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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Evaluation Overview

Since 1978, UN-Habitat has supported the development of human settlements policies in Sri Lanka.\(^1\) Since this time, UN-Habitat has cooperated with the Government to initiate a range of national programmes and projects.\(^2\) After the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami, UN-Habitat increased its support of Sri Lanka. The Southern Coast and North-East experienced severe damage, with 30,000 houses damaged and 70,000 destroyed. UN-Habitat’s activities ranged from advocacy to policy advice, coordination and building partnerships, implementation of housing recovery and reconstruction projects, and technical assistance. From 1983-2009, the conflict between the Government of Sri Lanka and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) resulted in the devastation of the Northern and Eastern Provinces. By 2009, 450,000 people had been displaced and 160,000 houses were damaged or destroyed. Between 2009 and 2016, UN-Habitat facilitated the construction of houses and community infrastructure facilities in these provinces. UN-Habitat’s accumulated effects in Sri Lanka over the last four decades are evident in their work in post-disaster reconstruction, housing, climate change and disaster risk reduction, water and sanitation, low-income settlement upgrading, livelihoods, gender equality, urban planning, policy development, and capacity building.

As stated in the ToR, the purpose of this country programme evaluation is, “to document and assess the results and accumulated effects of the UN-Habitat programme in Sri Lanka conducted with emphasis on the period from 2013 to 2017.”\(^3\) This period covered the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Sri Lanka (2013-2017), which was linked to priorities defined by the Government of Sri Lanka.

Out of the projects in the country portfolio, two projects with different characteristics were reviewed in-depth with regard to results and accumulated effects at project level. Thematically, UN-Habitat’s portfolio in Sri Lanka focusses mainly on housing, infrastructure, and community engagement. The two projects focus on infrastructure and community engagement. Housing is a strong element of UN-Habitat’s larger portfolio in Sri Lanka, as outlined below in Background and Context.

The selected projects reflect UN-Habitat’s vision on the three-pronged approach\(^4\) and its country mission, as well as, focus on improving livelihoods, cross-cutting issues, availability of data, donors, and collaboration with other UN agencies. These two projects are:

2. Human Development Initiative through Empowerment and Settlement Improvement in the

---

1. https://unhabitat.org/srilanka/
4. The three-pronged approach places emphasis on urban legislation, urban planning and design, and urban economy and municipal finance. These correspond to the first three focus areas of the strategic plan for 2014–2019, and they can be seen as the levers for transforming cities and human settlements into centres of greater environmental, economic and social sustainability. A fourth focus area, or sub-programme, urban basic services, is also prioritized, as large numbers of urban dwellers in developing countries still lack access to adequate basic services, especially water and sanitation as well as reliable waste management services, sustainable mobility solutions and safe domestic energy. See, for example, UN-Habitat, Economic Foundations for Sustainable Urbanization: A Study on Three-Pronged Approach: Planned City Extensions, Legal Framework, and Municipal Finance, Second Edition, March 2017, https://unhabitat.org/books/economic-foundations-for-sustainable-urbanization-a-study-on-three-pronged-approach-planned-city-extensions-legal-framework-and-municipal-finance/

This evaluation will provide information to UN-Habitat management, its offices and staff responsible for project development and implementation in UN-Habitat country offices, regional offices and at headquarters, as well as its governing bodies, donors and key stakeholders in Sri Lanka of the value-added, achievements, lessons, challenges and opportunities for UN-Habitat’s Sri Lanka operations.

These findings should inform future strategy, adjustments, opportunities, collaboration, replication and upscaling. These are all important in future mainstreaming, especially given that the Sri Lanka programme is one of the largest in UN-Habitat Asia’s portfolio. The findings will highlight country lessons that can be utilized in other countries. Institutional aspects will be emphasized, especially the support received from the Headquarters in relation to the income generated from the Country Programme on an annual basis.

Evaluation Objectives and Intended Audience

In terms of the specific objectives, this evaluation will:

1. Assess the relevance of UN-Habitat Sri Lanka’s programme between 2013 and 2017 to attain accumulated positive results for beneficiaries, local authorities, and government institutions that are supportive of UN-Habitat’s strategic objectives.
2. Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the UN-Habitat projects in Sri Lanka in achieving results and the accumulation of results.
3. Identify what successful approaches and strategies worked, and which did not, drawing out key findings and lessons from UN-Habitat’s experience in Sri Lanka.
4. Take into account the intended users of the evaluation, make recommendations to effectively deliver, develop and expand UN-Habitat’s portfolio in Sri Lanka.

The evaluation will examine mainstreaming of such issues as resource mobilization, coordination, ownership, and adherence to critical crossing-cutting issues (human rights, gender, youth, and climate change). The intended audience is the UN-Habitat management, its offices and staff responsible for project development and implementation in UN-Habitat country offices, regional offices and at headquarters, as well as its governing bodies, donors and key stakeholders in Sri Lanka.

Methodology

In the ToR, UN-Habitat proposed using the five evaluation criteria. These criteria consist of: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability. The evaluation was conducted by two independent consultants, Dr Stephen Van Houten (International Team Leader) and Mr Manikku Wadu Leelaratne (Local Evaluator), in close consultation with the UN-Habitat Evaluation Unit, the Regional Office for Asia and Pacific, and the UN-Habitat Country Office Sri Lanka. The evaluation was carried out during February and March 2018.

Based on the ToR and discussions with UN-Habitat, the following multi-faceted, mixed design methods were used, all of which are participatory, inclusive and target group sensitive. The data was collected through the following methods: Desk review, key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs), observation, site visits, photos, videos, and validation workshops.

Interviews and FGDs were conducted in Colombo, and Mannar and Nuwara Eliya Districts. Skype and telephone interviews were used where required. FGDs were used to accommodate larger groups of key
respondents. The total number of respondents was 256, with 62 interviews and 15 FGDs, with 45% female and 55% male respondents. There were 10 site visits (see Summary in Annex 2), 5 for each project, and 2 Validation Meetings.

Most Important Findings and Conclusions

This first Sri Lanka Country Programme evaluation by UN-Habitat shows satisfactory overall and project-specific results achieved for the period 2013-2017. These achievements were evident in the areas of post-disaster construction, housing, urban planning, climate change, disaster risk reduction, water and sanitation, low income settlements and upgrading, and humanitarian relief. This evaluation showed that the Country Programme made significant contributions to Goal 11 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development – Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable – as well as to the other Goals, namely (number of the goal in brackets):

- Provide equitable and inclusive quality education and life-long learning opportunities for all (4)
- Attain gender equality, empower women and girls everywhere (5)
- Secure water and sanitation for all for a sustainable world (6)
- Ensure access to affordable, sustainable, and reliable modern energy services for all (7)
- Reduce inequality within and among countries (10)
- Promote actions at all levels to address climate change (13)
- Achieve peaceful and inclusive societies, rule of law, effective and capable institutions (16)
- Strengthen and enhance the means of implementation and global partnership for sustainable development (17).

These results achieved spanned a period of marked political upheaval, civil war, and natural disasters with subsequent displacement and damage. This evaluation showed that UN-Habitat responded positively to the ensuing needs and opportunities in Sri Lanka.

A summary of the findings according to the five evaluation criteria is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RELEVANCE</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Stakeholders, at all levels, claimed that the Country Programme (2013-2017) and the two projects that were in-depth reviewed were relevant and useful, in response to the global, UN, UN-Habitat, donor, national, regional and local needs and priorities. UN-Habitat’s success in consistently responding to beneficiary needs across almost four decades was the common theme of the evaluation. UN-Habitat, based on its history, current projects, and planned work, is well placed to remain relevant and useful in Sri Lanka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>This evaluation showed that the Country Programme (2013-2017) has a strong history of effectiveness in Sri Lanka. Stakeholders shared numerous positive changes to beneficiaries. The People’s Process has been instrumental in ensuring involvement and ownership in these projects. How these results are achieved, and can be further enhanced, with the involvement of HQ was a common theme in the interviews. Certain UN-Habitat strategies and policies remain a challenge to the Country Programme. In the two projects, this evaluation showed that results were achieved in a coherent manner. Both projects show clear signs of participation, inclusion, and ownership, all of which contribute to impact and sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>This evaluation showed the Country Programme delivers projects in a timely and cost-effective manner. Stakeholders highlighted UN-Habitat’s reputation for efficiency, as well as their strong operations. There was</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
clear evidence that UN-Habitat’s progress and efficiency gains from 2013-2017 worked through the Government’s national programmes with respect to design, management, implementation, reporting, and resource mobilization. The UN-Habitat Country Office, ROAP, and national partners had the capacity to design and implement projects. Institutional arrangements were adequate for implementing UN-Habitat’s Country Programme. This evaluation showed that the two projects: acquired appropriate resources with due regard for cost; implemented activities as simply as possible; attempted to keep overheads as low as possible; achieved deliverables on time and budget; and addressed duplication and conflicts.

Over the last 39 years, the UN-Habitat Country Programme’s projects have had an impact in Sri Lanka. This is evident in their attainment of accumulated results to the targeted population, beneficiaries, local authorities, government institutions, and national priorities across a wide range of areas like providing permanent shelter, safe and secured infrastructure, healthy and more climate resilient environments, a sense of personal and community dignity, livelihood, skills training, and capacity building programmes. This evaluation showed that that Country Programme (2013-2017) and the two projects had impact on the individual, community and institutional levels. Stakeholders spoke strongly and appreciatively about UN-Habitat’s impact on both the operational and normative levels. There was much discussion about the need to investigate and communicate the linkages between operational and normative interventions. Respondents argued that the accumulated results are supportive of UN-Habitat’s strategic objectives.

The UN-Habitat Country Programme Sri Lanka (2013-2017) engaged the participation of beneficiaries in the design, implementation, monitoring and reporting phases of the programmes. National project staff’s capacity was built to enhance and sustain their involvement in urban development. Projects showed UN-Habitat’s ability to promote innovative and lasting partnerships and multi-stakeholder engagements. These projects, including the two under review, can clearly be replicated or scaled up in Sri Lanka and other similar countries. Sri Lanka’s classification as a Middle-Income Country (MIC) has resulted in less donor consideration and funding. Opportunities exist for Government prioritized projects.

These lessons learned highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the programme preparation, design, and implementation that affected performance, outcome, and impact.

- Ensuring projects are relevant to global, regional, national, and local needs results contributes to stakeholder buy-in and participation. Responding to beneficiary needs remains central to any successful project.
- The utilisation of the People’s Process was central to the success of projects. Respondents not only appreciated the openness and inclusion of the process, but they have also incorporated the process into Government, school, community, and business activities.
- Project ownership resulted from the engagement of the stakeholders in the project planning, implementation, monitoring and maintenance planning.
- Transparency with stakeholders builds trust. It is also relatively uncommon in similar projects, and much appreciated and emulated by stakeholders.
- UN-Habitat’s ability to form transformative partnerships shows how this can have significant intended and unintended impacts of projects, and how they form the basis of future collaboration.
- Having strong project leadership and staff contributes to good outputs, outcomes and impacts.
• The backbone of projects is a decentralised operations team who can respond to requests and problems effectively and efficiently.

• Understanding the importance of and the linkages between operational-normative activities is key to UN-Habitat’s future work and how it chooses to engage with countries and projects. This evaluation showed strong evidence for their linkages and the importance of creating a “one model” approach.

• A robust M&E system with an M&E officer on-site is crucial to projects, including short-term projects.

• The development and measurement of impact indicators are important for both operational and normative activities, for example, the use of the good practice of monitoring dash boards.

• The integration of cross-cutting issues can be achieved with commitment, planning, and good monitoring.

• Local economies were boosted through project interventions. This was evident in the capacity building of builders, creating a local skilled labour force, expansion of building material suppliers and manufacturers, and the procurement of locally produced furniture and school equipment.

• Having a standardised selection process of beneficiary sites allowed for transparent selection and communication.

• It is possible to implement a fast-track participatory infrastructure project consisting of multifaceted activities over 15-18 months (social and technical assessment 3 months, civil work 9-12 months, and consolidation 3-6 months), with adequate Government and Donor support.

• The use of Community Action Plans and Community Contracting are successful modes of operation with communities.

Main Recommendations

These recommendations aim to be specific, practical, related to verifiable actions, and identify the responsible person or entity (addresses: CP = Country Programme; ROAP = Regional Office; and HQ = Headquarters). They apply across the planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>ADDRESSEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop a funding plan to deal with the current funding challenges in Sri Lanka</td>
<td>ROAP, CP, HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that is coherent and in line with the HQ resource mobilization strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Support Government efforts to develop a coherent project actions budget to present to major donors</td>
<td>ROAP, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ensure integration of cross-cutting issues and its funding during planning, implementation, reporting and evaluation</td>
<td>HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identify and mobilize private sector opportunities in the provision of investment capital and the upscaling of activities</td>
<td>HQ, ROAP, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Decide on UN-Habitat’s role in supporting the implementation of the National Housing Policy, as requested by the Government</td>
<td>ROAP, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supplement the strengths of the Country Programme through the appointment of a programme manager with substantive knowledge and skills to drive national programmatic issues</td>
<td>HQ, ROAP, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Continue strengthening and enhancing collaboration, capacity, and performance management of the country programmes</td>
<td>HQ, ROAP, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Facilitate international exposure for key country team staff to enhance familiarity with new technology and international business processes, for example, through twinning arrangements between country teams</td>
<td>ROAP, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Implementing Partner(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Decentralise financial functions through increased delegation of authority to functioning country teams, with adequate oversight</td>
<td>HQ, ROAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Review and respond to current problems reported with Umoja</td>
<td>HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Develop more policies to support lower-middle income and low-income families through housing financing, social housing, etc.</td>
<td>HQ, ROAP, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Improve M&amp;E activities at the country level by recruiting an M&amp;E Officer for the Sri Lanka country programme</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Increase community participation in the joint monitoring of project progress</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Create online M&amp;E dashboards to provide live progress of progress against baselines and targets</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Create impact indicators for future projects, especially for training and capacity related activities</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Improve organisational knowledge management system and learning processes</td>
<td>HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Support knowledge management and learning initiatives from UN partners in the integration of cross-cutting issues</td>
<td>HQ, ROAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ensure that key recommendations from monitoring and evaluation activities are shared with other regional offices and HQ, and consider how to transfer knowledge through training opportunities</td>
<td>HQ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Purpose

As stated in the ToR, the purpose of this country programme evaluation is, “to document and assess the results and accumulated effects of the UN-Habitat programme in Sri Lanka conducted with emphasis on the period from 2013 to 2017.” This period covered the UNDAF for Sri Lanka (2013-2017), which was linked to priorities defined by the Government of Sri Lanka.

Out of the projects in the country portfolio, two projects with different characteristics were reviewed in-depth with regard to results and accumulated effects at project level. Thematically, UN-Habitat’s portfolio in Sri Lanka focusses mainly on housing, infrastructure, and community engagement. The two projects focus on infrastructure and community engagement. Housing is a strong element of UN-Habitat’s larger portfolio in Sri Lanka, as outlined below in Background and Context.

The selected projects reflect UN-Habitat’s vision on the three-pronged approach and its country mission, as well as, focus on improving livelihoods, cross-cutting issues, and availability of data, donors, and collaboration with other UN agencies. These two projects are:

- Sustainable Resettlement through Community-Driven Improvement of the Learning Environment in Mannar, Sri Lanka, 2015-2017

This evaluation will provide information to UN-Habitat management, its offices and staff responsible for project development and implementation in UN-Habitat country offices, regional offices and at headquarters, as well as its governing bodies, donors and key stakeholders in Sri Lanka of the value-added, achievements, lessons, challenges and opportunities for UN-Habitat’s Sri Lanka operations.

These findings should inform future strategy, adjustments, opportunities, collaboration, replication and upscaling. These are all important in future mainstreaming, especially given that the Sri Lanka programme is one of the largest in UN-Habitat Asia’s portfolio. The findings will highlight country lessons that can be utilized in other countries. Institutional aspects will be emphasized, especially the support received from the Headquarters in relation to the income generated from the Country Programme on an annual basis.

1.2. Specific Objectives

In terms of the specific objectives, this evaluation will:

- Assess the relevance of UN-Habitat Sri Lanka’s programme between 2013 and 2017 to attain accumulated positive results for beneficiaries, local authorities, and government institutions that are supportive of UN-Habitat’s strategic objectives.
- Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the UN-Habitat projects in Sri Lanka in achieving results and the accumulation of results.
- Identify what successful approaches and strategies worked, and which did not, drawing out key findings and lessons from UN-Habitat’s experience in Sri Lanka.

---

• Take into account the intended users of the evaluation, make **recommendations** to effectively deliver, develop and expand UN-Habitat’s portfolio in Sri Lanka.

The evaluation will examine mainstreaming of such issues as resource mobilization, coordination, ownership, and adherence to critical crossing-cutting issues (human rights, gender, youth, and climate change).

1.3. Past Evaluations

Bilateral donors and others have conducted various evaluations interventions in Sri Lanka, for example, the evaluation of the EU-funded Housing Construction Programmes. However, these reports, while referring to UN-Habitat, do not provide in-depth assessment of UN-Habitat’s priorities and value-added services.

2. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

2.1. Mandate

This evaluation is conducted by UN-Habitat at the request of the UN-Habitat Sri Lanka country programme management and forms part of UN-Habitat’s efforts to ensure that UN-Habitat evaluations provide a full representation of its mandate and activities, including evaluation of both humanitarian and development interventions. This evaluation is in-line with UN-Habitat’s Strategic Policy on Human Settlements in Crisis and Sustainable Relief and Reconstruction Framework (2008), UN-Habitat’s Evaluation Policy (2013), and the Revised UN-Habitat Evaluation Framework document (2015). The last document highlights the need for more country programme evaluations with evidence of UN-Habitat’s results at the country level. Evaluation is central to UN-Habitat’s mandate and activities, including programme planning, budgeting and the implementation cycle. Evaluation also supports UN-Habitat to manage for results by assessing the extent to which UN-Habitat humanitarian and development interventions are effectively delivering results.

2.2. Background

The United Nations Human Settlements Programme is the United Nations agency for human settlements. The UN General Assembly mandated the promotion of socially and environmentally sustainable towns and cities with the goal of providing adequate shelter for all, based on, inter alia, the Vancouver Declaration on Human Settlements, the Habitat Agenda, the Istanbul Declaration on Human Settlements, the Declaration on Cities and Other Human Settlements in the New Millennium, and UN Resolution 56/206. The UN Millennium Declaration recognizes the dire circumstances of the world’s urban poor and committed Member States to improve the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers – Target 11 of Millennium Development Goal (MDG) no.7 – a task mandated to UN-Habitat. This

---


UN-Habitat’s goals are “well-planned, well-governed, and efficient cities and other human settlements, with adequate housing, infrastructure, and universal access to employment and basic services such as water, energy, and sanitation.”

UN-Habitat works through a medium-term strategy approach for successive six-year periods. The current strategic plan covers 2014 to 2019 and implemented through two-year programmes.

The strategic readjustments in this plan stemmed from the current trends in rapid urbanisation together with recent global economic turmoil, increasing poverty, and growing consequences of climate change. UN-Habitat’s strategic plan (2014 – 2019) outlines seven focus areas:

1. Urban legislation, land, and governance
2. Urban planning and design
3. Urban economy
4. Urban basic services
5. Housing and slum upgrading
6. Risk reduction and rehabilitation
7. Research and capacity development.

The plan prioritises the first four focus areas, which were renamed and made specific. In particular, the plan highlights the importance of developing adequate urban policies and legal frameworks in order to support proper urban planning and design and then implementation. The plan emphasizes UN-Habitat’s role as a leading and acknowledged authority on urbanization matters. The plan also identifies four cross-cutting issues: Climate Change, Gender Equality, Human Rights and Youth. All cross-cutting issues are mainstreamed throughout the seven focus areas, ensuring that all policies, knowledge management tools and operational activities address these issues in their design and implementation.

---

As a UN agency, UN-Habitat is part of the UNDAF that outlined the overall vision of the United Nations Country Team (UNCT). This document aimed to provide its, “knowledge, convening power and expertise to the Member States in support of implementation through nationally owned, interlinked and transformative results. To do so, the United Nations is committed to delivering across mandates, sectors and institutional boundaries, and to practising more coherent and integrated system-wide strategic planning, implementation and reporting.”

Signed on 4 October 2012 by the United Nations and the Government of Sri Lanka, UNDAF was designed to support the Government’s achievement of its long-term development priorities that include sustainable and inclusive economic growth with equitable access to quality social services, strengthened human capabilities, and reconciliation for lasting peace.

UN-Habitat has four regional offices for Africa, Arab States, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Asia and the Pacific. The headquarters (HQ) is in Nairobi, Kenya. The Sri Lanka Country Programme is part of the Asia Regional Office (ROAP) based in Fukuoka, Japan. The regional offices are expected to implement the strategic plan in their region, as well as disseminate urban knowledge within their areas, implement local programmes, and strengthen regional partnerships.

2.3. UN-Habitat in Sri Lanka

Since 1978, UN-Habitat has supported the development of human settlements policies in Sri Lanka. Since this time, UN-Habitat has cooperated with the Government to initiate a range of national programmes and projects. UN-Habitat has supported Sri Lanka through sharing global trends, for example, the City Master Planning in the 1980’s to advocating enabling approaches that promote participatory planning, with a focus on poverty reduction and inclusiveness. UN-Habitat has also assisted Sri Lanka in mitigating the impacts of natural and manmade disasters.

Presently, UN-Habitat assists Sri Lanka in post-disaster reconstruction, plantation housing, climate change and disaster risk reduction, water and sanitation, low-income settlement upgrading, and urban planning. As part of its commitment to sustainable development, UN-Habitat provides technical assistance to the Government towards achieving the SDGs, in particular, Goal 11, Sustainable Cities and Communities.

UN-Habitat has also increased its collaboration with the Government and other stakeholders for the implementation of the New Urban Agenda and sustainable urbanization. The New Urban Agenda is the key technical driver of the “urbanization” elements of the SDGs. The New Urban Agenda addresses the way cities are planned, designed, managed, governed and financed to achieve sustainable development goals; focusing on transformation towards social inclusion and ending poverty, as well as enhancing urban prosperity and opportunities for all and environmentaly sustainable and resilient urban development.

Recent key achievements include: supporting communities to construct almost 40,000 post-disaster
houses; national and local interventions in climate change mitigation; disaster resilient urban planning; and low-income settlement upgrading programmes. Beneficiaries constructed all houses, and Community Based Organizations (CBOs) through the Community Implementation Agreements (CIAs) did the infrastructure. Only a few hundred houses in Nuwara Eliya are constructed jointly by beneficiaries and Estates Workers Housing Cooperative Societies (EWHCS).

UN-Habitat’s support of Sri Lanka rose sharply after the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami.\(^\text{16}\) The impact was severe on the Southern coast (the most densely populated and urbanized part of the country) and the North-East (conflict-affected) with a 20-year history of displacement.\(^\text{17}\) It was reported that more than 70,000 houses were destroyed, and 30,000 houses damaged. Most of the community infrastructure was destroyed. UN-Habitat’s activities ranged from advocacy to policy advice, coordination and building partnerships, implementation of housing recovery and reconstruction projects, and technical assistance.

The conflict between the Government of Sri Lanka and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), 1983-2009, resulted in the devastation of the Northern Province and, to a lesser extent, the Eastern Province. By May 2009, over 160,000 houses were damaged or destroyed and over 450,000 people were displaced in these two provinces. Between 2009 and 2016, UN-Habitat facilitated the construction of houses and community infrastructure facilities in these provinces.

UN-Habitat utilizes the People’s Process, which highlights the importance of participation by all stakeholders. UN-Habitat believes that in the implementation of projects, “the underlining principle has been to place the affected people at the centre of the process. This means mobilizing the affected communities to take decisions on their recovery and supporting them.”\(^\text{18}\) UN-Habitat also develops effective partnerships for planning, implementation, decision making, problem-solving, and resource sharing. UN-Habitat’s diverse experience in Sri Lanka over the decades highlighted a key lesson: the importance of operating at multiple levels, from central government to districts, DS divisions and villages.

In Sri Lanka, UN-Habitat’s operational activities are organized around the following themes:

- Post Disaster Recovery and Reconstruction
- Environment and Climate Change
- Land and Housing
- Disaster Risk Reduction
- Urban Planning and Governance
- Pro-poor Settlements Upgrading
- Water and Sanitation
- Community Infrastructure
- Social Inclusion.\(^\text{19}\)

The Sri Lanka National Development Strategy and the National Priority Programs guide these projects.\(^\text{20}\) UN-Habitat supports the two National Priority Programmes, namely the National Programme for Local

---

\(^{16}\) UN-Habitat, Terms of Reference, Evaluation of UN-Habitat’s Country Programme in Sri Lanka, 2 November 2017 (updated: 12 January 2018)


\(^{19}\) UN-Habitat, Sri Lanka Profile, [http://unhabitat.lk/infocus/un-habitat-sri-lanka-profile/](http://unhabitat.lk/infocus/un-habitat-sri-lanka-profile/)

Governance (in the Governance Cluster) and the Urban Management and Support Programme (in the Infrastructure Development Cluster).

In 2015, the GoSL endorsed the Sustainable Development Agenda 2030 and committed to national implementation from 1 January 2016. Following this commitment, the Government proposed the Sri Lanka Sustainable Development Act,21 and it changed the Ministry of Wildlife to the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Wildlife. GoSL’s national development goals and priorities focus on investing in the improvement of economic and social infrastructure to facilitate inclusive growth and development. According to the Central Bank of Sri Lanka, “economic infrastructure enables the provision of services that are consumed by the public while serving as an input into private sector economic activities. Hence, economic infrastructure augments output, enhances output capacity and productivity and reduces regional and social disparities. Development of social infrastructure is critically important to build a strong human capital base, which promotes high productivity while ensuring the well-being of individuals for equitable and inclusive development.”22

UN-Habitat projects are managed from the Country Office in Colombo. The team (currently at 98 persons) is headed by the Country Programme Manager for Sri Lanka. The Country Programme organogram can be found in Annex 7. UN-Habitat Sri Lanka has three main units to implement its normative and operational functions:

1. Housing and Community Infrastructure (including schools)
2. Urban Planning, Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change

The Project Management Unit (PMU) supports all programme staff in implementing their work and is responsible for human resources management, procurement, financial monitoring, compliance, and quality control. The Country Programme is supervised by a Senior Human Settlements Officer based at the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP). PMU is jointly overseen by the Country Programme Manager and Senior Human Settlements Officer. The country Programme is supported by technical teams in ROAP and UN-Habitat Headquarters in Nairobi.

UN-Habitat highlights the importance of a comprehensive communications and visibility strategy that aims to improve the organisation’s visibility and advocacy engagement. UN-Habitat’s country activities, updates, and news stories are available at the country website, http://www.unhabitat.lk. National daily newspapers, radio and television programmes, websites, and social media are used to provide exposure during annual events such as World Habitat Day and other important activities. As a part of the United Nations Communication Group (UNCG), UN-Habitat actively supports a people-centred approach to communication and advocacy.

The Country Programme contributes towards the New Urban Agenda, and monitoring, reporting and evaluation form a vital part in identifying project effectiveness and efficiency. The Country Programme uses the Results Based Management (RBM) approach to ensure the accomplishment of objectives and outcomes. UN-Habitat monitors all projects both formally and informally. Joint monitoring visits with donors are conducted when required. Donor reporting is generally done on a quarterly and annual basis. Progress reports are distributed among relevant programme staff and stakeholders for feedback. Community monitoring for individual projects is encouraged to encourage inclusivity and ownership. The Country Programme uses a georeferenced database in housing and community infrastructure projects.

Independent project evaluations are conducted at mid-term (depending on the project length) and all end-term projects with a focus on: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. UN-Habitat is part of the Monitoring and Evaluation Group responsible for supporting Driver Groups to apply RBM tools; development and implementation of the UNSDF Monitoring and Evaluation plan; and providing inputs to the Joint Annual One UN Country Report.

Since 1 July 2015, UN-Habitat and the Country Programme have been part of the UN-Habitat Programme Accountability Framework, which promotes good governance, considers relevant leading practices, builds a conducive environment for accountability and transparency, and assures business operations are conducted effectively through continuous improvement. UN-Habitat receives regular auditing and oversight.

2.4. Overview of Project Portfolio, 2013-2017

UN-Habitat’s Project Portfolio in Sri Lanka, 2013-2017 is presented below. These projects relate to UN-Habitat’s Focus Areas of housing and slum upgrading, urban basic services, urban economy, urban land legislation and governance, risk reduction and rehabilitation, urban planning and design, and research and capacity development. Projects are mainly large with budgets of several million USD and continuous phases. UN-Habitat’s current donors include: Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), European Union, Government of Australia Government of India, Government of Japan, Government of Korea through the Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA), Government of Sri Lanka, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Swiss Embassy, and Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). These projects cover both urban and rural areas and include the construction of houses, infrastructure, delivery of basic services, and supporting local governments.

**UN-Habitat Project Portfolio in Sri Lanka, 2013-2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>FUNDING PARTNER</th>
<th>QUANTUM OF FUNDING</th>
<th>DURATION</th>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support to Conflict Affected People through Housing</td>
<td>European Union, Government of Australia, and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation</td>
<td>USD 20,564,788</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
<td>Construction of 5,068 houses, 52 community wells, planting 20,000 trees and installation of 10 RWH systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Housing Project in Central and Uva Provinces</td>
<td>Government of India</td>
<td>USD 8,395,910</td>
<td>2012-2018</td>
<td>Construction of 17,944 Permanent Houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation of Community Infrastructure and Facilities in Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Province of Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Government of Japan</td>
<td>USD 3,629,712</td>
<td>2013-2015</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of 95.8 km of internal access roads and 6.14km of storm water drains, establishment of 62 rainwater harvesting systems in public buildings construction of 29 community centres and 22 preschools, planting of 76,184 trees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Implementing Body</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project for Rehabilitation of Community Infrastructure, Improvement of Livelihoods and Empowerment of Women in the Northern and Eastern Provinces</td>
<td>Government of Japan</td>
<td>USD 3,638,294</td>
<td>2014-2016</td>
<td>Construction of 45 community centres and 31 preschools, establishment of 76 RWH systems, construction of 13 community storage facilities and 15 small irrigation channels, rehabilitation of 13.62km storm, water drainage and 32 km internal roads, and planting of 70,568 trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Resettlement through Community- Driven Improvement of the Learning Environment in Mannar District, Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Government of Japan</td>
<td>USD 4,212,000</td>
<td>2015-2017</td>
<td>Construction of 15 schools and 7 teachers quarters, provision of equipment and improvement of school environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Housing Project in Plantation Settlements</td>
<td>Government of India</td>
<td>USD 1,100,000</td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
<td>Construction of 1,600 Permanent Houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter Relief for Flood Affected Families in Colombo and Gampaha Districts in Western Province, Sri Lanka</td>
<td>CERF, SWISS Embassy and UNHCR</td>
<td>USD 1,005,937</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Provision of NFI and Shelter to flood affected people in Gampaha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Sri Lankan Cities Report</td>
<td>Australian Government DFAT</td>
<td>USD 475,000</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>Writing 7 chapters for filling the information gap and strategic planning to address related issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalytic Support to Peacebuilding in Sri Lanka, 2017 to 2018</td>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>USD 421,580</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Survey of 10,000 land plots, and regularization of 10,000 land titles for those who already possess survey plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter Relief for Flood and Landslide Affected Households in Kalutra and Galle Districts of Sri Lanka</td>
<td>CERF</td>
<td>USD 674,999</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Provision of NFI, Temporary and permanent shelter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5. Overview of Projects for In-depth Review

The portfolios of the two projects that were reviewed in-depth are outline below:

**In-depth Project Portfolios, 2013-2017**
1. Sustainable Resettlement through Community Driven Improvement of the Learning Environment in Mannar District, Sri Lanka

The conflict in Sri Lanka had a profound effect on the Northern and Eastern Provinces, with the destruction of homes and infrastructure facilities.\(^{24}\) Between 1990 and 2007, communities in Mannar District were displaced, and during 2009 and 2010 they were resettled in their places of origin.\(^{25}\) The Government of Sri Lanka, in conjunction with donors and development partners, reconstructed and rehabilitated basic community infrastructure. Despite these responses, there remained various outstanding basic services and infrastructure needs in the district.

In particular, educational facilities were inadequate, with classes being held outdoors or in temporary buildings without proper sanitary facilities, teaching materials, and facilities for extracurricular activities. This affected children’s learning opportunities, and their subsequent social and future employment opportunities. A shortage of adequately qualified teachers resulted from the absence of residential facilities. These factors resulted in lower teaching standards and academic performance in comparison to the rest of Sri Lanka, which, in turn, maintained cycles of poverty and discouraged families from returning to their original homes.

From 2015-2017, with a Government of Japan grant of USD 4.2 million, UN-Habitat initiated the project “Sustainable Resettlement through Community-Driven Improvement of the Learning Environment in Mannar District, Sri Lanka”. The national partners were the Ministry of Education, Community Based Organizations, Parents and Teachers Associations, and Government officials in the Mannar District. The Government of Japan granted a no-cost extension, extending the project for a period of six months ending on 31 March 2018.

In the project document, the justification of UN-Habitat’s engagement to undertake this initiative is explained as follows: “After the conflict, UN-Habitat had promoted holistic reconstruction programmes with the application of People’s Process in the country, making affected people at the centre of decision making, that supported the four pillars of sustainability including environmental, cultural, social and

\(^{24}\) UN-Habitat, Spaces to Learn, Improving the Learning Environment in Mannar District, 2017

\(^{25}\) UN-Habitat, Sustainable Resettlement through Community-Driven Improvement of the Learning Environment in Mannar District, Sri Lanka, \texttt{http://www.fukuoka.unhabitat.org/projects/sri_lanka/detail25_en.html}
economic aspects.” UN-Habitat was best placed to use the People’s Process to show that school building are not simply a construction but a ‘built environment’ with participation and ownership of parents, teachers, and community, with the introduction of indigenous construction techniques and innovative eco-green building technology. The project also promoted the greening of schools, school gardens environmental education, and hands-on training for parents, teachers, and students to maintain these facilities.

UN-Habitat’s adopted its methodology for sustainable recovery from disasters, the “People’s Process” model, to implement this project. As described before, this process encourages the active participation of all stakeholders from project inception to conclusion. Project decision-making and ownership is placed in the project beneficiaries’ hands. UN-Habitat partnered with, and provided technical supervision to, the School Development Committees (SDCs) for the planning and implementation of the project at each site. The SDCs managed the construction process. Community contracts (Community Implementation Agreements) were used to create community ownership and to ensure the sustainability of the assets. The Ministry of Education owns the school buildings and facilities, which are operated by the Regional Director of Education for the Mannar District and maintained by the school administration in collaboration with the Parents’ and Teachers’ Associations (PTAs).

The project’s objective was, "to contribute to the sustainable rehabilitation and reconstruction of conflict-affected people in the Mannar District, Northern Province, Sri Lanka, through the provision of an improved educational environment.” The expected outcomes were:

- Improved access to better learning space and environment for school children and teaching space and environment for teachers
- Improved access to improved health and sanitation conditions for children and teachers
- Improved quality of teaching to facilitate children’s learning
- Sustainability of project interventions.

The expected key outputs were:

- Construction of cost-effective, eco-friendly learning spaces in 15 schools
- Improvement of WASH facilities in 15 schools
- Installation of wells and water storage facilities in 15 schools
- Construction of teachers’ quarters in 7 schools
- Training of teachers in 15 schools
- Construction training programmes
- Training of children, parents, teachers, community members and Government officials on school maintenance and management
- Fostering ownership of completed schools and educational facilities.

2. Human Development Initiative through Empowerment and Settlements Improvement in Plantation Settlements in Sri Lanka

Sri Lanka’s plantation (estate) communities are among the country’ poorest and least developed. These
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communities have faced various forms of discrimination and political, socioeconomic and cultural deprivation, including the right to development. The estate sector has been described as, "the most deprived sector in terms of social development with poverty, education, health, nutrition, housing, safe drinking water, sanitation and women's empowerment being areas of concern. Hence, from a national perspective, there is a need to strongly focus on developing the plantation community to ensure that they are on par with the rural and urban sectors on MDGs and SDGs. It is also understood that this community has not been integrated into the national health, education, housing and other service delivery systems of the government." About one million people reside on the estates, with the sector employing, directly and indirectly, around 1.5 million people.

Low-paid women form the majority of persons employed in the plantation sector. Men are generally in casual employment because of the work's seasonal and irregular nature. Less qualified youth become menial labourers in the urban sector. Plantation problems include: poor access to basic services, insanitary living conditions, malnutrition, alcoholism, gender-based violence, gender-based inequalities, lack of recreational activities, and perceived social exclusion. Many plantation workers are Tamil, of Indian origin, and, until recently, stateless. Their vulnerability is increased by the fact that they do not possess National Identification Cards and gaps exist in the administrative institutional arrangements. It is important to ensure that plantation communities, particularly the youth, are fairly employed in order to ensure that they are better integrated into society at large.

These issues are intensified by the area’s environmental fragility of the central hills (over 300 metres), as cited by the National Physical Plan of Sri Lanka, which highlights areas of high rainfall, landslides, and highly erodible soils. Many of the landslide sensitive areas are in the plantation zones. More specifically, there are 11,814 families, in 282 locations, who are vulnerable to landslides. Most of these people live in poorly constructed houses along waterways on hillsides without surface drainage systems. Erosion lowers the soil quality and threatens plantation crops such as tea, and livelihoods including vegetable farming and home gardening. Cut-off roads and footpaths result in reduced access and risk to communication and services access, for example, schools and health facilities. The high number of landslides and damage recorded over the last decades show that the inadequacy of the efforts and measures taken.

Recent landslides have highlighted land tenure issues faced by these communities. Most families live in line rooms provided by the plantations. Land ownership rests with the State, even in plantations owned by private companies who operate on a long-term lease. The current government has agreed to support a programme of land rights and safe housing for this sector.

In response, UN-Habitat, supported by a USD 2 million grant from the Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA), initiated the “Human Development Initiative through Empowerment and Settlement Improvement in the Plantation Settlements in Sri Lanka.” This project covers the period January-December 2017. The collaborating partners are: communities (especially the most vulnerable, plantation communities, youth, women and people with disabilities groups), Plantation Human Development Trust (PHDT), Regional Plantation Companies (RPCs), Department of Co-operative Development Sri Lanka (DCDSL), Estate Worker Housing Cooperative Societies (EWHCS), local authority, the relevant Ministries, and the National Building Research Organisation (NBRO). The internal UN-Habitat collaboration is with the Participatory Slum Upgrading Programme (PSUP), Gender Unit, Urban Basic Services, Urban Economy,

---
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and Legislation.

The project was implemented in Nuwara Eliya, Walapane, and Kotmale divisions in Nuwara Eliya district, where UN-Habitat had a housing project. Two plantation settlements and one surrounding community were selected, with a total number of six settlements. Most of the population in the three divisions are linked to the larger plantations, with some small holdings of tea and vegetable crops. This project also utilised the People’s Process method and the Human Rights Based approach, which addresses the rights to adequate housings, the right to health, and the rights to education as part of the service delivery.

The project objective is, “empowered and resilient plantation communities with satisfactory living conditions, safer settlements, better access to basic services and improved livelihood skills.”32 The three specific objectives were to:

- Empower communities and increase the employability of youth
- Improve resilience and access to infrastructure facilities in plantation settlements
- Facilitate mainstreaming of the plantation settlements into the administrative procedures.

The expected outcomes were:

- Communities in target locations empowered through capacity building and improved employability of youth, elders and persons with disabilities.
  Indicators: # of men, women and youth with improved employment as a result of vocational training; # of men, women, youth, elderly and disabled persons who perceive improved access to services as a result of improved capacities.
- Improved and resilient settlements through sustainable settlement planning and improved community infrastructure facilities.
  Indicators: # of communities with improved resilience and access to community infrastructure.
- Awareness creation on the integration of plantation settlements into the mainstream administrative process.
  Indicators: # of stakeholder discussion and national level workshop at the end of the year

The associated outputs were:

- 1.1: Improved capacities of men, women, youth, elders and persons with disabilities to participate in the development of their communities
- 1.2: Improved employability of plantation youth through formal construction related vocational training
- 2.1: Settlement Improvement Plans incorporating disaster risk reduction and community infrastructure in keeping with local land use plans
- 2.2: Implement Community Infrastructure Projects
- 3.1: Local Stakeholders understand the need to incorporate these settlements into the mainstream development process
- 3.2: Wider dissemination at the national and regional level, based on the lessons learnt from the Project and knowledge and experiences shared in the national workshop.
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3. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Approach

The UN-Habitat Country Programme Sri (2013-2017) represents multi-faceted programming initiatives (projects/programmes) that were reviewed and assessed. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the United Nations Evaluation Group’s Norms and Standards for Evaluation.\(^\text{33}\) In the ToR, UN-Habitat proposed using the five evaluation criteria below. These criteria consist of: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITERIA</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RELEVANCE</td>
<td>The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirement, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td>The measure of the extent to which an intervention meets its objectives. Objectives are defined quantitatively as expected outputs or results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>The positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY</td>
<td>The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each criterion was broken down into specific questions (Annex 4), and, taken together, these criteria provide management with the critical information needed to understand the programme and determine what should be done next. UN-Habitat recommended that the rating of the performance of the country programme be measured using the following scale. These ratings are based on the findings of the desk review, interviews, and focus group discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING OF PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Satisfactory (5)</td>
<td>The programme/project had several significant positive factors with no defaults or weaknesses in terms of relevance/efficiency/effectiveness/sustainability/impact outlook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory (4)</td>
<td>The programme/project had positive factors with minor defaults or weaknesses in terms of relevance/efficiency/effectiveness/sustainability/impact outlook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Satisfactory (3)</td>
<td>The programme/project had moderate to notable defaults or weaknesses in terms of relevance/efficiency/effectiveness/sustainability/impact outlook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory (2)</td>
<td>The programme/project had negative factors with major defaults or weaknesses in terms of relevance/efficiency/effectiveness/sustainability/impact outlook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory (1)</td>
<td>The programme/project had negative factors with severe defaults or weaknesses in terms of relevance/efficiency/effectiveness/sustainability/impact outlook.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UN-Habitat Evaluation Unit 2015

3.2. Methodology

The evaluation was conducted by two independent consultants, Dr Stephen Van Houten (International Team Leader) and Mr Manikku Wadu Leelaratne (Local Evaluator), in close consultation with the UN-Habitat Evaluation Unit, the Regional Office for Asia and Pacific, and the UN-Habitat Country Office Sri Lanka. The evaluation was carried out during February and March 2018.

Based on the ToR and discussions with UN-Habitat, the following multi-faceted, mixed design methods were used, all of which are participatory, inclusive and target group sensitive. Interviews and FGDs were conducted in Colombo, and Mannar and Nuwara Eliya Districts. Skype and telephone interviews were used where required. FGDs were used to accommodate larger groups of key respondents. The total number of respondents was 256, with 62 interviews and 15 FGDs, with 45% female and 55% male respondents. There were 10 site visits (see Summary in Annex 2), 5 for each project, and 2 Validation Meetings. The complete list of people interviewed or consulted can be found in Annex 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desk Review</th>
<th>To be provided by the Country Office and ROAP. Documentation to be reviewed will include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project documents and concept notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• UN-Habitat documents for programming in Sri Lanka, including Habitat Country Programme Document for Sri Lanka (HCPD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Progress and monitoring reports, including financial reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation reports by UN-Habitat and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Donor documentation (including websites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• UN-Habitat strategic plans and work programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any other relevant documentation (such as news stories at UN-Habitat Web site, press release, publication, success stories, mission reports of HQ/ROAP staff visited Sri Lanka).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interviews &amp; Focus Group Discussions</td>
<td>With national stakeholders and other UN agencies in Sri Lanka, beneficiaries, partners, etc. These include: staff (Country, ROAP &amp; HQ), donors, Government officials, teachers, students, parents, educational authorities, School Development Society, and Regional Plantation Companies’ Officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Visits</td>
<td>To observe and assess the two selected projects of UN-Habitat in Sri Lanka:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mannar District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nuwara Eliya District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It should be noted that while UN-Habitat is operating in five districts, only two districts were visited, where the two projects were operational.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation Meetings</td>
<td>At the end of the data collection phase, 2 Validation Meetings were held with staff and key stakeholders to present and validate the findings: (1) Country Team (Colombo), and (2) HQ and ROAP (Skype).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This evaluation covered country wide activities with a focus on the two projects. This country programme and project-specific focus is highlighted in the interviews with government counterparts and line ministries for current and closed projects:

- Secretary, Ministry of Education
- Secretary, Ministry of Hill Country New Villages
- Secretary, Ministry of Housing & Construction
- Secretary, Ministry of Lands and Parliamentary Reforms
- Secretary, Ministry of Reconciliation and National Integration
- Secretary to the Prime Minister.
Interviews with the main donors: European Union, Government of Japan, and KOICA.

With regards to the field mission to Mannar, UN-Habitat has implemented the following projects:

- Support to Conflict Affected People Through Housing (EU Phase I, USD 20.5 million)
- Improving Living Conditions in Returnee Areas of Sri Lanka through Housing (EU Phase II, USD 22.6 million)
- Project for Rehabilitation of Community Infrastructure, Improvement of Livelihoods and Empowerment of Women in the Northern and Eastern Provinces
- Sustainable Resettlement through Community Driven Improvement of the Learning Environment in Mannar District, Sri Lanka.

With regards to the field mission in Nuwara Eliya, UN-Habitat has two active projects:

- Indian Housing Project
- Human Development Initiatives.

The Evaluators also met with a large number of beneficiaries, local authorities and key UN-Habitat staff members at the country, regional and HQ levels.

In the interviews, descriptive, normative, and impact questions were used in the data collection to ensure that past, present, and future conditions were described, as well as cause-and-effect relationships. The quality of evidence was addressed through the following evidence criteria: Beneficiary Voice and Inclusion, Appropriateness, Triangulation, Contribution, and Transparency.

After data collection, the data was described, analysed, and interpreted. This was through the following methods: Data triangulation, testing reliability, testing validity, assessing sufficiency of data, assessing contradictions, and comparing with comparative standards (of other similar projects and initiatives). An Evaluation Matrix was used as a framework for sorting the data. Findings were gained through data: patterning, coding, and weighting.

In the interviews, descriptive, normative, and impact questions were used to ensure that past, present, and future conditions were described, as well as cause-and-effect relationships. Following the ToR and discussions with UN-Habitat, this evaluation used the specific questions to assess the Country Programme (Annex 4).

3.3. Other

This evaluation also used site and field visits, photos, and videos to collect data and provide programme evidence (Annex 3).

3.4. Limitations

Various limitations were identified during the evaluation. One, the issue of language was highlighted as a potential issue during the data collection. It is important for respondents to be able to express themselves in their first language, and this limitation was mitigated through the use of a translator, where required, and the local evaluator.
Two, given that ROAP, HQ, and staff elsewhere in the country were part of the interview schedule, face-to-face interviews were not always possible. These interviews were conducted via Skype and telephone, with follow-up emails to clarify information.

Three, resources and time were limited for the Country Programme assessment. This placed constraints on the evaluators and the country team, especially during the data collection phase. This evaluation could have been at least two weeks longer.

Four, the fact that two projects were selected for in-depth review placed limitations on the overall Country Programme assessment. There were challenges in using the desk review and interview data to attribute effects (outcomes) to UN-Habitat. The assessment of more projects could have mitigated this limitation. Since only two projects were reviewed in-depth, the evaluators: (1) Made use of existing evaluation reports, notably the EU evaluation of EU funded housing reconstruction programmes in Sri Lanka to ensure housing was well covered; (2) Highlighted that the two projects for in-depth review both refer to UNDAF priorities (page 14); and (3) Used field visits (to areas with multiple projects), where interviews focused on the Country Programme performance and the performance of the two projects.
4. FINDINGS

This first UN-Habitat Country Programme Sri Lanka evaluation shows excellent overall and project-specific results for the period 2013-2017. These achievements were noted in the areas of post-disaster construction, housing, urban planning, climate change, disaster risk reduction, water and sanitation, low income settlements and upgrading, and humanitarian relief.

The findings are presented according to the five evaluation criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The findings are fact-based, and each criterion begins with the performance ranking score followed by the extent to which achievements have been achieved, partly achieved, or not achieved. Finally, the integration of climate change, gender, human rights, and youth issues is discussed. The overall ranking scores are outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKING SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

- **Highly Satisfactory** = Projects had negative factors with severe defaults or weaknesses
- **Satisfactory** = Projects had negative factors with some defaults or weaknesses
- **Partially Satisfactory** = Projects had some strengths & weaknesses, but overall there was no measurable change
- **Unsatisfactory** = Projects had positive factors with minor defaults or weaknesses
- **Highly Unsatisfactory** = Projects had several significant positive factors with no defaults or weaknesses
4.1. Relevance

Relevance is a measure of the extent to which interventions meet recipient needs, country priorities, and are consistent with organisational and donor policies. This evaluation showed that the UN-Habitat Country Programme Sri Lanka (2013-2017) responded to and reflected needs, priorities and policies.

One of the strongest themes across the stakeholder interviews was the success of the Country Programme in being consistently relevant to the needs of beneficiaries over the past 39 years. A Government respondent stated, “they have been there for us across so many years of complicated conflict and natural disasters, and they have always known how to respond to the most urgent needs of the people.” This historical presence and relevance is also evident in the following partner response, “UN-Habitat has managed to create a strong, reliable and responsive presence in Sri Lanka. They are well respected for this.”

The interviews showed an alignment and close working relationship with the Prime Minister’s Office and various Government Ministries, including the:

- Ministry of Disaster Management
- Ministry of Education
- Ministry of Health, Nutrition and Indigenous Medicine
- Ministry of Hill Country New Villages, Infrastructure and Community Development
- Ministry of Housing and Construction
- Ministry of Lands and Parliamentary Reforms
- Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment
- Minister of National Integration and Reconciliation
- Ministry of Power and Renewable Energy
- Ministry of Prison Reforms, Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
- Ministry of Provincial Councils and Local Government.

The UN-Habitat Country Programme Sri Lanka is aligned with UN-Habitat’s Strategic Plan (2014-2019), with its mission is to promote socially and environmentally sustainable human settlements development and the achievement of adequate shelter for all. The Country Programme is also aligned with the New
Urban Agenda, and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This evaluation showed that the Country Programme made significant contributions to Goal 11 – Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable – as well as the other Goals, namely (number of the goal in brackets):

- Provide equitable and inclusive quality education and life-long learning opportunities for all (4)
- Attain gender equality, empower women and girls everywhere (5)
- Secure water and sanitation for all for a sustainable world (6)
- Ensure access to affordable, sustainable, and reliable modern energy services for all (7)
- Reduce inequality within and among countries (10)
- Promote actions at all levels to address climate change (13)
- Achieve peaceful and inclusive societies, rule of law, effective and capable institutions (16)
- Strengthen and enhance the means of implementation and global partnership for sustainable development (17).

Respondents stated that the Country Programme (as stated in the New Urban Agenda) was successful in considering culture and cultural diversity as important contributions to the sustainable development of human settlements and citizens and allowing people to play a unique and active role in development interventions.

Both projects were clearly aligned with the national development goals priorities as identified by the GoSL, as evidenced in, for example, the Sri Lanka National Development Strategy and the National Priority Programs, namely the National Programme for Local Governance (in the Governance Cluster) and the Urban Management and Support Programme (in the Infrastructure Development Cluster). UN-Habitat’s alignment is also evident in their support of Sri Lanka’s endorsement of SDGs 2030, Vision 2025, National Physical Plan 2011-2030, and the finalisation of the National Housing Policy framework. In particular, the two projects promoted the implementation of SDG 11 in terms by 2030:

- Ensuring access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrading slums
- Enhancing inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries
- Reducing the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to the global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations
- Providing universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities
- Supporting positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning
- Increasing the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, and develop and implement, in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, holistic disaster risk management at all levels.

UN-Habitat assisted the Government with the implementation of the new Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) adopted in March 2015. Of bearing to these two projects is the target to, "substantially reduce disaster damage to critical infrastructure and disruption of basic services, among them health and educational facilities, including, through developing their resilience by 2030."34

In Mannar, UN-Habitat was aligned to the Ministry of Education for the specific programmes:

- Education Sector Development Programme (ESDP) 2006-2010 (teacher and student training)
- Transforming the School Education System as the Foundation of a Knowledge Hub Project (TSEP) 2012-2017, funded by World Bank (training and construction activities)
- The financial allocation for Quality Inputs (QI), Student Learning Improvement Grants (SLIG) (covering the expenses under these allocations for consumable items, recurrent expenditures and training for students)
- Nearest School is Best School (NSBS) 2016-2020 (training and school construction).

Examples of specific alignment in Nuwara Eliya included the following stakeholders:

- Local authorities
- Department of Co-operative Development Sri Lanka (DCDSL)
- Plantation Housing Development Trust (PHDT)
- Relevant communities and plantation companies (RPCs)
- Various Ministries
- Other agencies, including the National Building Research Organisation (NBRO) and the Road Development Authority (RDA).

Respondents across the stakeholder spectrum spoke strongly the extent to which the project outputs and outcomes were relevant to the needs of target beneficiaries. The particular historical and political contexts were prominent in stakeholder responses. Government respondents all spoke about the long-term relationship with UN-Habitat and project relevance. A Government respondent stated, “we have a long relationship with UN-Habitat, and it has always been positive, supportive, and relevant ... this project (Mannar) was very relevant to the Government and the country’s history as it has contributed to the development and reconciliation of the North-East.” A principal noted the direct relevance to beneficiaries, “UN-Habitat addressed our community needs in the best and most direct way. We had temporary, tin classrooms that were hot and full of dust and many health problems; now we have beautiful classrooms that are functional and help the learning of students.” A local government official stated, “this is the kind of project we want to be involved with. It is sensitive to the region’s history and the many needs of the people who have suffered because of the war. It also helps students and their families, and also teachers and principals.”

A community respondent said, “this programme (Nuwara Eliya) has helped raise our living standards.” These living standards included a more secure living environment, improved life skills, increased capacity, and better access to health care. Respondents in this project also noted that the project had created an enabling environment to bring the vulnerable communities into mainstream administrative processes, thus strengthening governance. Respondents noted that this project helped supported Government to take their services closer to vulnerable parts of the country.

In summary, stakeholders, at all levels, claimed that the Country Programme (2013-2017) and the two projects that were in-depth reviewed were relevant and useful, in response to the global, UN, UN-Habitat, donor, national, regional and local needs and priorities. UN-Habitat’s success in consistently responding to beneficiary needs across almost four decades was the common theme of the evaluation. UN-Habitat, based on its history, current projects, and planned work, is well placed to remain relevant and useful in Sri Lanka.
4.2. Effectiveness

Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which an intervention meets its objectives. Objectives are defined quantitatively as expected outputs or results. Effectiveness is evaluated by comparing what has been obtained with what was planned, and thus outputs and results indicators are all that are required. A project’s effectiveness is assessed by asking: To what extent were the objectives achieved or are likely to be achieved? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

This evaluation showed the Country Programme’s long and strong history of effective projects in Sri Lanka. For example, UN-Habitat provided housing reconstruction support to 10,600 Tsunami-affected families and 31,350 post-conflict returnee families. Over 320,000 people were provided with access to safe drinking water through wells and rainwater harvesting systems. Eight cities were supported to prepare disaster risk reduction and preparedness plans. Support was provided to the Government of Sri Lanka on the preparation of the National Climate Change Policy, National Housing Policy and Climate Resilient Action Plans for two coastal cities. Currently, housing is being provided to 1,600 plantation families. Government respondents highlighted that UN-Habitat had effectively delivered projects across a wide range of areas, for example, housing, infrastructure, WASH, disaster risk reduction, policy, and capacity building. A government respondent noted, “I have worked with UN-Habitat for over 20 years now and one thing you know about them is that they will deliver high-quality projects.” Donors also spoke highly of UN-Habitat’s ability to work effectively, often under challenging circumstances. One donor stated, “in Sri Lanka they are known to be the most effective UN implementing partner.”

The evaluation showed that the objectives of the two programmes under in-depth review were achieved. This was evidenced in the final reports for each programme, as well as in the interviews with UN-Habitat respondents.

---

SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>EXTENT OF PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent were results achieved in a coherent manner with the involvement of regional office and Headquarters and relevant UN-Habitat strategies and policies?</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What kind of positive changes to beneficiaries have resulted from products and services?</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What areas of work have proven to be most successful in terms of ownership in relation to the local context and the needs of beneficiaries? To what extent and in what ways has ownership, or lack of it, impacted the effectiveness of the projects?</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent cross-cutting issues of youth, gender equality, climate change/environmental capacity development and human rights have been addressed by UN-Habitat?</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

staff, donors, government and beneficiaries. The programmes were monitored through the UN-Habitat M&E and reporting structures. Quarterly reports showed measured progress, challenges, and responses in the programme implementation.

**Sustainable Resettlement through Community-Driven Improvement of the Learning Environment in Mannar, Sri Lanka, 2015-2017 (known as the Mannar School Project)**

At the end of the reporting period (April – September 2018), all planned construction activities had been completed for the Mannar School Project.\(^{36}\) This included the: construction of learning spaces 15 schools; improvement of WASH facilities in 15 schools; installation of rainwater harvesting systems, wells and water storage facilities in 15 schools; and construction of teachers’ quarters in 7 schools, including three sets of cluster quarters with separate accommodation blocks for male and female teachers.

Twenty-five local Community Based Organizations (CBOs), most of which were School Development Committees (SDCs), were responsible for the successful completion of construction through the process of community contracting. The total number of community contracts signed during the project period was 256. Two schools were also upgraded due to the project construction:

1. Hunaisfarook GMMS was a primary school (grades 1-5) during the baseline survey, and now it has been upgraded to grade 1-11
2. Bathiudeen GMMS was a primary school (grades 1-5) during the baseline survey, and now it has been upgraded to grade 1-9.

Capacity building was the other part of the expected outputs. During the project, a total of 137 training sessions took place (61 more sessions (180%) than the 76 originally planned), with a total number of 3,745 persons (37% females, 63% males) trained, consisting of government officials, principals, teachers, parents, community members, contractors, and students.\(^ {37}\) A summary of the training topics and number of sessions can be found in Annex 5. The UN-Habitat Mannar team also conducted a survey of selected schools to measure impact. These results are presented and discussed under Impact below.

Of the outstanding activities that were listed for the final period (October 2017 – March 2018), all were completed by end-February 2018, except for this final evaluation:

- Conduct hygiene promotion awareness programmes
- Conduct community ownership programmes for communities
- Conduct operation and management training for educational officials
- Audits of School Development Society financial accounts
- Handing over of completed facilities
- External end-line evaluation of the project.
- Complete the two knowledge products (photobook and video documentary).

A total of 53 commemorative plaques with donor and partner logos were installed in completed buildings in order to ensure project visibility. These buildings include classrooms, canteens, administrative blocks, teachers’ quarters, and WASH facilities. The plaques include the name of the school, donor, implementing partner and the School Development Society in English, Sinhala, and Tamil in accordance with the GoSL language policy. Beneficiary respondents stated that they appreciated how the high-quality plaques had been subtly incorporated into the buildings. These comments contrast with what respondents described as “big notice boards on some project properties that make us feel like we had nothing to do with the

---

\(^{36}\) UN-Habitat, Bi-Annual Report for the period April - September 2017, Sustainable Resettlement through Community-Driven Improvement of the Learning Environment in Mannar, Sri Lanka

\(^{37}\) UN-Habitat, Training Update, Sustainable Resettlement through Community-Driven Improvement of the Learning Environment in Mannar, Sri Lanka, 3 March 2018
project and have no ownership in the future.”

Two knowledge products were produced for this project: (1) a photo book, “Space to Learn,” and a video that outlines post-conflict reconstruction projects supported by UN-Habitat and the Government of Japan, including this project. Respondents, including the Donor, stated that these knowledge products were of an excellent quality and have been useful in illustrating project achievements. The photobook was evident in meetings with most stakeholders, who used the photobook to proudly speak of the positive community changes because of the project. Communication and visibility outputs included articles and news features on the project webpage on the UN-Habitat Sri Lanka website and online newspapers.

UN-Habitat worked closely with Donors, Government, other agencies and beneficiaries. During project implementation, UN-Habitat worked closely with the Ministry of Education and the Northern Provincial Ministry of Education. At the local level, UN-Habitat collaborated with the Zonal Departments of Education in Mannar and Madhu for project implementation activities. In the decision-making processes, UN-Habitat collaborated with the School Development Committees (SDCs), parents, teachers, local government officials, and officials from the Zonal Director of Education. During the project, five progress review meetings were held at the Provincial, District and Divisional levels. A total of 160 persons participated in these review meetings, representing the Provincial and Zonal Education Departments, Pradeshiya Sabhas (Technical Officers), Medical Officers of Health, and UN-Habitat.

Respondents spoke positively about UN-Habitat’s safety measures and site management. A principal commented, "we appreciate the safe environment that was created for the students and teachers. We all learned a lot about safety and the importance of safety." On each site safety boards and dustbins were installed to ensure construction safety and maintenance of clean sites. UN-Habitat encouraged construction workers to get insurance that covered worker compensation and third-party liabilities, including loss of construction material and equipment. No reports of accidents or injury to workers or school children were reported. Maintenance training was completed in the project’s fourth quarter. Beneficiaries spoke highly of the Maintenance Plan, and proof of the plan, checklists and actual maintenance completed was verified in all five site visits.

**Human Development Initiative (HDI) through Empowerment and Settlement Improvement in the Plantation Settlements, Sri Lanka, 2017 (known as the Plantation Settlements Project)**

The Plantation Settlements Project activities were nearing completion at the end of the reporting quarter. Of the 22 planned community infrastructure interventions, 15 had been completed at the time of this evaluation. The remaining 7 interventions are nearing completion. Direct beneficiaries of the completed infrastructure facilities were 18,117 persons. Two hundred birth certificates were issued during the project. There were 20 stakeholder meetings. On 27 November 2017, a national workshop, “Empowering Communities through Settlement Improvement in the Plantation Sector,” was held at the Kingsbury, Colombo. Participants included key stakeholders representing GoSL, KOICA, development partners, Regional Plantation Companies, humanitarian and development agencies, and the beneficiary communities. A conference report was drafted, and national newspapers provided wide coverage of the event.

Capacity building was the other part of the expected outputs. During the project, a total of 120 training

---

38 UN-Habitat, Quarterly Progress Report, No.4 (October- December 2017, updated on 12 March 2018), Human Development Initiative through Empowerment and Settlement Improvement in the Plantation Settlements in Sri Lanka

39 Total count is 23, 14 infrastructure activates were planned but as a result of good management and several cost-saving measures, 9 additional activities were approved and completed.
sessions took place (20 less sessions, 83% of the 145 originally planned), with a total number of 3,643 persons (51% females, 49% males) trained, consisting of government officials, CBOs, community members, contractors, and students. The reduced number was the result logistical difficulties and some sessions being combined due to time constraints and other logistical difficulties. The training topics and the number of sessions can be found in Annex 6.

Nine formal vocational training programmes, offering National Vocational Qualifications (NVQ) Level 3, were completed. A total of 164 students were enrolled, with 139 having successfully completed the training. Job scoping has begun, and 41 students were employed. Formal Vocational Training Courses, offered in partnership with the Vocational Training Authority (VTA), National Apprentice and Industrial Training Authority (NAITA), and Gamini Dissanayake Foundation, include Carpentry and Wood Work, Electrical Wiring, Information Technology, Business English and Personality Development, Tailoring, Nursing, Finance and Accounting, Pre-school Teacher Training, and Hospitality Management.

Communications and visibility project outputs include the national workshop, a video documentary outlining project activities, articles in national newspapers, and the placement of 11 visibility signboards in community infrastructure facility sites. Staff have updated the project webpage and UN-Habitat’s Facebook site with information on project activities, particularly the national workshop and case studies.

Project activities for the final month of March 2018 include:

- Completion and handing over of all community infrastructure facilities
- Job placement for youth completing vocational training programmes
- Livelihood support including improvements to the home gardening programme
- Formulation of operation and maintenance plans for completed infrastructure facilities
- Development and dissemination of the exit strategy.

The key Plantation Project challenges were ongoing inclement weather conditions, shortages of skilled labour and building materials, and the resulting price escalations. Another challenge that impeded progress was the connection of storm water drains from community infrastructure project to the main drains of Road Development Authority roads. This evaluation verified documents, communication and process that showed that UN-Habitat worked closely with all relevant stakeholders to mitigate these challenges.

This project experienced more delays than the Mannar Project. In order to better understand this, it should be mentioned that in Sri Lanka the government structure is composed of Central, Provincial, and Local Government. This structure is applied across the country, except in the central regions (Nuwara Eliya and, in general, the plantation sector), where land is leased to Regional Plantation Companies. The Companies have their own Estate Managers. Communities in the plantation sector work for the Plantation Companies, who have more say over community issues. Involvement of Regional Plantation Companies and Estate Management are additional layers in the normal government administrative procedures. Respondents noted that these additional layers contributed significantly to project planning and implementation.

There were various factors that contributed to the effectiveness of these two projects, and the Country Programme projects during 2013-2017. Central to all respondent feedback was the importance of the People’s Process. A respondent stated, “UN-Habitat’s participatory process was an important contributor to meeting beneficiary needs. Donors commended UN-Habitat for this method and stated that it

---

40 Project staff cited the short span of the project and practical issues in organising training as the main reason for this shortfall.

41 UN-Habitat, Training Update, Sustainable Resettlement through Community-Driven Improvement of the Learning Environment in Mannar, Sri Lanka, 3 March 2018
facilitated the high-level of participation and buy-in. Project interventions were developed at Community Action Planning (CAP) workshops, where the community members participated in the decision-making process. In housing projects, members were selected through a consultative process involving prospective beneficiaries, government officials, donor representatives and UN-Habitat. Moreover, CBOs carried out the work with technical input from UN-Habitat, thereby strengthening ownership and effectiveness. Activities beyond the skill levels of the CBOs were contracted out to small local contractors through the standard bidding process, with the community and UN-Habitat responsibility for supervising the implementation. This process supported capacity building of communities and creating opportunities for livelihood activities.

Respondents also noted that the People’s Process, with its inbuilt transparency, strengthened project sustainability through engagement and future maintenance planning. A government respondent stated, “the People’s Process is very important in a country like Sri Lanka where so many people have been displaced and marginalised. It gives hope and power back to people. It reminds us that community requirements are best served by collective community engagement, not top-down or individual responses.” Various respondents noted that the People’s Process acknowledges that schools and houses are not to be seen in isolation, and that service needs like power, water, and sanitation must be incorporated into planning and implementation. The role of the People’s Process in fostering inclusion, participation, ownership and sustainability is immense.

Another major contributor to effectiveness was UN-Habitat’s ability to develop and nurture transformative partnerships. Evidence of this was clear in the desk review documentation, interviews, focus groups, and observations of informal conversations between UN-Habitat staff and various stakeholders. Part of this is due to the People’s Process, yet there are other components that need to be highlighted. Respondents spoke about the high quality of UN-Habitat staff in Colombo and in the projects. Staff are clearly committed to the projects and the organisation, and they conduct themselves professionally with stakeholders. A Government respondent said, “we will work with UN-Habitat any day because their staff is knowledgeable, helpful and humble.” Their ability to work across all levels of stakeholders is evident in the community member comment, “we see them as one of us. They are family and are always welcome back here. What they have done for us no-one will ever really understand.” The strengths of the staff are discussed further in the report.

Another aspect of UN-Habitat’s success in building partnerships is their ability to collaborate with stakeholders not usually included in similar projects. For example, UN-Habitat collaborated with universities and research organizations in the development of cost-effective and appropriate technologies. These organisations included the National Engineering Research and Development Centre (NERDC), Integrated Development Association (IDEA), Intermediate Technology Development Group (ITDG), National Building Research Organisation (NBRO), Disaster Management Centre (DMC), and National Housing Development Authority (NHDA). Respondents admired UN-Habitat’s to engage the wider community. One Government respondent stated, "UN-Habitat has friends everywhere, and they all seem to be very useful." This comment speaks to UN-Habitat’s wide scope and the hard work of the staff to engage and develop these collaborations. Highly successful partnerships enhance the cross-fertilisation of good initiatives in other countries with similar programming. For example, the State of Afghanistan Cities programme,42 funded by the Government of Australia, played a significant role in encouraging the Australian government to fund similar initiatives in Pakistan and Sri Lanka.43 This example is further highlighted below under Impact.

Finally, the M&E system will be discussed as one of the contributors to effectiveness. UN-Habitat’s
Country Programme M&E system is well designed, managed and communicated. All required evaluation documents were provided and up-to-date. Site visits showed an M&E system that is well-organised and accessible. Reports are well-written, and, according to Donors, submitted on time. Project staff were able to provide data quickly when asked by the evaluators. A few issues were raised as potential areas of improvement. The Plantation Project did not have an M&E person at the project site. Even though this was a one-year project, staff felt that the project would have been strengthened with this expertise in the project team in Nuwara Eliya. The reports also showed that impact indicators are not as comprehensive as they should be, which makes the measuring of impact a little more difficult. This issue was particularly noticeable in the capacity building activities. This evaluation also found that there is no internal evaluation at the end of this project using the five evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. This is a useful process not only in how it feeds into a final external evaluation but also in how it helps staff articulate and measure the project throughout the project cycle. A minor issue was that many reports had not been finally edited, with spelling mistakes.

An overall challenge is the communication and engagement between HQ and ROAP/Country Programme. From HQ, there is the perception that there could be more involvement of HQ staff and expertise in the design and planning of projects. Also, that ROAP and the Country Programme could mainstream more of what HQ is involved in, especially in the urban sector. Country Programme respondents stated that they would like HQ to be more engaged with the Country Programme through regular country and project visits. Some respondents argued that while these issues are improving there is still a long way to go to making the communication and engagement stronger.

In summary, this evaluation showed that the Country Programme (2013-2017) has a strong history of effectiveness in Sri Lanka. Stakeholders shared numerous positive changes to beneficiaries. The People’s Process has been instrumental in ensuring involvement and ownership in these projects. How these results are achieved, and can be further enhanced, with the involvement of HQ was a common theme in the interviews. Certain UN-Habitat strategies and policies remain a challenge to the Country Programme. In the two projects, this evaluation showed that results were achieved in a coherent manner. Both projects show clear signs of participation, inclusion, and ownership, all of which contribute to impact and sustainability.
4.3. Efficiency

Efficiency is a measure of the relationship between outputs (intervention products or services) and inputs (the resources that it uses). A project is regarded as efficient if it utilizes the least costly resources that are appropriate and available to achieve the desired outputs. Assessing project efficiency requires the comparison of different approaches to achieving the same outputs, which is easier when there is a similarity in activities.

Stakeholders argued that the UN-Habitat Country Programme Sri Lanka operates efficiently. Government respondents stated that they liked working with UN-Habitat because the finances are managed professionally and transparently. A Government respondent stated, “UN-Habitat is upfront about all things financial, and we have actually learned and adopted many things from them in this regard.” Donors and Government respondents spoke about UN-Habitat’s ability to maximise output for a given level of resources. A Donor stated, “they often manage to do more with the funding than originally planned.” Government stakeholders with a long working relationship with UN-Habitat noted that there is a strong operations country team backed by strong ROAP operations staff.

Respondents noted that in the UN-Habitat projects (2013-2017) beneficiaries were encouraged to follow efficient practices. Beneficiaries spoke of their appreciation of UN-Habitat’s assistance in developing their financial knowledge and systems. A beneficiary noted, “we have had other projects in our area before and we always thought that those [funding] organisations had endless money. With UN-Habitat we understood how much money there was and what could be done with it. Our expectations were more realistic.” Beneficiaries and CBOs tried to maximize the benefits within the given budget, for example, by reducing construction waste, sharing resources, bulk purchasing of materials, and voluntary contributions, where applicable, supported through close monitoring of UN-Habitat technical staff. Another feature of the Country Programme projects was the establishment of strong linkages between communities and key stakeholders, which allowed communities to approach the relevant authorities with greater confidence and ensure that things were resolved quickly and satisfactorily.
The two projects under in-depth review operated efficiently, with sufficient funding to match the expected activities and outputs. Budgets were available, up-to-date, communicated with the donors, and signed off. Donors reported satisfaction with budget timeliness and professional standards. The UN-Habitat programme managers and the finance department responded promptly and reasonably to all related enquiries in the evaluation.

The updated financial summary (as of 12 March 2018) showed the following for the two projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Resettlement through Com. Driven</th>
<th>Human Development Initiatives (HDI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committed 2.8%</td>
<td>Committed 13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursed 97.0%</td>
<td>Disbursed 84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 0.1%</td>
<td>Balance 1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total 100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD 4,212,713</td>
<td>USD 2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents involved in operations highlighted the excellent financial status and management of the two projects. A respondent noted, “the Sri Lanka team’s delivery and achievement were exceptional.” For example, there were savings in both projects which were reinvested in the projects. In the Mannar Project, there was a cost saving of USD 300,000 from other budget lines, which was then invested in additional work in the same schools. This additional work included drainage, fencing and trees. The agreed budget for schools was USD 2.84 million while we have spent USD 3.14 million. In the Plantation Project, the fund for infrastructure was USD 1,020,000. Under KOICA, 14 infrastructure activates were planned but as a result of good management and several cost-saving measures, 9 additional activities were approved and completed.

UN-Habitat made progress and efficiency gains working through the government’s national programs with respect to design, management, implementation, reporting, and resource mobilization. All Government respondents highlighted the People’s Process when discussing efficiency. They argued that the People’s Process encouraged their participation in the entire project cycle. They contrasted this with their experience working with other partners, where the Government is excluded from planning and implementation. For example, a respondent stated, “all service procurement has been conducted in a transparent manner according to prevailing standard practices, open quotations, tender committees, and tender documents with technical specifications with appropriate authorizations.”

At the national and local level, Government said that they had incorporated aspects of the People’s Process into their own work process. Local Government stressed the importance of them and beneficiaries being included by UN-Habitat. In the Mannar Project, a Government respondent said, “we have learned so much from Habitat, and so have the principals, teachers and parents. Even our children have learned how to do things better.” Respondents noted that UN-Habitat was also will to engage Government around existing procedures, for example, in procurement and accounting. In Mannar, the UN-Habitat team asked the DoE accountant to provide training to the team to improve their skills. According to the accountant, UN-Habitat’s increased capacity in these areas allowed them to work more effectively and efficiently with Government.

Both donors spoke positively about UN-Habitat’s efficiency. The Japanese Government appreciated that the transparency regarding the finances, and the timely and detailed reporting. The Government of Korea stated that they were very happy with the project, especially in UN-Habitat’s ability to respond to a project that needed to be developed and implemented quickly. Both donors stated that the funds had been well spent with visible and strong outputs. Moreover, they said that the project effectiveness and efficiency in relatively short periods of time allowed them to say that they would welcome the opportunity to work again with UN-Habitat.
There was a considerable mobilization of resources by the Country Office with the support of ROAP. Between 2013 and 2017, the donor base funding reached USD 40 million. This is significant in that the USD 40 million represents the stable continuation of UN-Habitat’s operations in Sri Lanka. These donors were: CERF, DFAT, European Union, Government of Australia, Government of India, Government of Japan, Government of Korea, KOICA, Government of Sri Lanka, Ministry of Transport, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Swiss Embassy, and UNHCR. Currently, there are more than 10 proposals that have been submitted to different donors as well as to the Sri Lankan government.

Respondents stated that one of the main successes of the projects was UN-Habitat Country Office, ROAP, and national partners’ capacity to design and implement projects in effective and efficient ways. Various respondents contributed the success of the projects to the qualified personnel in Operations and Programmes (Country Programme and ROAP), some with almost 20 years’ experience in local and regional offices under ROAP. This ability to train, retain, and move key staff is an important component of UN-Habitat’s regional success. A respondent noted that the Operations staff are, “well trained in developing and following the system.” ROAP’s trust in the Country Programme is evident in the decentralisation of process execution. The Country Office appreciates ROAP’s support and guidance.

As evidenced in the visit to the Country Office and the two field visits, the UN-Habitat team is professional, knowledgeable, effective, and efficient. They clearly have good working relationships with Government (at all levels), partners, and beneficiaries. Government spoke very highly of UN-Habitat staff’s work ethic and the nature of engagement with various people in the projects. The Government appreciates UN-Habitat’s leadership and the way that local staff are trained and developed in the organisation. Field site meetings showed that the staff were well-liked and respected in the communities. Respondents emphasized the competence of both project managers and attributed much of the projects’ success to their leadership and the support they received from the Country Office. Both project teams stated that the teams were the correct size and possessed the necessary skills and experience. Government and beneficiaries spoke highly of UN-Habitat's flexibility. A principal stated, "we appreciate the flexibility. It makes things much easier, and from this, we have learned to be more flexible." Staff spoke highly and appreciatively of the fact that UN-Habitat has retained staff at the completion of the projects, moving them to other projects. At the Country Programme level, there was discussion of the need for a senior programme manager who could supplement the current structure country. This person would bring experience that would help identify and drive national programmatic issues. This evaluation found that financial and human resources information is well articulated at the Country and ROAP levels.

With regards to efficiency, UN-Habitat’s collaboration with universities and research organisations is of particular interest and serves as an example of how effective collaboration contributes to efficiency. This collaboration highlights the development of cost-effective technologies. Examples include:

Mannar Project

- Fair-face wall construction method described above has been widely used in building schools in combination with earth-based technologies
- Use of Compressed Stabilized Earth Blocks and earth plaster paint developed by UN-Habitat in association of Moratuwa University and the National Engineering Research and Development Centre (NERDC)
- Introduction of pre-cast concrete doors and window frames in collaboration with NERDC
- Introduction of the Filler Slab technique in several school buildings as a low-cost building technology, following the training in South India
- Local production of precast grills and cellular blocks by School Development Committees.

Plantation Project
• Introduction of composite wastewater management in collaboration with the University of Peradeniya, Faculty of Engineering. Management of waste, rainwater runoff, kitchen wastewater, bathing water, and toilet effluent
• Introduction of an innovative greywater recycling system for gardening and homestead cultivation
• Introduction of rainwater harvesting and reusing for drinking purposes on a pilot scale.
• Twin pit latrine system which provides compost and eliminates the risk to the fragile landscape by digging deep pits was introduced
• In building houses and community buildings sand usage was minimized by adopting ‘Fair Face’ wall construction method. Sand mining is considered a serious threat to the environment and therefore elimination of plastered walls is considered a major break-through in promoting eco-sensitive construction. The technology was developed by UN-Habitat with the technical support from NERDC.

Some of the challenges will now be discussed. Staff commented on problems associated with Umoja. Staff were generally negative about the system, stating that it required significant manual intervention, thus having negative effects on effectiveness and efficiency. There is no Financial Report module which could be immediately generated and presented to a donor. Now, it requires a manual intervention before the report can be printed. Respondents commented on the delays caused by the system. Another problem cited is the delegation of authority (DOA). For example, the USD 100,000 for community implementation agreements (CIAs) and the USD 40,000 for procurement are seen as unrealistic. It was also stated that some of the Umoja business processes are not aligned with UN Financial Regulations and Rules. For example, a purchase order or contract created in Umoja could immediately be approved by the Approving Officer without certification.

Some respondents noted that while it might be impossible to overhaul Umoja, increased delegation to functioning country offices with the necessary support from HQ is possible. This would address what some regard as the over-centralisation of the current system. Other respondents argued for a complete review, citing payment delays as one of the biggest problems contributing to inefficiency. Respondents were united in the view that efficiency and effectiveness could be improved by reviewing parts of the whole Umoja system.

Respondents noted that the response times from HQ could also be improved, as at present there is the need for significant follow-up actions at the Country Programme level. Linked to this was the observation that there is enough experience in the Country Programme for more financial decentralisation from HQ. This would allow HQ to perform the monitoring functions, and the Country Programme the operations, thus improving efficiency. While further decentralisation is an important step, it is vital that there is adequate oversight to maintain UN-Habitat’s positive reputation.

In summary, this evaluation showed the Country Programme delivers projects in a timely and cost-effective manner. Stakeholders highlighted UN-Habitat’s reputation for efficiency, as well as their strong operations. There was clear evidence that UN-Habitat’s progress and efficiency gains from 2013-2017 worked through the Government’s national programmes with respect to design, management, implementation, reporting, and resource mobilization. The UN – Habitat Country Office, ROAP, and national partners had the capacity to design and implement projects. Institutional arrangements were adequate for implementing UN-Habitat’s Country Programme. This evaluation showed that the two projects: acquired appropriate resources with due regard for cost; implemented activities as simply as possible; attempted to keep overheads as low as possible; achieved deliverables on time and budget; and addressed duplication and conflicts.

44 “Umoja is a single, global solution that is enabling efficient and transparent management of the United Nation’s financial, human and physical resources and improving programmatic delivery.” Source: UN, Umoja, https://umoja.un.org/
4.4. Impact

Impact is a measure of the notable intervention effects on the beneficiaries, be they positive or negative, expected or unforeseen. It is a measure of the broader intervention consequences, e.g., social, political, and economic effects at the local, regional and national level. It can be difficult measuring the intervention impact in proportion to the overall situation of the target group.

Two central challenges in assessing impact are dealing with effects that are numerous and varied (boundary judgment) and the result of complex interactions (attribution). To assess impact, this evaluation used the principals of systems theory (understanding complex adaptive systems) and probability-based inferences (assessing what would have happened if the intervention did not occur).

This evaluation showed that across the last four decades there is clear evidence of impact on targeted populations, local authorities, and government institutions. For example, evaluations of projects like the Rehabilitation of Community Infrastructure and Facilities in the Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Province (2013-2015), Disaster Resilient City Development Strategies for Sri Lankan Cities Phase I & II (2011-2014), and Indian Housing Project (2012-2015) show significant impacts in serving many vulnerable villages and communities by way of providing permanent shelter, safe and secured infrastructure, healthy and more climate resilient environments, and sense of personal and community dignity. Moreover, community livelihood was strengthened through empowerment, skills training, and capacity building programmes undertaken during project implementation.

Experienced Government respondents highlighted the pivotal role of the People’s Process when discussing impact. A Government respondent said, “UN-Habitat initiated participatory housing in Sri Lanka in the 1980s, and, because this powerful methodology was taken up by Government, all state housing is linked to UN-Habitat.” Various Government respondents spoke about the successful incorporation of the People’s Process into government processes. The Country Office’s application of

---


46 Project Completion Evaluation of Disaster Resilient City Development Strategies for Sri Lankan Cities Phase I & II. Funded by Australia. 2011-2014

47 Indian Housing Project. Funded by India. Oct.2012 to Dec.2015
People’s Process produced several lessons for UN-Habitat to mainstream into their work. For example, the Lunawa Lake Involuntary Resettlement project (2002-2009),\(^{48}\) is considered an innovative and replicable approach for involuntary resettlement in urban areas.\(^{49}\) This project also highlighted the importance of political will and strategic alliances to project success.\(^{50}\) The success of this project enabled significant investment by the Government of Japan, Government of Sri Lanka and the private sector for city infrastructure and access improvements for better living environments.

This evaluation also noted Lalith Lankatilleke’s massive impact on UN-Habitat, the Government, and housing in general. He was a UN-Habitat staff member between 1978 and 2006, in Sri Lanka, other Country Programmes, and then finally at ROAP, where he retired as the Senior Human Settlements Officer of UN-Habitat. As the pioneer of the People’s Process in Sri Lanka’s hugely influential Million Houses Programme in 1984, under the leadership of President Premadasa, his role has been pivotal to Sri Lanka’s housing programmes since then. A Government respondent noted, “Lalith Lankatilleke’s enormous influence in improving housing and people’s welfare in Sri Lanka, through his deep respect for people and the involvement of communities, is something that makes me very proud to say I know him and have worked with him.” The influence of Mr. Lankatilleke and his colleagues working in these early projects was a common theme of the interviews.

The impact of the People’s Process is seen not only in Sri Lanka but in other National Programmes, for example:

- Afghanistan: Various programmes over four decades, including the National Solidarity Plan (NSP)
- Bangladesh: Urban Poverty Alleviation Programme (2000-to date)
- Namibia: Build Together National Housing Programme (1992-to date)
- Pakistan: Post Earthquake Housing Reconstruction Programme (2006 – 2011)
- South Africa: National Housing Programme (1995 – to date)
- Thailand: Ban Mekong.\(^{51}\)

UN-Habitat successfully incorporated the work of these early pioneers, and the People’s Process is central to all of the projects under review in the period, 2013-2017. Respondents listed the important impact of completed projects in this period, for example, Support to Conflict Affected People through Housing (2011-2014), Infrastructure and Facilities in Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Province of Sri Lanka (2013-2015), Improvement of Livelihoods and Empowerment of Women in the Northern and Eastern Provinces (2014-2016), and Emergency Shelter Relief for Flood Affected Families in Colombo and Gampaha Districts in Western Province, Sri Lanka (2016). Long-term impacts were discussed, especially in terms of housing, post-disaster construction, disaster risk reduction, water and sanitation, livelihoods, and women’s rights and empowerment. This impact was evident at the micro and levels (from respondent examples of personal and community impacts), as well as the micro (from respondent examples, especially government officials, who noted that these projects had influenced how Government policy). A Government respondent noted, “the previous projects in the North-East [cited above] showed us a new way of working and we have incorporated these approaches and methods into our work. We don’t always get it right, but UN-Habitat’s previous work guides us.” UN-Habitat’s ongoing impact is evidenced in the Government respondent who said, “UN-Habitat continues to change the lives of people, especially people who really need the assistance.”

---

51 Lankatilleke, L., Social Space for All, Housing Programme for Urban Communities, People’s Process of Housing, 1 February 2016
The India Housing Project’s impact was often cited because of the huge scale and influence. The Government of India is assisting Sri Lanka with financing the rebuilding of homes for 50,000 families as part of post-conflict rehabilitation efforts. The Project is being implemented as a full grant assistance with USD 270 million from the Government of India, making it one of the largest grant assistance projects ever undertaken by India overseas. At present, UN-Habitat is providing technical assistance and this has paved the way for further such partnerships in other countries, for example, Nepal and Afghanistan. Currently, the Government of India, the Government of Afghanistan, and UN-Habitat are discussing a partnership for an Afghan returnee housing programme in Jalalabad (USD 32 Million).

Donors and Government respondents noted the impact of the State of Sri Lankan Cities Report, which is already providing much needed data for planning and implementation. This is also an interesting example of regional influence and impact, as this report was based on the success of the State of Afghan Cities (2015). UN-Habitat’s impact is also evident in the support provided to the Government in the drafting of the New Housing Policy. A Government respondent said, “We still have much to do around policy development, especially in land, but UN-habitat has helped us formulate a way forward. This new policy has helped develop us in Government, and it will also help the people of Sri Lanka.”

Based on UN-Habitat’s success in Sri Lanka, the Government (through cabinet approval) has approved the sole-sourcing of UN-Habitat to prepare the Resettlement Plan for the construction of a double track in the Maradana-Homagama section of the Kelani Valley railway line. The project is currently ongoing, and successful completion of this project in 2018 will strengthen Colombo’s growth strategy. Various respondents argued that this project is innovative and has the potential to serve as a good business model for UN-Habitat.

UN-Habitat’s Country Programme in Sri Lanka has also had an impact on UN-Habitat’s international institutional reputation. A donor stated, “UN-Habitat’s work in Sri Lanka has contributed to UN-Habitat’s good name internationally.” Impact was evident across UN-Habitat’s Focus areas of housing and slum upgrading, urban basic services, urban economy, urban land legislation and governance, risk reduction and rehabilitation, urban planning and design, and research and capacity development. Impact is thus clear across operational and normative activities. Finally, a participant in one of the FGDs approached the evaluator at the end of the session and stated, “UN-Habitat has helped my extended family through different projects in different parts of the country. Their impact on my family’s survival, comfort, and happiness is beyond the greatest words I could speak.”

This evaluation showed impact in both projects under in-depth review, if to slightly different degrees. The reasons for this difference are the length of projects (Mannar - 3 years; Nuwara Eliya - 1 year) and the different political-social-economic contexts (greater socio-political complexity in Nuwara Eliya). In order to further explore this issue, the delineation of micro (individual), meso (group or community) and macro (institutional and policy) impacts will be used. The Mannar project saw clear micro and meso impacts, with some beginning evidence of macro impacts. The Nuwara Eliya project witnessed impacts on the micro level and to a lesser degree the meso level.

In the Mannar Project, the impacts are clearly visible in the individual lives of the beneficiaries. Before the project, children were being taught in temporary structures. Some of these structures are still standing and were observed by the evaluator. They are nothing more than inadequate spaces with open walls, dust floors and tin roofing. Teachers and students had to work under extremely trying conditions. In all schools, principals, teachers, parents and students described the difficulties of trying to teach and learn under these conditions. Teachers and children complained of headaches, exhaustion, dizziness, coughing and tight chests. Principals and teachers provided many examples of these conditions and subsequent symptoms led to lowered attention and concentration in the children, and high levels of
absenteeism (one school recorded 30%; another 40% absenteeism). An SDC respondent stated, “before it was Hell; now it is Heaven.”

The new classrooms are larger than average classrooms (33x33, instead of 20x20), well ventilated, cool, and light. The classrooms are neat and clean, with space for children to hang up their school bags and cubicles in which to store their books. Respondents noted that the previous symptoms have completely disappeared and that children are now able to concentrate on their work. A teacher commented, "now children are coming to school with a happy mind." A student stated, "now our teachers are kinder and less frustrated." Absenteeism is virtually zero, with the normal rates now that are linked to expected illness. For example, one school showed attendance records before and after the building of the classrooms, with a previous school attendance rate of 74%, versus the current and consistent rate of 99%. Notably, school performance has significantly improved. Every school produced evidence of higher grades and improvement in other areas like science and sports competitions. One school showed performance records of the school average before and after the project: 62% (August 2016) versus 72% (August 2017). The principal noted that there is evidence that this will be at least 80% in August 2018. Principals observed that the new classrooms had also led to the increased enrolment of students and news has spread about the classrooms and the improved performance of the students.

A note about the building materials and construction process. Respondents spoke strongly about how the local construction persons and parents were, as a result of their involvement in the construction of the schools, now involved in the production of, for example, eco-technology bricks. Respondents also spoke about how parents were now incorporating the materials and design into the construction of their own houses. One of the unintended impacts is evidenced in the findings that four respondents stated that these technologies and methods were now being used in the wider community.

WASH facilities and training were incorporated into the project. Each classroom has a wash station outside the entrance, and where there was previously open defecation in some of the school grounds there are now male and female toilets. Respondents stated that there had been a significant shift in hygiene knowledge and practices in the schools. Not only are children washing their hands and using the toilets, but questioning showed that they understand why they are doing it. The impact of the WASH training is clearly evident. Various parents observed that the children were bringing these WASH practices home and sharing these practices with family, extended family, and neighbours. A parent said, “before we did not understand all of this hand washing, but now we all do it every day, even my very old and stubborn father.”

In each school, a kitchen and dining room were also built as part of the project. The kitchen is comprised of a food preparation, storage, cooking, and washing up area. Cooking is done by two volunteer parents on a rotating schedule, with ingredients provided by all parents each day. The children are provided with one hot meal. These meals are eaten in the dining room, with chairs and tables provided by UN-Habitat. Principals and teachers noted that this has made a significant difference to the children because before the project each child, if they were able, brought food which was eaten at the school desk. This resulted in the dirty and messy workspaces. Respondents also noted that this new system is fairer to all children because everyone is eating the same healthy meal. Notably, parents expressed commitment to this new system, which was evidenced in their sense of pride and ownership of the meal system. A principal noted, "the parents' involvement is very important to us. We now have a food system that everyone supports, and that is run independently by parents.” One of the few criticisms is the use of fires to cook food in the kitchens. A Government respondent asked that this be changed to gas stoves in the future. UN-Habitat is aware of this issue, noting that was difficult to change community attitudes to open fire cooking. In the building design, both firewood and gas stoves are available, but schools use firewood because it is freely accessible, and it is logistically difficult to refill gas cylinders.
The water harvesting and management systems, and greening have had an impact on the schools and communities. This is especially noteworthy because Mannar is a drought-stricken area and schools have in the past been severely impacted by the shortage of water. The installation of water tanks and drip irrigation systems, as well as the planting of gardens and trees, is changing the school landscape. Photographs from before the project show dry dusty and uneven school and playgrounds. Now the grounds are landscaped, and even though it is still early after planting, the many trees and plants are beginning to transform the school landscapes. Teachers, parents and students are involved in the planting and maintenance of the gardens. Parents are also taking these water management and gardening methods back into their communities. A parent said, "we have a new understanding of water and the importance of our environment." Another project addition was the laying of paths from the entrance to classrooms. Many examples were provided of how the use of these paths has improved the cleanliness of clothes and hands and the state of classrooms. Respondents are proud of their schools, and students are proud of their new building and the greener and friendlier learning environment. A teacher commented, "we now have an alive learning environment." Principals and teachers spoke of this increased cleanliness, discipline and pride.

Teachers’ quarters were also visited. Previously teachers were either commuting significant distances every day (sometimes over 100 km) or the temporary classrooms doubled up as bedrooms in the evening. Principals spoke of unmotivated and exhausted teachers, while teachers described the difficulty of sleeping with no walls, having to cook in the classrooms, and having to get the space ready as a classroom before the children arrived each morning. Few teachers wanted to work at these schools. The new quarters are arranged around two-person occupancy unit, with a separate kitchen with a gas stove, bathroom, and living room. There are also a few family units. Teachers spoke positively about the new quarters. They like the space and the ability to be on the school grounds during the week. Most teachers return home on weekends. Teachers reported that they are now able to provide afternoon and evening extra classes for students. Principals noted that teacher performance has improved significantly. Teachers also thanked the Government of Japan and UN-Habitat for responding to specific requests like erecting a fence in front of the female and male quarters to provide privacy. There is also a great sense of pride in these quarters. Principals noted that the new quarters and classrooms are attracting teachers from other schools and districts.

With regards to macro impact, there are three interesting examples from the Provincial Ministry of Education in Mannar who had adopted:

- The school selection process and criteria used by UN-Habitat in Mannar for the selection of the most deserving schools. They began implementing the “Nearest School – The Best School” project, which is part of the 2016-2020 Mid-term Strategic Development Programme.
- The land surveying and local authority approval processes for school buildings. The local authority confirmed that public and government departments are now using these processes for making applications and obtaining approvals.
- Adopted the accessibility of schools and water sanitation designs. The UN-Habitat accessibility designs provide proper access for disabled and elderly people.

The incorporation of the People’s Process into housing and settlement development is another example of macro impact. As discussed above in efficiency, the People’s Process was at the heart of almost all interviews and FGDs. Respondents articulated the importance of this process to planning, participation, community monitoring and sustainability. Four national Government respondents in four different meetings stated that they have adopted the People’s Process into their methods. One of these respondents said, “this is a process that works and gets community buy-in, and when you do this it creates successful projects and it lessens your problems every day.” Principals and teachers explained how they had adopted the People’s Process into school management. A Principal noted, “we now realise that this is the best way to get parents involved in the long-term, in a way that is best for the child’s learning.
Parents and community members stated that they are using the principles of the People’s Process in the running of their homes and their businesses.

The Plantation Project focused on developing basic infrastructure facilities in the estate sector for underprivileged communities and mainstreaming them into the government administrative processes. Beneficiary benefits are visible in their project involvement and ownership. Respondents expressed their enthusiasm and happiness about the facilities, as well as their confidence that a conducive environment has now been created to address their issues. There was evidence that the project has benefits for the larger community through infrastructure developments such as MPCC and CDCs. While it is still too early to see macro level impacts, there are opportunities for replicating the interventions in other parts of the plantation sector. A few details of impact are now discussed.

In looking at good governance, one of the main project impacts was the mainstreaming of plantation sector communities into the government administrative process. For example, UN-Habitat was able to facilitate the issuance of 200 new birth certificates, duplicate birth certificates to those who have lost the originals, and pseudo (quasi) age certificates to people who did not have birth certificates before in the estate sector communities. This initiative helped establish identity and provide access to other basic services, for example, access to birth certificates, education, and employment. Beneficiaries spoke enthusiastically and gratefully about this initiative.

Plantation beneficiaries highlighted the empowerment of themselves and their communities as a significant impact. This empowerment has resulted from the new infrastructure, exposure and capacity building. Beneficiaries highlighted important activities such as the capacity building of communities on implementing and managing project activities, skill development for self-employment of individuals (especially youth), building the community resilience to natural disasters and environmental impacts, and managing family income. On the youth employment programmes, 199 youths (83 females and 116 males) participated, with 103 (52%) persons having completed the training, 34 (17%) employed, and 55 (28%) on the job training. Three women who received project training on tailoring have jointly started tailoring business. As one of them stated, "we received good training on dressmaking for children and ladies. We can now undertake orders confidently."

Plantation respondents also emphasized the impact of the People’s Process. Community groups, especially the members of EWHCS and RDS, were entrusted with the project implementation and management responsibilities. They stated that the exposure and experience that they received from these interventions has improved their confidence and capacity to do similar types of community work. Beneficiaries noted the importance of transparency in their work. Another impact is evident in how community groups have built up linkages and working relationships with many key stakeholders, both in the government and private sectors. Respondents argued that through these linkages they are now able to work independently with government agencies and private sector entities in resolving their issues.

The Plantation Project improved village access through road improvement. For example, Kikiliyamana GN Division in Kotmale DS Division, 38 beneficiaries who grow vegetables as their livelihood were served by a 2 ft. wide gravel footpath adjoining an open drain. Under the Plantation Project, the road was widened to a 6 ft. concrete-paved road that could accommodate vehicles, with a concrete slab over the drain. Beneficiaries of this intervention and other similar ones stated that their lives had been vastly improved, in terms of access, transport options, buying fertiliser, and being able to take their vegetables to the market in a more effective and efficient way.

Most women in the plantation sector engage in livelihood activities to support their families, and they must leave their houses early in the morning and come back late in the evening. In this situation, child care is a challenge, with resulting child neglect developmental issues. This issue has been identified as a priority at the Community Action Planning (CAP) meetings, with the suggestion of creating child
development centres (CDCs). The Plantation Project responded to this need by building CDCs. An estate medical doctor, under whose oversight the CDCs operate, explained that, "the CDCs are equipped to take care of children at three levels – Infants, Toddlers and Pre-school". In addition, CDCs provide food for the children, and facilities for mothers to come and feed their infants. Respondents stated that the CDCs have provided women in the plantation sector with the safe and proper care of their children. Moreover, these mothers can now engage in productive livelihood activities with "confidence and peace of mind."

As outlined above, respondents were clear that UN-Habitat’s work in Sri Lanka has had an impact on beneficiaries and national development priorities. As in the UN-Habitat Afghanistan Country Programme Evaluation (2017), the issue of how supportive these development results are to UN-Habitat’s strategic objectives raised an interesting and important debate. This debate focusses on the current and central debate in the humanitarian and development sectors, namely: the importance of operational and normative interventions, and the possible links between them. This is also referred to as the service delivery (operational) – technical support (normative) debate. Briefly stated, over the last five years there has been a strategic shift for many donors, UN agencies, and INGOs away from service delivery projects towards more normative initiatives that build partner and government capacity in areas like policy development and systems strengthening. UN-Habitat made this shift in their Strategic Plan (2014-2019). Given the nature of their work in their larger portfolios like Afghanistan, much of their past work has been rooted in service delivery with an increasing focus on technical assistance. Moreover, UN-Habitat has achieved excellent results in the area of service delivery. It should be mentioned that service delivery outputs are also more visible and tangible, especially to beneficiaries and governments.

The two projects under review in this evaluation have distinct operational and normative activities. Donors, Government, and the project teams stated clearly that they favour both service delivery and normative activities in the same project. A Government respondent stated, "UN-Habitat must be involved in both technical assistance and implementation. This combination is their unique method, and it seems like they don’t even know it." Respondents noted that UN-Habitat used implementing partners, especially local partners, to do the actual construction of buildings and that UN-Habitat was involved in the service delivery to show how it is to be done. In other words, by guiding the whole project and providing the related capacity building to partners, it was providing the necessary technical assistance. As one respondent stated, "that is the normative part that adds to sustainability through ownership and strengthening regulatory frameworks."

While there is general agreement that both types of activities are, and should be, part of the same project, the debate does appear to have become polarised into an either/or scenario, that is, UN-Habitat should do either service delivery or normative work. There is the view across organisational levels that Country and ROAP favour service delivery and HQ favours normative activities. This evaluation found this impression to be over-simplified and not representative of the nuanced and complex views of UN-Habitat respondents. Respondents stated that projects like these two should be regarded as one package or one model. Service delivery can be seen as the entry point into normative work. A respondent noted, "service delivery is a strong door opener for normative activities."

Various respondents in and out of HQ said that the time was right to explore and clarify this issue, in particular, the linkages between the two project components. Other respondents highlighted the opportunities for UN-Habitat in doing this work and being able to use it in other countries and share a one package model with other partners, especially as this is an issue that is currently troubling various international actors. A respondent stated, "we [UN-Habitat] have an important role to play in advising countries who are at different levels about the service delivery-normative debate and the vital linkages." Respondents also stated that knowledge management forms a vital part in the clarification and progress of this issue. As noted in efficiency, UN-Habitat needs to improve its knowledge management system, especially the sharing and integration of best practices and lessons learned. Following this line of thought, a UN-Habitat respondent also noted that at WUF9 various participants stated that they required more
than the simply the normative. The respondent said, “they want to know how to do it, the “how” from our learnings.” This highlights the importance of clarifying, consolidating, and communicating this approach.

Following the findings of this evaluation, there is clear evidence of operational-normative linkages. Both projects under in-depth review are clearly both operational and normative, and respondents appreciate this linkage. These projects form an excellent model of how normative products and tools are integrated into and practised in operational activities. These projects show how the results of operational activities can be used to refine normative products. UN-Habitat's challenge is how to take these lessons and turn them into actions and policies, thereby integrating the operational-normative model and supporting UN-Habitat's strategic objectives.

Looking more broadly at the UN-Habitat Country Programme Sri Lanka (2013-2017), there are clear connections between UN-Habitat’s operations and their impact on national policies and programmes. In other words, there is strong evidence of projects that resulted from UN-Habitat’s good reputation following on from major operational post-Tsunami and post-conflict programmes. For example, the National Housing Policy has strong links to UN-Habitat’s on-going operations. The National Housing Policy, which aims to create a nationwide “People’s Housing Movement,” is a direct reflection of the people’s housing process that UN-Habitat followed in post-disaster and post-conflict housing programmes. The current Government’s Rural Housing Programme, Plantation Housing Programme and the Rehabilitation Housing Programme are all based on the People's Process. UN-Habitat’s recommendations on the Urban Housing Programme are going to be implemented in a major inner-city development project, under the principles of the New Urban Agenda. The Government has requested UN-Habitat’s technical assistance to do this. What the current Government is doing is synchronised with both UN-Habitat’s operations and technical advice.

In summary, over the last 39 years, the UN-Habitat Country Programme’s projects have had an impact in Sri Lanka. This is evident in their attainment of accumulated results to the targeted population, beneficiaries, local authorities, government institutions, and national priorities across a wide range of areas like providing permanent shelter, safe and secured infrastructure, healthy and more climate resilient environments, a sense of personal and community dignity, livelihood, skills training, and capacity building programmes. This evaluation showed that that Country Programme (2013-2017) and the two projects had impact on the individual, community and institutional levels. Stakeholders spoke strongly and appreciatively about UN-Habitat’s impact on both the operational and normative levels. There was much discussion about the need to investigate and communicate the linkages between operational and normative interventions. Respondents argued that the accumulated results are supportive of UN-Habitat’s strategic objectives.
4.5. Sustainability

Sustainability is a measure of intervention benefits after external support has been completed. Many interventions fail once the implementation phase is over, mainly because the beneficiaries do not have the financial resources or motivation to continue the programme activities. Sustainability is becoming a core theme in evaluations as international and national stakeholders emphasize autonomy, self-reliance and long-term improvements.

This evaluation showed that the Country Programme projects (2013-2017) were sustainable. Respondents’ appreciation and admiration of UN-Habitat’s project sustainability was another common feature of this evaluation. A Government respondent stated, “We know UN-Habitat will facilitate involvement and a sense of pride that give their projects permanence.” Respondents argued that the key component to this sustainability was the People’s Process which promoted involvement, accountability, skills transfer, transparency, and ownership. Community monitoring and reporting were also seen as important to sustainability. The capacity of national project staff to sustain and enhance their involvement is evident in the training and integration of local staff into the project planning, implementation, and monitoring. There was evidence that functional linkages with the national and local government had been established. Donors and Government respondents were united in their view that the projects were sustainable. As stated above in Effectiveness, UN-Habitat’s ability to establish strong transformative partnerships is vital in sustaining any project.

In the Mannar Project, beneficiaries spoke strongly about how they had taken responsibility for the projects. This was evident in beneficiary involvement throughout the project cycle, and after project completion. Respondents provided evidence in the form of Maintenance Plans and documented maintenance actions. The common beneficiary refrain was how these buildings and grounds were going to be there for a long time, and that they would continue to contribute to the community. A parent said, “come back in 5 years, 10 years, 15 years and you will see an even better school.”
In the Plantation Project, respondents noted that the People’s Process is the backbone of UN-Habitat activities, which has resulted in attitudinal and behavioural changes in beneficiaries and other key stakeholders. A respondent stated that the People’s Process has, “empowered people through exposure to decision making processes and thinking differently, which strengthened the ownership of the project outputs.” Once handed over, all infrastructures developed under the initiative will come under the management of the Plantation Human Development Trust (PHDT), the primary body for conducting social and infrastructure programmes in the plantation sector. Respondents argued that the PHDT can maintain the activities. It was generally considered that the capacity building of beneficiaries and stakeholders has made a significant contribution towards the replication of similar interventions elsewhere. Respondents stated that the possibility of replicating similar interventions is very high, as there are many communities with similar contexts and needs.

Stakeholders are clear that they want UN-Habitat to be engaged in similar projects in the future. They cited the glaring gaps and needs in Sri Lanka, and UN-Habitat’s country experience and good relationship with the Government as reasons for future engagement. Out of the four accepted types of programme transitions – termination, extension, expansion and redesign – respondents argued for the last three. The Government argued that there are still many opportunities for UN-Habitat to work with Government and that this is an important time to sit down and discuss needs and future opportunities.

UN-Habitat Sri Lanka, through the Country Programme and ROAP’s involvement, are actively engaged in the identification of new opportunities. For example, there are currently four projects that are classified as “High Probability (Hard Pipeline)” involving the Government of Sri Lanka (Ministry of Transport and Civil Aviation, Ministry of Transport and Civil Aviation, and Ministry of Hill Country New Villages) and the Government of India. Furthermore, there are seven projects classified as “Maybe Probable (Soft Pipeline)” involving the Government of China (two projects), Government of Sri Lanka (Ministry of National Integration), Global Climate Readiness Fund, EU and Government of Sri Lanka, KOICA, and Adaptation Fund.

A major challenge follows the fact that Sri Lanka is now regarded as a Middle-Income Country (MIC). This has resulted in less donor consideration and funding has been decreasing. There are still funding opportunities for Government prioritized projects if a portion of the funds is provided by the Sri Lankan government. In terms of process, such projects should go from the government system to donors, and then to UN or UN-Habitat who can be implementing partners. Other funding sources could be the Sri Lankan government for projects like its housing project, surveys, and resettlement plan. Interviews showed that there is still substantive interest in areas like land related projects, housing, and disaster and risk reduction.

In summary, the UN-Habitat Country Programme Sri Lanka (2013-2017) engaged the participation of beneficiaries in the design, implementation, monitoring and reporting phases of the programmes. National project staff’s capacity was built to enhance and sustain their involvement in urban development. Projects showed UN-Habitat’s ability to promote innovative and lasting partnerships and multi-stakeholder engagements. These projects, including the two under review, can clearly be replicated or scaled up in Sri Lanka and other similar countries. Sri Lanka’s classification as a Middle-Income Country (MIC) has resulted in less donor consideration and funding. Opportunities exist for Government prioritized projects.

4.6. Integration of Climate Change, Gender, Human Rights, and Youth Aspects

UN-Habitat’s cross-cutting themes are climate change, gender, human rights, and youth. The overall goal of mainstreaming cross-cutting themes is to strengthen programmatic interactions, thus ensuring the
achievement of project outcomes for all intended beneficiaries, especially persons in vulnerable conditions.\textsuperscript{52} UN-Habitat’s Global Strategic Framework (2014-2019) stresses the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues throughout the seven Focus Areas, to safeguard that all policies, knowledge management tools and operational activities address these issues in both project design and implementation. The Strategic Plan states, “work on cross-cutting issues will follow a two-track approach consisting of mainstreaming and issue-specific projects. Mainstreaming will seek to ensure that cross-cutting issues are integrated into the work of all focus areas, both conceptually and in all operational projects. Issue-specific projects will seek to fill identified gaps in the field and will be located in the most appropriate focus area.”\textsuperscript{53}

This evaluation found that the Country Programme projects (2013-2017) and the two projects reviewed in-depth had strong integration of cross-cutting issues, as evidenced in the articulation and implementation of climate change, gender, human-rights and youth themes. While there are no separate funds for these themes, programme staff ensured that they were embedded in all project planning and implementation, as well as in related training. The integration of these cross-cutting issues was largely achieved through partnerships. Projects successfully partnered with communities, UN agencies, INGOs, universities, and various levels of government. Projects highlight the methods and benefits of developing transformative partnerships.

Across all four cross-cutting themes, project staff highlighted two problems. One, limited funding means that activities are limited. Two, there is a lack of related regional research that could inform work in Sri Lanka. Project staff also noted that despite their success in the developing partnerships, there was still more work to be done to ensure improved impact and sustainability. Details of the four cross-cutting issues are highlighted below.

**CLIMATE CHANGE (AND ENVIRONMENT)**

Building on UN-Habitat’s Strategic Plan, the Climate Change Strategy (2014-2019) supports and elaborates upon the two-track approach.\textsuperscript{54} As the poor are disproportionately affected by environmental degradation, environmental management is addressed through nature conservation in settlements, energy efficiency, green technologies, water and sanitation, waste, and alternative power generation at the household level.

In the two projects, there are various examples of how UN-Habitat addressed climate change and environment. Alternative, local building materials were used in the housing and school construction, which could support local economic development. The embodied energy and pollution levels of these building materials are low, thus enhancing sustainable and green building practices. The building materials are hazard-free. Other examples include:

- Cellular block-less sand – less use of sand and improved thermal comfort
- Compressed Soil Earth Block – use of less sand and cement consumption and improved thermal comfort
- Fair-faced wall masonry – less use of sand and cement
- Precast concrete door and window frames instead of timber
- Aluminium frames used instead of timber frames – in the Mannar schools this practice was particularly useful given the previous high levels of corrosion due to the location of the schools so near to the sea

• Landscaping, gardening and tree planting
• Building resilience of the environment and the communities to the impacts of climate change through the construction of retaining walls and concrete paved roads
• Training on the manufacturing of related building materials.

In Mannar, UN-Habitat assisted 17 schools to adopt environment-friendly practices and improve the learning environment through the “Greening Our Schools” initiative. Respondents spoke strongly about the significant improvement in the learning environment through the use of training, alternative materials, green fencing, school gardening, and tree planting. Students, parents, and teachers are proud of the initiatives and their involvement in making their schools more environmentally sustainable and models to other schools in the area who are adopting similar practices.

HUMAN RIGHTS

In April 2002, UN-Habitat and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), launched the United Nations Housing Rights Programme (UNHRP).\(^5\) This programme objective was to assist States and other stakeholders with the implementation of their commitments in the Habitat Agenda, thus ensuring the realisation of the right to adequate housing.\(^5\) In 2013, the mainstreaming of human rights was included in the Strategic Plan, which allowed UN-Habitat to apply human rights issues in its provision of adequate housing and basic services for vulnerable communities. The mainstreaming of human rights mandates that all projects are focused on ‘those furthest behind.’ A core component of this is the participation of communities in work affecting them. It also encourages in-depth analysis of the underlying and root causes of particular problems. This was reflected in the two programs under review in that communities participated in the construction of schools and facilities, and they were engaged in understanding the causes of problems in the school and plantation systems.

UN-Habitat uses the principles of equality, non-discrimination, participation, and accountability to improve its programmes. This evaluation found that the projects contribute to the realization of the SDGs, which are premised on a rights-based approach. The People’s Process is strongly linked to the Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA), focusing on participation of diverse members of the community. Beneficiaries discussed the benefits of being included in the projects and how this made them feel better about themselves and their communities. A respondent stated, “UN-Habitat treats everyone the same way. We have never had anyone ask what we want. Now we have an equal voice.”

Specific examples from the two projects include:

• Disability access incorporated in the construction
• Citizens above the age of 60 were supported through partnerships
• People’s voices heard through the Community Action Planning (CAP) process
• Parents’ voice was equally represented in school projects
• Mainstreaming of marginalized estate communities into government administrative process
• Opening ceremonies were arranged and conducted with the inclusion of all religions.

GENDER

UN-Habitat’s Gender Policy outlines the organisation’s commitment to global consensus on non-discrimination and equality between men and women.\(^5\) In its pursuit for inclusive and sustainable urban

---


\(^{57}\) UN-Habitat, GPP: Policy and Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women 2014-2019, 2015,
governance, planning, economic management and basic service delivery, this policy outlines how staff can collaborate with authorities and civil society to ensure that the experience and skill of both women and men are included in all parts of urban development. Specific examples from the two projects include:

- Promotion of women’s equal participation in decision-making
- Development of female leadership, for example, principals and SDC presidents and office bearers in Mannar
- Training to reduce gender bias and discrimination
- Project development that benefitted both women and men equally
- Male and female toilets where previously there were none (Mannar Project)
- In Mannar, female quarters were constructed considering safety, security and accessibility
- Collection, analysis and dissemination of gender-disaggregated data
- High female participation in training programmes
- Support of the Government’s focus on female-headed households.

**YOUTH**

UN-Habitat recognises that youth’s economic, political, and social context contributes towards disillusionment, hopelessness, upheaval, instability and even violence.\(^{58}\) Thus, UN-Habitat accepts youth’s significant potential in creating a better urban future. Some project examples include:

- Youth are encouraged to be active partners and supported to play leadership roles (both projects)
- Skills training for youth
- UN-Habitat has worked with the Government, Local Authorities, NGOs and youth groups in urban, rural and estate sectors to promote better opportunities for marginalised youth
- In Mannar, past pupils are involved in project planning, implementation and maintenance
- SDCs engaged past students as young technical officers for construction supervision
- In Nuwara Eliya, rehabilitation of playgrounds and sports venues encourage youth to build team spirit and deviate from unscrupulous acts
- Youth club engagement in school activities like clean-up programmes and sports meetings.

In summary, this evaluation found that the Country Programme plays an active role in the Gender Theme Group (GTG), Human Rights Working Group (HRWG), and Youth Mechanism of the United Nations, Sri Lanka and National Forum Against Gender-Based Violence. The programme also supports two additional cross-cutting issues highlighted in the UNSDF 2018–2022, that is, conflict sensitivity and volunteering.\(^{59}\) In the two projects under review, UN-Habitat is strongly involved in the cross-cutting themes of climate change, gender, human rights, and youth. This has been achieved on limited funding and through the impressive use of partnerships.

---

[^58]: UN-Habitat, Youth, [https://unhabitat.org/urban-themes/youth/](https://unhabitat.org/urban-themes/youth/)
5. CONCLUSION

This first UN-Habitat Country Programme Sri Lanka evaluation showed excellent results in the achievement of the overall objectives and expected accomplishments for the projects (2013-2017) and the two projects under in-depth review. UN-Habitat has a long institutional history in Sri Lanka, which is an important factor in the relationships it has formed with Government and the people of the country. For stakeholders, UN-Habitat’s work highlights their response to the needs of vulnerable and marginalised persons. UN-Habitat is well-regarded and viewed as a partner for future programmes.

The findings show Country Programme projects that are relevant to the needs of Government, Donors, partners, and beneficiaries. Respondents complimented UN-Habitat on its ability to be relevant and useful. The projects were run effectively and efficiently, and they showed noticeable beneficiary, community and Government impact even within a relatively short period of time. These projects are clearly sustainable with obvious commitment and ownership from the beneficiaries and the Government, and they can be replicated and upscaled. Both projects were well integrated for cross-cutting issues, namely, climate change, gender, human rights, and youth.

There were many important contributors to the success of the projects. This evaluation found a well-articulated and implemented People’s Process at the centre of both projects. Staff are clearly skilled in the application of this methodology. The results are evidenced in the strong sense of project inclusion, participation, and ownership. One of the hallmarks of this evaluation is the sense of ownership and pride that beneficiaries showed towards their contributions and the outputs. Staff also managed to engage beneficiaries in the sustainability of the buildings through the maintenance plans. The People’s Process also ensured that through local contracting, the projects contributed to the community’s ability to improve livelihoods. Another notable aspect of the People’s Process was the staff’s ability to transfer this methodology into the daily lives of beneficiaries.

Another major contributor was UN-Habitat’s ability to work on both the operational and normative levels in the same project. Respondents are unanimous that both normative and operational activities are important. These projects highlighted the linkages between operational and normative and the strength of normative products that are based on field experience and evidence. Respondents argued this is how normative products become more practical and effective as policy tools. Measuring the impact of both operational and normative activities is vital. This evaluation found much debate around the issue of operational-normative linkages, and it is an opportune time for UN-Habitat to review and consolidate an organisational position that can then be adapted and applied according to different country contexts. This issue is a value-added for UN-Habitat’s operations.

This evaluation found a Country Programme, with the support of ROAP, that is outstanding in developing transformative relationships and collaborations. Many respondents highlighted UN-Habitat’s strength in this area and stated that they have learned much from UN-Habitat in this regard. While UN-Habitat’s long institutional history does play a part in this, it is evident that the staff play the major role in the ongoing identification and development of these partnerships. These partnerships form the basis of effective and efficient projects, as well as to future work and UN-Habitat’s standing as a connected and innovative organisation.

UN-Habitat enjoys a good relationship with the Government, and there are many opportunities for moving forward. Sri Lanka still faces many challenges and community needs are still great. The Government is keen to continue working with UN-Habitat, and various Government respondents noted that there was still much work to be done together. In some Government quarters, there is some uncertainty about the nature of these projects, and clarification of these issues in the near future could have positive outcomes.
Working in Sri Lanka does present unique challenges. A major challenge is that Sri Lanka is now regarded as a Middle-Income Country (MIC), which has resulted in less donor consideration and funding has been decreasing. This evaluation highlighted the challenges when working with Government or through Regional Plantation Companies. Respondents also highlighted the need for closer engagement with HQ. Another challenge is UN-Habitat’s knowledge management and learning system, which needs to be improved according to staff respondents. There are many lessons and good practices from Sri Lanka that can be used not only in the country but also regionally and globally.

The UN-Habitat Country Programme Sri Lanka is operationally and programmatically strong. The Country Programme, with its committed and skilled team and leadership, has achieved much, some of it shared, much of it unshared. The Country Programme is well placed to continue supporting the people of Sri Lanka by informing future strategy, adjustments, opportunities, collaboration, replication and upscaling.
6. LESSONS LEARNED

These lessons learned highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the programme preparation, design, and implementation that affected performance, outcome, and impact.

- Ensuring projects are relevant to global, regional, national, and local needs results contributes to stakeholder buy-in and participation. Responding to beneficiary needs remains central to any successful project.
- The utilisation of the People’s Process was central to the success of projects. Respondents not only appreciated the openness and inclusion of the process, but they have also incorporated the process into Government, school, community, and business activities.
- Project ownership resulted from the engagement of the stakeholders in the project planning, implementation, monitoring and maintenance planning.
- Transparency with stakeholders builds trust. It is also relatively uncommon in similar projects, and much appreciated and emulated by stakeholders.
- UN-Habitat’s ability to form transformative partnerships shows how this can have significant intended and unintended impacts of projects, and how they form the basis of future collaboration.
- Having strong project leadership and staff contributes to good outputs, outcomes and impacts.
- The backbone of projects is a decentralised operations team who can respond to requests and problems effectively and efficiently.
- Understanding the importance of and the linkages between operational-normative activities is key to UN-Habitat’s future work and how it chooses to engage with countries and projects. This evaluation showed strong evidence for their linkages and the importance of creating a “one model” approach.
- A robust M&E system with an M&E officer on-site is crucial to projects, including short-term projects.
- The development and measurement of impact indicators are important for both operational and normative activities, for example, the use of the good practice of monitoring dash boards.
- The integration of cross-cutting issues can be achieved with commitment, planning, and good monitoring.
- Local economies were boosted through project interventions. This was evident in the capacity building of builders, creating a local skilled labour force, expansion of building material suppliers and manufacturers, and the procurement of locally produced furniture and school equipment.
- Having a standardised selection process of beneficiary sites allowed for transparent selection and communication.
- It is possible to implement a fast-track participatory infrastructure project consisting of multi-faceted activities over 15-18 months (social and technical assessment 3 months, civil work 9-12 months, and consolidation 3-6 months), with adequate Government and Donor support.
- The use of Community Action Plans and Community Contracting are successful modes of operation with communities.
# 7. Recommendations

These recommendations aim to be specific, practical, related to verifiable actions, and identify the responsible person or entity (addresses: CP = Country Programme; ROAP = Regional Office; and HQ = Headquarters). They apply across the planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>ADDRESSEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop a funding plan to deal with the current funding challenges in Sri Lanka that is coherent and in line with the HQ resource mobilization strategy</td>
<td>ROAP, CP, HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Support Government efforts to develop a coherent project actions budget to present to major donors</td>
<td>ROAP, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ensure integration of cross-cutting issues and its funding during planning, implementation, reporting and evaluation</td>
<td>HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identify and mobilize private sector opportunities in the provision of investment capital and the upscaling of activities</td>
<td>HQ, ROAP, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Decide on UN-Habitat’s role in supporting the implementation of the National Housing Policy, as requested by the Government</td>
<td>ROAP, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supplement the strengths of the Country Programme through the appointment of a programme manager with substantive knowledge and skills to drive national programmatic issues</td>
<td>HQ, ROAP, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Continue strengthening and enhancing collaboration, capacity, and performance management of the country programmes</td>
<td>HQ, ROAP, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Facilitate international exposure for key country team staff to enhance familiarity with new technology and international business processes, for example, through twinning arrangements between country teams</td>
<td>ROAP, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Decentralise financial functions through increased delegation of authority to functioning country teams, with adequate oversight</td>
<td>HQ, ROAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Review and respond to current problems reported with Umoja</td>
<td>HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Develop more policies to support lower-middle income and low-income families through housing financing, social housing, etc.</td>
<td>HQ, ROAP, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Improve M&amp;E activities at the country level by recruiting an M&amp;E Officer for the Sri-Lanka country programme</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Increase community participation in the joint monitoring of project progress</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Create online M&amp;E dashboards to provide live progress of progress against baselines and targets</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Create impact indicators for future projects, especially for training and capacity related activities</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Improve organisational knowledge management system and learning processes</td>
<td>HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Support knowledge management and learning initiatives from UN partners in the integration of cross-cutting issues</td>
<td>HQ, ROAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ensure that key recommendations from monitoring and evaluation activities are shared with other regional offices and HQ, and consider how to transfer knowledge through training opportunities</td>
<td>HQ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**BACKGROUND**

The United Nations Human Settlements (UN-Habitat) is the lead United Nations agency for Cities and Human Settlements. The agency was established as the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS), through the General Assembly Resolution 32/162 of December 1977, following the first global Conference of United Nations on Human Settlements that was held in Vancouver, Canada, in 1976.

In Sri Lanka, cooperation between the Government and UN-Habitat has a long history, dating back to 1978, with UN-Habitat providing assistance to a range of national programmes and projects. UN-Habitat presently assists Sri Lanka in post disaster reconstruction, plantation housing, climate change and disaster risk reduction, water and sanitation, low income settlement upgrading, and urban planning.

As part of its contribution to sustainable development, UN-Habitat is committed to provide technical assistance to the government towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), primarily towards Goal 11 of building inclusive, safe and sustainable cities and human settlements; while also contributing to several other SDG goals. UN-Habitat Sri Lanka is also increasing its collaboration with the Government and other stakeholders for sustainable urbanization and the implementation of the New Urban Agenda.
UN-Habitat adopts a participatory process in the implementation of its programs. All initiatives are developed and implemented in partnership with a range of key stakeholders. At the commencement of projects, effective partnerships are formed for collaborative decision making, problem solving and resource sharing.

In addition to direct implementation of housing and rural rehabilitation and development initiatives, the enhancement of professional and technical skills, and the delivery of need-based humanitarian relief, UN-Habitat has supported government counterparts with technical assistance in policy, planning and urban management.

The diversity of UN-Habitat’s experience across Sri Lanka reflects a key lesson learned over the past two decades of operation: the importance of operating at multiple levels from central government to districts, DS divisions and villages addressing a range of issues. Core to UN-Habitat’s work has been the importance of participation by all stakeholders, as embodied in UN-Habitat’s ‘people’s process’.

At present, UN-Habitat has a presence in five districts of the country, including capital Colombo, the country team works closely with experienced field staff that are often from the areas in which the projects they manage are implemented, and are well placed to assess the situation on the ground, including possible local sensitivities.

UN-Habitat works closely with the United Nations Resident Coordinator for Sri Lanka and with other UN organizations at the strategic level to ensure better coordination and cooperation of programs.

**Justification / Mandate of the Present Evaluation**

This evaluation intends to look at the effects of the UN-Habitat country programme in Sri Lanka, with a wider strategic focus with regard to accumulated effects over a longer time frame. It is conducted by UN-Habitat at the request of the country programme management.

The evaluation is conducted as part of UN-Habitat’s efforts to ensure that UN-Habitat evaluations provide a full representation of its mandate and activities, including evaluation of both humanitarian and development interventions, and in-line with the 2015 Revised UN-Habitat Evaluation Framework document, requesting for more country programme evaluations with evidence of UN-Habitat’s results at country level. Evaluation is integral to UN-Habitat’s mandate and activities including programme planning, budgeting and implementation cycle and supports UN-Habitat to manage for results by assessing the extent to which UN-Habitat humanitarian type and development interventions are effectively delivering results.

The evaluation also responds to UN-Habitat’s strategic policy on human settlements in crisis and sustainable relief and reconstruction framework, which has guided UN-Habitat’s work in the humanitarian sector since 2004 post Tsunami and 2009 post conflict, which states that ‘regular and periodic evaluation’ of the policy should be undertaken.

**Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation**

The purpose of this country programme evaluation is to document and assess the results and accumulated effects of the UN-Habitat programme in Sri Lanka conducted with emphasis on the period from 2013 to 2017.

This evaluation will provide UN-Habitat management, its offices and staff responsible for project development and implementation in UN-Habitat country offices, regional offices and at headquarters; its governing bodies, donors and key stakeholders in Sri Lanka with a forward-looking objective assessment
of the value-added by UN-Habitat, achievements, lessons, challenges and opportunities for UN-Habitat’s operations in Sri Lanka.

**Scope of the Evaluation and Sampling**

Out of the projects identified in the portfolio, two projects with different characteristics will be reviewed in-depth with regard to results and accumulated effects at project level. The selected projects reflect UN-Habitat’s vision on the three-pronged approach and its country mission, as well as, focus on improving livelihoods, cross-cutting issues, and availability of data, donor, and collaboration with other UN agencies.

**RESPONSIBILITIES**
The three primary deliverables for the evaluation that are expected from the international consultant: 1) inception report with evaluation work plan, 2) draft evaluation report and 3) final evaluation report.

The evaluator will review the assignment outlined in the terms of reference (TOR) ([http://www.fukuoka.unhabitat.org/vacancy/index_en.html](http://www.fukuoka.unhabitat.org/vacancy/index_en.html)) and undertake an initial desk review, identify information gaps, redefine the methodology to be used in the evaluation and develop an inception report and evaluation work plan that will guide the evaluation process. The draft evaluation report must meet minimum requirements for draft reports. The evaluation report should follow the standard format of UN-Habitat Evaluation reports, putting forward the purpose, focus, scope, evaluation methodology, evaluation findings (with assessment of achievements and rating of performance according to evaluation criteria), lessons learned and recommendations.

The implementation phase of the evaluation will involve the overall data collection and analysis of the evaluation. The international consultant will conduct a field mission to the UN-Habitat Country Office in Colombo, Sri Lanka. The evaluation team, consisting of an international evaluation consultant and a supporting national consultant will be expected to undertake field visits, which will include consultations with beneficiaries of projects as well as visits to projects.

**Lead Evaluator**
The evaluation shall be carried out by an international consultant supported by a national consultant during data collection and data analysis. The international consultant is responsible for the inception report with work plan, including that of the national consultant, quality of work and preparation of the evaluation report.

**Responsibilities and Evaluation Management**
This evaluation is commissioned by UN-Habitat and managed by the Evaluation Unit. The Evaluation Unit will manage the evaluation in close consultation with the country office management ensuring that the evaluation is contracted to suitable candidates; providing advice on code of conduct of evaluation; providing technical support as required; ensuring that contractual requirements are met; and approving all deliverables (evaluation inception report with work plan, draft and final evaluation reports).

The international consultant and the national consultant will be selected by the Evaluation Unit through a consultative process with ROAP and the Country Office. The international consultant will be contracted through ROAP. The national consultant will be contracted through the Country Office in Sri Lanka.

ROAP and the UN-Habitat Country Office in Sri Lanka will provide logistical support to the evaluation team. ROAP will be responsible for contracting of the consultant through UNOPS.

A reference group with members from the Evaluation Unit, the Country Office in Sri Lanka, the Regional
Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) and the Programme Division will be established for the purpose of this evaluation.

The evaluators are responsible for meeting professional and ethical standards in conducting the evaluation, and producing the expected deliverables as described in the terms of reference.

COMPETENCIES

- **Professionalism**: Ability to perform a broad range of administrative functions, e.g., budget/work programme, human resources, database management, etc. Ability to apply knowledge of various United Nations administrative, financial and human resources rules and regulations in work situations. Shows pride in work and in achievements; demonstrates professional competence and mastery of subject matter; is conscientious and efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results; is motivated by professional rather than personal concerns; shows persistence when faced with difficult problems or challenges; remains calm in stressful situations. Takes responsibility for incorporating gender perspectives and ensuring the equal participation of women and men in all areas of work.

- **Communication**: Speaks and writes clearly and effectively; listens to others, correctly interprets messages from others and responds appropriately; asks questions to clarify, and exhibits interest in having two-way communication; tailors language, tone, style and format to match audience; demonstrates openness in sharing information and keeping people informed.

- **Client Orientation**: Considers all those to whom services are provided to be “clients” and seeks to see things from clients’ point of view; establishes and maintains productive partnerships with clients by gaining their trust and respect; identifies clients’ needs and matches them to appropriate solutions; monitors ongoing developments inside and outside the clients’ environment to keep informed and anticipate problems; keeps clients informed of progress or setbacks in projects; meets timeline for delivery of products or services to client.

EDUCATION
Advanced academic degree (Master or equivalent) in urban development, environment, gender, housing, infrastructure, governance, or related fields.

WORK EXPERIENCE
The international consultant is expected to have:

- Extensive proven experience in conducting evaluations and delivering professional results, presenting credible findings derived from evidence and putting conclusions and recommendations supported by the findings. Examples of evaluation reports produced by lead evaluator to be included in expression

- of interest.

- More than 10 years of experience in results-based management, professional project management and monitoring and evaluation.

- *Please refer to the full TOR for additional requirements.*

LANGUAGE SKILLS
Must be fluent in English; working knowledge of local language is an advantage.

REMUNERATION
Payments will be based on deliverables over the consultancy period. There are set remuneration rates for consultancies. The rate is determined by functions performed and experience of the consultant. The fees will be paid as per agreement.
International Travel (Home – Colombo)
The cost of a return air-ticket from the place of recruitment on least-cost economy and visa fee will be reimbursed upon submission of travel claim together with the supporting documents including copy of eticket, receipts and used boarding passes. Three quotations from the reputable travel agents shall be submitted for UN-Habitat’s clearance prior to purchase of tickets.

Transportation
Such as vehicle arrangements for field visits will be covered by UN-Habitat.

Applications should include:
1. Cover memo (maximum 1 page)
2. CV in the PHP format, accessible through the INSPIRA website (inspira.un.org) Please note, if using INSPIRA for the first time, you need to register in order to activate your account, which will allow you to log in and create a personal History Profile. The PHP should be attached to the application as a PDF file.
3. Summary CV (maximum 2 pages), indicating the following information:
   a. Educational Background (incl. dates)
   b. Professional Experience (assignments, tasks, achievements, duration by years/ months)
   c. Other Experience and Expertise (e.g. Internships/ voluntary work, etc.)
   d. Expertise and preferences regarding location of potential assignments
   e. Expectations regarding remuneration

* PHP can be also download from UN-Habitat/ROAP-vacancy website: www.fukuoka.unhabitat.org

All applications should be submitted to:
UN-Habitat Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
ACROS Fukuoka, 8th Floor
1-1-1 Tenjin Chuo-ku, Fukuoka, 810-0001 Japan
habitat.fukuoka@unhabitat.org

Please indicate the Post Title: “SRL-Evaluation of UN-Habitat’s Country Programme” in your e-mail subject. Please note that applications received after the closing date stated below, will not be given consideration. Only short-listed candidates whose applications respond to the above criteria will be contacted for an interview. The fee will be determined according to the qualifications, skills and relevant experience of the selected candidate. In line with UN-Habitat policy on gender equity, applications from female candidates will be particularly welcome.

Deadline for applications: **12 November 2017**
## Annex 2: List of People Interviewed or Consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PERSON INTERVIEWED</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>VENUE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chanaka Talpahewa</td>
<td>Country Programme Manager, UN-Hab.</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>23 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Salem Karimzada</td>
<td>Project Management Officer, UN-Hab.</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>23 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>V Sivagnanasothy</td>
<td>Secretary, Assistant Director, Minister of National Integration and Reconciliation</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>26 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ranjini Nadarajapillai</td>
<td>Secretary, Minister of Hill Country New Villages</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>26 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Zuhair J Kariapper</td>
<td>Deputy Project Manager (Infrastructure), UN-Hab.</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>26 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Susitha Thilakaratne</td>
<td>IT Assistant, UN-Hab.</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>26 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>EMSB Ekanayake</td>
<td>Secretary to the Prime Minister</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>26 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>RM Abeyratne</td>
<td>Secretary, Ministry of Housing and Construction Chairman, National Housing Dev. Auth. (NHDA) Consultant, National Housing Dev. Auth. Director Director, Housing</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>27 Feb 2018</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jie Soo Lee</td>
<td>Deputy Resident Representative, KOICA</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>27 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dr IHK Mahanama</td>
<td>Secretary, Ministry of Lands</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>27 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Aziza Usoof</td>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting Manager, UN-Hab.</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>27 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MSM Aleem</td>
<td>Project Manager for Mannar Schools, UN-Hab.</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>27 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Indu Weerasinghe</td>
<td>Project Manager, UN-Hab.</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>27 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Laxman Perera</td>
<td>Human Settlement Officer, ROAP, UN-Hab.</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>28 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lalith Lankathilake</td>
<td>Consultant to Gov., and former UN-Habitat Staff</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>28 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>S Hettiarachchi</td>
<td>Secretary, Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>28 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hasin Y Hasyim</td>
<td>Programme Management Officer, ROAP, UN-Hab.</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>28 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kayo Imamura</td>
<td>Embassy of Japan</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>28 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MSM Aleem</td>
<td>Project Manager for Mannar Schools, UN-Hab.</td>
<td>Mannar</td>
<td>1 March 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>UN-H, Mannar Team (8): MSM Aleem</td>
<td>Mannar Office, UN-Hab. Project Manager for Mannar Schools M&amp;E Assistant Technical Officer CMA Assistant Engineer T.O. Engineer Driver Driver</td>
<td>Mannar</td>
<td>1 March 2018</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Community Beneficiaries (22): Estate Workers Housing Cooperative Society (EWHCS), Rural Development Society (RDS), &amp; Community Members</td>
<td>Agarapatana GND, Diagama West</td>
<td>Diagama</td>
<td>1 March 2018</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>PB Saman Kumara</td>
<td>President, EWHCS and General Manager, Diagama West Tea Estate</td>
<td>Diagama</td>
<td>1 March 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>School Beneficiaries (15): Principal, Teachers, Parents, Youth Committee, &amp; SDC</td>
<td>MN/ Hunaisfarook Government Muslim Mixed School</td>
<td>Mannar</td>
<td>2 March 2018</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>School Beneficiaries (10): Principal, Teachers, &amp; Parents</td>
<td>MN/ Periyapandivirichchan Primary School</td>
<td>Mannar</td>
<td>2 March 2018</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Residence Beneficiaries (15): Principal, Secretary, Teachers, Parents, &amp; SDC</td>
<td>MN/ Thadhchanamaruthamadhu Government Tamil Mixed School</td>
<td>Mannar</td>
<td>2 March 2018</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Shamir Shalih</td>
<td>Senior Programme Associate, UN-Hab.</td>
<td>Nuwara Eliya</td>
<td>2 March 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>VSMJ Athavan</td>
<td>Engineer, UN-Hab.</td>
<td>Nuwara Eliya</td>
<td>2 March 2018</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 28</td>
<td>M Nimalan</td>
<td>Engineer, UN-HB.</td>
<td>Nuwara Eliya</td>
<td>2 March</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Athula Wijewardhana</td>
<td>Regional Director, Plantation Human Development Trust (PHDT)</td>
<td>Nuwara Eliya</td>
<td>2 March</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sumathipala G Wathugala</td>
<td>Engineering Consultant (Civil), UN-Hab.</td>
<td>Nuwara Eliya</td>
<td>2 March</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>K Sarawanalumy</td>
<td>Gender Associate, UN-Hab.</td>
<td>Nuwara Eliya</td>
<td>2 March</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td><strong>Community Beneficiaries (20):</strong> Women Rural Development Society (WRDs) and Community Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Community Beneficiaries (20): Women Rural Development Society (WRDs) and Community Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Athula Wijewardhana</td>
<td>Regional Director, PHDT, Nuwara Eliya,</td>
<td>Nuwara Eliya</td>
<td>2 March</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>N Thevanathan C Varatharajan</td>
<td>M&amp;E Assistant, UN-Hab. Technical Officer, UN-Hab.</td>
<td>Mannar</td>
<td>3 March</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td><strong>School Beneficiaries (9):</strong> Teachers, Parents, &amp; SDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>School Beneficiaries (12): Principal, Teachers, Parents, Students, &amp; SDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td><strong>Community Beneficiaries (36):</strong> Youth, Community, &amp; Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Mr. Mahesh</td>
<td>Assistant Engineer</td>
<td>Liddesdale</td>
<td>3 March</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>A Sinthuja</td>
<td>Community Mobilization Assistant</td>
<td>Liddesdale</td>
<td>3 March</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Mr. Yogananda</td>
<td>Store Keeper</td>
<td>Liddesdale</td>
<td>3 March</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td><strong>Community Beneficiaries (22):</strong> Trainees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Zuhair J Kariapper</td>
<td>Deputy Project Manager</td>
<td>Nuwara Eliya</td>
<td>3 March</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td><strong>Local Gov. Partners (6):</strong> AC Sarufudeen T Thanesselwaran T Christirajah SS Sebastian MM Shasimalakkar AM Junaid</td>
<td>Principal Principal DEO, Mannar ZDE, Mannar Principal DEO</td>
<td>Mannar</td>
<td>5 March</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td><strong>Gov. Partners (3):</strong> Dr FS Vettinathan KC Vincent ML Reval</td>
<td>MoH, Coordinator for MCN SPHS Former AD, ZEO</td>
<td>Mannar</td>
<td>5 March</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td><strong>Partners, ZEO, Madhu (6):</strong> CM Jalaldaum Mrs P Juddias AV Jeyeselvan S Pathmahanal SRI Cooralydas L Malini Werinton</td>
<td>ZEO, Madhu Principal, Thiyapaddy Primary Principal, Kunchukulam Primary Principal Zonal Education Office Accountant, ZEO, Madhu</td>
<td>Mannar</td>
<td>5 March</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td><strong>Local Gov. (3):</strong> V Suvankar P Naavalan S Suthahar</td>
<td>Management Assistant, MWPS Secretary, MWPS Secretary, MWPS</td>
<td>Mannar</td>
<td>5 March</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Mr. Anura Kumara Hapugahawatta</td>
<td>Rural Development Officer, Kothmale</td>
<td>Kothmale</td>
<td>5 March</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Mr ACM Safeer</td>
<td>Community Mobilization Assistant, Dunsinane</td>
<td>Dunsinane</td>
<td>5 March</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Dr Rajendra</td>
<td>Secretary, EWHCS and Estate Medical Doctor, Dunsinane Estate</td>
<td>Dunsinane</td>
<td>5 March</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>OS Perera</td>
<td>Assistant Commissioner of Cooperative Development</td>
<td>Nuwara Eliya</td>
<td>05 March</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>AMGN Bandara</td>
<td>Addl. District Registrar, District Secretariat Office</td>
<td>Nuwara Eliya</td>
<td>5 March</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>FGDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Interviews 62</td>
<td>Total FDGs 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Persons Interviewed 65</td>
<td>Total Persons in FGDs 191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL RESPONDENTS:** 65 + 191 = 256

Females 114 (45%); Males 142 (55%)

### SITE VISITS (10)

1. Hunaisfarook Government Muslim Mixed School, Mannar
2. Periyapandivirichhan Primary School, Mannar
3. Thadchchanamaruthamadhu Government Tamil Mixed School, Mannar
4. Gowriambal Government Tamil Mixed School, Mannar
5. Shythivinayagar Hindu College, Mannar
6. Child Development Centre with playground, Roads with drainage and guard stones, Agarapathana
7. MPCC, Retaining walls, Cooperative shop, Diagama West
8. Roads with drainage, Pre-school rehabilitation, Retaining walls, Kikilliamanna
9. MPCC, Playground with Toilets, Wally ball court, Roads with drainage, Liddesdale
10. Child Development Centre with Leisure park, Retaining walls, Dunsinane

### VALIDATION MEETINGS (2)

2. Regional & HQ Teams, UN-Habitat, Skype, April 2018 (x persons)
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Annex 4: Interview Questions

### RELEVANCE

1. What is the relevance and value added of UN-Habitat’s country programme in Sri Lanka for the country’s development objectives and responds to national plans and needs?
2. To what extent is the UN-Habitat country programme, responsive to UN and UN-Habitat strategies and contribute to achieving sustainable urbanization?
3. To what extent are the outputs and outcomes of projects implemented by UN-Habitat relevant to the needs of target beneficiaries?

### EFFECTIVENESS

1. To what extent were results achieved in a coherent manner with involvement of regional office and Headquarters and relevant UN-Habitat strategies and policies?
2. What kind of positive changes to beneficiaries have resulted from products and services?
3. What areas of work have proven to be most successful in terms of ownership in relation to the local context and the needs of beneficiaries? To what extent and in what ways has ownership, or lack of it, impacted the effectiveness of the projects?
4. To what extent cross-cutting issues of youth, gender equality, climate change/environmental capacity development and human rights have been addressed by UN-Habitat?

### EFFICIENCY

1. To what extent did the UN-Habitat Country Office, ROAP, and national partners have the capacity to design and implement projects?
2. To what extent were institutional arrangements adequate for implementing UN-Habitat’s Country Programme in Sri Lanka? What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the projects face and to what extent has this affected its efficiency?
3. What progress and efficiency gains of the UN-Habitat working through the government’s national programs with respect to design, management, implementation, reporting, and resource mobilization?

### IMPACT OUTLOOK

1. To what extent the country programme has (or are expected to attain) attained development results (accumulated results) to the targeted population, beneficiaries, local authorities, government institutions and addressing national priorities that are supportive to UN-Habitat’s strategic objectives?

### SUSTAINABILITY

1. To what extent did UN-Habitat engage the participation of beneficiaries in design, implementation, monitoring and reporting?
2. To what extent was the capacity of national project staff built to sustain or enhance their involvement in urban development issues and with UN-Habitat?
3. To what extent and in what ways have UN-Habitat country programme promoted partnerships and multi-stakeholder engagement in the UN-Habitat’s priority areas of work and fostered partnership with national stakeholders and other development partners?
4. To what extent will projects implemented by the country programme be replicable or scaled up at national or local levels or encourage collaboration between cities at provincial level?
Annex 5: Training – Mannar Schools Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Child-Friendly School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Training on Safety and Security in School Construction</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Awareness of the People’s Process</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Capacity Building of CBOs on Financial Management, Materials Procurement &amp; Monitoring Progress</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Follow-up Training on Capacity Building of CBOs on Financial Management, Materials Procurement &amp; Monitoring Progress</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Training on Construction Technology</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Demonstration on Fair-faced Wall Construction</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Awareness of Health and Hygiene</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Capacity Building for Government Officials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Divisional Progress Review Meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Provincial Level Progress Review Meeting (PPRM)/District Monitoring Committee Meeting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Compressed Stabilised Earth Block</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>School Facilities Maintenance Plan</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Experience Sharing Session with National Housing Development Authority (NHDA)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>In-house Capacity Building (construction techniques)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>137</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 6: Training – Plantation Settlements Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff capacity building - 1. DRR; 2. Settlement planning; 3. Environment and landscape management; 4. People’s Process; 5. Community Contracting; 6. Technical reviews)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Technical Inspection Review for TOs (TIR) and stakeholders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Right to employment and Education (Child labour/ drop out/consequences of early pregnancy)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hygiene and Environmental Awareness to Students</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gender Justice and Rights (GJR)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gender awareness and development (GAD)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assessment of prospective service providers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Workshop on Gender-Based Violence and Child Protection</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Awareness among youth and parents on child abuse, Gender-Based Violence and social offence (Use of alcoholism and associated risk)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Solid waste and water management (SWWM)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Organic home gardening (OHG) and composting</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wastewater management, Hygiene promotion, Solid waste management</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Savings and household cash Management (through HASL)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Capacitating disabled/elderly and link with service providers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Career guidance programme (through Vocational Training Authority, VTA, and National Apprentice and Industrial Training Authority, NAITA)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Carpentry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Information technology, English language and personality development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pre-school teacher training /Child Care Assistance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tailoring course</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Nursing Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hospitality management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Community Contract, project orientation and tendering process for material procurement and hiring skilled labour</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>District level Steering Committee meeting (DSC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>CBO capacity building/Financial management training</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Community Action Planning workshop (CAP)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Facilitation to get basic legal document to marginalized families</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Creating awareness and capacity building of Local Authorities on good governance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lesson Learned Workshop (LLW)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Training and capacity building of EWHCS (Economic empowerment and governance)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Advocacy on women's rights</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>HDI project launching ceremony</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Workshop on Fundamental considerations of Human Settlement Planning in Hill Country</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2D, 3D AutoCAD and MS Project training for Technical staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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