

2. Evaluation framework

2.1. Objective and approach of evaluation

Three and a half years have passed since the inception of the Project. It is scheduled to come to an end in six months, i.e. 18 March 2011. The Project Team has been undertaking a range of activities in order to achieve the project purpose. It is important for the concerned authorities to review its progress made thus far and to examine to what extent the activities have led to producing expected outputs, thereby leading to the attainment of the project purpose. The examination will make it possible to judge the level of Project's success. It will also predict how much the Project is likely to achieve the overall goal several years after the project period.

The purpose of the terminal evaluation is to objectively evaluate the level of success of the Project and to identify the reasons behind it. Based on the results of the evaluation, the study is to give suggestions and recommendations to the concerned organisations with the aim of providing lessons learned, which are useful for future direction of the Project and similar projects. It also judges whether the assistance should be terminated or requiring follow-up cooperation.

The evaluation team (hereinafter referred to as "the Team") adopted "the Five Evaluation Criteria" for project evaluation. The Five Evaluation Criteria, proposed by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) at the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in 1991, are meant to be used for evaluating development assistance activities. The five criteria are namely:

- 1) **Relevance:** A criterion for considering the validity and necessity of a project regarding whether the expected effects of a project (or project purpose and overall goal) meet with the needs of target beneficiaries; whether a project intervention is appropriate as a solution for problems concerned; whether the contents of a project is consistent with policies; whether project strategies and approaches are relevant, and whether a project is justified to be implemented with public funds of Official Development Assistance (ODA);
- 2) **Effectiveness:** A criterion for considering whether the implementation of project has benefited (or will benefit) the intended beneficiaries or the target society;
- 3) **Efficiency:** A criterion for considering how economic resource/inputs are converted to results. The main focus is on the relationship between project cost and effects;
- 4) **Impact (prediction*):** A criterion for considering the effects of the project with an eye on the longer term effects including direct or indirect, positive or negative, intended or unintended; and,
- 5) **Sustainability (prediction*):** A criterion for considering whether produced effects continue after the termination of the assistance.

* Since the terminal evaluation is conducted before the project has finished, these two criteria, impact and sustainability, are based on prediction rather than actual achievement.

By examining the Project's progress and achievement by using these five criteria, the evaluation study ascertains the value of the project from different viewpoints. It attempts to assess performance, make a value judgment about the project, and make recommendations and draw lessons learned.

The evaluation uses the Project Design Matrix (PDM) agreed upon by both the Sri Lankan and Japanese sides. The PDM has been revised twice since the first PDM was formulated in March, 2007. The Project is now being conducted in line with PDM Version 3 (Annex 1) dated on 16 March 2010. Thus, the terminal evaluation was undertaken based on the specifications stipulated in PDM Version 3.

2.2. Members of the evaluation team

The Team is composed of the following personnel

The Japanese side

Mr. Takuya Otsuka	Leader	JICA Sri Lanka Office
Mr. Hideki Sonoyama	Participatory Development/ Evaluation Planning	JICA Sri Lanka Office
Dr. (Ms.) Kumiko Shuto	Evaluation and Analysis	IC Net Limited

The Sri Lankan side

Ms. I.V.N Preethika Kumudunie	Deputy Chief Secretary (Planning), Southern Province Planning Secretariat
Mr. G. Sumedha Chandrajith	Assistant Director (Planning), Southern Province Planning Secretariat
Mr. W. Wimalasena	Assistant Director (Planning), District Planning Secretariat, Hambantota District

2.3. Schedule of the evaluation

The terminal evaluation study was conducted during the period between 1 and 20 October 2010 (Annex 2). The Team visited the Project sites as well as Colombo during that time for data collection purposes.

2.4. Methods of the evaluation

2.4.1. Data collection

The study collected data (both quantitative and qualitative) relevant to the Project from a range of information sources by using multiple information-gathering methods. This approach enabled the Team to undertake triangulation of methods and information sources, thereby ensuring reliability of

the study. For facilitating efficient data collection the evaluation grid based on Five Evaluation Criteria was formulated (Annex 3).

The focus of the study during the Team's visit to the Project sites was on the collection and analysis of qualitative data, rather than quantitative one, since the main purpose of the field visit was to make in-depth analysis of hindering and contributing factors to the implementation of the Project and to understand reasons for having such factors. Thus, research methods adopted for the field study centred on qualitative data collection methods including key person interviews, focus group discussions, observation, and a questionnaire with many open-ended questions.

The following table (Table 1) shows methods used and information sources the Team accessed during the study period:

Table 1 Data collection method and source of information

Method	Source of information
Literature review	Policy papers, project documents, written reports by experts, JCC and RCC minutes, past questionnaire survey results, website information, and Newsletters, etc.
Questionnaires	Japanese experts (five persons) and counterpart personnel (CP) (four persons)
Interviews	Government officials of Sri Lanka, Pradeshiya Sabha (Local Council) Chairperson, frontline government officials, CP, and national staff employed by the Project, Japanese experts (see Annex 6 for the list of interviewees of the key informant interviews)
Focus group discussions	Community members (eight GN Divisions)
Observation	PIC meetings (three DS Divisions) and CAP activity sites (eight GN Divisions)

Review of literature was undertaken mainly in Japan before the fieldwork. The main purpose of the literature review was to confirm the level of the project performance and implementation process. At the same time, questionnaires were prepared distributed to those who were directly involved in operation of the Project, i.e. to the Sri Lankan CP and the Japanese experts, and the answers were collected soon after the Japanese members of the Team arrived in Sri Lanka. A total of five Japanese experts and four CPs responded to the questionnaires with detailed answers.

After the Team reached the project sites, in-depth interviews were conducted with key informants such as the CP, Japanese experts and National staff employed by the Project. The individual interviews were also conducted for the frontline government officials who were involved in facilitating the CAP activities at the GN Division level. The interviews were to generate in-depth information on the Project's achievement and to supplement/ confirm information gathered by the literature review and the questionnaire survey.

Focus group discussions were organized with farmers' groups and other CBOs at all the eight target GN Divisions. Each group consisted of around six to nine participants who were the members of the same community. The Team also observed CAP activities of different sectors (rural infrastructure,

agriculture, income generation, etc.) in the eight GN Divisions (see Annex 2 for the details of the activity sites visited) and some questions for clarification were asked to the community members or frontline government officials who were at the scene. The information collected by way of observation supplemented and complemented the information derived from focus group discussions or literature review.

2.4.2. Data analysis

The qualitative as well as quantitative information gathered through the above-mentioned data collection methods was examined by adhering to the five evaluation criteria. The quantitative information collected through the questionnaire survey was tabulated by each criterion as per attached Annex 4. Quantitative data collected from the answers to the questionnaire were compiled as simple descriptive statistics, i.e. total counts and average scores, which were also included in Annex 5. The final results of the analyses were then presented in Annex 4 and in a narrative form in Section 4 “Evaluation results”.

2.5. Limits and constraints of the evaluation

Although it was ideal to visit all the activity sites for observation purpose, the Team was unable to do so because of time, resource and logistical constraints. The Team tried to gather as much information as possible both from the literature review, the focus group discussions with the community members and the interviews with the frontline officials so that the information provided sufficient data for evaluation.

In addition to the constraints mentioned above, there was also a problem relating to the objectively verifiable indicators specified in the PDM. The quantitative data for some of the indicators were not available at the time of the evaluation and the Team resorted to collecting qualitative data by way of interviews and focus group discussions. The qualitative data were then used as proxy indicators and analysed for the assessment of achievement of the targets set in the PDM.

The Team made every effort to overcome constraints and limits of the evaluation as explained above. Therefore, it is reasonably said that the information collected within the evaluation framework maintains a certain level of reliability and validity.

3. Achievement of the project

3.1. Achievement of the inputs

3.1.1. Inputs from Japan

3.1.1.1. Dispatch of Japanese experts

Both long-term and short-term experts, totalling ten persons, in seven different fields of expertise were dispatched from Japan during the project period. The total Man-Months (MM) of Japanese experts up to August 2010 was 112.55 as shown in Table 2. The despatch of Japanese experts had been conducted in accordance with the Plan of Operation (PO) and no major delays or changes had occurred thus far.

A total of 128.16 MM is planned to be inputted by the end of the Project period.

Table 2 Dispatch of Japanese experts

No.	Position	Year 1 MM	Year 2 MM	Year 3 MM	Year 4 MM	Year 5 MM	Total MM
1	Chief Advisor/ Rural Community Development	4.10	6.10	9.93	9.87	3.53	33.53
2	Agricultural Infrastructure -1, 2	4.10	6.50	3.40	0.00	1.57	15.57
3	Operation and Maintenance	1.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	0.00	11.00
4	Agricultural Production-1	0.00	1.50	1.50	0.00	0.00	3.00
5	Agricultural Production-2	0.00	0.00	2.00	4.37	1.33	7.70
6	Marketing and Processing-1,2	1.03	1.00	2.90	4.43	1.40	10.76
7	Coordinator -1, 2	4.10	6.70	7.23	9.13	3.83	30.99
Total		14.33	23.80	31.96	30.80	11.66	112.55

According to the interviews and questionnaire survey, it had become clear that it was often felt by many that the experts in the agricultural field as well as rural infrastructure needed to stay in Sri Lanka for a longer time period so that they can monitor the progress of the activities on the ground in more effective ways. It may have been appropriate if an additional MM in those fields had been provided, although it was not possible to do so due to resource limitations for the Project.

With regard to the capacity, expertise, skills and work ethics of the Japanese experts, there were enough testimonials from the CP and beneficiaries which emphasized the experts' professionalism, dedication and commitment to the Project as well as their accommodating attitude towards all the project participants.

3.1.1.2. Training in Japan and third countries

As of October 2010, a total of 16 people were selected and sent to the training programs held in Japan as well as in third countries including China and Indonesia. The training courses were on topics such as rural development, One Village One Product (OVOP) and other technical skills. The names of the training courses, the organisations and positions of the participants, and the periods of the training are as shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Training in Japan and third countries

No.	Name of training	Training period			Participants' organisation/ position
		From	To		
1	CP Training on Rural Development through Community Approach in Japan	10 Jan 2008	22 Jan 2008	1. 2. 3.	Chief Secretary of Southern Provincial Council Deputy Chief Secretary of Southern Provincial Council District Secretary, Hambantota District
2	OVOP International Seminar in China	13 Nov 2008	21 Nov 2008	1. 2. 3. 4.	Divisional Secretary, Hambantota Division Divisional Secretary, Lunugamwehera Divisional Secretary, Sooriyawewa Assistant Director, Department of Small Enterprise Development
3	CP Technical Exchange in Indonesia	16 Feb 2009	28 Feb 2009	1. 2. 3. 4.	Assistant Project Manager (Lunugamwehera DS Division) Assistant Project Manager (Sooriyawewa DS Division) Assistant Project Manager (Hambantota DS Division) Department of Agriculture, Southern Provincial
4	OVOP International Seminar in Indonesia	12 Nov 2009	20 Nov 2009	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	Additional District Secretary, Hambantota Enterprise Promotion Manager, Industrial Development Board, Hambantota Hambantota District Chamber of Commerce Private producer Private producer

The interviews with the training participants confirmed that the contents and duration of the training were appropriate to meet the training needs of the participants. The experience of participating in the training increased interests in rural development/ OVOP and enhanced the participants' enthusiasm in their work. Those participated in the OVOP training, in particular, were putting the knowledge gained in action and working as leaders of OVOP promotion in Hambantota. They are also active members of the Hambantota Product Promotion Committee (HPPC). The OVOP training is planned to be conducted again in December 2010.

It was also confirmed that it was appropriate for the Project to send most of them to the other Asian countries rather than to Japan in terms of both efficiency and effectiveness. Sri Lanka shares similar socio-cultural backgrounds with other developing countries in Asia and the participants can learn a lot from the training in countries like China and Indonesia.

3.1.1.3. Provision of equipment

Equipment including vehicles, motorcycles, computers, software, printers and photocopiers, etc. was provided by JICA for project operation (Annex 7) and 16,064,000 rupees was spent for purchasing these items up to 10 August 2010. Through the questionnaire survey, report from the Project and observation at the project office, it was confirmed that all the pieces of the equipment provided had been used on a daily basis and nothing had fallen in disuse. All the items were also properly maintained.