**Inception Report**

Evaluation of the Project

Addressing Sexual Bribery Experienced by Female Heads of Households, including Military Widows and War Widows in Sri Lanka to Enable Resilience and Sustained Peace

November 2018-September 2020

Melissa Andrade Costa

International Consultant

Nadhiya Najab

National Consultant

October 2020.

Index

[LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS 3](#_Toc53437910)

[1. Introduction 4](#_Toc53437911)

[2. Evaluation background 5](#_Toc53437912)

[3. Object of the evaluation 7](#_Toc53437913)

[4. Evaluation Purpose, Objectives and Scope 13](#_Toc53437914)

[5. Evaluation Methodology 14](#_Toc53437915)

[5.1. Overall methodological approach and design 14](#_Toc53437916)

[5.2. Data Collection 16](#_Toc53437917)

[5.3. Sampling 18](#_Toc53437918)

[5.4. Methods of Analysis 18](#_Toc53437919)

[5.5. Limitations and risks involved 19](#_Toc53437920)

[6. Evaluation Workplan 20](#_Toc53437921)

[7. Ethics of the evaluation 21](#_Toc53437922)

[8. Timeline 23](#_Toc53437923)

[\*In the event that COVID19 related mobility restrictions are imposed, the proposed field data collection timeline may be subject to variation, affecting the subsequent outputs proposed. 24](#_Toc53437924)

[9. Quality assurance and Evaluation Management 24](#_Toc53437925)

[Appendix A. Rapid Assessment 26](#_Toc53437926)

[Appendix B. Evaluation Matrix 29](#_Toc53437927)

[Appendix C. Documents Reviewed 40](#_Toc53437928)

[Appendix D. Evaluation instruments 42](#_Toc53437929)

[Appendix E. Index of Evaluation Report 61](#_Toc53437930)

[Appendix F. Stakeholder Analysis 62](#_Toc53437931)

[Table 1. Evaluation Questions 13](#_Toc52749288)

[Table 2. Gender Results Effectiveness Scale used in UNDP´s evaluation fo GEWE (2015). 15](#_Toc52749289)

[Table 3. Gender Responsive Index to evaluate the Project Addressing Sexual Bribery Experienced by Female Heads of Households, including Military Widows and War Widows in Sri Lanka to Enable Resilience and Sustained Peace 16](#_Toc52749290)

[Table 4. Categories of Stakeholders to be interviewed 18](#_Toc52749291)

[Table 5. Major components of implementation 21](#_Toc52749292)

[Table 6. Timeline of project evaluation 24](#_Toc52749293)

[Table 7. Stakeholders involved in the project and their roles 63](#_Toc52749294)

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CEJ | Centre for Equality and Justice |
| CIABOC | Commission to Investigate Allegations of Bribery or Corruption |
| CSO | Civil Society Organization |
| DAC | Development Assistance CommitteeCommittee |
| FHH | Female Heads of Households |
| ISB | Industrial Service Bureau |
| OECD | Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development |
| PBF | Peacebuilding Fund |
| PBSO | UN Peacebuilding Support Office |
| RPK | Rajarata Praja Kendraya |
| TR | Term of Reference |
| UNDAF | United Nations Development Assistance Framework |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UN Women | United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women |
| WRC | Women’s Resource Centre |

# Introduction

The purpose of this inception report is to provide direction to the evaluation of the project Addressing Sexual Bribery Experienced by Female Heads of Households, including Military Widows and War Widows in Sri Lanka to Enable Resilience and Sustained Peace. In the inception phase, key actors were consulted, namely: The Project manager and the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist from UN Women, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) focal point and staff from the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), the funding partner and responsible for overseeing the initiative. During this period, the evaluation team (international and national consultant) came together to review the key documents and the Terms of Reference to propose an evaluation design that is useful to promote learning to all the actors involved.

This document is composed of the following sections:

* Object of the evaluation: with the description of the key features of the project being evaluated;
* Evaluation purpose, criteria and questions: with the objective of the evaluation and the major issues which will be investigated during the evaluation process;
* Evaluation Methodology: explaining the approach to the evaluation and the methods which are going to be used;
* Methods of Analysis: describing the evaluation team´s method for qualitative analysis;
* Major components of implementation: describing the evaluation process with its key deliverables;
* Stakeholder Analysis: the major stakeholders were mapped and divided according to categories and roles so that to ensure no one is missed;
* Ethics of the Evaluation: describing the concerns around an evaluation which is around a very sensitive topic and the precautionary measures the evaluation team will have;
* Timeline: pointing at key dates for the deliveries along the whole evaluation process;
* Evaluation Matrix: presenting the criteria/indicators which are going to be used to answer the evaluation questions, the sources of information, data collection tools and methods of analysis;
* Documents Reviewed: a full list of documents reviewed is presented for the purposes of making the report more solid and coherent;
* Evaluation instruments: guides for semi-structured interviews are presented.

This inception report incorporates feedback from the following stakeholders: UN Women Sri Lanka, UN Women Regional Office and UNDP Sri Lanka.

# Evaluation background

Sri Lanka has experienced nearly three-decades of armed conflict between the armed forces of the Government of Sri Lanka (GoSL) and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) which officially came to an end in May 2009; a period characterised by waves of conflict, militarisation, and displacement (International Crisis Group, 2011).[[1]](#footnote-2) While the root causes of the protracted war are multiple and complex, the post-independence politics of a majority-led leadership and the local and global political economic situation laid the foundations for violent social and political dissent. Sri Lanka’s history of conflict is not limited to the civil war, with the country experiencing violent insurrections led by Sinhala youth particularly in 1987 across the south, central, and western regions of the country. The proliferation of militant groups in the north and east of Sri Lanka culminated into fully- fledged war in the early 1980s, with the LTTE emerging as a protagonist in the drawn-out conflict with the state. Intermittent conflict led to several waves of internal displacement, and the Indian Ocean tsunami of 2004 added to the number of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in war-affected regions of Sri Lanka (Sanguhan and Gunasekara, 2017).[[2]](#footnote-3)

The period of armed conflict is attributed to the death and casualty of thousands of civilians, armed forces, and LTTE combatants, as well as multiple displacements, cases of physical and mental disabilities, and the destruction of homes and public property (Jayasundere & Weerackody, 2013).[[3]](#footnote-4) It is estimated that nearly 470,000 persons experienced displacement from their places of origin as a consequence of the armed conflict (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, 2012).[[4]](#footnote-5) Upon return to their places of origin once the fighting had ceased, much of what they had known was no more; houses were damaged and destroyed, schools were razed to the ground, agricultural land was overgrown, fishing equipment destroyed, and the provision of basic services was stunted. With nearly 90,000 FHHs (UN, 2015)[[5]](#footnote-6) estimated to be widowed at the end of the armed conflict, and FHHs accounting for approximately 23.5% of the total number of households in the country, the burden of responsibility on women to support their households is significant. FHHs include widows of soldiers, LTTE cadres, and other militant cadres and widows of civilians. This category also includes women whose spouses are disabled or have divorced or abandoned them.

While women across the country were affected by the conflict, they experienced different effects based on their ethnicity, class and socio-economic status. The change in roles and responsibilities for women within a deeply patriarchal society comes with its own challenges in terms of navigating the multiple burdens and exploitative conditions. This is reflected to an extent in Sri Lanka’s female labour force participation rate which has continuously remained low at 30-35 percent in the past two decades, which is surprising given the high levels of educational attainments and other social indicators compared to neighbouring countries in the region (Ranaraja, Hassendeen & Gunatilaka, 2016);[[6]](#footnote-7) indicative of the strong socio-cultural influences.

The decades of armed ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka were visibly gendered. While men were the main casualties of war, women were left to cope with the loss of family members due to death and disappearances of income earners. FHHs were thus propelled into additional responsibilities of income generation while continuing to engage in carework. Sri Lanka’s history is contextualised by militarization, a protracted armed conflict and the condoning of political violence which has contributed towards a culture of violence and impunity in the country since the 1980s, with a significant impact on violence against women. Despite the guarantee of fundamental rights and non-discrimination towards women in Sri Lanka since the 1978 Constitution, the Women’s Rights Bill is yet to be approved; and women’s rights, ensured in international instruments— such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)—although ratified, have not yet been incorporated into national legislation.[[7]](#footnote-8) Furthermore, gender-based discrimination still exists in instances of inheritance rights, in settlements, and in religious personal laws.[[8]](#footnote-9) Although Sri Lanka has measures in place to protect women against sexual and gender-based violence, a study by Jayasundera (2009) highlights that women in Sri Lanka still encounter issues due to the lack of enforcement of these laws.[[9]](#footnote-10)

Women are limited in their opportunities to work and seek new ways of life in structural ways, such as in transportation, just to give an example. According to a report by the UNFPA (2017), sexual harassment in public transport is among the key deterrents that restrict the movement of women for economic opportunities. The same report revealed that almost 90 percent of the surveyed women had experienced some form of sexual violence (ibid). These findings further reiterate how external conditions influence women’s choices and opportunities for engaging in economic opportunities outside the relative physical safety of their private sphere.

A crippling consequence of the armed conflict as identified by Jayatilaka and Amirthalingam (2015) was the deterioration of livelihoods and the local economy. It is a burden increasingly born by FHHs as they navigate their new responsibilities towards supporting their households amidst economic deprivation, exclusion from inheritance, inability to vindicate property rights and lack of access to land (ICG,2011).[[10]](#footnote-11) FHHs with limited support systems, are particularly vulnerable in contexts where abuse of power and authority exists in accessing state and non-state assistance/services, resulting in instances of coercion and transactional sex. In a report published by the *‘*Leader of the Opposition’s Commission on the Prevention of Violence against Women and the Girl Child (2014)[[11]](#footnote-12), it documents instances of women having to offer sexual favours to access resources and food entitlements or to receive assistance for building homes, securing land rights, accessing state facilities and jobs; and for certain military widows even in instances of accessing their partners’ pensions. In a report published by the International Bar Association (2019)[[12]](#footnote-13) the term ‘sextortion’ is used to define assistance and provisions offered to vulnerable women in return for sexual favours, where the need and desperation for survival is abused by individuals in positions of power in the absence of viable alternatives by those seeking assistance. It is recognised as an extreme breach of trust and misuse of power. While it is a violation of Sri Lankan law for public officials to solicit bribes, the term ‘sexual bribery’ is not expressly mentioned in the Bribery Act, and the definition of “gratification” in the Interpretation section of the Bribery Act does not yet include sexual gratification as a form of gratification.

In Sri Lanka, this problem - neglected in the past - has been specially flagged by the research of the organization called FOKUS Women (now Centre for Equality and Justice), which published a number of studies showing how sexual bribery affected military widows and war widows in the country. UN Women together with United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Centre for Equality and Justice (CEJ), proposed to the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) a project with a focus on ´Addressing Sexual Bribery experienced by Female Heads of Households, including Military Widows and War Widows in Sri Lanka to enable resilience and sustained peace. ´

# Object of the evaluation

The project “Sexual Bribery Experienced by Female Heads of Households, including Military Widows and War Widows in Sri Lanka to Enable Resilience and Sustained Peace” aims to empower Female Heads of Households in the three target districts of Kurunegala, Anuradhapura and Kilinochchi by addressing the high incidence of sexual bribery and exploitation against them. The project which initially included only Military Widows (Sinhalese) and War Widows (Tamil) was expanded to consider other categories of Female Heads of Household which consist of women who are divorced, separated, abandoned, and those with disabled partners (also related to long-drawn effects of the armed ethnic conflict). The project also intends to target public officials and institutions at a national level with the intention of improving the existing environment and response towards sexual bribery and exploitation.

The project has two outcomes, namely:

Outcome 1: Empowered Female Heads of Households (including military and war widows) have sustainable livelihoods, and access social support services with dignity;

Outcome 2: Increased commitment of public institutions to prevent and respond to sexual bribery and to protect Female Heads of Households (including military and war widows) from sexual exploitation.

The project envisioned to start with sensitization of women, building of collectives and work with media to be followed by professional training and giving of grants to allow women to improve their livelihoods in order to reduce their dependence on service providers for assistance, as well as improve access to complaint mechanisms and legal assistance with regard to sexual bribery. In parallel, key government officials were meant to receive training to strengthen their knowledge and attitudes to enhance their awareness and instil responsibility to prevent sexual bribery and sexual exploitation.

Under outcome 1, the project included actions on awareness and sensitization around the theme with resources such as puppetry and forum theatre in combination with a nationwide social media campaign. This work was carried out by CEJ and its local implementation partners Rajarata Praja Kendraya (RPK), Women’s Resource Centre (WRC), Viluthu and Jaffna Social Action Centre (JSAC), with the support of Power of Play and ACT4, and Ngage Strategic Alliance - a media company for the communication part. The project progressed on helping to form women’s collectives and bringing out awareness of the issue and promoting media insertions. However, under outcome 1, the delivery of a platform for women to register complaints remotely against perpetrators of sexual bribery is still under way along with the trainings on ‘leadership and peacebuilding’ for FHHs from the same mobilised groups and collectives. An additional element under outcome 1 was training given to FHH on how to identify and deal with children and adolescents at risk of substance abuse (a component which has already been implemented by the project).

Under outcome 1, output 1.3, the economic sustainability component is led by two partner organizations: Chrysalis, a civil society organization which helps to empower women through training, and the Industrial Service Bureau (ISB) which helps to promote entrepreneurship in the country. The trainings targeting economic resilience were meant to start in early 2020, but due to COVID-19 and other impeding factors mentioned earlier, they are taking place as the evaluation is carried out (they started in March and are on going as of Sept/Oct 2020). The trainings are in the area of Product Development, Financial Literacy & Business Planning, Marketing and Technology. The beneficiaries are being provided with grants for their proposed business and it will culminate in an exhibition of their products in the form of diversity market fairs in each of the 3 districts, with open dialogue, exchange of knowledge and peacebuilding and reconciliation workshops.

Under Outcome 2, the main government partner was the Ministry of Women and Child Affairs and Social Security (MWCA) and the Commission to Investigate Allegations of Bribery or Corruption (CIABOC). The MWCA was replaced in the government structure in August 2020, by the State Ministry of Women and Child Development, Pre-Schools and Primary Education, School Infrastructure and School Services. In this area , UN Women, UNDP and CEJ are engaged with UNDP taking the lead with Ministry of Women and Child Development and CEJ leading discussion with CIABOC. The project is helping to strengthen existing institutional processes and structures within ministries, including anti-sexual harassment committees and expand the definition of bribery to explicitly include sexual bribery by public officials. This front also includes training to be given to state officials at a central and local level. It is important to highlight that engagement both at a central and local level is crucial, considering the diversity of the country in terms of language, culture and context.

The above-mentioned project was approved by PBF in 2018 and officially started in November 2018 (as funds were disbursed from PBF, however the project proposal by the UN agencies indicated start date of January 2019) with a total budget of US$ 1,500,000 for a period of 18 months. On April 2020, the project was approved for a six-month no-cost extension with a new project closure date of 31 October 2020. As the no-cost extension comes to an end, this evaluation is carried out to look at what the project was able to achieve. A new extension is currently being discussed between UN Women and PBF as the delivery rate of the project is still under 60%.

Since the inception of the project in November 2018, the country was faced with four major socio-political events which affected the delivery of the project: the Constitutional Crisis which took place in October 2018 and hampered government work until late January 2019; the Easter Sunday attacks in April 2019 which caused the death of 250 people, shifted the government’s focus towards security and resulted in increased ethnic tensions across the country (halting all programmes in the 3 districts); the Presidential Election in November 2019 which captured the political agenda of the country; and the challenges associated with COVID-19 (which are still present) heavily impacted operations in the country due to the imposition of island-wide curfew and mobility restrictions, especially in the beginning of the pandemic and lastly the Parliamentary elections in August 2020 where further changes took place within Government & Ministries. These are some of the reasons which may have influenced the low delivery rate of the project up to Sept/Oct 2020.

The reconstructed Theory of Change in the next page shows the rationale of the project with the activities listed, the outputs, outcomes and impact expected in terms of behaviour change at an individual and institutional level. It is important to highlight in this case, the assumptions added to the rationale of the project can be summarized as follows:

* FHH are willing to take part in the activities of the Project (collectives, events and other services);
* Government institutions and public officials in diferent levels are willing to get involved in the Project;
* CSOs are able to engage with FHH;
* FHHs have the skills to use the digital platform to complain on sexual bribery, sexual harassment & exploitation and are also able to write business proposals;
* FHH use their new skills to enhance their business.

These assumptions will be explored in the course of the evaluation. They involve asking the FHH to which extent they were motivated to participate in the project activities and mobilized to do so, asking Government officials about their engagement in the project, the actions taken and effectiveness of CSOs in mobilizing the FHH and to which extent FHH had the required skills to use the digital platform (even if under test) and write business proposals and finally, to which extent FHH actually used their new skills developed during the trainings to enhance their businesses. One further note is in order. The evaluation team is aware that the digital platform is still being implemented, but it was factored in the theory of change as part of the project design.





Figure 1. Reconstructed Theory of Change - Outcome 1

Figure 2. Reconstructed Theory of Change - Outcome 2



# Evaluation Purpose, Objectives and Scope

According to the Term of Reference (ToR), the evaluation purpose is to bring evidence on progress towards peacebuilding impacts and examine the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and contributions towards gender equality objectives of the programmatic interventions for national and local stakeholders and rights-holders in all three target districts.

This evaluation is a contractual requirement by PBF and poses an opportunity to take stock of what has happened so far, help generate lessons and give recommendations for future steps within the project and further work in the area..

The evaluation will consider the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee´s (DAC) dimensions of Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact, Sustainability and Gender Equity and Human Rights. It will also be conducted in accordance with the United Nations Evaluation Group Norms and Standards as well as the UN Women Evaluation Policy and Handbook (please see item on Ethics of the Evaluation). The following evaluation questions will guide the evaluation process in each criterion. It is important to note that these questions were elaborated based on the ToR and they are detailed in the Evaluation Matrix in Appendix B. All the dimensions proposed in the TOR are incorporated as questions and also criteria/indicators in the evaluation matrix.

Table 1. Evaluation Questions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Criteria | Evaluation Questions (EQ) |
| Relevance | **Evaluation question 1:** To what extent were the project’s strategies relevant to national and local contexts?  **Evaluation question 2:** To what extent did the project align with the needs and priorities of the intended beneficiaries and international standards on gender equality and women’s empowerment? |
| Effectiveness  Effectiveness and Gender Equality and Human Rights | **Evaluation question 3:** To what extent did the project reach the planned results?  Sub-questions: a) What were the reasons for the achievement or nonachievement of planned results?  b) Were there any unexpected results or unintended consequences of the results both positive and negative?  **Evaluation question 4:** To what extent did the project make timely adjustments to its strategy to maintain its relevance and effectiveness?  **Evaluation question 5:** To what extend did the output level interventions translate into progress towards outcomes?  **Evaluation question 6:** What measurable changes in gender equality and women’s empowerment have occurred as a result of the project?  Sub-question: a) To what extent did the project address and respond to existing power dynamics and gender relations? |
| Efficiency | **Evaluation question 7:** Have financial and human resources been allocated sufficiently and strategically to achieve project outcomes?  Sub-questions:   1. Have the outputs been delivered in a timely manner? 2. How can results be assessed in relation to resources allocated (value for money)? |
| Impact | **Evaluation question 8:** What measurable changes in women’s contribution to and participation in peacebuilding have occurred as a result of support provided by the project to target stakeholders?  Sub-question: a) What are the early indications of peacebuilding impact? |
| Sustainability | **Evaluation question 9:** To what extent was capacity developed in order to ensure sustainability of efforts and benefits?  Sub-question:a)Are there any mechanisms developed and/or interventions linked with existing mechanisms at local and national levels to ensure continuation?  **Evaluation question 10:** Are national partners committed to continuing the project or elements of the project? |
| Gender Equality and Human Rights | **Evaluation Question 11:** To what extent did the project actively identify and include the most marginalized in Sri Lanka, ensuring no one is left behind? |

In terms of scope, the project will address results at a national (policy and procedures) and local level (FHH in the three districts involved in the project).

# Evaluation Methodology

### Overall methodological approach and design

The methodology will respond to the indicators proposed for each evaluation question (See Appendix A). A mixed method approach is proposed. The focus of the evaluation will be qualitative and triangulation will be key in order to contrast different sources and reach a common ground which is based on evidence. Triangulation will take place using a variety of information sources: official project documents, informants from the government, from the key UN agencies involved and also from the Civil Society Organizations participating in the project. The initial desk review already identified that there are contrasting views about the implemention of the project. This will be further investigated in the course of the evaluation as to reach a picture that is able to present different perspectives of reality. Triangulation is about checking different sources and views in order to identify a broader understanding of what has actually taken place.

The evaluation design will be a) *participatory* and b) based on a *4th generation approach c) utilization focused and 4) attribute value to the project through a* *Gender Results Effectiveness Scale*. As for the participation (letter a), the evaluation proposes constant interaction with all key stakeholders. UN Women, UNDP and PBF should take part throught the whole evaluation process (initial consultation, data collection, presentation after field work, presentation of draft report and draft of recommendations). This is to ensure that the evaluation is useful for all the partners involved. CEJ has not been involved up to this moment and should be one of the first key actors to be interviewed as they were heavily involved in project implementation. A close dialogue should also be in place between the evaluation team and UN Women to schedule the interviews which should be communicated officially to relevant stakeholders. The national consultant will help facilitate the schedule of interviews with UN Women. In addition, all the organizations implementing the project on the field will be heard and a strong part of the evaluation data will come from the beneficiaries, where the Female Heads of Households will be able to express their views about the intervention and give suggestions for the future.

As for letter b) on the *4th generation approach,* according Lincoln & Guba[[13]](#footnote-14), this type of evaluation deal with the need of capturing multiple perspectives about a certain reality. This means considering individual experiences and how they are shaped by their social reality (related to race, gender and history). This fits perfectly well in the context of the project where issues of gender, conflict and history are at the core of the initiative. In this sense, they suggest there is mutual causality, in which facts are not just generated in a sequence of cause and effect, but they mutually influence each other back and forth and in different directions. It is not only about UNDP and UN Women implementing a project and causing a chain of cause and effect, but also about how the actors on the ground influence UNDP, UN Women and other partners in their work and policy direction. The fourth generation of evaluation is also associated with use, how much and how the evaluation can contribute to affect change. It is also about using different types of methods so that different sources of information come together to offer a richer picture of reality.

In terms of letter c) utilization focused, the evaluation team proposes to focus the work on producing results that are useful for all the organizations involved and consulting them step by step. The evaluation team used the inception phase to consult the key stakeholders and asked them what they really wanted to know to make the evaluation more useful. Their answers have guided the building of this document.

In terms of the Gender Results Effectiveness Scale, the evaluation team proposes to use this tool inspired by the document UN Women’s Good Practices in Gender Responsive Evaluation document (2020).[[14]](#footnote-15) This document shows a scale created in the context of the evaluation of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) contribution to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE). This scale is described below:

Table 2. Gender Results Effectiveness Scale used in UNDP´s evaluation fo GEWE (2015).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Gender negative | Result had a negative outcome aggravated or reinforced existing gender inequalities and norms |
| Gender blind | Result had no attention to gender, failed to acknowledge the different needs of men, women, girls and boys, or marginalized populations |
| Gender targeted | Result focused on the number of equity (50/50) of women, men or marginalized populations that were targeted. |
| Gender responsive | Result addressed differential needs of men or women and addressed equitable distribution of benefits, resources, status and rights but did not address root causes of inequalities in their lives |
| Gender transformative | Result contributed to changes in norms, cultural values, power  structures and the roots of inequalities and discriminations |

Based on the project framework and the rapid assessment, the project proposes to use the following Gender Responsive Scale to do an overall assessment of the project after the data collection and analysis:

Table 3. Gender Responsive Index to evaluate the Project Addressing Sexual Bribery Experienced by Female Heads of Households, including Military Widows and War Widows in Sri Lanka to Enable Resilience and Sustained Peace

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Gender negative | Result had a negative outcome aggravated or reinforced existing gender inequalities and norms |
| Gender targeted | Project was able to deliver key outpus of the project for vulnerable women. |
| Gender responsive | Project had the right focus and addressed needs of women as voiced by them, helping them be more financially independent and well informed about their rights. Government has established or is in the way to establish regulations and protocols to better protect women. |
| Gender transformative | Result contributed to attitudinal change at both individual and institutional level – to treat women including widows with respect and dignity. |

### Data Collection

The methodology of the proposed evaluation will include:

* **Desk review of relevant documents**:

The initial desk review has considered all the key documents involved in the design and management of the project (project document, monitoring spreadsheets, Annual Project Progress Reports, media reports, baseline survey, documents from the government, list of planned business courses, selection criteria for beneficiaries etc). For the full list of documents, please refer to Appendix D.

* **Rapid assessment**: based on the desk review of relevant documents and consultation of key stakeholders, a rapid assessment was carried out and is presented in Appendix A. The Rapid Assessment involved the following steps: a) assessment of the data available; b) brief critical analysis of the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework of the project; c) brief analysis of the consistency of the data available; d) refinement of evaluation demand and initial findings in each area to be investigated by the project. At each step, issues of concern were identified to discuss with comissioning organizations and better plan the evaluation process. In light of COVID-19, this Rapid Assessment became particularly important to help prepare the field work.
* **Remote and in person semi-structured interviews:** during the inception phase, desk review and consultation of stakeholders, a list of possible interviewees was drafted to include the key stakeholders that should go through a remote or in person semi-structured interview (See Stakeholder Analysis in Appendix F). These include project staff and stakeholders from UN Women, UNDP and PBF in order to determine the nature of the interventions implemented, the objectives and outcomes. National and District level government officials, local-level project officers and officials in charge of implementation, as well as state service providers in the project locations in the districts of Kurunegala, Anuradhapura and Kilinochchi will be interviewed. The interviewees will be asked about their preference (for in person or remote interview) and even in case of in person interviews, both consultants will be present (the international consultant will be connected via an on-line meeting platform). In face of the COVID-19 pandemic which has affected global travel, the field work is going to be carried out by the national consultant with remote assistance by the international consultant.
* **Telephone survey:** in light of COVID-19 and as this inception report was being reviewed, the evaluation team proposed to condut a Telephone Survey with the beneficiaries of the project in replacement of the Focus Group Discussions initially envisaged. The evaluation team will use the database of beneficiaries collectively built among the various partners as the starting point for the survey. It will also provide a budget estimate for the costs involved in hiring additional assistance for data collection and processing. The detailed outline of the survey which is being discussed with UN Women and UNDP will be detailed in the evaluation report.

It is important to mention that the Monitoring and Evaluation framework developed by the project proposes a Baseline and End line survey with the purpose of measuring the achievements of the project. However, during the process of desk review, the evaluation team decided not to carry out an End line survey for the following reasons:

* The study which is considered the baseline survey was carried out in September 2019 after the work of building collectives and part of the sensitization activities of the project (which means the data collected is after phase 0 of the project);
* From September 2019 up to September 2020, the project faced many implementation delays, and few core project actions have been carried out (which means there is not much impact to expect since then);
* The reports mention a survey fatigue from the part of project beneficiaries as many different actors of the project asked them research questions leading to complaints from their part;
* A survey with beneficiaries would demand extra assistance given to the national consultant which has not been budgeted for in the evaluation.

In light of these circumstances and considering the delivery rate of the project, a survey was not considered appropriate to be carried out by the evaluation team at this point. The focus will be on the quantitative data arriving from the desk review (secondary data) and also on the qualitative data from the interviews and carried out with specific groups of FHH and both female and male public servants who have actually engaged in project activities. The quantitative data in this case will be mainly from the reports of the number of trainings, activities and beneficiaries involved.

### Sampling

During the inception process, a stakeholder analysis was carried out, considering who the major actors are and their role in the project, as to identify the list of people to take part in the semi-structured interviews. In addition, in the semi-structured interviews, actors will be asked to refer to other relevant stakeholders who should be considered in the process (snowball sampling). The table below presents a list of interviewees by type.

Table 4. Categories of Stakeholders to be interviewed

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Category | Number |
| Rightsholders | 12 |
| Local Government staff | 6 |
| Implementing CSOs and private partners | 13 |
| Funding recipient UN organizations (RUNOs) | 4 |
| National Government Officials | 5 |
| Development Partners | 2 |
| Total | 42 |

### 

### Methods of Analysis

The evaluation will combine a number of methods of analysis: 1) Identification of key themes and contents in the desk review; 2) Review of quantitative data in the project documents, 3) a standard method used by the international consultant when dealing with qualitative data which is explained below and summarizes the evaluation process.

One important concern of this project is that involves distinct ethnic groups. The evaluation team will be very careful about flagging the different perpsectives of the two groups as to ensure that both groups are heard. These differences will be considered when analysing implementation achievements and gaps during the course of the project.

1. First review of individual interviews: the text from the interviews which was recorded will be initially reviewed and cleaned where typos and missing text will be corrected. In this step, initial patterns are to be identified and quotes highlighted in the transcripts. Data will be organized according to the evaluation questions and indicators of the evaluation matrix as an overall framework. However, the different perspectives from the stakeholders will be acknowledged through the presentation of the key findings according to each indicator. This important step will help the evaluation team to review the key points that have emerged. The insights and patterns identified will go to an ‘evaluation diary’ which help build the key messages of the evaluation which will be fit into the findings sections of the evaluation report and signal possible conclusions and recommendations to be further thought through in the analytical process.
2. Organization of report by evaluation question and indicators/criteria: the structure of the report will be set according to the evaluation questions and indicators/criteria presented in the inception report. During this stage, key patterns and insights from step 1 will be placed in the draft evaluation report to be further developed. Potential lessons learned and recommendations will also be identified for helping the evaluator not to lose any insights and data identified in this area.
3. Insertion of qualitative data by evaluation question: as the structure is set and key points identified, relevant parts of the interviews will be used for quotes to support the arguments and key ideas already identified in Steps 1 and 2. It is important to emphasise that the evaluation team will be very careful about not identifying the participants of the evaluation and any particular situation which may link the quote with the respondent. Contrasting views will be presented as to give a more accurate picture of what was found in the process. Along the qualitative analysis of indicators/criteria, there will also be a quantitative analysis in order to complement the arguments around the key findings identified. The quantitative analysis will involve simple frequency and descriptive statistics related to the project documents.

### Limitations and risks involved

The project document identifies four risk and potential mitigation strategies (pages 17-18) reproduced below:

1. Reduced momentum and de- prioritisation of peacebuilding and reconciliation at the national level.
2. Public officials and key institutions are reluctant to engage/participate in sensitisation programmes.
3. Fear of reprisals results in reluctance of female heads of households, including military widows and war widows to participate.
4. Female heads of households, including military widows are not inclined to engage in peer-exchanges programmes with female heads of households, including war widows of the North, due to prejudices held, having lost their husbands to the conflict, and vice versa.

The risks identified above continue to hold true, with the likelihood of the risk increasing as a result of changes in socio-political conditions since the inception of this project, particularly as result of the delays in implentation (1,2). The second risk identified with regard to the limited buy-in of public officials to participate or engage in sensitisation programmes is a result of the changing government and persons in charge, limiting the opportunity to benefit from the mitigation strategy identified. With regard to the third risk identified, the project indicators shared indicate that there has been no increase in the number of reported incidents of sexual bribery or exploitation since the implementation of the project and the formation of the community groups. It is possible that the deployment of the online and offline mobile app may have an impact through increased anonymity. However, it is not possible to ascertain its effectiveness without its deployment and the ability to assess the results. For the fourth risk identified, a possible mitigation measure not identified would be to approach FHHs who are bi-lingual (Sinhala and Tamil) which could help beneficiaries interact and share common experiences, particularly among FHHs who have never travelled outside their localities. Furthermore, it is not possible to assess the viability of this risk identified as the diversity fairs have not been implemented at the time of compiling this report.

Additional risk factors not identified at the outset relate to the impact of COVID19 and its impact as a result of limited movement across state lines; and increased ethno-religious and nationalist sentiments since the election of the incumbent government particularly in Killinochchi in the northern province of Sri Lanka, which is a minority dominant district. The risks identified will be assessed in conjunction with the mitigation strategies and considered when evaluating the degree of success of the project implementation in the final report.

At the time of writing the inception report, there are no mobility restrictions in the three project locations on account of COVID19. If the situation changes, in-person interviews will be conducted virtually to ensure the safety of the beneficiaries, project staff and the evaluators. In such an instance, while remote interviews would be possible with key persons, recent experience has indicated that virtual interactions with beneficiaries have limitations in terms of establishing rapport and confidence, particularly with regard to sensitive content as is covered through this project. As a result, focus group interactions with the female community groups may also be hampered in the event of mobility restrictions. In such an instance, data collection through focus group discussions with project beneficiaries will have to be revised and conducted in close coordination with local implementation partners to establish virtual interactions despite recognising the possible bias in information collected in this manner. The viability of this option will be discussed with CEJ during the forthcoming meeting scheduled.

# Evaluation Workplan

According to the Terms of Reference, four components should be involved in implementing the evaluation process, which are described as follows:

Table 5. Major components of implementation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Component | Steps involved |
| Desk Review and Inception Report | * Kick-off meetings with UN Women, CEJ, UNDP and PBF * Stakeholder analysis * Drafting of the inception report (with the design of the evaluation including data collection tools) |
| Data Collection | * Remote/in-person semi-structured interviews * In-depth document review in addition to the inception phase * Focus Groups Discussions in the three project locations (now under discussion) * Debriefing (presentation) to key stakeholders (as agreed with UN Women, PBF and UNDP) of preliminary findings after semi-structured interviews. |
| Draft Evaluation Report and Case Studies | * Writing of draft evaluation report with key findings and lessons learned (max 40 pages, excluding annexes). * Presentation of Draft report for a larger audience of stakeholders |
| Final Evaluation Report | * Review of report based on the feedback received. * Delivery of final evaluation report. |

The work will also be divided between the national and international consultant according to the following responsibilities:

**International Consultant:**

* Overall work supervision
* Overall responsibility for inception report
* Remote data collection whenever possible (considering the limits related to the language and the travel restrictions due to COVID-19)
* Presentation of results from data collection with national consultant
* Overall responsibility for evaluation report
* Presentation of evaluation report
* Overall responsibility for delivering the evaluation report

**National Consultant:**

* Assistance with writing the inception report
* Scheduling interviews
* Preparation of field work
* Carrying out interviews with international consultant
* Assistance with writing the evaluation Report
* Assistance with the presentations of results to key stakeholders

The two consultants will be working closely together in order to add the knowledge of the local context to the knowledge of international evaluation procedures and the *modus operandi* of the United Nations.

# Ethics of the evaluation

The evaluation will be based in the principles set by the United Nations Evaluation Group in the document ´Norms and Standards for Evaluation´ which has served as a landmark document for the United Nations and beyond. The UNEG guidelines for Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations will also be used in the process. All the participants will be briefed about the confidentiality of the information which will only be used upon the direct authorization of each stakeholder. In addition, the participants will also be informed that they have the right not to answer questions they do not feel confortable with or to stop the interview at any time.

This project deals with a particularly sensitive issue. Considering the sensitivity of the topic and the survey fatigue which has already been mentioned, the evaluation team will restrict the questions tp the beneficiaries to the impact of the project activities in women´s overall empowerment, not touching upon the individual problems of sexual bribery they might have been faced with. The project will deal with the target group as Female Heads of Households not making a distinction between war widows, military widows or women affected by sexual bribery. The evaluation will also consider the Ethical and safety recommendations for intervention research on violence against women from the World Health Organization with a focus on: 1) safety of respondents and the research team; 2) protecting confidentiality; 3) careful selection and training of research assistants in the field; 4) gathering of information on assistance available for women at a local level in case of their request and 5) ensure careful presentation and interpretation of data so that it is used to advance policy and intervention development.

The research assistants in the field will receive guidance on: a) the objectives of the evaluation; b) the careful handling of the topic; c) the respect that should be in place towards all the participants (mindful about the topics of the discussion); c) services available for the women who request them. It is important to note that the services available for women who had experienced any type of abuse have already been mapped by the national consultant and is already available for the field work.

Moreover, due to the overall context of the country, the COVID-19 challenge and the sensitivity of the issue, the evaluation will heavily consider the principle of ´Do No Harm´, which consists of a careful and deep respect towards beneficiaries and special caution about not increasing conflict. At the end of all interactions with beneficiaries, information will be provided on service providers they could reach out to for social and legal assistance.

The UNEG principles used for this evaluation are detailed below to ensure they are truly incorporated in the evaluation process from the beginning to the end. They are as follows:

1. Utility: the evaluation will serve the diferente stakeholders involved with the purpose of helping with decision making and answering the questions posed by the comissioning organizations.
2. Necessity: the evaluation will be conducted bearing in mind that it is needed for the Project team to enhance learning and accountability. It will not be arbitrary and will respect time and resources devoted to it.
3. Independence: the evaluation shall be free of bias. The evaluation team will exercise its Independence, attributing value to the Project based on evidence and not only on any personal interest of any kind. If this becomes compromised by any pressure, the evaluation team will report accordingly.
4. Impartiality: every initiative has its own merit and setbacks. The evaluation will aim to be balanced in terms of showing both sides of what has taken place in the course of Project implementation. In order to ensure this, diferente perspectives will be heard and incorporated in the report. The evaluators will be very mindful of their own cultural and social background as to avoid bias based on their own profile.
5. Credibility: the evaluation will be based on rigor design, data collection, observation and analysis so that it is credible and of high quality. Arguments should be coherent, structured and logical as to allow clarity and comprehensiveness.
6. Conflicts of Interest: the evaluation team has no conflict of interest in the evaluation. But, if any conflict of interest arises, it shall deal with it openly and honestly.
7. Honesty and Integrity: the evaluation team is experienced with evaluations for the United Nations and will work considering its capacity. It will openly point at the limitations of the evaluation in the report and be honest about the results it finds.
8. Accountability: the evaluation team is committed to completing the evaluation within the timeframe and budget agreed as per signed in the contract.
9. Information protection: this evaluation will inform everyone about data management and protect the confidentialy of the Information provided by stakeholders and other actors involved in the evaluation.
10. Respect for Dignity and Diversity: the evaluation tem will take into account and respect the diferences in culture, local customs, religious beliefes and practices, disability, age and ethnicity, respecting all the individuals who are part of the evaluation process.
11. Respect for individual will and sensitivity towards vulnerability: individuals will be respected in their right to participate or not in the evaluaiton. The evaluation will also seek to hear the ones who are more vulnerable and ensure their inputs are included in the evaluation report. Special care will be taken in the case of participation of children and Young people.
12. Redress: stakeholders will be informed if they want to seek redress for any problem suffered in the course of the evaluation or the actions it covers.
13. Confidentiality: participants will be briefed about their right to provide Information in confidence. Information in the report will be disclosed in a way not to reveal the identity of informants.
14. Avoidance of Harm: the evaluation will seek to minimize risks and burdens on the participants of the evaluation.
15. Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability: the evaluation team will seek to present the most accurante, complete and reliable report it is able to, according to its capacity and in its best will and faith.
16. Transparency: the evaluation will make the commissioners of the evaluation informed of all the evaluation procedures and steps in the course of the evaluation.
17. Reporting: the evaluation team will make the evaluation report available for the comissioning organizations and encourage them to share with the other stakeholders.
18. Omissions and wrongdoing: if the evaluation finds evidence of any wrong-doing or unethical conduct it will inform the Evaluation Manager.

Lastly, it is important to note that the data from this evaluation will be stored in the evaluators Personal Computers with passwords and this raw data will not be shared to any parties outside the commissioning organizations. Data in the report will be anonymized.

# Timeline

Table 6. Timeline of project evaluation\*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Month | September | | | | October | | | | November | | | | Dec | |
| Activity/Week | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **1** | **2** |
| Initial Meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Desk Review |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Draft Inception report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Final inception report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Semi-structured interviews |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data Collection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Debriefing preliminary findings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **05** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Draft evaluation report and power point |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **13** |  |  |  |  |
| Presentation to the Project team |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **13** |  |  |  |  |
| Review of Draft report by commissioning organizations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **20** |  |  |  |
| Final evaluation report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **04** |  |

# \*In the event that COVID19 related mobility restrictions are imposed, the proposed field data collection timeline may be subject to variation, affecting the subsequent outputs proposed.

# Quality assurance and Evaluation Management

UN Women has developed a Global Evaluation Reports Assessment and Analysis System (GERAAS). The purpose of GERASS is to give guidance and an Evaluation Quality Assessment to review evaluations carried out by the institution. It is guided by UNEG norms and standards. The evaluation team consulted the GERASS matrix and is aware of the expectations for this evaluation process and delivery of final evaluation product.

According to the Term of Reference for this evaluation an Evaluation Management (EMG) and Evaluation Reference (ERG) group will be established to oversee and facilitate the evaluation process. The EMG will be composed by UN Women and UNDP program and M&E focal points for the project under evaluation, a regional evaluation specialist at the UN Women Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, and representatives from main CSO partner, CEJ and will be chaired by a representative of the senior management at UN Women Sri Lanka. They are the ones who will be responsible to produce a management response after the evaluation within one month of the approval of the final evaluation report and also share the findings.

The ERG will have a technical specialist at UN Women Regional Office and a PBSO representative. It will be consulted to provide feedback to strengthen the evaluation process and related deliberables. A template will be used by UN Women to provide comments to the evaluation team and the evaluation team will keep record of all the changes made, always sending to the evaluation commissioners a clean copy of the deliverable and one with the history of changes.

The international consultant will do the overall guidance of the evaluation and will be responsible for assuring the quality of the field work and also of the key deliverables.

# Appendix A. Rapid Assessment

|  |
| --- |
| **Project:** Addressing Sexual Bribery Experienced by Female Heads of Households, including Military Widows and War Widows in Sri Lanka to Enable Resilience and Sustained Peace |
| **Period:** November 2018-September 2020 |
| **Methodology:** Desk review of secondary data (documents related to project) and consultation with the following stakeholders   * UN Women Sri Lanka * United Nations Development Programme Sri Lanka * Peacebuilding Fund |
| **Issues of concern:** The Centre for Equality and Justice (CEJ) is being consulted after the delivery of inception report to help feed into the inception process and prepare fieldwork. |
| **Overview of data available:**   * Project documents and later revised results framework * Needs assessments available (Qualitative study on the training needs of female heads of households including military and war widows in Kilinochchi, Kurunegala and Anuradhapura) * Baseline data (Mapping study of women’s self- help groups in Anuradhapura, Kilinochchi and Kurunegala, Sri Lanka and Study on perceptions of reconciliation and peacebuilding among female heads of households including military and war widows in Kilinochchi, Kurunegala and Anuradhapura * Monitoring tracker * Quarterly reports by implementing partner * Reports from activities and outputs delivered (guidelines, manuals, legislation, training records, minutes) * Financial reports * Evaluation guidelines (GERASS Independent Evaluation and Audit Services, UN Women Global Evaluation Quality, Assessment and Rating matrix, Global Evaluation Report Assessment and Analysis System (GERAAS) Guiding Note * Ethical guidance (UNEG, WHO)   The documents were sufficient for the inception phase. |
| **Issues of concern:** None. The documentation provided was enough for the inception phase. |
| **Monitoring and Evaluation Framework:**  *Consistency of data available:* the project produced a monitoring excel sheet which helped with the process of following the evolution of indicators and also a baseline assessment. However, the baseline study was carried out between September to November 2019, one year after the launch of the project. Due to the low delivery of the project in the period Sept/2019 – July/2020, the evaluation team concluded it would not be timely to carry out a survey for an endline study.  *Project indicators:* there is data available for almost all indicators and the project evaluation will be able to explore almost all indicators, except for two:  % of Female Heads of Households – FHH (including military and war widows) who are subjected to sexual bribery and sexual exploitation when accessing services.  # of FHH (including military and war widows) that are members of collectives formed/strengthened who have increased knowledge of their rights, disaggregated by type of widow  In the first case, the baseline study mentioned surveyed 217 beneficiaries to collect these data. As the evaluation will not carry an endline survey for the above-mentioned reasons of consistency of data available and as also explained in the Methodology Section of this report, this data will not be available.  The second indicator will not be available for the same reason. Therefore, the evaluation team proposes to adapt it to a qualitative indicator which should read as follows:  FHH (including military and war widows) that are members of collectives formed/strengthened report to have increased knowledge of their rights, disaggregated by type of widow (in a scale 1-3, where 1 is not increased, 2- increased to a certain extent, 3 – increased to a great extent). |
| **Refinement of evaluation demand:** Beyond being a standard procedure for PBF to have its projects evaluated, PBF informed the evaluation team that this evaluation will help feed into the evaluation of PBF portfolio in the country which involves several projects. The support of PBF in the country is coming to an end at the end of 2020 and it is very likely it will not be renewed. Hence, providing lessons learned for future interventions in other countries and even in Sri Lanka in other interventions is expected by PBF. |
| **Issues of concern:** The delivery of the project is still under 60%, there will not be enough time to fully deliver on the outputs expected. The evaluation will focus on what has been achieved so far and try to generate lessons for future interventions in activities that have been delivered and may have the potential to be replicated (e.g. Puppet Theatre etc). |
| **Initial findings in each area to be investigated by the project:**  *Relevance:* The intervention area of the project is very sensitive (sexual bribery related to public officials). The organization which was entitled of the project from the part of the government has been demobilized and dispersed. This points to an issue of concern to be further investigated in the course of the evaluation. To which extent was the project timely and aligned with government priorities at the time of inception or priorities have changed with the new government? Both past and current government officials will be consulted in order to bring a balanced and broader perspective to the evaluation.  *Effectiveness:* The project was able to reach a higher delivery in Outcome 1 and less so on Outcome 2. There have been achievements higher than expected in the area of creating collectives and also creative work in terms of sensitization via art interventions (puppet theatre and social media campaigns). The initial design of the trainings delivered by the implementing partners is solid and well structured. The greatest challenges were in terms of the timeframe for delivering the trainings (due to COVID-19 and other contextual factors), implementing the grants and promoting dialogue with the government. The quality of the process involved in creating the collectives and promoting the art interventions will be further looked at during the Focus Group Discussions. The reaction to the initial trainings and also the prospect for implementation of protocols discussed with the government will be further investigated during the field work.  *Efficiency:* The delivery of the project is low in relation to the initial timeframe. There were a number of contextual factors which have impacted the delivery of the project (Constitutional crisis, Easter attacks, elections and COVID-19) which are beyond the control of the project. However, problems have also been identified between RUNOs and the local implementing partner in terms of reporting, communication and alignment of expectations. This will be looked at in the course of the evaluation.  *Sustainability:* PBF is withdrawing its support to the country for the moment and there are expectations that the new government of Sri Lanka will opt for a more internal process of peacebuilding with less interference from the international community. Judging from the demotion of the former Ministry of Women and Children’s Affairs to a State ministry, there is an initial expectation that this issue should figure lower in the domestic agenda. However, the problem of sexual bribery has been flagged by Civil Society Organizations established in the country and the project has involved many local organizations. The evaluation will further look at the will of the current government structure in taking this type of intervention forward, the perspective of local CSOs in working in the topic and further, how local government sturctures have reacted to the project and their perspective to continue taking it on.  *Impact:* There is little evidence in the documents of the project and initial consultation of stakeholders of impact over peacebuilding in the course of project implementation.The interview and focus group guides explicitly incorporate this topic which will be investigated by the evaluation.  *Gender, Equity and Human Rights:* The initial project timeframe was of 18 months, extended to 24 months. Considering the sensitivity of the issue and deep-seated power structures in the country, how much the project was able to change power relations is to be investigated. There is no evidence for that from the desk review. Female Heads of Households will be directly consulted and the evaluation report will look to see to which extent the project was able to promote changes in this regard. |
| **Overall issues of concern:** The data available up to now is important, but limited to offer evidence of the key problems and also achievements. Only after the key stakeholders are heard, including the FHH, the project team will be able to map and consistently point at the key struggles and achievements behind the implementation of the project and offer lessons learned for future interventions. |

# Appendix B. Evaluation Matrix

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation question 1:** To what extent were the project’s strategies relevant to national and local contexts? | | | |
| **DAC Evaluation Criterion covered by this Evaluation Question:** Relevance | | | |
| **Indicators/Criteria** | **Source of Information** | **Data Collection Tool** | **Data Analysis Methods** |
| * 1. Alignment of project with National Framework for Women-headed Households (2017–2019) and other relevant policies as reported by the national government (scale 1-3, where 1 is not aligned, 2 is partially aligned and 3 is fully aligned) | * National Government Staff * National Framework for Women-headed Households (2017-2019) | * Semi-structured interviews * Desk Review | * Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| * 1. Alignment of project with local policies as reported by local government officials (scale 1-3, where 1 is not aligned, 2 is partially aligned and 3 fully aligned) | * Local government officials | - Semi-structured interviews  - Desk Review | * Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| * 1. Alignment of project with needs of local context as perceived by local civil society organizations implementing the project (scale 1-3, where 1 is not aligned, 2 is partially aligned and 3 fully aligned) | * CEJ staff * Local partners Staff | * Semi-structured interviews | * Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| **Evaluation question 2:** To what extent did the project align with the needs and priorities of the intended beneficiaries and international standards on gender equality and women’s empowerment? | | | |
| **DAC Evaluation Criterion covered by this Evaluation Question:** Relevance | | | |
| **Indicators/Criteria** | **Source of Information** | **Data Collection Tool** | **Data Analysis Methods** |
| * 1. Alignment of project with beneficiaries´ needs as reported by them (scale 1-3, where 1 is not aligned, 2 is partially aligned and 3 fully aligned) | * Beneficiaries | - Focus Group Discussions | * Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| 2.2. Alignment of project with RES 1325, CEDAW and SDG 5 (scale 1-3, where 1 is not aligned, 2 is partially aligned and 3 fully aligned) | - UN Women staff  - UNDP Staff  - RES 1325, CEDAW e SDG 5 | * Desk review | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| **Evaluation question 3:** To what extent did the project reach the planned results?  Sub-questions: a) What were the reasons for the achievement or nonachievement of planned results?  b) Were there any unexpected results or unintended consequences of the results both positive and negative? | | | |
| **DAC Evaluation Criterion covered by this Evaluation Question:** Effectiveness | | | |
| **Indicators/Criteria** | **Source of Information** | **Data Collection Tool** | **Data Analysis Methods** |
| * 1. % of FHH (including military and war widows)   beneficiaries who have used the grant provided to establish or upscale an existing business venture, disaggregated by widow type. | * Project reports * UNDP Staff * Companies carrying out trainings | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. # of widows’ collectives inclusive of FHH   formed/ strengthened | * Project reports * CEJ Staff | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. # of FHH (including military and war widows)   that are members of collectives formed/  strengthened who have increased knowledge of their rights, disaggregated by type of widow | * CSOs implementing the project * FHH | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. % of FHH (including military and war widows)   trained to access legal and other services,  disaggregated by type of widow. | * Project reports * CEJ Staff | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. # of users accessing the online/offline   complaints reporting platform. | * Project reports * CEJ Staff | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. # of civil society organizations who are   increasingly providing services, information and referrals for FHH including war and military widows | * Project reports * CSOs implementing the projects * CEJ Staff | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. # of FHH (including military and war widows) provided with legal assistance through CSOs | * Project reports * CSOs implementing the projects * CEJ Staff | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. # of complaints filed by FHH (including military and war widows). | - CEJ Staff  - Local government officers  - National government officers | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. # of FHH (including military and war widows) who are trained to commence a business or enterprise. | * UNDP Staff * UN Women staff * Project reports | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. # of FHH (including military and widows) provided with grants, disaggregated by type of widow. | * UNDP Staff * UN Women staff * Project reports | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. # of Diversity Market Fairs held. | * UNDP Staff * UN Women staff * Project reports | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. # of Circulars/ guidelines/ policies which   incorporate explicit commitment and/or accountability measures within the public sector to prevent and respond to sexual bribery and exploitation. | * UNDP Staff * UN Women staff * Project reports * National government officers | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. # of complaints received and action taken by the Anti-Sexual Harassment Committees. | * UNDP Staff * UN Women staff * Project reports * CEJ Staff * National government officers | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. # of sensitisation programmes held for public officials on sexual harassment policies, legal frameworks, guidelines on response mechanisms, and accountability measures. | * UNDP Staff * UN Women staff * Project reports * National government officers * Local government officers | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. # of public officials who complete the course on handling bribery complaints, including sexual bribery, harassment and exploitation. | * UNDP Staff * UN Women staff * Project reports * National government officers * Local government officers | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. # of legal aid clinics conducted by capacitated local public officers on preliminary assistance to survivors on possible legal remedies. | * UNDP Staff * UN Women staff * Project reports * Local government officers | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. # of public institutions with established and functioning Anti-Sexual Harassment committees | * UNDP Staff * UN Women staff * Project reports * National government officers | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| * 1. # of state/public sector institutions provided with technical support to integrate/adopt measures on addressing sexual bribery and exploitation | * UNDP Staff * UN Women staff * Project reports * National government officers | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | * Descriptive statistics |
| **Evaluation question 4:** To what extent did the project make timely adjustments to its strategy to maintain its relevance and effectiveness? | | | |
| **DAC Evaluation Criterion covered by this Evaluation Question:** Effectiveness | | | |
| **Indicators/Criteria** | **Source of Information** | **Data Collection Tool** | **Data Analysis Methods** |
| 4.1. Capacity of the project to adjust to the circumstances to maintain relevance as assessed by key stakeholders (scale 1-3, where 1 is no capacity, 2 partial capacity and 3 is full capacity) | - UN Women Staff  - UNDP Staff  - CEJ Staff  - CSOs staff  - National government staff  - Local government staff | - Semi-structured interviews | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| 4.2. Capacity of the project to adjust to the circumstances to maintain effectiveness as assessed by key stakeholders (scale 1-3, where 1 is no capacity, 2 partial capacity and 3 is full capacity) | - UN Women Staff  - UNDP Staff  - CEJ Staff  - CSOs staff  - National government staff  - Local government staff | - Semi-structured interviews | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| **Evaluation question 5:** To what extend did the output level interventions translate into progress towards outcomes? | | | |
| **DAC Evaluation Criterion covered by this Evaluation Question:** Effectiveness | | | |
| **Indicators/Criteria** | **Source of Information** | **Data Collection Tool** | **Data Analysis Methods** |
| 5.1. Perception of FHH that their access to collectives´ services, information about their rights and business training have helped them to have sustainable livelihoods and access social support services with dignity (scale 1-3, where 1 it has not helped, 2 it has partially helped and 3 is has fully helped). | - FHH | - Focus Group Discussions | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| 5.2. Perception of national government officials that their access to training and activities to strengthen accountability mechanisms to report and respond to sexual bribery and exploitation has helped to increase commitment of public institutions to prevent and respond to sexual bribery and to protect female heads of households, including military and war widows from sexual exploitation (scale 1-3, where 1 it has not helped, 2 it has partially helped and 3 is has fully helped). | - National government officials | - Semi-structured interviews | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| **Evaluation question 6:** What measurable changes in gender equality and women’s empowerment have occurred as a result of the project?  Subquestion: To what extent did the project address and respond to existing power dynamics and gender relations? | | | |
| **DAC Evaluation Criterion covered by this Evaluation Question:** Effectiveness and Gender Equality and Human Rights | | | |
| **Indicators/Criteria** | **Source of Information** | **Data Collection Tool** | **Data Analysis Methods** |
| 6.1. Attitude change from local public officers (increased respect) towards FHH as reported by them (scale 1-3, where 1 it has not changed, 2 it has partially changed and 3 is has fully changed). | - FHH | - Focus Group Discussions | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| 6.2. Repeated and collectively agreed stories told by FHH which indicate women they know have been economically (more resources) or politically empowered (more voice) as a result of the project. | - FHH | - Focus Group Discussions | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| **Evaluation question 7:** Have financial and human resources been allocated sufficiently and strategically to achieve project outcomes?  Subquestion:   1. Have the outputs been delivered in a timely manner? 2. How can results be assessed in relation to resources allocated (value for money)? | | | |
| **DAC Evaluation Criterion covered by this Evaluation Question:** Efficiency | | | |
| **Indicators/Criteria** | **Source of Information** | **Data Collection Tool** | **Data Analysis Methods** |
| 7.1. Whether the budget was sufficient and adjusted as needed in a cost-efficient manner (in a scale 1-3 where 1 budget was not sufficient and not adjusted, 2 budget was partially sufficient and adjusted and 3 where budget was sufficient and adjusted as needed). | - UN Women Staff  - UNDP Staff  - PBF  - CEJ  - CSO´s | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| 7.2. Whether the staffing was adequate and adjusted based on partner perception on the technical capacity of the project staff (in a scale 1-3 where 1 staff was not adequate and not adjusted, 2 staff was partially adequate and adjusted and 3 where staff was adequate and adjusted as needed). | - UN Women Staff  - UNDP Staff  - Government partners  - CEJ  - CSO´s  - PBF | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| 7.3. Whether sufficient time was allocated for implementation and adjusted as needed based on perception of key stakeholders (in a scale 1-3 where 1 time was not adequate and not adjusted, 2 time was partially adequate and implementation adjusted and 3 where time was adequate and implementation adjusted as needed). | - UN Women Staff  - UNDP Staff  - Government partners  - CEJ  - CSO´s  - PBF | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| 7.4. To what level the coordination and collaboration mechanism for planning and implementation of the project worked well (in a scale 1-3 where 1 coordination and collaboration mechanisms were not adequate, 2 coordination and collaboration mechanisms were partially adequate and 3 where coordination and collaboration mechanism was adequate) | - UN Women Staff  - UNDP Staff  - Government partners  - CEJ  - CSO´s  - PBF | * Desk review * Semi-structured interviews | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| 7.5 Were the results observed worth the monies spent? (Value for money) |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation question 8:** What measurable changes in women’s contribution to and participation in peacebuilding have occurred as a result of support provided by the project to target stakeholders?  Subquestion: What are the early indications of peacebuilding impact? | | | |
| **DAC Evaluation Criterion covered by this Evaluation Question:** Impact | | | |
| **Indicators/Criteria** | **Source of Information** | **Data Collection Tool** | **Data Analysis Methods** |
| 8.1. Repeated and collectively agreed stories told by FHH about women they know changing attitudes and promoting actions towards conciliation between disputing parties as a result of the project. | - FHH | - Focus Group Discussions | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| 8.2. Reported objective changes by FHH of women´s contribution to peacebuilding as a result of the project. | - FHH | - Focus Group Discussions | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| **Evaluation question 9:** To what extent was capacity developed in order to ensure sustainability of efforts and benefits? | | | |
| **DAC Evaluation Criterion covered by this Evaluation Question:** Sustainability | | | |
| **Indicators/Criteria** | **Source of Information** | **Data Collection Tool** | **Data Analysis Methods** |
| 9.1. Government officials reporting change in attitude and concrete actions towards protecting FHH (in a scale 1-3 where 1 there were no changes, 2 there were partial changes and 3 there was a complete change) | - Government officials | - Semi-structured interviews  - Focus Group Discussions | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| 9.2. FHH reporting use of new knowledge after taking part in business trainings (in a scale 1-3 where 1 no use of new knowledge, 2 limited use of knowledge, 3 considerable use of knowledge) | - FHH | - Focus Group Discussions | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| 9.3. FHH reporting knowledge about how to deal with cases of sexual abuse by government authorities (in a scale 1-3 where 1 no knowledge, 2 limited knowledge, 3 considerable knowledge) | - FHH | - Focus Group Discussions | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| **Evaluation question 10:** Are national partners committed to continuing the project or elements of the project?  Subquestion:Are there any mechanisms developed and/or interventions linked with existing mechanisms at local and national levels to ensure continuation? | | | |
| **DAC Evaluation Criterion covered by this Evaluation Question:** Sustainability | | | |
| **Indicators/Criteria** | **Source of Information** | **Data Collection Tool** | **Data Analysis Methods** |
| 10.1 Resources allocated to continue work in this area (in Sri Lanka Rupees) by the national government. | - UNDP Staff  - UN Women Staff  - Government officials | - Semi-structured interviews  - Desk review | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| 10.2. Allocation of the theme within the government structure (in a scale 1-3, 1 coordination managed by third or other levels of government authority within the ministry 2 coordination managed under second level government authority 3 close to the president or highest ministerial authority) | - UNDP Staff  - UN Women Staff  - Government officials | - Semi-structured interviews  - Desk review | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| 10.3. Structures, protocols or interventions created as a result of the project. | - UNDP Staff  - UN Women Staff  - Government officials | - Semi-structured interviews  - Desk review | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| **Evaluation question 11:** To what extent did the project actively identify and include the most marginalized in Sri Lanka, ensuring no one is left behind? | | | |
| **DAC Evaluation Criterion covered by this Evaluation Question:** Gender Equality and Human Rights | | | |
| **Indicators/Criteria** | **Source of Information** | **Data Collection Tool** | **Data Analysis Methods** |
| 11.1 Protocols used by the project to target the most vulnerable FHH. | - UN Women Staff  - UNDP Staff  - CEJ | * Semi-structured interviews * Desk review | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |
| 11.2. Perception of FHH of whether the project targeted the most vulnerable FHH. | - FHH | - Semi-structured interviews | - Evaluator´s standard method for qualitative analysis (see item 4.1) |

# Appendix C. Documents Reviewed

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| N | Name |
|  | Mapping study of women’s self- help groups in Anuradhapura, Kilinochchi and Kurunegala, Sri Lanka |
|  | Study on perceptions of reconciliation and peacebuilding among female heads of households including military and war widows in Kilinochchi, Kurunegala and Anuradhapura |
|  | Draft perception survey tool on Reconciliation and Peacebuilding among Military and War Widows in Kurunegala, Anuradhapura and Kilinochchi Districts of Sri Lanka implemented by the SSA |
|  | Quarterly reports by CEJ for the reporting periods:   * February to 31st May 2019 * July to September 2019 * October to December 2019 * January to February 2020 * January to March 2020 * April to June 2020   Bi- Annual report by CEJ for the period February to June 2019  Annual report by CEJ for the period February to December 2019 |
|  | Revised results framework |
|  | Project activity-indicator tracker |
|  | Qualitative study on the training needs of female heads of households including military and war widows in Kilinochchi, Kurunegala and Anuradhapura |
|  | Women’s entrepreneurship and business planning skill development training program agenda   * Selection criteria * Combined training schedule by UNW, Chrysalis and ISB * Financial literacy and business management module by Chrysalis and ISB * Product Development Training Module (Session Plan)   Training plan |
|  | Mental health capacity building rapporteur report – Kurunegala |
|  | Draft report of the design thinking workshop facilitated by Citra |
|  | Participants manual on Mobilising war and military widows including the women-headed households for sustainable peace |
|  | Draft lobby document for amending the law and policy to address sexual bribery in Sri Lanka |
|  | Draft code of conduct on sexual bribery and sexual harassment within the public sector |
|  | Proposed Amendments to the Human Rights Commission’s Sexual Harassment Policy |
|  | Public Administration Circular Issued to Prohibit Sexual Harassment and Sexual Bribery in the Public Sector |
|  | PBF GPI - Annual Financial Report - October 2019 |
|  | PBF-IRF 252- Semi Annual- 1262020\_ Project Budget (ENGLISH) \_Final |
|  | CEJ leaflet on sexual bribery   * for Anuradhapura * for Killinochchi * for Kurunegala |
|  | Details of women’s collectives |
|  | PBF Monitoring and Evaluation requirements summary  PBF project document |
|  | Communications toolkit |
|  | Training module on paralegal services for women’s Development officers and Field officers of the Ministry of women’s and child affairs (in Sinhala) |
|  | Handbook for trainees on paralegal services for women’s Development officers and Field officers of the Ministry of women’s and child affairs (in Sinhala) |
|  | Minutes of Anti-Sexual Harassment Committee Meeting held on 24th October 2019 with |
|  | Ministry of Women & Child Affairs and Dry Zone Development |
|  | Update to the Ministry of Women and Child Affairs and Social Security of UNDPs support, meeting minutes from 16th July 2020 |
|  | Minutes of meeting held to discuss UNDP’s overall engagement with the Ministry of Women and Child Affairs and Social Security (MWCASS) on SGBV & GPI |
|  | Handbill on eliminating workplace sexual harassment (Sinhala) |
|  | GERAAS Independent Evaluation and Audit Services, UN Women Global Evaluation Quality |
|  | Assessment and Rating matrix |
|  | Global Evaluation Report Assessment and Analysis System (GERAAS) Guiding Note |
|  | Pocket Tool for Managing Evaluation during the COVID-19 pandemic |
|  | UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System |
|  | WHO Ethical and safety recommendations for intervention research on violence against women |
|  | Training Needs Assessment - Economic Empowerment Component |
|  | Value Chain Analysis - Economic Empowerment Component |
|  | Training Manual - Leadership and Peacebuilding Sessions |

# Appendix D. Evaluation instruments

**For UN Staff**

**Semi-structured interview guide for the end of project evaluation “Addressing Sexual Bribery Experienced by Female Heads of Households, including Military Widows and War Widows in Sri Lanka to Enable Resilience and Sustained Peace”**

Thank you for meeting with us today. I/we have been commissioned by UN Women and the Peace Building Fund to conduct this end of project evaluation for the project “Addressing Sexual Bribery Experienced by Female Heads of Households, including Military Widows and War Widows in Sri Lanka to Enable Resilience and Sustained Peace”.

Based on your involvement and role within the project, we would like to use this opportunity to interview you, in order to capture your views, perceptions and feedback on the project. It is intended that your views shared will be used for learning and improving future project designs. We are interested in your understanding of the project, with regard to addressing the issues surrounding experiences of sexual bribery experienced by female headed households as well as the challenges experienced with regard to delivery, and recommendations. There is no right or wrong answer, and any responses shared as part of this interview will not be used to identify you by name, maininting confidentiality. The findings from interviews with yourself and other identified stakeholders will be tabulated and presented in a report to UN Women and the Peace Building Fund.

The interview is expected to last approximately 40 minutes to an hour. If you choose to, you may terminate your participation at any point of the interview. Before we begin, do you have any questions or need any further clarifications?

Control information:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name |  |
| Organization/ Institution |  |
| Designation |  |
| Date of interview |  |
| Contact information |  |

Relevance:

1. Since when have you been engaged with the project?
2. What is your role/association with the project?
   1. National policy level or local beneficiary level, implementation partner
3. To what extent were the FHHs included in the project design stage?
   1. To what extent were the needs of the FHHs in the project locations identified
4. Has the project design taken into consideration the heterogeneity of FHHs (including military and war widows) in war affected contexts?
   1. Probe for multiple categories of FHHs such as women who are divorced, separated, abandoned, and those with disabled partners (also related to long-drawn effects of the armed ethnic conflict)
   2. Explore why or why not?
5. How familiar are you with the issue pertaining to sexual bribery?
   1. How does the project align with the national and local level policies?
   2. How does the project align with the identified needs of the targeted beneficiaries?
   3. Are there any identified gaps between identified needs and implementation activities?
6. How familiar are you with regard to reporting mechanisms on issues pertaining to sexual bribery?
   1. What are some of the existing mechanisms and gaps/challenges in this area as per your knowledge?
7. How familiar are you with regard to the challenges associated with livelihood assistance for FHHs?
   1. How does the project align with the national and local level policies?
   2. How does the project align with the identified needs of the targeted beneficiaries?
   3. Are there any identified gaps between identified needs and implementation activities?
8. How has the project design understood and acted on differentiated access to and use of sustainable livelihoods and social support services?
9. How has the project design responded to the context related changes such as political upheaval and global health crisis such as COVID19?

Efficiency:

1. With regard to the budget
   1. How were the proposed activities implemented within the budegetary limits?
   2. How was the budget spread across the project duration?
   3. When external challenges were experienced, was or how was the budget adjusted accordingly to meet the desired outcomes?
      1. was there flexibility in this regard?
      2. were outputs/activities revised accordingly?
2. On staffing
   1. Was/is staffing adequate for the implementation of the project objectives?
   2. Was/is there a requirement for training of staff to be responsive to the sensitivity of the subject matter?
3. Was the time allocated for implementation adequate?
   1. How did you respond to changes in timelines as a result of external shocks such as the constitutional crisis, Easter attacks, COVID19?
   2. What measures were taken to ensure all outputs were delivered in keeping with the initial no cost extension?
   3. did this have a financial implication?
4. Coordination and collaboration:
   1. At which stage did the coordination/ collaboration begin between agencies and implementation partners?
   2. To what extent did the institutions/implementing partners coordinate during implementation of Project outputs?
   3. What are some of the factors that facilitated/hindered coordination between multiple institutions and agencies for implementation of the project?
   4. How has this facilitated/hindered the achievement of results?

Effectiveness

1. In your view, has the project contributed towards conditions conducive to **social** empowerment for the FHHs to deal with the issues of sexual bribery and sexual exploitation?
   1. Could you share some examples?
2. In your view, has the project contributed towards conditions conducive to **economic** empowerment for the FHHs to deal with the issues of sexual bribery and sexual exploitation? (since this is still being implemented, ask about future expectations in this regard)
   1. probe for examples, or expected/desired outcomes?
3. What measurable changes in preventing and responding to sexual bribery and protection of FHHs from sexual exploitation had taken place as a result of the project?
   1. To what extent are FHHs aware of response mechanisms available to them in the event of an incident of proposition of sexual bribery?
   2. To what extent do FHHs make use of the reporting/protection mechanisms available?
      1. Can you share any examples of incidents when FHHs have benefited?
4. Has there been any changes in public institutions to prevent and respond to incidents of sexual bribery?
   1. Has there been any formal commitment from public institutions indicating changes to existing practices aimed at preventingprevent and/or responding respond to incidents of sexual bribery?

probe for: the establishment of anti-sexual harassment committees; broadening of the definition of bribery to include sexual favours; commitment of financial resources; capacity builing workshops

1. To what extent were the following outputs delivered? What were the key results in the following outputs? Which outputs had the most/least results as compared to the initial plan? What may have contributed to this?
   * 1. Output 1.1 Female heads of households, including military widows and war widows have **increased knowledge** of their rights and have access to complaint mechanisms on bribery.
     2. Output 1.2 **Civil society Is strengthened** to provide services for the protection of victims of sexual exploitation and sexual bribery
     3. Output 1.3 Female heads of households, including military widows and war widows **increase their entrepreneurial knowledge and skills**
     4. Output 2.1 The **capacity of public institutions** and officials are built to prevent and respond to bribery and to **protect female heads** of households, including military and war widows from sexual exploitation.
     5. Output 2.2 Strengthen existing accountability mechanisms to report and responsibility mechanisms to report and respond to sexual bribery and exploitation.

Impact

1. What measurable changes in women’s contribution to household survival have occurred?
2. Have there been increases in reporting of incidents of sexual bribery as a result of increased awareness?
   1. Why or why not?
3. What measurable changes in women’s contribution to and participation in building a more cohesive and inclusive society have occurred as a result of support provided by the project to target stakeholders?
   1. Have there been any examples of social cohesion as a result of the collectives created through the project?
4. Which communication channel utilized as part of the project had the widest reach?
   1. Disaggregate by beneficiaries and (broader) project/community participants
5. What changes to existing institutional processes, practices, and structures within ministries, particularly with regard to anti-sexual harassment have been implemented?
6. What are the early indications of peacebuilding impact as a result of the implementation of the project?

(If the diversity fairs have been implemented at the time)

1. Has there been any visible, organic social cohesion across ethnicities or geographical boundaries as a result of the diversity fairs?
2. Have there been any alternative examples of social cohesion as a result of the formation of women’s collectives?

Sustainability

1. To what extent has local capacity been strengthened in order to ensure sustainability of the FHH groups established?
   1. To what extent has the capacity of partner organisations been strengthened through this project?
      1. probe for trainings, capacity building workshops etc attended
      2. probe for application of knowledge gained at said trainings or capacity building workshops.
   2. What factors can be considered to attribute to increased capacity of local partners/beneficiaries?
   3. Have partner organisations initiated engagement with identified groups independent of the project perview?
   4. What is your perception of continued local partner engagement with identified beneficiary groups beyond the project duration?
   5. Have any measures been taken to ensure that partner organisations will self-sustain beyond the project duration?
      1. probe for examples

With regard to engagement with Ministry officials in particular:

1. Is there any evidence of national government partners’ committed to continuing the project or elements of the project beyond the project lifetime?
2. What resources have been allocated to ensure continuation of the agenda on sexual extortion beyond the project period?
3. Have there been any changes to legislation or establishment of committees or protocols since the project was initiated towards the protection of women?
   1. What has UN Women’s role been in this regard?

Gender equality and human rights

1. Comparing the initial stages of the project with the end, has there been any observed changes in mindset among beneficiary communities with regard to the role of FHHs and their position/perception in society?
2. Through communications/interactions with service providers or local implementing partners, has there been any positive or negative feedback with regard to the role of FHHs and their position/perception in society attributed to the implementation of this project?
   1. please elaborate/ provide examples
3. Can you provide any examples of the extent to which the project was able to or was not able to address and respond to existing gendered power dynamics, cultural norms and post-war political economies?
4. Has there been a percieved change in perception towards FHHs by male local and/or national level government staff members as a result of the project being initiated?

**For Implementation Partners**

**Semi-structured interview guide for the end of project evaluation “Addressing Sexual Bribery Experienced by Female Heads of Households, including Military Widows and War Widows in Sri Lanka to Enable Resilience and Sustained Peace”**

Thank you for meeting with us today. I/we have been commissioned by UN Women and the Peace Building Fund to conduct this end of project evaluation for the project “Addressing Sexual Bribery Experienced by Female Heads of Households, including Military Widows and War Widows in Sri Lanka to Enable Resilience and Sustained Peace”.

Based on your involvement and role within the project, we would like to use this opportunity to interview you, in order to capture your views, perceptions and feedback on the project. It is intended that your views shared will be used for learning and improving future project designs. We are interested in your understanding of the project, with regard to addressing the issues surrounding experiences of sexual bribery experienced by female headed households as well as the challenges experienced with regard to delivery, and recommendations. There is no right or wrong answer, and any responses shared as part of this interview will not be used to identify you by name, maininting confidentiality. The findings from interviews with yourself and other identified stakeholders will be tabulated and presented in a report to UN Women and the Peace Building Fund.

The interview is expected to last approximately 40 minutes to an hour. If you choose to, you may terminate your participation at any point of the interview. Before we begin, do you have any questions or need any further clarifications?

Control information:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name |  |
| Organization/ Institution |  |
| Designation |  |
| Date of interview |  |
| Contact information |  |

Relevance:

1. What is your role/association with the project?
   1. probe for National policy level or local beneficiary level, implementation partner or other
2. Since when have you been engaged with the project?
3. To what extent were the FHHs included in the project design stage?
4. To what extent was the heterogeneity of FHHs (including military and war widows) in war affected contexts taken into consideration for the selection of beneficiaries?
   1. Probe for multiple categories of FHHs such as women who are divorced, separated, abandoned, and those with disabled partners (also related to long-drawn effects of the armed ethnic conflict)
   2. Explore why or why not certain categories of FHHs were excluded/included?
5. To what extent does the project outcomes align with the needs of the local community?
6. How familiar are you with the issue pertaining to sexual bribery?
   1. How does the project align with the national and local level policies?
   2. How does the project align with the identified needs of the targeted beneficiaries?
   3. Are there any identified gaps between identified needs and implementation activities?
7. How familiar are you with regard to reporting mechanisms on issues pertaining to sexual bribery?
   1. What are some of the existing mechanisms and gaps/challenges in this area as per your knowledge?
8. How familiar are you with regard to the challenges associated with livelihood assistance for FHHs?
   1. How does the project align with the national and local level policies?
   2. How does the project align with the identified needs of the targeted beneficiaries?
   3. Are there any identified gaps between identified needs and implementation activities?
9. How has the project design understood and acted on differentiated access to and use of sustainable livelihoods and social support services?
10. How has the project design responded to the context related changes such as political upheaval and global health crisis such as COVID19?

Efficiency:

1. With regard to the budget
   1. How were the proposed activities implemented within the budegetary limits?
   2. How was the budget spread across the project duration?
   3. When external challenges were experienced, was or how was the budget adjusted accordingly to meet the desired outcomes?
      1. was there flexibility in this regard?
      2. were outputs/activities revised accordingly?
2. On staffing
   1. Was/is staffing adequate for the implementation of the project objectives?
   2. Was/is there a requirement for training staff to be responsive to the sensitivity of the subject matter?
3. Was the time allocated for implementation adequate?
   1. How did you respond to changes in timelines as a result of external shocks such as the constitutional crisis, Easter attacks, COVID19?
   2. What measures were taken to ensure all outputs were delivered in keeping with the initial no cost extension?
      1. did this have a financial implication?
4. Coordination and collaboration:
   1. At which stage did the coordination/ collaboration begin between yourself and the funding agency?
   2. Was there any collaboration across implementation agencies?
   3. To what extent did the institutions/implementing partners coordinate during implementation of Project outputs?
   4. What are some of the factors that facilitated/hindered coordination between multiple institutions and agencies for implementation of the project?
   5. How has this facilitated/hindered the achievement of results?

Effectiveness

1. In your view, has the project contributed towards conditions conducive to **social** empowerment for the FHHs to deal with the issues of sexual bribery and sexual exploitation? i.e. how has the formation of widows collectives helped the members?
   1. Could you share some examples?
   2. To what extent would you say that members of the collectives have increased knowledge of their rights with regard to sexual exploitation?
      1. is there a distinction by type of FHH?
   3. To what extent are FHHs likely to utilise online/offline complaints reporting plaforms?
      1. please elaborate
2. How has the project helped beneficiaries who received grants to start or improve business ventures?
   1. Do you see a distinction based on the FHH category or household composition?
3. In your view, has the project contributed towards conditions conducive to **economic** empowerment for the FHHs to deal with the issues of sexual bribery and sexual exploitation? (since this is still being implemented, ask about future expectations in this regard)
   1. probe for examples, or expected/desired outcomes?
4. What measurable changes in preventing and responding to sexual bribery and protection of FHHs from sexual exploitation had taken place as a result of the project?
   1. To what extent are FHHs aware of response mechanisms available to them in the event of an incident of proposition of sexual bribery?
   2. To what extent do FHHs make use of the mechanisms available?
      1. Can you share any examples of incidents when FHHs have benefited?
      2. What are some of the possible reasons for FHHs to utilise or not utilize the protection/reporting mechanism?
5. Has there been any changes in public institutions to prevent and respond to incidents of sexual bribery?
   1. Has there been any formal commitment from public institutions indicating changes to existing practices aimed at preventing and/or responding to incidents of sexual bribery?
      1. probe for: the establishment of anti-sexual harassment committees; broadening of the definition of bribery to include sexual favours; commitment of financial resources; capacity builing workshops
   2. What are some of the factors contributing to revision/non-revision within public institutions?
6. To what extent were the following outputs delivered?
   1. What were the key results in the following outputs?
   2. Which outputs had the most/least results as compared to the initial plan? What may have contributed to this?
      1. Output 1.1 Female heads of households, including military widows and war widows have increased knowledge of their rights and have access to complaint mechanisms on bribery.
      2. Output 1.2 Civil society Is strengthened to provide services for the protection of victims of sexual exploitation and sexual bribery
      3. Output 1.3 Female heads of households, including military widows and war widows increase their entrepreneurial knowledge and skills
      4. Output 2.1 The capacity of public institutions and officials are built to prevent and respond to bribery and to protect female heads of households, including military and war widows from sexual exploitation.
      5. Output 2.2 Strengthen existing accountability mechanisms to report and responsibility mechanisms to report and respond to sexual bribery and exploitation.

Impact

1. What measurable changes in women’s contribution to household survival have occurred?
2. Have there been increases in reporting of incidents of sexual bribery as a result of increased awareness?
   1. Why or why not?
3. What measurable changes in women’s contribution to and participation in building a more cohesive and inclusive society have occurred as a result of support provided by the project to target stakeholders?
   1. Have there been any examples of social cohesion as a result of the collectives created through the project?
4. Which communication channel utilized as part of the project had the widest reach?
   1. Disaggregate by beneficiaries and (broader) project/community participants
5. What changes to existing institutional processes, practices, and structures within ministries, particularly with regard to anti-sexual harassment have been implemented?
6. What are the early indications of peacebuilding impact as a result of the implementation of the project?

(If the diversity fairs have been implemented at the time)

1. Has there been any visible, organic social cohesion across ethnicities or geographical boundaries as a result of the diversity fairs?
2. Have there been any alternative examples of social cohesion as a result of the formation of women’s collectives?

Sustainability

1. To what extent has local capacity been strengthened in order to ensure sustainability of the FHH groups established?
   1. To what extent has the capacity of partner organisations been strengthened through this project?
      1. probe for trainings, capacity building workshops etc.
   2. What factors can be considered to attribute to increased capacity?
   3. Have partner organisations initiated engagement with identified groups independent of the project perview?
   4. What is your perception of continued local partner engagement with identified beneficiary groups beyond the project duration?
   5. Have any measures been taken to ensure that partner organisations will self-sustain beyond the project duration?
      1. probe for examples

With regard to engagement with Ministry officials in particular:

1. What evidence do you see of national government agencies’ committment to (continuing to) make changes with regard to sexual bribery beyond the project lifetime?
2. What resources have been allocated to ensure continuation of the agenda on sexual extortion beyond the project period?
3. Have there been any changes to legislation or establishment of committees or protocols since the project was initiated towards the protection of women?
   1. What has your organisation’s role been in this regard?

Gender equality and human rights

1. Comparing the initial stages of the project with the end, has there been any observed changes in mindset among beneficiary communities with regard to the role of FHHs and their position/perception in society?
2. Has there been any (positive or negative) feedback with regard to the role of FHHs and their position/perception in society attributed to the implementation of this project?
   1. please elaborate/ provide examples
3. Can you provide any examples of the extent to which the project was able to or was not able to address and respond to existing gendered power dynamics, cultural norms and post-war political economies?
4. Has there been a percieved change in perception towards FHHs by male local and/or national level government staff members as a result of the project being initiated?

**For Government Partners/Representatives**

**Semi-structured interview guide for the end of project evaluation “Addressing Sexual Bribery Experienced by Female Heads of Households, including Military Widows and War Widows in Sri Lanka to Enable Resilience and Sustained Peace”**

Thank you for meeting with us today. I/we have been commissioned by UN Women and the Peace Building Fund to conduct this end of project evaluation for the project “Addressing Sexual Bribery Experienced by Female Heads of Households, including Military Widows and War Widows in Sri Lanka to Enable Resilience and Sustained Peace”.

Based on your involvement and role within the project, we would like to use this opportunity to interview you, in order to capture your views, perceptions and feedback on the project. It is intended that your views shared will be used for learning and improving future project designs. We are interested in your understanding of the project, with regard to addressing the issues surrounding experiences of sexual bribery experienced by female headed households as well as the challenges experienced with regard to delivery, and recommendations. There is no right or wrong answer, and any responses shared as part of this interview will not be used to identify you by name, maininting confidentiality. The findings from interviews with yourself and other identified stakeholders will be tabulated and presented in a report to UN Women and the Peace Building Fund.

The interview is expected to last approximately 40 minutes to an hour. If you choose to, you may terminate your participation at any point of the interview. Before we begin, do you have any questions or need any further clarifications?

Control information:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name |  |
| Organization/ Institution |  |
| Designation |  |
| Date of interview |  |
| Contact information |  |

Relevance:

1. What is your role/association with the project?
   1. probe for National policy level or local beneficiary level, implementation partner or other
2. Since when have you been engaged with the project?
3. How familiar are you with the issue pertaining to sexual bribery?
   1. How does the project align with the national and local level policies?
   2. How does the project align with the identified needs of the targeted beneficiaries?
   3. Are there any identified gaps between needs of the targeted beneficiaries and implementation activities?
4. How familiar are you with regard to reporting mechanisms on issues pertaining to sexual bribery?
   1. What are some of the existing mechanisms and gaps/challenges in this area as per your knowledge?
5. How familiar are you with regard to the challenges associated with livelihood assistance for FHHs?
   1. How does the project align with the national and local level policies?
   2. How does the project align with the identified needs of the targeted beneficiaries?
   3. Are there any identified gaps between identified needs and implementation activities?

Efficiency:

1. On staffing
   1. Was/is staffing adequate for the implementation of the project objectives?
   2. Was/is there a requirement for staff to be trained in order to be responsive to the sensitivity of the subject matter?
2. Was the time allocated for implementation adequate?
   1. How did you respond to changes in timelines as a result of external shocks such as the constitutional crisis, Easter attacks, COVID19, elections etc?
3. Coordination and collaboration:
   1. At which stage did the coordination/ collaboration begin between yourself and UN Women/UNDP?
   2. Did you collaborate with multiple agencies?
      1. What were they?
   3. To what extent did the institutions/implementing partners coordinate during implementation of Project outputs?
   4. What are some of the factors that facilitated/hindered coordination between multiple institutions and agencies for implementation of the project?
4. What are some of the factors that facilitated/hindered the achievement of results?

Effectiveness

1. What measurable changes in preventing and responding to sexual bribery and protection of FHHs from sexual exploitation have taken place as a result of the project?
2. In your view, has the project contributed towards conditions conducive to **social** empowerment for the FHHs to deal with the issues of sexual bribery and sexual exploitation?
   1. Could you elaborate?
3. In your view, has the project contributed towards conditions conducive to **economic** empowerment for the FHHs to deal with the issues of sexual bribery and sexual exploitation? (since this is still being implemented, ask about future expectations in this regard)
   1. Could you elaborate?
4. In your knowledge, has there been any changes in public institutions to prevent and/or respond to incidents of sexual bribery?
   1. Has there been any formal commitment from public institutions indicating changes to existing practices aimed at preventing and/or responding to incidents of sexual bribery?
      1. probe for: the establishment of anti-sexual harassment committees; broadening of the definition of bribery to include sexual favours; commitment of financial resources; capacity builing workshops
      2. probe for circulars/policies/guidelines directed towards preventing incedents of sexual bribery
   2. What are some of the factors contributing to revision/non-revision within public institutions?
5. To what extent were the following outputs delivered? To what extent are you familiar with these proposed outputs:
   1. anti-sexual harassement committees
   2. sensitisation programmes held for public officials on sexual harassment policies, legal frameworks, guidelines on response mechanisms, and accountability measures.
   3. course on handling bribery complaints, including sexual bribery, harassment and exploitation
   4. legal aid clinics on providing preliminary legal assistance to survivors of SE/SB
6. If you have participated in capacity building trainings/workshops, what is your perception towards your individual and institutional capacity to prevent SE/SB from occurring?
   1. can you share any feedback on the trainings conducted
      1. probe for usefulness, room for improvement

Impact

1. What changes to existing institutional processes, practices, and structures within ministries, particularly with regard to anti-sexual harassment have been implemented?

Sustainability

1. Have you participated in any trainings delivered by the project?
   1. If not you personally, did someone in your department participate?
   2. What did you learn?
   3. Were the lessons learnt at the training applicable to you?
      1. are you able to apply the learning from the training, and if so how?
      2. if the learnings are not applicable, what could be done to improve?
2. What is the national government agencies’ committment to continuing to implement the elements of the project beyond the project lifetime?
   1. Has there been any change since the initiation of the project?
3. What resources have been allocated to ensure continuation of the agenda on sexual extortion beyond the project period?
4. Have there been any changes to legislation or establishment of committees or protocols since the project was initiated towards the protection of women?
   1. What has UN Women’s role been in this regard?

Gender equality and human rights

1. what changes have you or your staff experienced in how women belonging to FHHs are perceived when comparing the beginning of the project to present?
   1. what could be possible contributory factors?
2. what changes have taken place with regard to service provision towards FHHs by male local and/or national level government staff members as a result of the project being initiated?
3. Can you provide any examples of the extent to which the project contrinuted towards addressing and respond to existing gendered power dynamics, cultural norms and post-war political economies?

Questionnaire/Guide for the Focus group discussions among beneficiaries (under discussion due to COVID-19)

You have been selected, with the support of Rajarata Praja Kendraya/ Women’s Resource Centre/ JSAC/ Viluthu, to participate in this focus group discussion. By participating in this discussion, you will not receive any direct benefits; however, the views expressed will be beneficial in informing any projects which will be designed and implemented in the future.

This tool is designed to capture your thoughts and opinions. There is no correct or incorrect response. The opinions you provide will be anonymous, and no one will be identified individually. Only collective information will be used to identify common perceptions towards reconciliation, peacebuilding, sexual bribery and the project delivery. Once completed, the results will be tabulated and presented in a report to UN Women and the Peacebuilding Fund.

You may choose not to engage in this activity, and there will be no adverse consequences. Additionally, if you do participate, but at any point, if you feel that you would rather not give your views on the matters, you have the freedom to stop answering the questions.

I have read and understood the description provided above and consent to participate in this study.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name and Signature Date

Please fill in the following information for record keeping purposes. This information will not be used to identify you individually.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name |  |
| District |  |
| DS Division |  |
| GN Division |  |
| Name of the group/collective |  |
| Phone number |  |

1. Gender
   1. Male
   2. Female
   3. Other
2. Age \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
3. Religion
   1. Buddhism
   2. Hinduism
   3. Islam
   4. Christianity
   5. Catholicism
   6. Other
4. Ethnicity
   1. Sinhala
   2. Sri Lankan Tamil
   3. ~~M~~Sri Lanka Moor
   4. Up-country Tamil
   5. Other
5. What is your civil status?
   1. Unmarried
   2. Married
   3. Living with a man, not married
   4. Abandoned
   5. Separated
   6. Divorced
   7. Widowed
   8. Other (may include disappeared)
6. Who are the dependents in your family? (select multiple)
   1. Parents
   2. Young children (under the age of 16)
   3. Adult children
   4. Disabled partner
   5. Other
7. Are you currently engaged in an income generating activity?
   1. Yes
   2. No

Warm up questions and relevance

Begin by introducing ourselves and the purpose of convening the Focus Group Discussion (FGD). Reiterate that anything said in this space will remain confidential.

1. Can everyone please introduce yourselves?
2. When did you join this group?
3. How often do you meet on average per month?
   1. What are the other instances in which you would meet members of this group?
   2. Who convenes the meetings?
4. What are the reasons for you all to come together and form this group?
   1. Probe on the reasons for the group’s existence
   2. What are your 3 priority needs as FHHs?
   3. What are the activities carried out through the group?
   4. What are the support services available to members through this group?
5. Can you share some examples of knowledge or skills gained through participating in this group?
   1. Are there instances where you would share the knowledge gained outside in the community?
      1. What are some of these instances?
6. What are some of the key challenges you experience due to your position as a FHH?
   1. Probe for societal discrimination, negative perceptions of them, accessing services,etc
7. Are you familiar with the concept of sexual bribery?
   1. What does it mean to you?
   2. What does it entail?
   3. What are some of the instances when it could happen?
   4. How prevalent is it as an issue in this area?
8. Are you aware of mechanisms available to report instances of sexual bribery?
   1. What are they?
   2. What would prevent someone from reporting such an incident?

Livelihoods

1. How many of you are engaged in income generating activities?
   1. Probe for descriptions, when it was initiated and whether they received further assistance to develop existing ventures through this project
   2. What are the biggest challenges you experience in accessing capital?
2. What are the challenges associated with engaging in income generating activities as women and FHHs in particular?
   1. Ask beneficiaries to rank the challenges listed.
   2. How has COVID19 affected your existing income stream?
3. For those who rely on pensions or salaries of deceased (military) husbands
   1. Are they able to manage their household expenses?
   2. How did COVID19 impact you?
   3. Probe for any instances where the salary has been downgraded to retirement pension and what this shift means for managing household expenses.
4. What are the support services in place available to assist you with challenges experienced particularly as FHHs?

Efficiency and Effectiveness

1. Since forming the group and now (present day) what benefit have you gained, what activities have you engaged in?
   1. Have there been activities organized you were unable to join?
      1. If yes, probe for reasons such as timings, care responsibilities etc.
2. Were you able to reach out to a member of \_\_\_ (insert relevant implementation agency) if you had any queries or needed any assistance outside of the meetings?
3. Has being a part of this group given you the confidence to meet challenges you might experience in your everyday life?
   1. Probe for examples, particularly with regard to social and economic empowerment
4. Do you feel there is a change in how state service providers such as development officers, samurdhi officers, or persons in positions of power respond to you or in the provision of service since this project was initiated?
   1. Probe for examples (purpose here is to determine if the training for service providers has made a difference in the delivery of services, particularly to FHH)

Impact and Sustainability

1. Do you feel like there has been a change in women’s contribution and engagement in community level engagement, leadership roles, since the initiation of this project/ the formation of these self-help groups?
   1. Can you share examples of such instances?
   2. If there has been NO change, what could be some of the reasons for this to be so?
2. What are the overall benefits you feel you may have gained from being a member of this group?
3. Have any of you engaged with other (vulnerable) women in the community outside of this group?
   1. Do you share your knowledge with them?
      1. Probe reasons for engaging or not engaging
4. Do you think there are other categories of vulnerable women who could benefit from being a part of a collective such as this?
   1. Probe for examples and reasons
5. Have you invited other women to participate in this group since you joined?
6. Did you participate in the puppet show/forum theatre?
   1. What are your views on the message communicated?
   2. What were the key take-aways from this event?
   3. Did you discuss the shows content with those who did not attend?
   4. Did you experience any change in service provision since the event was hosted?
7. Are you aware of any other communication material on the subject matter of sexual harassment?
   1. How did you come across it?
   2. What are your views?
8. Have any of you received livelihood assistance through this project or being a part of this group?
   1. How has it made a (measurable) change in your perceived wellbeing of your household?
      1. Please elaborate
      2. how have you used any new knowledge gained through the livelihood assistance training?
         1. probe for instances where they did not gain any new knowledge.
   2. Would you continue to participate in this group if you did not receive any livelihood assistance?
9. Have you received any other form of training, capacity building programmes, knowledge through this group?
10. Have you interacted with women from other community/ethnic groups who are also FHHs?
    1. In which context did this occur? (in order to determine if it was organic or project led)
11. Do you think providing livelihood assistance is a means of promoting peace and reconciliation or minimizing instances of conflict?
12. Do you feel you contribute to peacebuilding in anyway?
    1. probe for attribution to the project?
13. Do you feel like you have experienced a transformation in how you view yourself or in how others may view you, as a FHHs since being a part of this collective/group?
    1. Particularly when seeking services from state service providers or
    2. When engaged in income generating activities

Do you have any questions for us?

Share information about local service providers who may be in a position to assist participants with their emotional wellbeing

# Appendix E. Index of Evaluation Report

Index

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Acknowledgments

Executive Summary

1. Evaluation Background

1.1. Object of the evaluation

1.2. Context of the Intervention

1.3. Results Chain

1.4. Stakeholder analysis

2. Evaluation Purpose

2.1. Objectives

2.2. Purpose of the evaluation

2.3. Evaluation Scope

2.3.1. Thematic scope

2.3.2. Chronological scope

2.3.3. Geographical scope

3. Methodology

3.1. Evaluation Criteria

3.2. Methods for data collection and analysis

3.3. Data Sources and Sampling strategy

3.4. Methods of Analysis

3.5. Limitations of the evaluation process

4. Ethical Considerations

4.1. Key ethical evaluation principles

4.2. Ethical Safeguards

5. Evaluation Principles

5.1. Human rights benchmarks and participation of stakeholders

6. Findings

6.1. Evaluation Question 1: Relevance

6.2. Evaluation Question 2: Efficiency Effectiveness

6.3. Evaluation Question 3: Effectiveness

6.4. Evaluation Question 4: Impact

6.5. Evaluation Question 5: Sustainability

6.6. Evaluation Question 6: Human Rights, Gender and Equity

7. Conclusions

8. Lessons Learned

9. Recommendations

Appendix A: List of people interviewed

Appendix B: Evaluation Matrix

Appendix C. Interview guide

Appendix D. Interview Guide for Focus Groups

Appendix E. Documents Reviewed

Appendix F. Terms of Reference

# Appendix F. Stakeholder Analysis

For the purpose of this evaluation, stakeholders are defined as those individuals, groups, or entities which are directly involved in carrying out the work of the project. It is important to mention that this particular project involves many actors at a local level which should be considered (mainly implementing partners of CEJ, ISB and Chrysalis).

A stakeholder analysis includes a mapping of all the relevant actors and their level of involvement in the initiative to make sure that all the key actors are considered. The stakeholders identified will be classified according to their level of involvement in the initiative:

1. Funding recipient UN organizations (RUNOs): UN Women is the lead agency and UNDP is the co-agency.
2. Development partner: it refers to all the development partners involved in the initiative who could be in advisory roles, carrying out joined projects or as donors at a central level.
3. Implementing government partner: this includes all the implementing partners at a central level or on the ground who are part of the government.
4. Implementing Civil Society Organization partner: this includes all the Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) who are implementing the project locally.
5. Rights holders: this refers directly to the end-beneficiaries, in this case, Female Heads of Households (FHH).
6. Influencer: this includes external stakeholders to the initiative who may have some degree of influence over project.
7. Implementing private partners: this includes private organizations which may be involved in the implementation of the project beyond the partnership with CEJ (e.g. ISB, Chrysalis etc)

The next table details the stakeholders and their roles in the project. All of the stakeholders mentioned will be considered during the evaluation process in one degree or another.

Table 7. Stakeholders involved in the project and their roles

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N | Name | | Position/ Organization | | Role | | Contribution |
|  | Ana Guedes Mesquita | Programme officer, Peace Building Fund, New York | | Development partner | | Overall project supervision | |
|  | Hanaa Singer | UN Resident Coordinator | | Development partner | | UNDAF guidance for UN Women work in the country | |
|  | Ramaaya Salgado | Programme Analyst/Country Focal Point, UN Women Sri Lanka | | RUNO | | Major head of project | |
|  | Welder Mtisi | Regional Operations Manager, Bangkok, Thailand, UN Women | | RUNO | | Occasional technical assistance to the project | |
|  | Shyamala Gomez | Executive Director, Centre for Equality Justice | | Implementing CSO partner | | Overall supervision of CEJ´s work as Implementer of the project on the ground | |
|  | Ando Anthappan | Senior Project Coordinator, Centre for Equality Justice | | Implementing CSO partner | | Technical and administrative manager of the project from CEJ´s part | |
|  | Bimali Ameresekere | Gender Specialist, United Nations Development Programme | | RUNO | | Coordination of business training, grants and dialogue with MWA, Technical lead for UNDP on the project | |
|  | Lihini Ratwatte | Project Officer, Peacebuilding, UN Women, Sri Lanka | | RUNO | | Joint Program Officer to coordinate joint action of both UN Agencies | |
|  | Upul Ranaweera | Monitoring & Reporting Officer, UN Women | | RUNO | | Assistance on M&E to the project | |
|  | Sumika Perera | Project Coordinator, Women’s Resource Centre | | Implementing CSO partner in the Kurunegala district | | Implementer on the ground | |
|  | Sheela Ratnayake, Rupa Gamage | Rajarata Praja Kendraya | | Implementing CSO partner in the Anuradhapura district | | Implementer on the ground | |
|  | Maithreyi Rajasingham | Viluthu | | Implementing CSO partner in the Killinochchi district | | Implementer on the ground | |
|  | Nadarajah Sukirtharaj | JSAC | | Implementing CSO partner in the Killinochchi district | | Implementer on the ground | |
|  | To be defined by CEJ | Power of Play | | Implementing CSO partner of the puppetry sessions in Kurunegala and Anuradhapura | | Implementer on the ground | |
|  | To be defined | ACT4 | | Implementing CSO partner of the forum theatre in the Killinochchi district | | Implementer on the ground | |
|  | Vindhya Fernando. K. Vinopavan | Chrysalis | | Implementing Private Partner (women’s training programmes) | | Implementer on the ground | |
|  | Neelakanth Wanninayake/ Anusha Bandara | Industrial Services Bureau (ISB) | | Implementing Private Partner (livelihood training component in the project locations) | | Implementer on the ground | |
|  | To be defined by UNDP or CEJ | Grama Niladhari Officers | | Local level state officials to assess the awareness and perceptions of the programmes implemented through the project | | Local/Village level administrative officers | |
|  | To be defined | Ranaviru Sevana/Ranaviru Women’s Association | | Implementing Private Partner  Organisation responsible for disbursing assistance to military widows | | Possible links on the ground – surveillance of our current work is also being done through this mechanism ….. so need to exercise caution as we may do harm | |
|  | To be defined | Sri Lanka Institute of Development (SLIDA) | | Implementing Private Partner (providers of training to state service providers) | |  | |
|  | To be defined | Ministry of Women’s Affairs (MoWA)  Women Development Officers (district & relevant divisional) on the ground | | Implementing government partner organisation at a central administrative level | | Major government partner | |
|  | To be defined | Commission to Investigate Allegations of Bribery and Corruption (CIABOC) | | Implementing government partner organisation at a central administrative level | | Key commission in the government in dialogue with the project | |
|  | To be defined | Legal Aid Commission (LAC) | | Implementing government partner (provides legal assistance to vulnerable groups) | | Key commission in the government in dialogue with the project | |

1. International Crisis Group. (2011). *Sri Lanka: Women's insecurity in the North and East.* Colombo/Brussels: Crisis Group. Asia Report No.217 <https://www.ecoi.net/en/file/local/1055886/2016_1324563161_217-sri-lanka-womens-insecurity-in-the-north-and-east-ko.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. https://securelivelihoods.org/wp-content/uploads/12.-Tracking-change-in-livelihoods-service-delivery-from-a-2012-2015-in-Sri-Lanka-2.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Jayasundere, R. & Weerackody, C. (2013). *Gendered implications of economic development in the post conflict Northern and Eastern Regions of Sri Lanka*. Sri Lanka: Care International Sri Lanka. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre. (2012). *Sri Lanka a hidden displacement crisis*. Norwegian Refugee Council. Retrieved from <https://www.internal-displacement.org/sites/default/files/publications/documents/201210-ap-srilanka-overview-en.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. United Nations. (2015). *Mapping of Socio-Economic Support Services to Female Headed Households in the Northern Province of Sri Lanka.* Colombo: United Nations, Sri Lanka. <http://lk.one.un.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Mapping-of-Socio-Economic-Support-Services-to-Female-Headed-Households-in-the-Northern-Province-of-Sri-Lanka.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Ranaraja, S., Hassendeen, S. & Gunatilaka, R. (2016). Factors affecting women’s labour force participation in Sri Lanka. Colombo: International Labour Organisation Country Office for Sri Lanka and the Maldives. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Asian Development Bank, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH. (2015). Country Gender Assessment Sri Lanka Update. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. ibid [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Jayasundere, R. & Weerackody, C. (2013). Gendered implications of economic development in the post conflict Northern and Eastern Regions of Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka: Care International Sri Lanka. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. International Crisis Group. (2011). Sri Lanka: Women’s insecurity in the North and East, Asia Report N°217-220, 20 December 2011. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. http://gbvforum.lk/r-library/document/Report%20of%20the%20Leader.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Carnegie, S. (2019). Sextortion: A crime of corruption and sexual exploitation [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Lincoln and Guba In: Alkin, Marvin (2012). *Evaluation Roots: A Wider Perspective of Theorists’ Views and Influences*, Second Edition. Sage Publication: Los Angeles. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. https://www.unwomen.org/-/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/library/publications/2020/good-practices-in-gender-responsive-evaluations-en.pdf?la=en&vs=2431 [↑](#footnote-ref-15)