the ILO CO in New Delhi and from ILO’s technical units in Geneva.

  **2.2 LED Tourism**

- **Duration:** 18 months
• Geographical coverage: Eastern Province, Sri Lanka
• Direct beneficiaries: The main beneficiaries of the intervention were identified as those from disaster and conflict affected vulnerable communities i.e. the districts of Batticaloa and Amapra.
• Indirect Beneficiaries: More than 10,000 micro and small entrepreneurs in the targeted conflict-affected communities, service providers and local government
• Key Collaborators/Implementing Partners: Ministry of Labour and Trade Union Relations, Ministry of Tourism, Employers Federation of Ceylon, and Private Sector
• Donor contribution: AUD 1.4 million
• ILO Technical Units: DEVINVEST/EMPLOYMENT

The project was designed to contribute directly to three key priority / result areas of DFATs Sri Lankan Aid Programme as follows:

- Increased economic and social development opportunities for vulnerable, lagging and conflict-affected target communities delivered;
- Access to sustainable livelihoods and income generating activities and;
- Social protection for excluded and vulnerable people through better access to government services.

Development Objective
Contribute to reducing the incidence of poverty by creating sustainable employment and livelihood opportunities for vulnerable populations in the Eastern Province through promotion and development of an eco-friendly pro-poor tourism sector.

The project was premised on three main immediate outcomes as follows:

Intermediate Outcome A: Increased supply chain linkages of local supplies and service providers to the more established tourism and hospitality operators

Intermediate Outcome B: Improve efficiency of MSME’s to provide quality service to the tourism industry

Intermediate Outcome C: Government/semi-government institutions and stakeholders in the province mainstream eco-friendly, sustainable gender sensitive pro-poor tourism

The ILO project performance framework is reflected in the project proposal and attached as Annex ..., which provides detailed information about project objectives, outputs, performance indicators, and targets.

Management Arrangements

Project Management Arrangements: The programme was managed by a Field Management Team (FMT) located in Ampara District. This comprised of a National Programme Manager assisted by Field Coordinator (stationed in Batticaloa), Programme Assistant and 1 Finance Assistant.

Technical Support: Specialist technical consultants (international and national) were engaged to support the FMT while a Gender consultant was engaged to support the project in the field on a regular basis to guide mainstreaming gender into all programming activities.

Overall responsibility: This was held by ILO’s Country Director who ensured the overall responsibility for organisation, administration and financial management of the two projects and communications between ILO and AusAID. The project was backstopped by a Program Officer in the ILO Country Office (CO) in Colombo with technical backstopping, guidance, insight, from ILO’s; ILO’s Decent Work Team based Bangkok and New Delhi as well as from relevant technical units in ILO Geneva.

Oversight and Accountability: A tripartite Project Advisory Committee (PAC) comprised of representatives of relevant government ministries and institutions as well as private sector, employers
and worker organizations was set up to provide strategic guidance during the implementation of the Project. This was co-chaired by the ILO and Government (Ministry of Labour and Relations).

3. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES & SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The main purpose of this final independent evaluation is to assess the extent to which the project objectives have been achieved and at assessing the impact of the project particularly on improving the status quo of the direct and indirect beneficiaries. The final evaluation will also identify lessons learnt and good practices for both accountability and learning for possible similar interventions in the future.

The final evaluation will include consideration of whether the means of action have made contributions toward achieving relevant Decent Work Country (DWCP) outcomes and national development goals. The focus will also be on assessing the emerging impact of the interventions (either positive or negative) and the sustainability of the two project’s beneficiaries and the local partners’ strategy and capacity to sustain them. It will also look at strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and challenges and any external factors that have affected the achievement of the immediate objectives and the delivery of the two projects outputs. The final evaluation will also assess the extent to which the two projects have responded to the recommendations of the midterm.

Demonstrate the outcomes achieved by the program against the Theory of Change and the extent to which these have contributed to the ACRP3 end of program outcomes:

- An assessment of the partnership and level of collaboration and cooperation with relevant technical and local government agencies and other local partners to ensure quality control, and the contribution to strengthening impact, and sustainability and the relevance of such collaboration;
- Assess the effectiveness and impact of the program approaches and identify key successes and challenges and the factors underpinning these (special consideration should be made to the contribution of the partnership approach to these);
- Articulate clear lessons learned;
- Make recommendations based on lessons learned to inform future programming approaches.

To achieve the above mentioned purposes, this final evaluation will focus and address the following:

- The ILO’s overall approach to the two projects formulation, preparation of individual projects, budgeting, project management, backstopping and monitoring including coordination mechanisms among various stakeholders (including international partners and other ILO projects) in the project areas and how effective this has been.
- The extent to which the two projects have achieved the results and the immediate objectives and targets;
- Programme experiences that can be learned with regard to promoting social protection, gender equality and environmental sustainability;
- The effectiveness of social protection; how the beneficiaries, communities, and social protection partners have benefited from the project, what seems to work and what not, overall perception and a first assessment of sustainability;
- An initial assessment of the programme’s indirect impacts including but not limited to the impact of social preparation, training and capacity building, the forming of associations and groups etc;
- An analysis of the transition from emergency employment to local resource-based works, skills development and small enterprise recovery and an assessment of the linkages between the 3 medium term components also reviewing the sustainability of the work – what can be done to link recovery to medium term development and how did the ILO do this even at the earliest humanitarian/emergency phases? How effective has this been?
Examine the performance of the two projects by assessing the extent to which outputs have been delivered and immediate objectives have been achieved;

Assess strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and challenges and any external factors that have affected the achievement of the immediate objectives and the delivery of the outputs;

Assess the emerging impact of the interventions (either positive or negative) and the sustainability of the two project’s benefit and the local partners’ strategy and capacity to sustain them.

Draw lessons and provide concrete recommendations for future design and implementation of projects/programs based on the evaluation findings and conclusions.

Highlight recommendations for sustainability, lessons learnt and good practices.

**Scope:** The evaluation will include the 2 projects mentioned above from the start till the end of June 2016 and it will cover all the geographical coverage of the project.

**Clients:** primary clients are the beneficiaries and ILO constituents, secondary clients are the ILO and donors and other key stakeholders

- The Constituents (Ministry of Labour and Trade Union Relations, Sri Lankan Government, Employers’ and Workers’ Organisations)
- The implementing partners (Civil Society organizations, provincial and local governments and Private sector association)
- The Donor (DFAT).
- ILO Country Office for Sri Lanka and the Maldives
- Project Management Team
- DWT-New Delhi
- ILO technical unit at HQ
- RO-Bangkok

While this evaluation will seek to address a set of relevant evaluation questions, the findings of the evaluation will be used for promoting accountability and organizational learning among the stakeholders including the ILO.

The final evaluation findings and recommendations will be primarily addressed to the implementing partners and the ILO units directly involved in backstopping the project.

**4. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY QUESTIONS**

This final evaluation will assess the extent to which the project partners and beneficiaries have benefited from the project and the extent to which the project strategy and implementation arrangements were successful. The evaluation should address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation, 2012 ([http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_176814/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_176814/lang--en/index.htm)).

The following OECD/DAC evaluation criteria will be applied:

- Relevance and strategic fit of the project;
- Validity of the project design;
- Project effectiveness;
- Efficiency of resource use;
- Sustainability of project achievements/results;
- Impact orientation;
The suggested analytical framework for the final evaluation of the project is set out in Annex 1. A more detailed analytical framework of the questions and questions/sub-questions may be modified by the evaluation team in consultation with the evaluation manager.

In addition the evaluation is expected to be based on the following UN programming principles:

- Application of result-based management;
- Gender equality and non discrimination;
- Adoption of human rights-based approach;
- Capacity development;
- Environmental sustainability;

The gender dimension should be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. In terms of this evaluation, this implies involving both men and women in the consultation, evaluation analysis and evaluation team. Moreover the evaluators should review date and information that is disaggregated by sex and gender and assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve lives of women and men. All this information should be accurately included in the inception report and final evaluation report.

- Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and/or sustainability are the evaluation criteria against which the intervention will be assessed.
- The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions but the changes should be agreed between the evaluation manager and the evaluator and reflected in the inception report.
- The evaluation criteria (OECD/DAC criteria) and suggested questions under each criteria is provided in Annex 1.
- Evaluator may suggest and make necessary changes on the questions upon approval by the evaluation manager.

5. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The final evaluation will comply with evaluation norms and standards and follow ethical safeguards, all as specified in ILO’s evaluation procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards. The evaluation is an independent evaluation and the final methodology and evaluation questions will be determined by the evaluation team in consultation with the Evaluation Manager and will receive technical guidance from the respective project managers, assisted by ILO technical specialists and national and local partners.

In order to enhance usefulness and impartiality of the final evaluation of the two interventions, evidence-based approach to evaluation will be adopted. A combination of tools and methods will be used to collect relevant evidence. Adequate time will be allocated to plan for critical reflection processes and to analyse data and information. The methodology will include:

- **Review of documents** related to the project, including the initial project document, progress reports, technical assessments and reports, project monitoring and evaluation documents.
- Review of technical products (training manuals, tools, technical guidelines, etc.) and other publications used or developed by the project, if any.
- **Review of other relevant documents** such as the Decent Work Country Program of Sri Lanka, the national employment policy and programme strategy, national laws and regulations on employment. Comprehensive list of references provided.
- **Internal meetings and Interviews** with ILO Country Office Management and the Country Director, Project staff, backstopping Program Officers and DWT Specialists both at HQ and in DWT New-Delhi, other project/program staff of the country office as necessary.
• Interviews with other key project stakeholders at National level e.g. concerned officials/representatives of tripartite constituents, relevant private sector associations, selected National Steering Committee Members and donor representative and focal person.

• Conduct field missions, interview and focus group discussion in project sites located in and around the Northern and Eastern Provinces of Sri Lanka with key stakeholders (a list of project sites will be provided and project visits agreed).

• Pro-active and informed consultation with and participation of the key stakeholders in the evaluation process and the finalization of the report will be ensured.

• Conduct stakeholders’ workshop to validate information and data collected through various methods organized by the Project with assistance from the ILO Country Office for Sri Lanka and Maldives to share the preliminary findings with local stakeholders in the project municipalities. The draft terms of reference for the evaluation and a draft evaluation report will be shared with relevant stakeholders

• A detailed methodology will be elaborated by the evaluation team on the basis of this TOR, desk review and initial meeting with project management team and documented in the Inception Report, which is subject to approval by the evaluation manager.

• The gender dimension should be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. In terms of this evaluation, this implies involving both men and women in the consultation, evaluation analysis, and if possible within the evaluation team. Moreover the evaluators should review data and information that is disaggregated by sex and gender and assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve lives of women and men. All this information should be accurately included in the inception report and final evaluation report.

6. MAIN DELIVERABLES

a) An inception report – upon the review of available documents and an initial discussion with the project management (EVAL Guidelines –Checklist 3). The inception report will:
   • Describe the conceptual framework that will be used to undertake the evaluation;
   • Elaborate the methodology proposed in the TOR with changes as required;
   • Set out in some detail the data required to answer the evaluation questions, data sources by specific evaluation questions, data collection methods, sampling and selection criteria of respondents for interviews
   • Detail the work plan for the evaluation, indicating the phases in the evaluation, their key deliverables and milestones;
   • Set out the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed and the tools to be used for interviews and discussions.
   • Set out outline for the final evaluation report

b) Preliminary Findings to be shared with the ILO and then presented at a stakeholders’ workshop at the end of evaluation mission.

c) First draft of Evaluation Report (Checklist 5 to be provided to the Evaluation Team) - to be improved by incorporating Evaluation manager’s comments and inputs. The Evaluation Manager holds the responsibility of approving this draft.

d) Final draft of evaluation report incorporating comments received of ILO and other key stakeholders. The report should be no more than 30 pages long excluding annexes with executive summary (as per ILO standard format for evaluation summary). The quality of the report will be assessed against the EVAL checklist 5, 6 and 7 to be provided to the Evaluation Team). Any identified lessons learnt and good practices will also need to have standard annex templates (1 lessons learnt per page to be annexed in the report) as per EVAL guidelines. The
report should also include a section on output and outcome level results against indicators and targets of each project.

**Suggested content for the report (Check list 5 to be provided to the Evaluation Team):**

- Cover page with key project data (project title, project number, donor, project start and completion dates, budget, technical area, managing ILO unit, geographical coverage); and evaluation data (type of evaluation, managing ILO unit, start and completion dates of the evaluation mission, name(s) of evaluator(s), date of submission of evaluation report).
- Table of contents
- Acronyms
- Executive Summary
- Background on the two projects and their respective intervention logic
- Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation
- Methodology and evaluation questions
- Review of implementation
- Presentation of findings
- Conclusions and Recommendations (including to whom they are addressed)
- Lessons Learnt and potential good practices and models of intervention/Possible future directions
- Annexes (list of interviews, overview of meetings, proceedings stakeholder meetings, other relevant information). The deliverables will be circulated to stakeholders by the evaluation manager and technical clearance for the deliverables will come from the evaluation manager. The evaluation report will be in English.

**e) Evaluation summary**

In line with the ILO standard format, an evaluation summary will also be drafted by the evaluation team leader after the evaluation report is finalized. The evaluation manager will assess it against EVAL checklist 8.

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

**7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND WORK PLAN**

The evaluation will be co-funded from the two project budgets. The evaluation is being managed by Ms. Belinda Chanda, based at the ILO Country Office for Islamabad and Ms. Parmonrat Pringsaluaka-M&E Officer, Regional Office Bangkok. They will be in charge of developing the evaluation ToR, the selection of the consultants in consultation with the ILO’s Office in Sri Lanka.

ILO Country Office for Sri Lanka and Maldives and the project will handle all contractual arrangements with the evaluation team and provide any logistical and other assistance as may be required.

The evaluation consultant reports to the Evaluation Manager’s. The evaluator will be an international consultant selected through a competitive process from qualified consultants.

The consultant will lead the evaluation and will be responsible for delivering the above evaluation
outputs using a combination of methods as mentioned above.

**Evaluator**

- One independent international evaluation specialist with the relevant experience and qualifications. He/she should have a proven track record in the evaluation of complex projects, experience with country situations similar to that of Sri Lanka and with arrangements as used in the set-up of the current project. Experience in a community-based employment programmes or project in a post crisis condition will be an advantage.
- Depending on the evaluator’s local language competency, translators may be recruited to assist in interviewing community members.

**Qualifications**

- University Degree with minimum 10 years of experience in project / program evaluation
- An evaluation expert in development field with demonstrated technical expertise in evaluation methodologies and previous proven skills and experience in undertaking evaluations of similar projects;
- Strong background in local economic and enterprise development as well as Human Rights Based Approach programming and Results Based Management;
- Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative research methodologies;
- Experience in direct and participatory community-based observation, and experience in participative evaluation techniques would be an asset;
- Knowledge of ILO’s roles and mandate and its tripartite structure as well as UN evaluation norms and its programming is desirable;
- Excellent analytical skills and communication skills;
- Demonstrated excellent report writing skills in English;
- Experience in working in Sri Lanka will be desirable.

**Stakeholders’ role:** All stakeholders in Sri Lanka particularly the project teams, ILO CO-Colombo, DWT/CO-New Delhi, ILO technical unit at HQ, and donor will be consulted and will have opportunities to provide inputs to the TOR and draft final evaluation report.

**The tasks of the Projects:** The project management teams will provide logistical support to the evaluation team and will assist in organising a detailed evaluation mission agenda. The projects will also ensure that all relevant documentations are up to date and easily accessible by the evaluation team.

**Proposed Evaluation Plan**

**Time frame and responsibilities (Tentative)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible person</th>
<th>Time frame (by end)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of the TOR –draft</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of list of stakeholders with E-mail addresses and contact numbers</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>April, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing the TOR with all concerned for comments/inputs</td>
<td>Project Manager, Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>Last week of April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization of the TOR</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>Last week of April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of the TOR</td>
<td>Evaluation Office</td>
<td>First week of May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement and selection of consultant</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager/</td>
<td>Second week of May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsible person</td>
<td>Time frame (by end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and issuance of contract</td>
<td>Evaluation Office</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft mission itinerary for the evaluator and the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>In parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief evaluators on ILO evaluation policy</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>7 June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report submitted to Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
<td>14 June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Mission</strong></td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
<td><strong>June (at the latest starts mid June for 2 weeks)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report submitted to Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
<td>11 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing the draft report to all concerned for comments</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>22 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated comments on the draft report, send to the evaluator</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>29 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalisation of the report and submission to Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>13 August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the final report</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the final report to EVAL</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>27 August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of the final evaluation report</td>
<td>Evaluation Office</td>
<td>End of August 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. ANNEXES

Annex 1: Suggested Evaluation Criteria and analytical framework
Annex 2: Project performance framework
Annex 3: Tentative mission itinerary – to be provided by the project
Annex 4: List of documents to be reviewed
Annex 6: List of ILO staff and key stakeholders to be interviewed
Annex 7: All relevant ILO evaluation guidelines and standard templates
Annex 1: Suggested Criteria and Analytical framework (Applicable to both Projects under evaluation)

1) Relevance and strategic fit of the intervention
   • To what extent have the Projects contributed to the Objectives and priorities of the relevant DWCP 2013-2017, UNDAF 2013-2017 and the country’s overarching national development plans such as Cooperative Sector Development Policy, Ministry of Economic Development, Tourism Development Strategy
   • Has the Project addressed the needs of the ultimate beneficiaries and of direct recipients? Was the project aligned with the strategic objectives of the Local Government Units?
   • How the project has contributed (or not) towards gender equality goal of ILO?
   • Were the project strategies and the selected means of action appropriate considering the cultural setting, capacity of institutional partners for project implementation and the capacities of intended men and women beneficiaries in Sri Lanka?

2) Validity of design
   • Was the project design realistic and adequate to meet the project objectives? To what extent was the project design adequate and effective in addressing the needs of ultimate beneficiaries and the capacities of the project partners?
   • Were the planned project objectives, means of action and outcomes, relevant, coherent and realistic to the situation on the ground? Did it address gender needs and interests?
   • Were the capacities of various project’s partners taken into account in the project’s strategy and means of action? Did the project design adequately plan for an effective participation of local governments in the management of the project?
   • Which risks and assumptions were identified and managed? To what extent have they affected the project?
   • Were the planned monitoring and evaluation arrangements adequate? Were the targeted indicator values realistic and can they be tracked?

3) Project Effectiveness
   • To what extent did the two projects achieved intended objectives?
   • What have been major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the projects’ objectives?
   • Examine the effectiveness of project institutional framework, its management arrangement and coordination mechanism with other relevant ILO projects, and with other implementing partners
   • Examine the extent that the project has adjusted/modified its strategy to respond to changing situation on the ground or challenges faced
   • To what extent were the identified risks and key assumptions relevant in the country situation? To what extent the mitigation strategies were effective in addressing the risks during the implementation of the project?
   • How has the project contributed to and benefitted from tripartism?
   • To what extent the project has managed the practice of knowledge management and lessons dissemination and visibility effort on project branding?

4) Efficiency of resource use
   • Has the project been implemented in the most efficient way vis-à-vis its financial and human resources?
   • Have activities been implemented in a cost efficient manner and have project objectives been achieved on-time and with planned budget?

5) Effectiveness of Management Arrangements
• Did the two projects receive adequate and timely technical support from DWT and administrative/management support from the Country Office? If not, how that could be improved? How the gender composition of the management and backstopping team affect the performance of the two projects?

• How well did the projects manage their finances? This should include budget forecasts, delivery monitoring, actions taken for improving the delivery, budget revision and financial reporting. What percentage of the budget was spent on men specific activities?

• How effective was the monitoring mechanism set up for the respective projects? How were the Project steering committee and the donor involved in monitoring? Were any significant corrective actions recommended and follow-up actions taken following monitoring missions? Did the M&E system in place allow to collect sex-disaggregated data, monitor results and prepare regular progress reports?

6) Impact

• What has happened as a results of the two projects? To what extent did the projects make their contribution to broader and longer team crisis response and decent work goal in Sri Lanka?

• What real difference that the project has made to the ultimate beneficiaries, capacity of local authorities, and to gender equality?

• What changes have been observed in relation to the objectives of the intervention? How have women, men, the poor, different ethnic groups experienced these changes?

• To what extent can observed changes be attributed to the intervention?

• To what extent are these changes likely to be sustained?

• Are there unintended impacts (including consideration of different segments of society)?

• What interventions and approaches delivered the impact? What are key contextual features for these (e.g. gender, poverty, ethnicity etc)?

• What is the contribution of the ACRP 3 partnership to the program (what has been achieved through partnering approaches that may not have been otherwise achieved).

7) Sustainability

• To what extent will the project’s benefits/impact continue after they have ended?

• What are the major factors which will have or will influence the continuity of the two project’s benefit?
Annex 2: Project Performance Framework – TO BE PROVIDED

Annex 3: Tentative mission itinerary – to be provided by the project

Annex 4: List of documents to be reviewed
- Project Documents /Log Frames
- Progress Reports
- Mission Reports
- List and Profiles of Sub-Project Reports implemented under the project
- Sub-Project Accomplishment Reports per Implementing Partner

List of references – Tourism project
- Sri Lanka Tourism Development Authority, Sri Lanka Sustainable Development Project; Environment Assessment and Management Framework (June 2009), Colombo, Sri Lanka
- Tourism Development Ministry, Eastern Tourism Development Plan(2012), Trincomalle District, Sri Lanka
- PSD Facilitators, Gender Sensitive Value Chain Assessment in the Eastern Province, (November, 2014), Colombo, Sri Lanka

List of references for LEED project
- Mattram Foundation, Understanding the Post War Land Issues in Northern Sri Lanka (November 2015), Jaffna, Sri Lanka
- Steve.C (November . 2015) Enhancing the management and micro enterprise development capacity of Fishermen’s Cooperative Societies in Poonakary Divisional Secretariat Division, Colombo, Sri Lanka
- International Labour Organisation, Decent work country Programme, (2013), Colombo, Sri Lanka
- PSD Facilitator, Gender Sensitive Value Chain Development in the fruits and vegetables sectors (2013), Northern region Sri Lanka
- Ministry of Cooperative Development and internal Trade, Cooperative Sector Development Policy (2013), Colombo, Sri Lanka

Annex 5: List of ILO staff and key stakeholders to be interviewed
- Mr. Donglin Li, Country Director, ILO Office for Sri Lanka and the Maldives
- Ms Indra Tudawe, Senior Programme Office
- Ms Pramodini Weerasekera, Programme Officer
- Ms Nihal Devagiri, National Project Coordinator –LEED/LED Tourism
• Officials from DWT New Delhi/ ROAP/HQ
• Officials from the Ministry of Labour and Trade Union Relations
• EFC Officials
• Donor – DFAT
• Other key stakeholders

Annex 6: All relevant ILO evaluation guidelines and standard templates

Code of conduct form (To be signed by the evaluators)

Checklist No. 3 Writing the inception report

Checklist 5 Preparing the evaluation report

Checklist 6 Rating the quality of evaluation report

Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices

Guidance note 7 Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation

Guidance note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E of projects

Template for evaluation title page

Template for evaluation summary: