

Summary of the Terminal Evaluation for MANRECAP

1. Summary of the Project	
Name of the country : The Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka	Name of the Project : Mannar District Rehabilitation and Reconstruction through Community Approach Project (MANRECAP)
Sector: Peace Building/Rural Development	Type of cooperation : PROTECO ² / Contractor: M&Y Co. Ltd.
Section in-charge: JICA Sri Lanka Office	Counterpart organizations : Ministry of Nation Building and Estate Infrastructure Development, North and East Provincial council, Mannar District Secretariat
Period of Cooperation : 24 March 2004 - 23 March 2008	Total cost: 477 million Yen
<p>1-1 Background and outline of the Project</p> <p>The Government of Sri Lanka and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) signed the Cease-Fire Agreement in February 2002 with the facilitation of the Government of Norway. The ethnic conflict, which lasted for nearly 20 years from 1983, caused a massive damage to the Northern and Eastern area of the country, and it is estimated that more than 800,000 people were displaced internally and externally during the conflict. Many people still lived in a severe living condition, therefore the rehabilitation of infrastructure as well as reconstruction of the capacity of communities were required.</p> <p>In October 2002, JICA carried out a Needs Assessment Study on Reconstruction and Development in the conflict-affected areas in Sri Lanka. In September and December 2003, JICA carried out Project Formulation Surveys to formulate the concept and the activity plan of the “Mannar District Rehabilitation and Reconstruction through Community Approach Project (MANRECAP)”, in consultation with the relevant stakeholders in the field and in Colombo. The Record of Discussions (R/D) was signed on 2nd March 2004, between JICA and the Government of Sri Lanka, and MANRECAP Project was commenced.</p> <p>The Project, MANRECAP, which targets communities affected by conflict in Mannar DS District (Mannar Division and Manthai West AGA Division) of the northern region of Sri Lanka, aims at supporting the “rehabilitation” of basic infrastructure and the “reconstruction” of community capability on socio-economic activities through utilization of rehabilitated infrastructure. By doing so, the communities are expected to engage in rehabilitation and reconstruction activities on their own, from formulation of plans to implementation, and management and maintenance.</p> <p>The Project was planned to be implemented in four stages. The first stage contains the selection of target villages and formulation of a priority project plan, i.e. Community Action Plan (CAP) by CBOs (Community Based Organizations) and the government agencies. The second stage is for rehabilitation of basic infrastructure by CBOs using community contract system, and training for the government</p>	

² Proposed type technical cooperation project

officers and strengthening networking among them. The third stage stimulates socio-economic activities with focus on the utilization of basic infrastructure rehabilitated under the Project. The fourth stage as a final stage is for building capacity at community level to make CBOs be able to maintain and manage the infrastructure, and improving management of socio-economic activities.

In the Mid-term Evaluation which was carried out in March 2006, it was confirmed that the adopted method of CAP and CMR³ had been creating many positive attitude and actions among villagers in the focal villages and that this led to successful implementation of the Project in the first two years even under difficult circumstances. Because of this remarkable feature of MANRECAP, the Project was the first one which had been widely achieving social mobilization in the rehabilitation and reconstruction activities in the northern region. The PDM was revised based on the recommendations made by the Mid-term Evaluation Team.

After August 2006, deterioration of the security situation has hindered the Project from implementing its activities as planned. As a result, the entry/exit point to the uncleared area was closed frequently and Japanese Experts evacuated repeatedly from the Project site. The unstable security situation has caused (1) restrictions on movements of staffs, vehicles, equipment and materials, (2) negative impact on community participation in the Project activities, etc. Although most of the activities were carried out as planned despite the deteriorated security situations, some activities had to be abandoned in Manthai West AGA Division.

1-2 Narrative summary of the Project

(1) Overall Goal

The villagers in the focal villages realize the peace dividend, as their socio-economic conditions are improved.

(2) Project Purpose

People in the Project sites are able to act sustainably in order for their livelihood improvement and community development.

(3) Output of the Project

- 1) Community Action Plan (CAP) is formulated with the participatory method.
- 2) Basic community infrastructures are rehabilitated.
- 3) CBOs acquire necessary abilities for socio-economic activities mainly utilizing the infrastructures rehabilitated by the Project.
- 4) Cooperative relationships between the government officers and the CBOs in the focal villages are enhanced.

(4) Inputs (as of 30 September 2007):

Japanese side:

Long term experts: 8 persons

Short-term experts: 4 persons

Equipment and machinery provided: 5.3 Million Yen

Training in Japan: 6 persons

Local cost implementation: 192.0 Million Yen

³ Community Managed Rehabilitation. MANRECAP defines the method that the communities undertake the contracts for rehabilitate small scale community infrastructure of the villages as CMR. CMR aims at social mobilization and capacity building of the community.

<p>Sri Lankan side:</p> <p>Counterpart personnel: 6 persons Office space</p> <p>Local cost: 17.3 Million Sri Lankan Rupees</p>	
2. Member of the Terminal Evaluation Study Team	
Member of the Team	<p><u>Japanese side</u></p> <p>(1) Mr. Minoru HOMMA Japanese Team Leader Team Director, Poverty Reduction / Paddy Field Based Farming Area Team I, Rural Development Department, JICA</p> <p>(2) Mr. Shiro AKAMATSU Participatory Development Senior Advisor, Institute for International Cooperation, JICA</p> <p>(3) Mr. Atsutoshi HIRABAYASHI Peace Building Special Advisor, Urban and Regional Development/Peace Building Team I, Social Development Department, JICA</p> <p>(4) Mr. Kenji KURIHARA Project Management Associate Expert, Poverty Reduction / Paddy Field Based Farming Area Team I, Rural Development Department, JICA</p> <p>(5) Ms. Miki INAOKA Project Management 2 Assistant Resident Representative, JICA Sri Lanka Office</p> <p>(6) Mr. Yoshiaki KAKIZAKI Evaluation and Analysis Rural Development Institute Ltd.</p> <p><u>Sri Lankan Side</u></p> <p>(1) Mr. A. Nicollaspillai District Secretary/Government Agent, District Secretariat, Mannar</p> <p>(2) Mr. V. Visuvalingam Former District Secretary/ Government Agent, District Secretariat, Mannar</p> <p>(3) Ms. N. Jayawathani Assistant Director (Planning), Ministry of Nation Building and Estate Infrastructure Development</p> <p>(4) Mr. B. Sivapiragasam Deputy Director of Planning, Provincial Planning Secretariat, Eastern Provincial Council (EPC)</p>
Period of the study	6 October, 2007 - 23 October, 2007
3. Summary of the Terminal Evaluation	
3-1 Project Achievements	
<p>The Evaluation Team observes that the Project purpose is mostly achieved. Major outputs of the Project have been achieved since the prioritized infrastructures were rehabilitated, and the communities in the focal villages have been empowered through the application of CAP and CMR methods. However, some of the infrastructure constructions and socio-economic activities planned in Manthai West AGA Division were abandoned in 2006. The Japanese experts had to evacuate from the project site to Colombo and the activities were very much limited due to the deterioration in security situation since August 2006.</p>	

(1) Output 1: Community Action Plan (CAP) is formulated with the participatory method.

Achievement of Output 1 is high.

- 16 workshops were held in 10 focal villages in the first year (2004) and prepared CAP for each focal village. In addition, CAP review workshops were held in 2005 and 2007 for the purpose of responding to the rapid change of the situation in the conflict affected areas.
- Through CAP review workshops, all participants deepened the knowledge and skills on CAP method. The communities are now in a position to organize and conduct CAP workshops in a planned and constructive manner.
- Many of the needs of the communities which were prioritized in the CAP workshops have been fulfilled by the Project, and some other needs were met in collaboration with other donors.

(2) Output 2: Basic community infrastructures are rehabilitated.

The Achievement of Output 2 is generally high despite the deterioration of security in some of the targeted project villages.

- Most of the constructions of planned infrastructures were completed, though a few were abandoned due to security deterioration.
- Even in the adverse security situation in the Manthai West AGA Division, CBOs have been able to continue the CMR works to some extent without continuous supervision from the Project.

(3) Output 3: CBOs acquire necessary abilities for socio-economic activities mainly utilizing the infrastructures rehabilitated by the Project.

The Achievement of Output 3 is generally high and it will be high if the security situation is improved.

- Trainings on socio-economic activities were implemented almost on schedule and the implementation performance has increased in the focal villages through trainings.
- Small group savings led by the Women's Bank in Colombo have grown up as regional branch banks and have become a model as a platform for socio-economic activities. The communities gained access to those loans, especially for continuing agriculture production in each focal village of Manthai West AGA Division even after security deterioration.
- Seminar and study tours for the capacity building for the community: facilitation for CAP workshop, CMR and group saving activities were implemented in the first and second year as planned.
- Small scale income generation activities such as cement block making, poultry, palmyra products, bulrush mats, sari painting, and compost making were started in the focal villages.

(4) Output 4: Cooperative relationships between the government officers and the CBOs in the focal villages are enhanced.

The Achievement of Output 4 is generally high.

- The Project held prior discussions with relevant government officials, NGOs and communities on CAP and was able to receive proper assistance/services from them in order to implement community activities, and secure continuity after its completion.
- The Chief Secretary of North Eastern Provincial Council and GA Mannar fully supported the proposal for Diploma in Community Development and Management and suggested to realize the course in Vavuniya campus of Jaffna University. The diploma course was commenced in August 2007.

(5) Achievement of Project Purpose

It is observed that CBOs are organizing social activities and bringing in public services in collaboration with the government and NGOs by utilizing the constructed public buildings through CMR, and CBOs obtained an opportunity to gain profit and income through CAP/CMR. Despite the limited activities due to the deterioration of security, the Project activities continued to be implemented as planned the outputs have been mostly achieved. From the observation, the Project purpose “People in the Project sites are able to act sustainably in order for their livelihood improvement and community development” is mostly achieved.

3-2 Evaluation result based on the five evaluation criteria

(1) Relevance

The relevance of the Project is high.

- 1) The Project fulfilled the prioritized needs of the focal villages on community infrastructure and socio-economic activities. The focal villages were selected both in government controlled/un-cleared areas, with set criteria. The applied methods of CAP and CMR through participatory approach are identified as appropriate because it empowers the local people and the CBOs to tackle their issues on their own initiatives.
- 2) It is confirmed that Project purpose is consistent with RRR (Relief, Rehabilitation and Reconciliation) policy as well as development policy of the Government of Sri Lanka.
- 3) The Project is also consistent with the Japanese foreign policy and a priority cooperation area of JICA for Sri Lanka.

(2) Effectiveness

The effectiveness of the Project is high.

- 1) The Project purpose was mostly achieved. However it should be noted that deterioration of the security condition and frequent change of the rules and regulations imposed affected over the project implementation.
- 2) MANRECAP has established and maintained effective and cordial relationship among stakeholders such as other donors, NGOs, government agencies and personnel, security forces, the LTTE, CBOs, and the village people for smooth implementation.

(3) Efficiency

The efficiency of the Project is moderate.

- 1) The Project has mostly achieved the project outputs except some of the project area which faced deterioration of security situation.
- 2) The input to the Project was appropriate. Especially the background of the dispatched experts has strongly contributed to the achievement of the Project outputs. Collaborative actions and mobilization of the other donor resources were obtained as much as possible in addition to the resource provided.
- 3) GA performed an indispensable function in coordinating and decision making for the smooth implementation.
- 4) The bi-annually organized JCC functioned well and issues including security matters raised at the JCC were passed to other organizations for further discussions and arrangements.

- 5) In Manthai West AGA Division, due to the deterioration in security situation since August 2006, some of the infrastructure constructions and socio-economic activities in the project plan were abandoned in 2006 therefore the activities in the area were very much limited.

(4) Impact

The impact of the Project is high.

- 1) Many positive changes are observed in the focal and adjacent villages. At the same time no significant negative impact on general livelihood is observed in the focal villages.
- 2) Negotiation and communication skills, knowledge on local resource management of the people have increased, attitude has positively changed, and thus capability has been significantly enhanced.
- 3) The deterioration of security situation in the Project area is an obstacle for the Project. However some positive changes have been observed through socio-economic activities to achieve the Overall Goal which is “The villagers in the focal villages realize the peace dividend, as their socio-economic conditions are improved”.

(5) Sustainability

The sustainability of the Project is at present difficult to evaluate since the security situation is unpredictable. The practical observance of the ceasefire agreement is the lifeline to assure the sustainability. Based on the ideas mentioned above, the followings are observed.

- 1) The capacity of the CBOs in the focal villages has been built to an extent that they can carry on several socio-economic activities on their own. Community people have gained knowledge in understanding official communication with relevant government departments. The Project has also imparted self-confidence and increased sense of trust and unity in the community while their personal dignity is maintained. The networking with adjoining villages has also been developed.
- 2) The rehabilitated and constructed infrastructure is well in use by the CBOs and the skills obtained through the trainings given by the Project have increased the income opportunities. The handing-over process of constructed infrastructure, facilities are now being conducted.
- 3) The government officials have gained experience in working with CBOs. Budget was partially allocated by the Government of Sri Lanka to implement some supplemental construction works. However, limited funds for development activities are available from the national budget to the area.
- 4) The Government is planning to introduce participatory community development policy. It will encourage the villagers to prioritise projects which are formulated based on their own needs and local resources will be utilized with the community participation. The experience of CMR introduced in the Project could be applied in the Government initiative.
- 5) Though the capacity at the local level is strengthened to some extent, the public administration in the area is yet to be strengthened due to conflict situation in the past.

3-3 Contributing factors to create positive effects

- (1) The methods of CAP and CMR through participatory approach are identified as appropriate for rehabilitation and reconstruction in conflict affected areas.

- (2) GA of Mannar District performed an indispensable function in coordinating and decision making for the smooth implementation of the Project.
- (3) The background of the experts of MANRECAP such as good command in local languages, and experience in community development in Sri Lanka contributed to maximize the performance of the Project.

3-4 Problems and their causes

- (1) Problems with regard to the Project framework
 - 1) The important assumptions identified at the time of project formulation were not realized due to security deterioration in the Project area.
 - 2) The Project has little flexibility to cope with changing security situations in terms of quantity of basic infrastructure and number of focal villages.
- (2) Problems with regard to the implementation process of the Project
 - 1) The workload of the Chief Advisor, Japanese experts and national staff were pressurized, as negotiation with the LTTE on imposed tax was more time consuming process than they expected.
 - 2) After August 2006, deterioration of the security situation has hindered the Project from implementing its activities as planned. As a result, the entry/exit point to the uncleared area was closed frequently and Japanese Experts evacuated repeatedly from the Project site.

3-5 Conclusion

As described above, the Evaluation Team observes that the Project purpose is mostly achieved. Major outputs of the Project have been achieved since the prioritized infrastructures were rehabilitated, and the community in focal villages has been empowered through the application of CAP and CMR methods.

As for the five criteria: (1) the relevance of the Project is high since the selection of target community was carefully done by considering the various factors in the context of conflict affected area and the needs of local communities were prioritized through CAP preparation; (2) the effectiveness is high: CAP and CMR methods effectively contributed to achievement of Project purpose; (3) efficiency is moderate: the coordination made by GA of Mannar District contributed a lot for smooth implementation, although the scarcity of local human resources and the deterioration of security situation hampered the Project implementation; (4) impact is high since the positive changes in socio-economic conditions were observed in the focal and adjacent villages; (5) sustainability is at present difficult to evaluate since the security situation is unpredictable.

It is noted that the deterioration of security situations in the area especially in the latter half of Project period severely hampered the Project activities and some activities in Manthai West AGA Division were forced to abandon halfway.

The Evaluation Team observes that although there are some abandoned activities due to security deterioration, the Project will complete the remaining activities by March 2008 and it is appropriate that the Project be terminated as originally planned.

The practical observance of the ceasefire agreement is the lifeline to assure the sustainability and for further interventions in the future.

3-6 Recommendations

Although the successful implementation of the Project mentioned above, the Team draws the following recommendations for further progress of the project.

(1) Measures to be Taken Before the Termination of the Project

- 1) Handing-over procedure must be completed by the Government officials and CBOs before the termination of the Project in order to assure proper operation and maintenance of the infrastructures provided by the Project.

(2) Measures to be Taken After the Termination of Project

- 1) It is recommended that the District Secretariat of Mannar continue to support the CBOs targeted by the Project in terms of community development.
- 2) It is recommended that the District Secretariat focus on the capacity building of government officers in participatory approaches through application of CAP and CMR methods in the area.
- 3) It was proved that the methods previously used in the Sinhala community such as CAP, CMR and Women's Bank Activity are applicable also in the Tamil community. The consultants, engineers, Women's Bank people from the South visited the sites in the Tamil area. This also brought new interchange among the people, which will benefit to the expanding of mutual understanding of the reality on the ground. It is recommended that this approach be taken over to other projects in the area.
- 4) It is appropriated to terminate the Project as planned schedule i.e. March 2008, as some of the infrastructure projects had to be abandoned due to the deterioration of security situation and no prospect of improvement. However the Sri Lanka side has high expectation of the completion of infrastructure projects, Japan and Sri Lanka need to discuss further to materialise in adjusting with security situation.

3-7 Lessons Learnt

The Project implementation under the circumstances of unstable security in conflict affected areas, was the first experience for JICA. In this regard, the Team draws several lessons learned from MANRECAP case.

(1) Coordination among the relevant organizations

The importance of coordination among the central and local governments, UN agencies, NGOs must be highlighted. In the case of MANRECAP, the GA of Mannar District played an indispensable role in coordinating the relevant organizations in order to bring about the best result for the people in the area.

(2) Rehabilitation through community empowerment in conflict affected areas

It is very important that the community receive tangible change, such as rehabilitation of infrastructure as peace dividend. In the case of MANRECAP, this rehabilitation was undertaken by applying the CAP and CMR methods, which empowered the CBOs at the same time.

(3) Post-conflict specific issues and project management

There are some post-conflict specific issues in the implementation of project such as de-mining,

land allocation, ownership and certificate issue, etc. The experiences acquired through MANRECAP on these issues must be shared for future reference.

(4) Consideration of local context and personnel recruitment

For the projects in conflict affected areas, local context is to be taken into most careful consideration to handle sensitive matters such as population balance of IDPs and host communities, land issues between the different groups. However, the experience of JICA experts in such types of intervention is limited, in general. To meet the requirements in such fields, involvement of local human resources should be considered. In case of MANRECAP, the national staff showed excellent performance for the implementation of the Project. The background of the experts of MANRECAP such as good command in local languages, and experience in community development in Sri Lanka also contributed to maximize the performance of the Project.

(5) Different status in “Post-Conflict” situation

This Project is considered as a project under “Post-Conflict” assistance. However the situation of “Post-Conflict” e.g. disarmament, demining and movement of returnees, is vary in different projects. It is a lesson-learnt that we recognise a possible change of “Post-Conflict” status and /or environment during project implementation period as the Project experienced. Despite the deterioration of security situation, at the implementation level, consolidated effort by the stakeholders was sought for adequate implementation. At the same time, this is also advisable that a Project’s design needs to be more flexible in its scale and target area as well as project’s plan of action to avoid risk in case of contingency.