RAISING ENVIRONMENTAL CONSCIOUSNESS IN SOCIETY - (RECS) PROJECT

EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

CONTENTS

Αв	BREVIATIONS	·ii
PR	EFACE	iii
Ex	ECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
Ра	rt 1	•
1.	Introduction	
	1.1 Background of the RECS Project	
	1.2 Activities supported by IUCN under RECS	
	1.3 Scope of the Evaluation	
	1.4 Structure of the Report	4
2.	Notes on the Evaluation	
	2.1 Purpose of the External Evaluation	
	2.2 Evaluation Process and Methodology	5
	2.3 Limitations	5
3.	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTS UNDERTAKEN	6
	3.1 Process followed for Planning & Implementation of RECS	6
	3.2 Project Objectives	7
	3.3 Roles & Responsibilities of Stakeholders and Partners	8
	3.4 Component-wise Project Activities with their Objectives	10
4.	Main Findings	·11
	4.1 Organizational Effectiveness in Implementing and Monitoring of RECS	11
	4.2 Assessment of Effectiveness	
	4.3 Assessment of the Efficiency	19
	4.4 Assess Quality of Project Implementation Strategy and of Project Monitoring	
	4.5 Assessment of Relevance	
	4.6 Assessment of Sustainability	
	4.7 Assessment of the Consortium Approach and the Leveraging Ability of the Project	22
5.	CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNT	23
	5.2 Conclusions	23
	5.3 Lessons Learnt	24
6.	RECOMMENDATIONS	24
Pa	rt 2	26
An	nex 1: RECS Project – Summary of Project Status/ Main Findings (as of end Dec. 2009)	26
	nex 2: List of Persons/Organizations consulted and sites visited (RECS) March 1 – 20, 2010	
	nex 3: Terms of Reference for the Final External Evaluation of the Project	
An	nex 4: Questionnaire Guidelines used for interviews	39
An	nex 5: A photographic presentation of project Status (CCSF)	47

ABBREVIATIONS

AB Accreditation Body

CAR Corrective Action Request

CB Certification Body

CBO Community Based Organization

CBI Centre for the Promotion of Imports from Developing Countries??

CCC Ceylon Chamber of Commerce
CEA Central Environmental Authority

CCSF Community Conservation Support Fund

CoC Chain of Custody

CSR Corporate Social Responsibility
EDB Export Development Board

EU European Union

FCCISL Federation of Chambers of Commerce & Industries in Sri Lanka

FD Forest Department
FI Forest Innovation

FMP Forest Management Plan FSC Forest Stewardship Council

FTN Forest Trade Network
GEF Global Environment Fund
GFTN Global Forest Trade Network

IFAD International Fund for Agricultural Development IUCN International Union for Conservation of Nature

LEF Local Environmental Fund
MDF Medium Density Fibre
M&E Monitoring and Evaluation

NEQ National Environmental Qualities

N & I Nature and Information

NGO Non Governmental Organization

NWG National Working Group
OMM Output Monitoring Matrix
PA Planters Association

RECS Raising Environmental Consciousness in Society

RNE Royal Netherlands Embassy
RPC Regional Plantation Companies
RRI Rubber Research Institute
SLSI Sri Lanka Standards Institute.
STC State Timber Cooperation

UNDP United Nations Development Programme

USJ University of Sri Jayewardenepura
WBIA Wood Based Industries Association

WSSD World Summit on Sustainable Development

PREFACE

The Raising Environmental Consciousness in Society (RECS) Project has been initiated as an outcome of the collaborative actions of RNE and IUCNSL since 1999. Based on the previous practical experience in the field of environmental conservation and in response to several discussions with the RNE, the proposal for RECS has been prepared in 2005 by a consortium led by IUCN with the participation of Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industries and Ceylon Chamber of Commerce.

Having signed an Agreement between RNE and IUCNSL in June 2006, the RECS project has been implemented for over 3 ½ years with an extension of one year. A mid-term evaluation has been conducted in mid 2008 as an independent exercise. The present external evaluation is considered as the ex-post evaluation of RECS project, for which provisions have been made in the above project proposal.

It was with great pleasure that I undertook the present assignment of External Evaluation of RECS, on the invitation of IUCN, as it provided me an opportunity to conduct an evaluation of complex project aiming at environmental conservation and sustainable development, for which all three sectors - public, private and civil society – have been participated. The project consisted of three components working at national- institutional level and local-organizational level with the involvement of a variety of stakeholders belonging to above three sectors.

The present evaluation was conducted by the consultant during a period of one month (March 2010), following a well-focused Terms of Reference and using a representative sample of project activities. Over one third of the pilot projects were visited and 27 stakeholders of different capacities were interviewed during the evaluation period to gather first hand information. The project document, biannual progress reports, and other project related materials were referred to, as secondary information sources.

I wish to take this opportunity to extend my sincere gratitude to those who contributed to the successful completion of the present evaluation. First of all I wish to pay tribute to all respondents of the project level stakeholders, who provided necessary information with lot of enthusiasm.

The RECS Project Team of IUCNSL led by Dr. Ranjith Mahindapala gave me an immense support for the entire process of the evaluation. My most profound gratitude should go to Mr. Asanka Abayakoon, the RECS Team Leader, who worked as the chief facilitator of the entire evaluation process, which included organizing all the stakeholder meetings and field visits, accompanying me with most of them, and above all providing me with all the project-related documents and some missing information I was after. I must put on record that without versatile support of Mr. Abayakoon, I would not have completed this external evaluation in time. My sincere thanks also go to Ms. Kumudeni Ekaratna, the Senior Programme Officer of IUCN, who particularly shared her experience relating to CCSF projects of RECS and provided me access to relevant documents.

Last not least, I am very much thankful to Mr. Bandula Hennadige – Senior Programme Officer of RNE, who not only paved way for me to undertake the evaluation, but also parted with some valuable information regarding RECS project planning, implementation and monitoring, amidst his busy schedules.

Finally I must mention that I alone am responsible for the views and comments contained in this final evaluation of RECS.

M H S Dayaratne (Consultant) April 20, 2010

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Government of Sri Lanka has taken certain attempts to counter the threats to the environment, and the highest policy level intervention in this direction has been the establishing of a separate Ministry for Environment and Natural Resources, and bringing in the Departments of Forest and Wilde Life and the Central Environmental Authority into its purview. Ministry together with its above agencies has led a process to strengthen and enforce legal provisions by making necessary amendments to the National Environmental Act of 1980 (No. 47) and has taken further steps to formulate environmental policies and strategies during the recent time.

As measures for incorporating government, private sector and civil society organizations for collective conservation actions, several international and national agencies have come forward with generous technical and financial assistance. Among them most important ones are; a) The Global Environmental Facility and Environmental Action plan of the World Bank, which provided limited funds for community-based environmental activities, and b) The Local Environmental Fund (LEF) of the Royal Netherlands Embassy (RNE), which is the recent initiative to contribute the active local CBO/NGOs for their conservation actions. The RNE's fund was administered by IUCNSL and it served as a vehicle to provide opportunity and encourage for concerned CBO/NGOs to carry out local level environmental activities.

On the other hand, the private sector being the other important stakeholder of the civil society was regarded as the collaborator to work with the state and CBO/NGOs in implementing national environmental strategies and programmes, and it has contributed for sustainable and replicable approaches for conservation and protection of the environment.

Objectives of the RECS Project

Main objective of the RECS project, as described in the proposal is 'to ensure that key stakeholders in resources management (the private sector, local communities and civil society members) demonstrate capacity to achieving national sustainable development and conservation objectives'. The objective of the proposal goes in line with the Sri Lankan environment policy, with focus on strengthening regional and local initiatives, participation of civil society, private sector and awareness building of environmental considerations into the development process. It is proposed to achieve these objectives through a set of interventions that are introduced under the RECS Project.

There are three specific objectives identified under the main objective of the project:

- Performance with respect to conservation and sustainable development by the corporate sector, mostly represented by the FCCISL and the CCC, strengthened and improved as the engine of development in the country;
- A system of supportive financial resources institutionalized to assist civil society activities that can guide policy and practices in sustainable directions; and
- The media, namely television and newspapers, harnessed as a vehicle for policy-related multi-stakeholder engagement of civil society actors with decision-makers, and for promoting broad-based education of the general public.

Hence, the project activities that were carried out during the 3-year project period basically covered three main project components in relation to and on par with these three objectives.

Scope of the Evaluation

The purpose of present external evaluation is to find out whether the project has achieved its objectives and intended outcomes, and to ascertain the impact of the project as anticipated by the donor and the consortium led by IUCN, CCC and FCCISL. It is expected that the evaluation would be based on an assessment of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of RECS activities using appropriate sampling of the activities undertaken.

Main Findings

The main source of information for the evaluation in general is the six-monthly progress reporting that has been executed by the RECS project team. The Output Monitoring Matrix (OMM) of these Progress Reports, in particular, can be regarded as the periodical update at a glance for an evaluation of this nature. The consultant could grasp the salient features of the project by comparing the activities included in Activity Matrix of the Project Proposal with that of the OMM in all six biannual progress reports.

These implementation arrangements have been accomplished from the outset of the project, as an excellent team effort, adhering to the guidelines provided by the original project proposal. It was encouraging to notice that the RECS team has been used the OMM effectively to undertake management and monitoring of the specific components outputs and related activities. Regular project team meetings have been convened to discuss implementation issues and to address certain constraints created as a result of externalities.

In general, the progress made by RECS over its life span of three and a half years, has been tremendous given consideration to the complexity of the component-wise activities that were implemented by a multi-disciplinary teams with common as well as conflicting agendas of their own. The effectiveness of the project was assessed with this factor in mind. In relation to the progress, the private sector involvement and cooperation, particularly CCC, CSR Sub-committee of CCC, FCCISL and others in environmental activities, were assessed and presented against each collaborative partner and/or action.

As two strong partners of the consortium, CCC and FCCISL have been actively involved from the inception of RECS making the effective performance with respect to conservation and sustainable development by the corporate sector possible. In achieving the first immediate objective both of these national chambers of commerce made their officials and members available for project-related activities. However, it was found that performance of some FCCISL-related project activities were negatively affected, during the final year of RECS implementation, owing to some critical changes occurred at the top management level.

Based on the performances of the civil society activities in 24 locations, where a good majority has been achieved excellent results, it is proposed to develop RECS phase II, as a programme in IUCN Regional Business and Biodiversity Programme to promote the concept of a sustainable fund which would facilitate small grants through corporate sector funding, whilst the initial capital for such a fund could be sought from a bilateral source.

The implementing strategy and project monitoring has been the responsibility placed mainly on the IUCN team and it depended upon the arrangement made for the fulfilment of the supervision requirements of RECS project.

It was quite relevant that RECS was identified by IUCN together with its partners, as they were committed strongly to applying partnership approaches where possible and feasible. The key

advantages of such an approach include involvement and association of all stakeholders and beneficiaries with the RECS Project from start to end, promoting local ownership.

The CSR and FSC project initiatives including the pilots that supervised by the national 'Consortium Partners' like CCC, FCCISL/SMED, are bound to be sustainable considering the level of commitment placed on such initiatives that have brought dividends to their member-beneficiaries.

The sustainability of the overall project needs to be considered in two dimensions, namely, sustainability of created benefits and sustainability of organizations involved. The benefits achieved needs to be sustained by linking them with supporting organizations of the government and other NGOs and wherever possible by replicating them in feasible locations with experienced and established communities / local bodies

Conclusions

- a) The RECS project strategy is a turn-around of the traditional mandate of a direct project approach, which generates dependency syndrome among partners / beneficiaries,
- b) Multi-agency and multi-tier approach aiming at a number of challenges of environmental conservation and sustainable development has brought about positive outcomes,
- c) A productive working collaboration among Government Agencies, Corporate Sector, Private Sector and local NGOs, have been a effective and rewarding one,
- d) The project management through a 'Consortium Approach' have worked effectively to achieve intended target and benefits within the project time span and beyond,
- e) Both short-term pilot projects and long-term environmental conservation practices like FSC and CSR with guided supply of technological and financial assistance have motivated implementing partners to change their mindset towards sustainable development,
- f) Project-assisted pilot activities have unleashed a set of environment-friendly initiatives, which are replicable and go on par with the mainstream development goals,
- g) Project as a whole is designed as a flexible one to expand its components / activities within the fund allocations and provisions made by other budget lines as and when required, and this flexibility has worked as a key to the success of the project and many initiatives it supported, for which the RNE – the donor deserves a special appreciation from all stakeholders of the project.
- Determination of the full achievement of benefits expected from long-term perspectives like CSR, FSC and knowledge disseminating activities is not yet possible, due to the short timeframe of the project,
- i) Full package of inputs allocated for some pilot projects under CCSF small grants, have not reached or delayed making some projects become less effective and unsustainable,
- j) All good practices and examples that have linked nature conservation with mainstream development bearing long-term sustainability and replicability, call for wider publicity and sharing through appropriate media,

Lessons learnt

- A project of this nature was most useful in demonstrating the multi-sector and consortium based management strategy, for meeting both the short-term and long-term critical needs of the partners/ beneficiaries,
- b) Improving project administrative capacity requires not only the basic needs or financial resources (CCSF) but more importantly it requires training, technical know-how, and longterm experimentation on knowledge imparting initiatives,

- c) Improvement to both urban and rural environment by 'good riddance of bad rubbish' the solid waste - by turning them into 'gold' and recycling of waste polythene can be regarded as environment-friendly and income generating pro-poor programmes,
- d) A vast array of partners and beneficiaries that consist of government, corporate and private sector big-timers, poor urban and rural families, elderly and women-headed families, women and children in remote villages, could be immensely supported by this type of supplementary assistance with a focus on raising environmental consciousness,
- e) Local NGOs/CBOs could make valuable contributions to, not only for direct income generating operations, but also for increase sense of ownership to environmental concerns, given the correct inbuilt guidance bringing far-reaching benefits/impacts in the long-run,
- f) The pragmatic and flexible planning and implementation approach adhered to RECS Project has been a positive contribution to the success of majority of IUCN assisted activities, at all operational levels.

Recommendations

- a) The RECS project strategy, which has worked as a turn-around of the traditional mandate of a direct project approach, must be replicated as a model for GO/Private/NGO led environmental conservation,
- The Multi-agency and multi-tier approach that deals with a number of challenges of environmental conservation and sustainable development, needs to be well documented and widely disseminated,
- c) The productive working collaboration among Government Agencies, Corporate Sector, Private Sector and local NGOs, need to be mainstreamed for far-reaching economic returns,
- d) The project management through a 'Consortium Approach' that worked effectively to achieve intended target and benefits within the project time span and beyond, needs to be shared with the government and like-minded people,
- e) Both short-term pilot projects and long-term environmental conservation practices like FSC and CSR with guided supply of technological and financial assistance should be further harnessed for negotiated partnerships and business relationships,
- f) Project-assisted pilot activities that have unleashed a set of environment-friendly initiatives, need to be replicated and connected to the mainstream development goals, including MDGs,
- g) The flexible nature of components/activities adhered to RECS model, needs to be shared with government, other donors and INGOs for achieving common goals,
- h) The benefits derived from long-term perspectives like CSR, FSC and knowledge disseminating activities should give long timeframe to assure sustainability of such challenging project components,
- The timely provision of full package of inputs allocated for pilot projects under CCSF small grants, requires more close supervision and monitoring by coordinating and implementing partners for better performance,
- j) All good practices and examples that have linked nature conservation with that of mainstream development bearing long-term sustainability and replicability, should give wide publicity through appropriate media,

PART 1

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the RECS Project

Sustainable Development has been placed as the key challenge of the third millennium across the globe. It has been the main focus for discussion at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), which was conducted during the period August – September 2002, in Johannesburg South Africa. While pursuing commitments of the governments for implementation of Agenda 21, this summit has paved way for a variety of other outcomes including the emphasis on the need for partnerships for sustainable development, within national governments of all participating countries.

This called for taking deliberate joint efforts of national and local governments, the private sector and civil society towards sustainable development. Thus, there is equally important role to play by each of these three development partners and they are mutually supportive and complementary, which require careful and constructive way forward with a series of practical programmes for action aiming at achieving sustainable development.

In the context of Sri Lanka too, it was the correct period of time for these three partners to get together for a course of action towards taking long-term measures for the protection and conservation of its rich biodiversity distributed within a range of ecosystems, which are inherited by the country's unique location with distinct climatic and topographical diversity, despite its smaller size.

The challenges that have brought about adverse consequences to the Sri Lanka's rich biodiversity are numerous and they include the pressures on population and habitat growth, new trends in industrial and tourism development, opening up of new avenues of commerce and trade, and non-adherence to pro-environment policies by concerned authorities both at national and local levels. The high population pressure of the country together with the continued practice of subsistence agriculture which lacked harmonized coexistence with the nature too have had negative impact on the biodiversity concerns.

Over the past two decades, however, Government of Sri Lanka has taken certain attempts to counter these threats, and the highest policy level intervention in this direction has been the establishing of a separate Ministry for Environment and Natural Resources, and bringing in the Departments of Forest and Wildelife and the Central Environmental Authority into its purview. Ministry together with its above agencies has led a process to strengthen and enforce legal provisions by making necessary amendments to the National Environmental Act of 1980 (No. 47) and has taken further steps to formulate environmental policies and strategies during the recent time. These actions and follow-up policy documents together have contributed to bind all organizations and individuals towards environment-friendly actions to rationally use natural resources mitigating environmental degradation, and ensuring sustainable development.

As measures for incorporating government, private sector and civil society organizations for collective conservation actions, several international and national agencies have come forward with generous technical and financial assistance. Among them most important ones are; a) The Global Environmental Facility and Environmental Action plan of the World Bank, which provided limited funds for community-based environmental activities, and b) The Local Environmental Fund (LEF) of the Royal Netherlands Embassy (RNE), which is the recent initiative to contribute the active local CBO/NGOs for their conservation actions. The RNE's fund was administered by IUCNSL and it served as a vehicle to provide opportunity and encourage concerned CBO/NGOs to carry out local level environmental activities.

On the other hand, the private sector being the other important stakeholder of the civil society was regarded as the collaborator to work with the state and CBO/NGOs in implementing national environmental strategies and programmes, and it has contributed for sustainable and replicable approaches for conservation and protection of the environment. Furthermore, publicity for awareness creation and educating the general public on environmental issues and concerns has been given heights to this agenda through print and electronic media, which includes scientific and general publications, newsletters, leaflets, and TV discussions and debates.

1.2 Activities Supported by IUCN under RECS

The Raising Environmental Consciousness in Society (RECS) Project has been initiated as an outcome of the collaborative actions of LEF/RNE and IUCNSL since 1999. Based on the previous practical experience in the field of environmental conservation and in response to several discussions with the RNE, the proposal for RECS has been prepared by a consortium led by IUCN with the participation of Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industries (FCCISL) and the Ceylon Chamber of Commerce (CCC).

IUCN - the International Union for Conservation of Nature, Sri Lanka Office and the Government of The Netherlands have signed an Agreement on 16th June 2006, to implement the RECS project and it consists, three main components. They are:

- 1. The Environment Agenda of the Private Sector strengthening and improving the performance of the corporate sector with respect to conservation and sustainable development. The expected final results as envisaged during project design under this component are:
 - A baseline survey on CSR levels and benchmarks for CSR improvement in selected industries:
 - An Environmental Business Leaders' Forum within the FCCISL and/or the CCC
 - Improved timber export results through FSC certification;
 - Improved environmental knowledge in small and medium-scale enterprises;
 - Environmental certification for industrial clusters;
 - Sharing of information between entrepreneurs, NGOs and Government on replicable
 models demonstrating CSR, NEQS, environmental audits, advisory and consultancy
 services, trade and sustainable development, and capacity building initiatives
 (publications, website, informal discussions);
 - Policy Debates leading to environmentally friendly decision making;
 - Publication of case studies for sharing of lessons learned.
- 2. The Environmental Consciousness of Local Communities institutionalized financial supporting system to local level environmental activities. It was envisaged that a Community Conservation Support Fund (CCSF) be set up as an effective financing window for local level community based organizations and other civil society organizations to access to required small scale grants on a sustainable basis. The key final outputs in this component are:
 - Establishment and full subscription of funds for the proposed CCSF, its management structures including the National Steering Committee and procedures (in keeping line with the Local Environmental Fund)

- Successful rounds of soliciting proposals, selecting them, and funding promising activities (at least 30 during the first two years)
- An institutional arrangement for capacity development of CBO members in initiating local level environmental action (part of community empowerment) by the end of programme with support from similar programmes (UNDP/IFAD etc)
- Holding lesson-sharing roundtables (at least 06 during the last two years of the project) among fund recipients;
- Publishing at least 03 reports in print and electronic media capturing and synthesizing the lessons learned in terms of successful local and community-based sustainable development projects and programmes.

3. Promoting a broad based public awareness campaign

Under this component the final results envisaged include:

- A series of televised roundtables will be produced on thematic areas to educate the public
 on current sustainable development issues. 12 thematic television programmes, one hour
 each, will be made available on a bimonthly basis.
- A series of news articles appearing on the print media on environment and development in Sri Lanka
- Convene a forum of consultations and policy roundtables involving lawyers, public representatives and policy makers to debate policies and regulations, their impacts on chosen subjects.
- Facilitate open debates convened by the National Committee of IUCN members bringing the Government and NGO sectors into a common platform of discussion
- Sponsor financial and technical assistance to at least 06 civil society representatives from
 Sri Lanka to participate in regional and global policy discussions

1.3 Scope of the Evaluation

According to the Terms of Reference, the scope of the evaluation will cover the specific tasks of assessment of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of RECS activities using appropriate sampling of the activities undertaken. The details of these tasks are listed below:

1. Assessment of organizational effectiveness in implementing & monitoring RECS;

The arrangement for the implementation of RECS; The human resources capacity; the operational resources available in carrying out project activities

2. Assessment of effectiveness;

- Progress on private sector (CCC, CSR Sub-committee of the CCC, FCCISL etc) involvement/ co-operation in environmental activities
- · Progress made on FSC certification.
- Progress on CCSF and its activities including selection criteria and approval process.
- Progress in funding empowerment, advocacy and capacity building of NGOs/CBOs.
- Progress in broad based public awareness campaigns and information dissemination and exchange of knowledge aimed at the improvement of the environment

- To what extent the interventions of the RECS contribute to address the environmental issues experienced by the target group (the public), which needs to be explained with specific examples.
- 3. Assessment of the efficiency; Progress towards achieving immediate objectives
- 4. Assess quality of project implementation strategy and of project monitoring;

Fulfilment of the supervision requirements of the RECS project with regard to implementation and monitoring,

- **5. Assessment of relevance**; To what extent can we determine if the project was a good idea/intervention given the situation it was set up to address?
- **6. Assessment of sustainability**; Is there evidence that there will be continued positive impact as a result of the project once it has finished? Why or why not? What should be done differently to ensure continued positive impact after the project life?
- 7. Assessment of the consortium approach of the project and the leveraging ability of the project; Support provided by consortium partners in the effective implementation of the project; The leveraging abilities of the various sub-projects and determination of whether they have played a catalytic role in generating interest from stakeholders

1.4 Structure of the Report

The report follows the structure designed by the consultant keeping in line with the provisions and requirements made in the TOR. The evaluation document is presented in two parts; Part 1 is the body of the report, which includes six chapters and Part 2 contains five Annexes.

The Chapter 1 on Introduction gives an account on the project background and scope for evaluation, While Chapter 2 brings up notes on the Evaluation, its purpose, assessment process, methodology and limitations to the evaluation, Chapter 3 is a description of the projects undertaken, and procedures followed for project planning & implementation. Most importantly, as the body of the evaluation, Chapter 4 deals with Main Findings, Organizational effectiveness in implementing and monitoring of RECS, assessment of effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability, and assessment of the consortium approach and the leveraging ability of the project. Chapter 5 is on conclusions and lessons learnt, and finally Chapter 6 provides the recommendations.

Five annexes under Part 2 are the documents pertaining to; I. RECS Project – Summary of findings by Project, II List of persons interviewed by institution / project / location, III. Terms of Reference for the External Evaluation, IV Questionnaire Guidelines used for interviews and V. RECS— a photographic presentation of project status.

2. Notes on the Evaluation

2.1 Purpose of the External Evaluation

RECS Project has been implemented for three and a half years in total during the period from July 2006 to December 2009, which includes an extension of exactly one year. As described in the Chapter 1 and by nature of the RECS Project, it contains three larger independent as well as interrelated components, under which a number of project activities have been undertaken by IUCN for implementation through a network of stakeholders and partners.

It was mainly a requirement stipulated in the project document and MOU as well as the RNE being the donor of the project that it should be subjected to a Final External Evaluation, after the completion of

the project. A Mid-term Assessment has also commissioned by an external evaluator in mid 2008, to fulfil the requirement of the donor agency (RNE), to evaluate the project after two years of implementation.

As indicated in the TOR for the evaluation and the RECS Project Proposal, the purpose of present external evaluation is to find out whether the project has achieved its objectives and intended outcomes, and to ascertain the impact of the project as anticipated by the donor and the consortium led by IUCN, CCC and FCCISL. It is expected that the evaluation would be based on an assessment of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of RECS activities using appropriate sampling of the activities undertaken

2.2 Evaluation Process and Methodology

The present external evaluation was undertaken by the consultant on the 18th of February 2010 and completed the process of information collection, field level interviews and observations on selected projects, interviews and discussions with key national, and field level project partners and stakeholders within three weeks time, which ended on 15th of March 2010. Since a few of the project stakeholders particularly at the national level, were not available for discussions during the planned period, the intended discussions with a few collaborated personnel were not possible.

The present evaluation was carried out by following the accepted methods of assessment, and keeping in line the speculated terms in the TOR, as well as giving consideration to the process described below. Data and information were collected through following three steps to analyse the performance, good practices, lessons learnt, gaps, and challenges to make recommendations for improvements of future programmes, as the final outcome:

- Review of secondary data and information; that are available in the Project Proposal, six biannual progress reports and various project-related documents, agency-level papers, publications, summary status reports, financial outflow summaries, and presentations by project implementers,
- <u>Collection of primary data and information</u>; that include individual interviews and discussions with IUCNSL Colombo office, RNE, CCC, FCCISL and FSC-related other project stakeholders, individual and group discussions with project beneficiaries under CCSF in the field locations, and
- <u>Field Observations carried out at selected project sites</u>; these were possible when the visits to selected key projects in 10 locations in 8 districts were conducted.

2.3 Limitations

For the conduct of evaluation of a complex nature like the RECS project with a number of activities, the evaluator faced with a few limitations and constraints, which are summarized below:

- The time allocated for the whole evaluation is short and limited considering the fact that only
 a period of 3 weeks could be allocated to cover activities under fairly large components
 involving quite an array of stakeholders, implementers and beneficiaries, who were
 operating in various field locations in 8 districts, which are diverse and scattered,
- All project-assisted activities have no clear output indicators following a systematic log-frame
 analysis, particularly under each CCSF- based community activities, and as such measuring
 the outputs and impact of some small projects posed a challenge to the evaluator, except for
 the objective related indicators presented in the project document.

 Owing to the change of project personnel in the top rank of IUCN and some of the key stakeholder institutions, particularly at the national level, and unavailability of some key informants at the time of evaluation, certain expected information were difficult to gather in time.

However, with the versatility that was available in the capacity of the RECS Team Leader, who operated for last phase of the project, and who was assigned to be available throughout the evaluation process, the evaluator managed to overcome almost all of these limitation to a great extent.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT UNDERTAKEN

3.1 Process Followed for Planning & Implementation of RECS

As described in the proposal, IUCN officials together with its consortium partners have made consultations with RNE, key NGOs and Government agencies in relation to the RECS Project. These consultations were primarily aimed at testing the experience and determining its relevance to project objectives, making contacts and collecting documentation, finding out the stakeholders' views on the Project, and identifying those unique characteristics associated with implementing the RECS Project. RNE concurred with IUCN that the planned facilitation of FSC (Forest Stewardship Council) Timber Certification as well as the Local Environmental Facility Small Grants Projects in the Environmental Sector, should be included as pilot activities for the creation of an environmental agenda for the private sector and local level communities. Integration of these activities into the wider environmental policy framework of the current project would result in maximum synergy and minimum duplication.

During the discussions held with stakeholders in the industrial sector, the need to reinforce the significant linkages between IUCNSL on the one hand and CCC and FCCISL on the other hand emerged fairly strongly. It was also endorsed that full acceptance of each other's objectives and priorities would be essential for the overall success of the RECS Project. This was an issue that would require continued attention throughout the project, and particularly during the inception and initial operational phases. Furthermore, RECS Project partners were in general agreement that the balance between industrial development and nature-cum-biodiversity protection need to be pursued by the Project. The similar opinion held for community development, particularly in working with local NGOs, and maintaining the balance seemed as quite a challenge.

Subsequently, the project proposal of RECS was prepared by IUCNSL in partnership with the two consortium members (CCC and FCCISL) as early as the year 2005. However, as seen above the project agreement between IUCN and RNE has been signed only in the following year, by June 2006, aiming at immediate implementation. In accordance with the consultation process, the project envisaged to implement a series of small scale environmental projects under Community Conservation Support Fund (CCSF). This fund has been created as an effective financial window for sustainable local level initiatives to be implemented through small grants.

Implementation of the 3-component based RECS project activities has taken off since July 2006 and till the end of 2009, with an extension of one year to the original project period. The process followed from mid 2006 onwards has been reported in the biannual progress reports, and hitherto six such reports have been produced by IUCN, which provided a tremendous amount of data and information to the consultant for the present evaluation.

According to the inception-cum-first progress report, a successful ground work has been taken place, in developing the foundation for most of the strategic initiatives under the RECS project, particularly

regarding the private sector-led FSC component and the Community Conservation Support Fund component. However, some minor delays have been experienced in the implementation of the Policy and Communications component related to establishing links with the media and holding regular monthly press briefings on environmental issues as well as matters related to the RECS Project.

As the first important step of the implementation of CCSF Component of RECS, IUCN published a paper advertisement inviting applications for a grant to implement small scale environmental projects. This paper advertisement dated September 3rd of 2006, carried the following message introducing the grant under CCSF:

"Available grants are for Government Organizations, Local Authorities, Community-based Organizations (CBOs), Local and National Non-Governmental Organizations, Private sector institutions, Professional Bodies working for environmental improvement and for educational training and Research Institutes on a competitive basis to support implementing small-scale initiatives/projects..."

The advertisement has listed seven areas, indicating that one or more of the seven areas should be aimed at by the prospective clients, who are keen to obtain the grants. Seven areas covered various environmental concerns ranging from implementing environmental action plans based on identified national priorities to developing multi-stakeholder partnerships in ensuring sustainable development at the local level.

In response to the paper advertisement of September 2006, IUCN has received 541 applications from various interest agencies and individuals, who are working in the field of environmental conservation, sustainable development and other related areas. Making use of the provisions made in the Project Proposal, a National Steering Committee (NSC) was established to oversee the matters pertaining to implementation of CCSF- based grant. This NSC on CCSF, which was comprised of 10 members from, RNE, IUCN, UNDP-GEF, CEA and other national GO and NGO partners, went through a screening process, firstly to short list around 100 small projects and secondly to ultimately select 24 agencies/individuals as most eligible for receiving grants (See Annex1 for details).

3.2 Project Objectives

As indicated in the Section 2.3 and the Logical Framework of the RECS Project Proposal, the project has one wider objective and three specific objectives, which are reproduced below:

<u>Wider objective</u> of the project reads 'to ensure that key stakeholders in resources management (the private sector, local communities and civil society members) demonstrate capacity to achieving national sustainable development and conservation objectives'. The objective of the proposal go in line with the Sri Lankan environment policy, with focus on strengthening regional and local initiatives, participation of civil society, private sector and awareness building of environmental considerations into the development process. It is proposed to achieve these objectives through a set of interventions that are introduced under the RECS Project.

The following are the *specific immediate objectives* identified under the project:

- Performance with respect to conservation and sustainable development by the corporate sector, mostly represented by the FCCISL and the CCC, strengthened and improved as the engine of development in the country;
- A system of supportive financial resources institutionalized to assist civil society activities that can guide policy and practices in sustainable directions; and

 The media, namely television and newspapers, harnessed as a vehicle for policy-related multi-stakeholder engagement of civil society actors with decision-makers, and for promoting broad-based education of the general public.

Hence, the project activities that were carried out during the 3-year project period basically covered three main project components in relation to and on par with these three objectives.

3.3 Roles & Responsibilities of Project Stakeholders and Partners

Given the complex nature of the RECS Project, a number of stakeholders and partners have been involved in the planning, implementation and monitoring of the project, both at national and local levels. The roles and responsibilities of these personnel are summarized by their agency and designation/position in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Project Stakeholders & Partners by their roles/responsibilities and Activities

Table 3.1: Project Stakeholders & Partners by their roles/responsibilities and Activities								
No	Stakeholders & Partners –	Roles / Responsibilities	Nature/ Type of Activities					
	By Agency/ Position		undertaken					
1	Donor - Royal Netherlands Embassy (RNE), Colombo							
	Senior Programme Officer -	-Managing the Project for RNE -Negotiate financial support -Member of NSC /Observer	-Assist/guide project identification -Prepare/Execute MOU & allocate funds -Participate in NSC meetings					
2	Implementing Agency – IUCN O	ffice, Colombo						
i ii	Country Representative RECS Team Leader / Project Coordinator	-Overall Project Management -Fund management, facilitate FSC certification, Extension of information & policy briefs; -Coordination, implementation	-Project formulation, negotiation of funds, -Liaise with project partners/implementers, -Attend meetings relating to 3					
III	Senior Programme Officer	and Monitoring of CCSF-based small projects (Re. Com. B.24)	-Attend meetings relating to 3 component- based project activities, -Make periodical field visits, resolve issues -Guide fund disbursements, -Prepare & submit biannual progress reports					
3	Implementer of Component – A:	Environmental Agenda for Priv	rate Sector - CSR and FSC Groups					
i	Ceylon Chamber of Commerce (CCC)		Establish EBL Forum, formulate MOUs, TORs for environmental certification, dentify & contract consultants, organise awareness workshops & trade promotion of best practice					
ii	Federation of Chambers of Com & Industries in Sri Lanka (FCCISL)	Raise environment awareness for its Regional Chambers, empower SMEs for piloting	dentify, implement & monitor 5 pilot orojects through 5 Regional Chambers of Commerce					
iii	Central Environmental Authority (CEA)- Director, Environmental Pollution Control	NCS member, awareness creation, authorize documents Impart knowledge/technology	Identify, prepare & disseminate nformation through publications, newsletters, leaflets, pamphlets; SME orioritization etc.					
iv	Export Development Board (EDB)	-Facilitate & collaborate with CBI for promoting FSC certified Timber Trade -Member of FSC-NSC	-Export promotional activity by with CBI -Coordinate & assist trade promotional activities with CBI on FSC certified timber products in overseas market.					
V	Sri Lanka Standards Institute (SLSI)	-Support to establish National FSC Standards -Certify timber exports through FSC -Member of FSC-NSC	Collect information on adopting FSC standards from other countries Draft National FSC standards Obtain final endorsement for standards FSC					
vi	Forest Department (FD)	Member of FSC-NSC & forest management units/ group	-Assist improve timber exports through FSC certification					
vii	State Timber Cooperation (STC)	Member of FSC-NSC & forest	-Assist improve timber exports through					

No	Stakeholders & Partners –	Roles / Responsibilities	Nature/ Type of Activities
	By Agency/ Position		undertaken
:::	Chair of Custody (CCC) Croup	management units/group	FSC certification
viii	Chain of Custody (COC) Group	Facilitate Group Certification of FSC	 -Work for certification of timber producers' groups
Х	Regional Plantation Corporation (RPC)	FSC accreditation for the RPC groups of companies - Member of FSC-NSC	-Effective functioning of FSC- NSC, -Accreditation and auditing functions of FSC -Guide RPC members on FSC process
хi	Rubber Research Institute (RRI)	- Member of FSC-NSC	Research & Publicity on FSC Certification
	Rubber Small Holders	- Member of FSC-NSC	Facilitate FSC Certification as a qualified group for accreditation.
4	Implementing Partners – B: Com	munity Component (Civil Socie	ty organizations) – CCSF Grants
i	District Planning Office, Polonnaruwa		-Establish of Nature Parks in 10 schools
ii	MAS Linea Aqua (Pvt) Ltd	Implement a nature-friendly project through a local CBO	Elimination of Cactus & Acacia from the Bundala National Park
iii	Wildlife and Nature Protection Society	Implement a nature-friendly project through a local CBO	Community based Environment, Wildlife and Nature Conservation through School Children
iv	Environmental Forum of Sri Lanka	Implement a nature-friendly project through a local CBO	Project for a Community living in a Mangrove & Lagoon Environment Kalido Beach, Kalutara
V	United Society for Harnessing of Solar Power	Implement a nature-friendly &energy saving project through a local CBO	Biodiversity conservation thru' env. education campaign in Buffer-zone communities around protected areas of Udawalawe
vi	Weligama Urban Council	Implement a nature-friendly project for income/employment generation by UC	Composting of Municipal Solid Waste in Weligama Urban Council Area
vii	Mahaweli Authority of Sri Lanka	Implement a nature-friendly project	Mary Mount Mini-catchment dev. thru' Integrated watershed mgmt. approach in Victoria Catchment
viii	Environmental Foundation Ltd	Implement a environmental education project with Judiciary	Building the Capacity of Sri Lanka's Judiciary to address Environmental Issues through the courts
ix	Sewalanka Foundation, Anuradhapura	Implement a nature-friendly project through local CBOs	Restoration of Natural Habitats in Village Tank Ecosystem in the dry zone, Anuradhapura District
Х	Roneasha Polymer Industries (Pvt) Ltd, Katana	Implement a nature-friendly project for income/employment generation	Community based awareness building & promotion of sustainable Solid Waste mgmt.
xi	Conservation Area Management Committee, Bibile		Conservation & sustainable use of natural resources thru' appropriate participatory mgmt.
xii	Kuruwita Pradeshiya Shaba, Kuruwita	Implement a nature-friendly project for income/employment generation by PS	Kuruwita Pradeshiya Shaba & Kuruwita Prison- based waste recycling project - 2 Phases
xiii	Women's Savings Effort- Wilpotha	Implement a nature-friendly project through a local CBO for common use	Restore Galkulama Tank & motívate community for an integrated environmental Programme
xiv	Biodiversity Programme Royal College Colombo 07	Implement a nature-friendly project	Urban School Biodiversity Garden
χV	Dumbara Surakinno	Implement a nature-friendly project	Conservation Knuckles through informed Ecotourism
xvi	Nature Team- University of Moratuwa	Implement a nature-friendly project	University of Moratuwa based Integrated Recycling Project.
xvii	Seth Sevana Foundation	Implement a nature-friendly project through a local CBO for common use	Recycling Polythene/Plastic Solid Waste to reduce Environmental Pollution while opening means for Income Generation for Low Income Families
xviii	Biodiversity Conservation Task	Implement a nature-friendly	Conservation of Ecosystems by

No	Stakeholders & Partners – By Agency/ Position	Roles / Responsibilities	Nature/ Type of Activities undertaken
	Force	project	Community Participation (RUK)
xix	Institute of Environmental Professionals (SL)	Implement a nature-friendly project	Supporting informed advocacy in sound environmental management
ХХ	Susitha Wadana Samithiya	Implement a nature-friendly project	OPENING DOORS: Raising Env. Consciousness Amongst Under- privileged School Children
xxi	Community Development Centre	Implement a nature-friendly project through a local CBO for common use	Rural Economic Strengthen by Conservation and Promotion of Traditional Roots and Yam Varieties.
xxii	Lady Ridgeway Hospital for Children	Implement a nature-friendly project	Healing garden by improving external environment of the Lady Ridgeway Hospital (LRH)
xxiii	Sri Lanka Association for the Advancement of Science	Implement a nature-friendly project	Conduct of the Nature Diaries Programme n 2008
xxiv	Ruk Rakaganno; Dambulla	Implement a nature-friendly project	To create awareness of biodiversity conservation among local community, students & nature lovers
5	lmplementing Partners – C: Polic	y and Communications Compo	nent (Media & Others)
Ī	TVEAP – TVE Asia Pacific	Environmental awareness raising among general public thru electronic media	Produce and broadcast 10 televised debates on critical environmental issues
li	National Cleaner Production Centre (NCPC) Sri Lanka	Environmental awareness raising among general public through print media; advise SMC on cleaner products	Prepare and publish materials on cleaner greener products to protect nature & save energy, water and other resources

Note: Rows in grey indicate the agencies/individuals that were visited and interviewed during the evaluation, by the consultant

Source: RECS Project document, biannual progress reports & field visits by consultant, March 2010.

3.4 Component-wise Project Activities with their Objectives

RECS project has been implemented under three main components, each of which comprised 3 sub-components, and small projects and activities were implemented under those sub-components. According to the Output Monitoring Matrix of the periodical progress reports, these project activities were implemented by assigned agencies, individuals, small and medium companies and civil society organisation depending on the nature of the activity, as shown in Table 3.1 above.

These project components, sub-components and activities with their immediate objectives are listed Table 3.2 below:

Table 3.2: Component-wise Project Activities with their Objectives

Component	Sub-component	Immediate Objective (no. of activities)
Component A: The environmental agenda of the private sector	A1 -Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) A2-Improved timber exports through FSC certification A3-Environmental certification for industrial clusters	-To strengthen and improve environmental performance by private sector (13 activities) -To establish and introduce forest and timber certification standards for all sector components (17 activities) - To investigate and potentially establish environmental certification for groups of SMC's (8 activities)
2. Component B: The environmental consciousness of local communities	B1:Community Conservation Support Fund, B2:Small-scale environmental projects	-To institutionalize a system of supportive financial resources (6 activities) -to initiate conservation or sustainable

Component	Sub-component	Immediate Objective (no. of activities)
	B3: Capacity enhancement in CBO's for initiating environmental action	use of natural resources (6 activities) -To enhance the capability of grantees in designing implementing, and monitoring projects (4 activities)
3. Component C: The higher political framework	C1: Extension of information C2: Facilitation of policy development C3: Participation in regional/global policy discussions	-To use the media as a vehicle to promote environmental education (5 activities) -To create a forum of Government, NGO's and public for dialogue on natural resources management (4 activities) - To facilitate participation in international policy discussions (3 activities)

Source: RECS Project Document (2005) & Biannual Progress Report (Jan-Jun 2009)

The activities that were implemented under each component and sub-component of RECS vary from simple paperwork, meetings and workshops to more complex technical paper preparation, technology transfer and dissemination of expert advice.

Of all the activities undertaken under RECS project, most challenging ones were getting the private sector on board for FSC certification and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), in relation to the Component one.

However, it was expected that at the end of the RECS Project period, all three of RECS's main target groups – the government, private sector and the civil society - will enjoy enhanced capacity to engage in conservation programmes and will be involved in governance issues and reforms.

4 MAIN FINDINGS

As mentioned in the Chapter 1, main findings in relation to the organizational effectiveness in implementing and monitoring of RECS, assessment of effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability, and assessment of the consortium approach and the leveraging ability of the project, are analysed and presented in this chapter, keeping in line with the TOR of the External Evaluation.

The main source of information for the evaluation in general is the six-monthly progress reports that has been executed by the RECS project team. The Output Monitoring Matrix (OMM) of these Progress Reports, in particular can be regarded as the periodical update at a glance for an evaluation of this nature. The consultant could grasp the salient features of the project by comparing the activities included in Activity Matrix of the Project Proposal with that of the OMM in all six biannual progress reports.

In support of the general analysis and thereby specific aspects of the assessment hereunder, are presented in Table 4.1, as a summary of findings.

4.1 Organizational Effectiveness in Implementing and Monitoring of RECS

The activities pertaining to the initial implementation and monitoring of RECS, as indicated in the Project Proposal include the mobilization of project team, preparation of M&E Matrix, preparation of cooperation agreements with partners and stakeholders, organising of the National Workshop, establishment of Project Supervisory Committee and preparation of the Inception Report.

These implementation arrangements have been accomplished from the outset of the project, as an excellent team effort, adhering to the guidelines provided by the original project proposal. It was encouraging to notice that the RECS team has been used the OMM effectively to undertake

management and monitoring of the specific components outputs and related activities. Regular project team meetings have been convened to discuss implementation issues and to address certain constraints created as a result of externalities.

However, it was observed by the consultant that in terms of human resources capacity within the IUCN project team, the change of staff members at the top during the halfway period of project implementation has created project management issues, causing obvious delays in project activities towards the end of project period. It is praiseworthy that the RECS team leader, who managed the final phase of the project, has been dynamic enough to rectify such lapses and delays to a great extent.

RECS by nature of its implementation modalities, particularly considering the short project's time span to implement activities coming under three larger components, has called for timely delivery of outputs by a range of operational resources including two NSC-based management, technical advice, knowledge imparting materials and publications. A good majority of these resources have been made available for intended operations with some delays at the inception relating to some activities under Components B and C. However, it was observed by the consultant that due to the involvement of multi-agency implementing partners, some of the deliverables were not possible within the project period. The best example is the delay in issuing some of the planned knowledge disseminating publications, which were either in the process of editing or in the press, even at the time of the evaluation (end of March 2010).

Table 4.1: Summary of findings against Expected Project Outputs

Component/Sub-	Expected Project Outputs		Summary of Findings					
Component								
Component A - The environmental agenda of the private sector								
A1 -Corporate Social	□ A baseline survey on CSR levels, including a needs		Completed during 2 nd half					
Responsibility (CSR)	assessment for capacity development, &		of 2006					
	benchmarks for CSR improvement in industrial							
	sectors;							
	□ An Environmental Business Leaders' Forum within		EBLF has been developed					
A2-Improved timber	the FCCISL and/or the CCC;		as an effective vehicle for					
exports through FSC	□ Improved timber export results through FSC		members					
certification	certification;	_	All private sector partners					
	□ Environmental curricula in Business Schools and		benefited					
	Vocational Training Centres;	_	FCCISL has dropped this					
	Improved environmental knowledge in small- and		from its priority list					
A3-Environmental	medium-scale companies;		SMEs benefited					
certification for industrial	 Environmental certification for industrial clusters; 							
clusters	 Sharing of information between entrepreneurs, 		RPC has taken					
	NGOs & Govt on replicable models demonstrating		commendable initiatives in					
	CSR, NEQS, environmental audits, advisory and		this regard, taking the					
	consultancy services, trade & sustainable		project-induced facilitation					
	development, and capacity building initiatives		into furtherance.					
	(publications, website, informal discussions);							
	□ Policy Debates leading to environmentally friendly							
	decision making;	0	Information dissemination					
	□ Publication of case studies to share lessons learned.		made through media has					
			been effective.					

Component/Sub-	Expected Project Outputs	Summary of Findings
Component		
Component B - The envi	onmental consciousness of local communities	
B1:Community Conservation Support Fund (CCSF),	 A well-functioning CCSF, with established management procedures thru' NSC, and keeping in line with the Local Environmental Fund; Acquisition of donor commitments towards the CCSF for continued funding; Successful rounds of soliciting proposals, selecting 	 CCSF has made tremendous impact on small scale CBOs/ SMEs
B2:Small-scale Environmental Projects B3: Capacity	 them & funding promising activities (30 in 1st two years); Guidance of implementation of at least 20 small-scale environmental projects by civil society organizations during the first two years of the project; Institutionalized capacity development of CBOs in initiating local level environmental action in coordination with & support from similar programs 	 24 qualified to implement most viable projects, and most of them have provided replicable models.
enhancement in CBO's for initiating environmental action		
		dissemination on best practices reached wider forum
□ Component C - The h	igher political framework	
C1: Extension of information	 A series of 12 television programmes of roundtables on thematic areas, one hour each, to educate the public on current sustainable development issues; A series of news articles in the printed media on environment & development in Sri Lanka, written to and inform and influence decision makers, as well 	 Effective TV programs contributed for awareness among wider audience Print media to enhance knowledge among practitioners
C2: Facilitation of policy development	as enabling grassroots involvement in decision- making processes towards a healthy environment; Organization of a series of consultations and policy roundtables involving lawyers, public representatives & policy makers to debate policies and regulations and their impacts on chosen	 Policy level peoples' involvement can take the initiatives very far
C3: Participation in regional / global policy discussions	subjects; Preparation of at least ten well-researched policy briefs, involving university students, possibly thru' an	 Subject of environmental

Component/Sub- Component	Expected Project Outputs	Summary of Findings
	 internship program with IUCN; Arrangement/facilitation of open debates bringing Govt & NGOs into a common platform of discussion; Provision of financial and technical assistance to at least six civil society representatives from Sri Lanka for participation in regional and global policy discussions 	conservation a matter of concern Wider involvement by civil society made possible

Source: RECS Project Document, Biannual Progress Report, & Field Survey in March 2010

4.2 Assessment of Effectiveness

In general, the progress made by RECS over its life span of three and a half years, has been tremendous given consideration to the complexity of the component-wise activities that were implemented by a multi-disciplinary teams with common as well as conflicting agendas of their own. The effectiveness of the project needs was assessed with this factor in mind.

In relation to the progress, the private sector involvement and cooperation, particularly CCC, CSR Sub-committee of CCC, FCCISL and others in environmental activities, were assessed and presented against each collaborative partner and/or action:

Progress on IUCN - CCC/CSR Collaboration:

- Having consolidated its relationship with the CCC, IUCN has supported the activities of its CSR Sub-committee membership on achieving the MDGs; the Corporate, Social and Environmental Responsibility Report was drafted and finalized during the first half of 2007, and subsequently it has been shared with CCC.
- IUCN and CCC through a process of careful selection have identified the companies that
 would be showcased under the benchmarking initiative; several meetings were held with the
 selected companies that have agreed to benchmark within three specified sectors, namely
 biodiversity, energy and waste management.
- The status of the biodiversity in the premises of "Mihila" Hydramani Group of Companies, CKT Apparels (PLC) located in Agalawatta in the Kalutara district, has been documented and recommendations made for future options; the company has taken recommendations forward in consultation with IUCN; the enhancement of biodiversity status has to be further documented at regular intervals.
- Discussions were had with *Hayleys* to bench mark the energy saving initiatives in selected group organizations. Action on this initiative will be taken forward during the extended period in collaboration with the CSR sub-committee of the CCC; documenting the lessons learnt from the bench marking initiative would be a part of the extended phase.
- The Elephant Transit Home at Udawalawe was re-constructed by *Dilmah* Tea Company with guidance from Forest Department and IUCN. The information centre was set up and IUCN has provided the technical knowhow and information to be displayed through RECS assistance.

Progress on IUCN – FCCISL/SMED Collaboration:

- IUCN had extensive discussions with FCCISL's Small and Medium Enterprises Development (SMED) Project on the possible collaborative opportunities; to determine the new priorities, FCCISL along with IUCNSL has conducted a planning workshop with the various Regional Chamber constituents to deliberate upon and identify specific areas of collaboration.
- The workshop has been opportune to identify pilot projects on the integration of environmentally sustainable procedures and technologies into the operations of the small and medium enterprises; in addition, it was found that SMEs in general were not aware on environmental issues as well as regulatory aspects including Environmental Protection Licences (EPLs), EIAs, etc; to address this gap, IUCN and FCCISL agreed to organize a series of capacity building workshops for the SME membership of the Regional Chamber constituents of the FCCISL.
- The work on three FCCISL outputs, namely, pilot projects on integrating environmentally sustainable procedures & technologies, awareness creation workshops on environmental issues and handbook on pollution abatement was completed successfully during the latter part of 2008.
- As a follow-up to SME work with FCCISL the curricular and course modules of the lectures and Pollution Abatement Handbook (in Sinhala) are ready for printing and the scripts are with printers.
- However, owing to changes occurred at the top management level of FCCISL during the final
 year of RECS implementations, performance of some FCCISL-related project activities were
 negatively affected, and therefore publication work in particular, were delayed and carried
 over even beyond the project period. The rectification and completion of such work were
 attended by the RECS Team Leader of IUCN.
- Five cleaner production pilot projects covering a service station (Anuradhapura), a paddy processing mill (Ampara), a desiccated coconut factory (Kurunegala), a lime kiln (Matale) and a seed paddy production factory (Pollonaruwa) have been completed; the environmental audits pertaining to these companies have also been completed and subsequently corrective actions have been initiated in collaboration with the specific entrepreneurs; efforts have been made to document all these approaches with positive results for wider dissemination amongst the sectors with the support of the University of Peradeniya. It was found that recycling of waste and/or contaminated water and control of air/land pollution through appropriate technology in these industrial locations are quite effective, and the partners have been able to increase their income by saving energy and the environment.

Progress made on FSC certification:

Development of a National Forestry Stewardship Council (FSC) Standard has been a great achievement in itself. SLSI has received some preliminary suggestions from Accreditation Services International (ASI) on the format and numbering in the draft. At the request of IUCN, a separate officer has been assigned by SLSI for accreditation matters. In addition IUCN has provided technical backstop on a regular basis. SLSI has been requested to submit more documents needed for the purpose of accreditation. Following standard procedures the Draft National FSC Standards have been made public. Following the incorporation of Public comments, the draft has been submitted to the SLSI Technical committee for approval. Comments of FSC are awaited prior to submission of the final draft to the SLSI Board for Approval.

The certification of 3 groups (Rubber small holders, Regional Plantation Companies [RPC] and Chain of Custody [CoC]), and 2 institutions (Forest Department [FD] and State Timber Corporation [STC]) Certifications have been decided. The constitution of both RPCs and CoC Groups has been completed in accordance with the FSC format, and the Groups have been legalized. The RRI Small-holders Group constitution has been finalized (the Sinhala version).

However, it was quite disappointing to find that both FD and STC, being the only two state institutions involved in certification process, have not been able to secure FSC certification facility, owing to their non-participation in the latter part of the process and their lethargic attitude towards continuation with the project.

The Procedures and Guidelines have been adopted and followed by the respective groups, Corrective Actions being affected; the identified Corrective Actions Requests (CARs) during the pre-scoping stage have been implemented. These were supported and enhanced by the pre-assessment checklists and Non Conformities (NCs) identified by the Lead Auditor from Control Union who has been engaged to carry out the Auditor Training and pre-assessments.

Regarding the short-term research projects by students, all contracted Research projects by university students have now been completed. Information from the research done, have been used in the Forest Management Plans.

Required actions relating to the revision of Forest Management Plans have taken place. The total Plantation Forest areas under the FSC programme from the State Forest sector would be approximately 25,000 ha. Maps are being completed for all these areas, and the conservation areas including High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) areas have been marked.

Progress on CCSF and its activities including selection criteria and approval process:

As described in Chapter three above, 24 projects were supported through the CCSF grant facility under small grant projects, following the selection process conducted by NSC members. These grants have been utilized for various activities relating to solid waste management, removal of invasive species, mini catchment development, restoration of tank ecosystems, development of school biodiversity gardens, conservation of local root crops and yams, development of butterfly parks and forest parks in public places such as schools and hospitals and for awareness raising and capacity building.

These projects are geographically located across the country as demonstration showcases, covering over 10 districts. On the recommendations of the NSC, some of the projects were provided with additional funds to ensure that they become successful replicable models for possible up-scaling by other donors (Annex I gives a summary status of these projects).

Furthermore, in relation to share the lessons learnt by small grantees with each other, several steps have been taken by the project management. Of these one most important event has been the conducting of a workshop on 'Lessons learnt from CCSF projects' at the Club Palm Garden in Beruwela from 23 - 25 June 2008, for which all 24 grantees were invited and the valuable lessons from the projects were shared by the grantees during the two day event. On the third day, the participants got the opportunity to gather first hand information by visiting the Weligama solid waste management project and a butterfly garden at Sangamitta Girls School in Galle, both of which are supported by the CCSF.

It should be noted that provision of additional funds to expand and/or follow on the successful project activities, was possible thanks to the flexibility nature of the project granted by RNE.

Progress in funding empowerment, advocacy and capacity building of NGOs/CBOs:

As a very effective positive step towards the sustainability of CCSF, a study on the furtherance of a small grants fund to sustain the Community Conservation Support Fund in the longer-run was carried out by a consultant and the report on the *'Furtherance of Small grants facility to sustain Community Conservation Support Fund (CCSF)'* has been made available, and this report has made 10 strong recommendations for the furtherance of the fund, followed by the highlight below:

'There should be a medium term to long term strategy within IUCN in order to mobilize required financial resources in order to further a similar small grants mechanism to the CCSF. This strategy should encompass outreaching to donors with whom IUCN Sri Lanka already developed mutual trust (through demonstration of capacity and integrity to manage similar grants as in the case of CCSF), outreaching to multilateral donors, taking advantage of IUCN's global standing as the prime organization in conservation of bio diversity (MFF and GEF etc.) and outreaching to the private sector.'

The effective nature of work in most of the NGO/CBO-based small grant projects, have been demonstrated best practices, which call for replication to other places where the need for environmental conservation is similar or even higher, and state and private sector attention should be crucial to influence such a more.

Progress in broad based public awareness campaigns and information dissemination and exchange of knowledge aimed at the improvement of the environment:

With regard to public awareness and information dissemination objective of RECS, quite an impressive number of steps have been taken by the project. Main highlights observed during the evaluation are summarized below:

- In strengthening relationship with the media, IUCN has continued to have good links with the
 media and several articles of interest have been published in the business sections of the
 leading dailies and magazines; during the closing phase of the RECS project the maximum
 coverage for success stories were planned for both forms of media.
- Extension of Information and Policy Briefs would also be an important component of RECS
 during the extended phase; here the focus has been in preparing documentaries on the
 success stories of CCSF, completion of lessons learnt in a booklet form, completion of fact
 sheets, and disseminating findings to diverse stake holders.
- As one of the activities of RECS *Sri Lanka 2048* a new, innovative series of television debates exploring prospects for a sustainable future for Sri Lanka in the Twenty First Century was aired on Sirasa TV and MTV Channels (Private) Ltd, during June July months of 2008. Each one hour debate involved; as panel and studio audience, over two dozen Sri Lankans from academic, civil society, corporate and government backgrounds participated. This editorially independent series accommodated a broad spectrum of expertise and opinion. Of the 10 topics that were debated in this series three were selected for further discussion by a select group of diverse stake holders. The topics selected included:
 - Business as Unusual focusing on the increasingly important role of business, in a world facing major environmental challenges,
 - Future Choices for Biological Diversity,
 - Solid Waste Management

• The round table discussions held aiming at producing practical recommendations for the consideration of diverse stake holders; as in the TV debate series, a cross section of participants from a varied spectrum was selected as invitees to these round table discussions. The meetings were held on 23rd October, 17th and 19th of November 2008, respectively and were facilitated by specialists in the field. The reports of these meetings and policy briefs have also been finalized.

To what extent the interventions of RECS contribute to address the environmental issues experienced by the target group (the public):

Whilst all three RECS's main target groups (government, civil society and the private sector) have been sufficiently addressed by the project interventions to varying degree, the most directly affected has been civil society, which represents the general public. As a whole the civil society has been benefitted both directly and indirectly by RECs assistance that has been extended through the CCSF-based Component Two of the project titled 'The Environmental Consciousness of local communities.'

The environmental issues that have been addressed by 24 projects under CCSF grants are of diverse nature, and represent almost all aspects of public concern. The selected activities relate to solid waste management, removal of invasive species, mini catchment development, restoration of tank ecosystems, development of school biodiversity gardens, conservation of local root crops and yams, development of butterfly parks and forest parks in public places such as schools and hospitals and for awareness raising and capacity building.

As a finding of the field survey carried out during the evaluation to a few of these projects, following <u>specific examples</u> are presented to ascertain what extent these interventions of RECS, have been contributed to address the issues:

- 1. Composting of Municipal Solid Waste in Weligama Urban Council Area, implemented by Weligama Urban Council: This project can be rated as the most effective environmental conservation project under CCSF, which has generated multiple benefits to the target group and area. They are; a) urban solid waste management to protect the public area, sea-bay, b) systematic recycling of waste and production of compost for sale, c) establishment of integrated farm with sales outlet, and d) creating employment for 24 unemployed youth in the community. This project is also most visited one by other local bodies (over 50), schools and other interested parties (over 60), as learning grounds, as it has provided a truly replicable model for the public.
- 2. Restore Galkulama Tank & motivate community for an integrated environmental Programme, implemented by Women's Savings Effort-Wilpotha: A village-based environment project has brought about multiple benefits to the public, which includes; a) community mobilisation, b) restoration of a multi-purpose tank, c) construction of structures for bathing and irrigation, d) community training in environmental aspects, e) planting of the tank catchment for erosion mitigation, f) home gardening, g) self-employment, h) tank-based village shop, and i) establishment of a recreation area. The project has directly benefitted 100 farm families and indirectly several 100s of people for other purposes. It is yet another replicable model as the level of sustainability is very high.
- 3. Community based awareness building & promotion of sustainable Solid Waste Management, implemented by Roneasha Polymer Industries (Pvt) Ltd, Katana: Being a private small-holder enterprise this project has aimed at recycling of waste polythene and making public awareness in pollution abatement and environment conservation. This has

three-fold benefits to the public, namely; a) environmental awareness and training for the general public in 20 GN divisions in Katana DS division of the Gampaha district, b) collection of polythene to make a daily living for 20 families and c) cleaning and selling of sorted material for recycling directly benefitting 5 - 7 women in Katana. The contribution to the target group is pollution mitigation and income generation. As an outcome of the project the chief private investor has been motivated to open up his own recycling factory in the Galle District, replicating the similar benefits to another municipal area.

- 4. Establish of Nature Parks in 10 schools coordinated by District Planning Office, Polonnaruwa, and implemented by staff/students 10 schools: This project has brought in more diverse benefits to the remote dry-zone district of Pollonnaruwa, through a group of dynamic officials, teachers and students of 10 selected schools. The main project outputs include; a) establishment of 10 forest parks with necessary plants and structures b) tools for composting and agro-planting, c) environmental knowledge by publications (Parisara Puwath), and d) organisation of do-you-know context and field education trips. The direct impact of intervention of this school-based project is carrying the conservation message to from school to their houses and to the wider society encouraging them for environmental consciousness.
- 5. Healing environment by improving external environment of the Lady Ridgeway Hospital (LRH), implemented by the Hospital staff: A very successful butterfly garden is established in the premises of LRH in Colombo, making a real difference to the hospital surrounding, with a dynamic staff of two medical doctors, where a beautiful flower garden to support over 55 native species of butterflies. The demonstration impact of this would make several more hospital premises in the vicinity become attractive butterfly-gardens.

4.3 Assessment of the Efficiency

In this section the assessment will be focus on the progress towards achieving the specific immediate objectives identified under the project:

Objective One: Performance with respect to conservation and sustainable development by the corporate sector, mostly represented by the FCCISL and the CCC, strengthened and improved as the engine of development in the country:

As two strong partners of the consortium, CCC and FCCISL have been actively involved from the inception of RECS making the effective performance with respect to conservation and sustainable development by the corporate sector possible. In achieving this first immediate objective both of these national chambers of commerce made their officials and members available for project-related activities. Most noteworthy achievements are highlighted below in order of importance (also given under Section 4.2):

- The baseline survey on CSR levels, including a needs assessment for capacity development, & benchmarks for CSR improvement in the industrial sectors,
- Formation of an Environmental Business Leaders' Forum.
- Facilitation of improved timber export through FSC certification (RPC, RSH, & CoC)
- Improved environmental knowledge in SME companies, (pilots with 5 factories)
- Environmental certification for industrial clusters (Hidramani, Heyleys & Dilmah),
- Sharing of information between entrepreneurs, NGOs & Govt on replicable models,
- Policy Debates leading to environmental friendly decision making;

Publication of case studies to share lessons learned.

The environmental conservation pilot project done with CCC members in 3 large companies) and with FCCISL with 5 Medium companies, in particularly have collectively contributed to achieve the positive results under this objective.

Objective Two: A system of supportive financial resources institutionalized to assist civil society activities that can guide policy and practices in sustainable directions:

Based on the performances of the civil society activities in 24 locations, where a good majority has been achieved excellent, it is proposed to develop RECS phase II, as a programme in *IUCN Regional Business and Biodiversity Programme* to promote the concept of a sustainable fund which would facilitate small grants through corporate sector funding, while the initial capital for such a fund could be sought from a bilateral source.

With the possibility of the Netherlands Committee of IUCN, it could make the initial contribution; other options suggested in the 6th Progress report include;

- CIDA, SIDA and DFID for securing bilateral assistance for a small grants facility.
- Establishment of an endowment fund to explore the possibility of initiating a strong campaign with selected donors like GEF,
- Development of Trust Funds (e.g. Mangroves for the Future),
- Dilmah Conservation Fund,
- Exploring funds allocated for CSR activities as a sustainable financing arm for environmental conservation,
- Other potential sectors/companies that can have further dialogue include concern private companies (Aitkin Spence, Plantation sector including Dilmah, Garment Sector (MAS holdings) and Banking Sector (HSBC, Standard Chartered etc)

Objective Three: The media, namely television and newspapers, harnessed as a vehicle for policyrelated multi-stakeholder engagement of civil society actors with decision-makers, and for promoting broad-based education of the general public;

As also mention in Section 4.2, the most outstanding performance achieved under this objective have been two-fold:

- The innovative series of television debates exploring prospects for a sustainable future for Sri Lanka in the Twenty First Century that was telecasted on Sirasa TV and MTV Channels (Private) Ltd, during June - July months of 2008; this included 10 TV series under the title of Talking today for a better tomorrow - 2048,
- The round table discussions held aiming at producing practical recommendations for the
 consideration of diverse stake holders; as in the TV debate series, a cross section of
 participants from a varied spectrum was selected as invitees to these round table discussions,
 held for 3 days in October and of November 2008.

The efficiency of these initiative lies with the capacity of the implementing and coordination agency, which needs to be sustained through proper institutionalisation. The experience of the TVE Asia Pacific and its CEO has immencely contributed to the very high quality production of the 10 TV series, in particular. The topics covered under these knowledge sharing and imparting session generated farreaching benefits covering a wide spectrum of audience.

4.4 Assess Quality of Project Implementation Strategy and of Project Monitoring

The implementing strategy and project monitoring has been the responsibility placed mainly on the IUCN team and it depended upon the arrangement made for the fulfilment of the supervision requirements of RECS project.

Throughout the implementation period of RECS, the implementation and monitoring has been carried out by the RECS Team comprising a Team Leader, FSC Sub-project Team Leader, FSC Project Officers and CCSF Officer. Three interns have assisted the FSC team. The team was further guided and assisted technically by the Head, Regional Business and Biodiversity Programme, IUCN Asia, and in addition, other professional staff of IUCN provided further support to the RECS team. During the project period of three and a half years, the Team Leader and the FSC Sub-project Team Leader have been changed once. However, this change has not affected very much to the project implementation and monitoring, except for more capacity addition to complete the delayed work, in terms of some national level implementation partners.

Other project implementation and monitoring partners are the consortium partners of CCC and FCCISL, and were mainly involved in work relating to FSC and CSR, in which they play supervisory roles and lead the NSC. In terms of RECS project activities (Component one) CCC, FCCISL and SLSI have signed separate MOUs with IUCNSL. During the evaluation, the consultant observed that there were instances that when fulfillment of assigned project activities relating to reporting and publications (by FCCISL/SMED) IUCN Team Leader had to take over them for timely completion.

The RECS team has been using the OMM effectively to undertake its day-to-day management and supervision of the specific components outputs and related activities. Regular project team meetings are convened to discuss implementation issues and also to address any stumbling blocks created as a result of extraneous factors. It was also noticed by the consultant that biannual format backed by OMM has been used exclusively for progress reporting throughout the project implementation period, maintaining a high quality standards.

4.5 Assessment of Relevance

The time of the RECS project formulation in late 2005, Sri Lanka together with many other countries in the region was just recovering from the shock of Tsunami experience (Dec. 2004) thanks to generous donor assistance by a large number of donors and INGOs. At the same time projects relating to MDG of UNDP were also had taken off the ground, in which Ensuring Environmental Sustainability was placed as the 7th Millennium Development Goal. All these projects plus many other INGO/NGO-based pro-poor interventions introduced various participatory and sustainable development approaches as the cornerstone for their interventions.

In this context, it was quite relevant that RECS was identified by IUCN together with its partners, as they were committed strongly to applying partnership approaches where possible and feasible.

The key advantages of such an approach include involvement and association of all stakeholders and beneficiaries with the RECS Project from start to finish, promoting local ownership.

This approach was quite opportune and practical for IUCN's mandate to elicit interest, ideas and commitment and to enhance longer-term sustainability of the identified interventions. It was also important and relevant that the partnership approach adhered to the project, was to be applied at two levels:

• At the institutional level, where the RECS Project envisages setting up partnerships with Government agencies and large NGOs (partly through the Supervisory Committee), in order

to avoid a Technical Assistance-driven Project and to enhance/strengthen local ownership. Where ever opportune, Partnership Forums will be organized, in which all relevant and potential stakeholders (Project Partners, other donors, NGOs) as well as representatives of the local/ national government participate to ensure collaboration, complementarities and (positive) impact maximisation of the different interventions in the area; and

At the implementation (field) level, the approach includes a stakeholder analysis and setting
up partnerships consisting of primary stakeholders/beneficiaries, officials, relevant other
contributors and IUCN to jointly undertake a situation analysis (including identification of
problems and needs), a process of prioritisation of needs and their potential solutions. It was
found that to a certain level, this approach has already been implemented in RNE-funded
small-scale projects.

The RECS approach suggested combines promotion of local ownership at both levels, as well as training, on the job learning and practical implementation skills development. The role of RECS' Project staff is to guide and when required to technically assist such a participatory planning process.

Finally it was also relevant that actual RECS field activities have been proposed to implement through a number of pilot projects, under each of the three Project components. It is fascinating to witness the success stories by most of these pilots, which have presented best practices for others to learn and adopt as appropriate to various field conditions.

4.6 Assessment of Sustainability

The RECS project's support is complementary and has strengthened implementation of at least some of ongoing project activities of all three groups (government, private and civil society/CBO) in the identified locations. Furthermore, provision of agro and business packages, tools and implements, grants and seed capitals (Wilpotha, Polonnaruwa, Weligama) also has link to other local projects of capacity enhancement.

The CSR and FSC project initiatives including the pilots that supervised by the national 'Consortium Partners' like CCC, FCCISL/SMED, are bound to be sustainable considering the level of commitment placed on such initiatives that have brought dividends to their member-beneficiaries.

The sustainability of the overall project needs to be considered in two dimensions, namely, sustainability of created benefits and sustainability of organizations involved. The benefits achieved needs to be sustained by linking them with supporting organisations of the government and other NGOs and wherever possible by replicating them in feasible locations with experienced and established communities / local bodies.

In terms of CCSF-based pilot projects, the basic principles of social mobilization like small group formation, micro capital building, and civil society linkages to relevant government mainstream need to be introduced as the next steps for these communities to gain institutional sustainability.

4.7 Assessment of the Consortium Approach and the Leveraging Ability of the Project

According to the project proposal, the Consortium established for the Project consists of IUCNSL, FCCISL, and CCC, and this partnership established was not only to execute the Project, but also to create a leading business advocate on issues connected with sustainable development, including appropriate policy development. The mandate of the Consortium was spelled out as:

"The Consortium was expected to create a framework that contributes effectively to sustainable development that demonstrates business progress in environmental and resource management

that strengthens corporate social responsibility, and shares leading-edge practices amongst members of FCCISL and CCC to contribute to a sustainable future"

Therefore, the Consortium approach has been introduced with sustainability aspect in mind to make sure that these business giants at the national level will take charge of the RECS project activities into furtherance and be positively involved in the continuation of the most promising project-induced initiatives like FSC, CSR and CoC groups and to replicate piloted best practices in other suitable locations.

Therefore, generally the support provided by consortium partners in the effective implementation of the project is very high. At the same time these partners have leveraging abilities of the various subprojects like the upgrading of the Elephant Transit Home Project at Uda-Walawe (by Dilmah), CKT Green Factory at Agalawatta (by Hydramani), and a few others, for which they have played a catalytic role in generating interest of various stakeholders.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNT

5.1 Conclusions

As conclusions of the RECS evaluation, a number of products and good practices that have brought about positive results are presented.

- a) The RECS project strategy is a turn-around of the traditional mandate of a direct project approach, which generates dependency syndrome among partners / beneficiaries,
- b) Multi-agency and multi-tier approach aiming at a number of challenges of environmental conservation and sustainable development has brought about positive outcomes,
- c) A productive working collaboration among Government Agencies, Corporate Sector, Private Sector and local NGOs, have been an effective and rewarding one,
- d) The project management through a 'Consortium Approach' have worked effectively to achieve intended target and benefits within the project time span and beyond,
- e) Both short-term pilot projects and long-term environmental conservation practices like FSC and CSR with guided supply of technological and financial assistance have motivated implementing partners to change their mindset towards sustainable development,
- f) Project-assisted pilot activities have unleashed a set of environment-friendly initiatives, which are replicable and go on par with the mainstream development goals,
- g) Project as a whole is designed as a flexible one to expand its components/activities within the fund allocations and provisions made by other budget lines as and when required, and this flexibility has worked as a key to the success of the project and many initiatives it supported, for which the RNE – the donor deserves a special appreciation from all stakeholders of the project,
- Determination of the full achievement of benefits expected from long-term perspectives like CSR, FSC and knowledge disseminating activities is not yet possible, due to the short timeframe of the project,
- Full package of inputs allocated for some pilot projects under CCSF small grants, have not reached or delayed making some projects (e.g. Solid Waste Management, Kuruwita PS) become less effective and unsustainable,
- j) All good practices and examples that have linked nature conservation with mainstream development bearing long-term sustainability and replicability, call for wider publicity and sharing through appropriate media,

5.2 Lessons Learnt

According to the findings of the evaluation, following are recorded as lessons learnt from the project implementation:

- A project of this nature was most useful in demonstrating the multi-sector and consortium based management strategy, for meeting both the short-term and long-term critical needs of the partners/beneficiaries,
- b. Improving project administrative capacity requires not only the basic needs or financial resources (CCSF) but more importantly it requires training, technical know-how, and long-term experimentation on knowledge imparting initiatives,
- c. Improvement to both urban and rural environment by 'good riddance of bad rubbish' the solid waste by turning them into 'gold' (e.g. Ranpohoniya of Weligama UC) and recycling of waste polythene (e.g. Ronesha Polymeyer Industry in Katana DS) can be regarded as environment-friendly and income generating pro-poor programmes,
- d. A vast array of partners and beneficiaries that consist of government, corporate and private sector big-timers, poor urban and rural families, elderly and women-headed families, women and children in remote villages, could be immensely supported by this type of supplementary assistance with a focus on raising environmental consciousness,
- e. Local NGOs/CBOs could make valuable contributions to not only for direct income generating operations, but also for increase sense of ownership to environmental concerns given the correct inbuilt guidance, bringing far-reaching benefits/impacts in the long-run,
- f. The pragmatic and flexible planning and implementation approach adhered to RECS Project has been a positive contribution to the success of majority of IUCN assisted activities, at all operational levels.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the conclusions made above, a set of recommendations are presented as the final outcome of the External Evaluation of IUCN-RECS project.

- a) The RECS project strategy, which has worked as a turn-around of the traditional mandate of a direct project approach, must be replicated as a model for GO/Private/NGO led environmental conservation.
- The Multi-agency and multi-tier approach that deals with a number of challenges of environmental conservation and sustainable development, needs to be well documented and widely disseminated,
- c) The productive working collaboration among Government Agencies, Corporate Sector, Private Sector and local NGOs need to be mainstreamed for far-reaching economic returns.
- d) The project management through a 'Consortium Approach' that worked effectively to achieve intended target and benefits within the project time span and beyond, needs to be shared with the government and like-minded people,
- e) Both short-term pilot projects and long-term environmental conservation practices like FSC and CSR with guided supply of technological and financial assistance should be further harnessed for negotiated partnerships and business relationships.
- f) Project-assisted pilot activities that have unleashed a set of environment-friendly initiatives, need to be replicated and connected to the mainstream development goals, including MDGs,

- g) The flexible nature of components/activities adhered to RECS model, needs to be shared with government, other donors and INGOs for achieving common goals,
- h) The benefits derived from long-term perspectives like CSR, CSR and knowledge disseminating activities should give long timeframe to assure sustainability of such challenging project components,
- The timely provision of full package of inputs allocated for pilot projects under CCSF small grants, need more close supervision and monitoring by coordinating and implementing partners for better performance,
- j) All good practices and examples that have linked nature conservation with that of mainstream development bearing long-term sustainability and replicability, should give wide publicity through appropriate media,

PART 2

ANNEX 1- RECS PROJECT - SUMMARY OF PROJECT STATUS / MAIN FINDINGS (AS OF END DECEMBER 2009)

RAISING ENVIRONMENTAL CONSCIOUSNESS IN SOCIETY (RECS) PROJECT: Component B - The Environmental Consciousness of Local Communities

No.	TITLE OF PROJECT	IMPLEMENTING PARTNER	PROJECT OBJECTIVE/S	OUTPUTS ACHIEVED	TOTAL FUNDS DISBURSED (Rs)	CURRENT STATUS / MAIN FINDINGS
1	Establishment of Ten Forest Parks in Schools of the Polonnaruwa District	District Planning Office, Polonnaruwa in Collaboration with 10 selected schools	-Establish 10 forest parks in 10 schools -Publish <i>'Parisara Puwath'</i> Newsletter -Conduct 'Do-you-Know contest	-Awareness for school children completed. 14 issues of the magazine; -'Pulathisi Parisara Puwath' published"Forest parks" established in 10 schools. Do you know contest held.	2,118,511	Majority of schools have developed environ-friendly parks; students are concerned about various conservation measures
2	Elimination of Cactus and Prosopis juliflora from the Bundala National Park	MAS Linea Aqua (Pvt) Ltd	-Eradication of invasive plants in Bundala Sanctuary; -Regeneration of indigenous species -Increase alternate habitats for migratory birds & wildlife	-15 ha cleaned of the two invasive species -Indigenous plants protected, -Short-term employment for CBO members provided -Awareness & ownership among local communities on env.	2,714,435	LA has taken steps to continue the work using own funds; Local CBO (BUSS) is very keen to go ahead with improving habitats in the remaining area of the sanctuary.
3	Community based Environment, Wildlife and Nature Conservation through School Children	Wildlife and Nature Protection Society	-Conserve & protect bio-diversity through action plans at govt. levelsp. by making school children aware of its importance through their active participation	-One hundred butterfly gardens established in 10 districts in Sri Lanka -Awareness created among school children on conservation of bio-diversity	2,599,275	Students & people are educated and aware of bio-diversity; Butterfly gardens established in selected locations
4	Project for a Community living in a Mangrove & Lagoon Environment Kalido Beach, Kalutara	Environmental Forum of Sri Lanka	Strengthen and empower the community to undertake the responsibility of utilising invaluable Kalido Beach & lagoon as a source of livelihood & recreation while living with arrested & protected environ for	-Beach & mangrove planting completedAssisted put-up a Library & mangrove demonstration plot established in a temple in Kalutara.	2,2918,887	Planted along coastal line; maintain of mangrove plants & other trees and composting them; improved plant nurseries; awareness creation &

			prosperity			SWM with local authority
5	Biodiversity Conservation through Environmental Education campaign in the Buffer zone communities around protected areas of Uda-Walawe (Phase 1)		makers; Awareness on economic benefits through conservation &	20,000 plants raised by 10 volunteers in nurseries & tank catchments planting covering an area of 10 ha completed; Awareness programmes in 10 schools completed; Awareness modules prepared.	1,957,494	Habitat enrichment done; Posters, photos, handouts on nature conservation issued; Collective efforts of community taken for the protection of natural resources
6	Composting of Municipal Solid Waste in Weligama Urban Council Area (Phase 1)	Weligama Urban Council	-Introduction of recycling UC solid waste for separation & compost making; hands-on training programme for small & medium local authorities in Sri Lanka; income/employment generation for UC and local unemployed	Successful SWM operation in place.	2,958,549	Solid waste disposed by recycling & composting to generate env - friendly venture with an integrated farm & sales outlet
7	Mary Mount Mini-catchment development through Integrated Watershed Management approach in the Mahaweli Victoria Catchment	Sri Lanka		Boulder bunds established in 71 farming units, 342 home gardens established; 8,000 plants raised 2 nurseries planted in the mini-catchment and home gardens.	2,150,975	CBO with guidance of MA has taken responsibility for implementing project activities; Incentive payment made for the contribution of CBOs
8	Building the Capacity of Sri Lanka's Judiciary to address Environmental Issues through the courts		Enhance skills & awareness among members of judiciary & attorney-atlow on env rights & responsibilities and their applications to court system -Generate & disseminate targeted guidance & reference materials on env. Laws; -Strengthen networking & information sharing	2 skill building workshops for legal professionals, National forum for Sri Lanka's judiciary held. Useful reference material prepared, database developed.	3,223,430	National forum to build general awareness held; -Skills building sessions on dealing with key env issues -Bank reference guide published & networking with env lawyers
9	Restoration of Natural Habitats in Village Tank Ecosystem in the dry zone- Anuradhapura District Phase 1	Foundation	Strengthen & empower communities/farmers to protect nature, wildlife population & biodiversity to ensure productivity of ecosystem	Katupathwewa tank reservation ecosystem enhanced though planting.	2,386,710	FO motivated to involve in the process by planting reserves with project inputs

10	Community based awareness building and promotion of sustainable Solid Waste Mgmt practices by setting up of framework & network for collection of polythene & other recyclable waste at the community level	Roneasha Polymer Industries (Pvt) Ltd		Awareness of school children in 20 schools increased; Awareness among communities in 20 GS divisions increased; 40 recyclable collectors are in operation on a continuous basis		Successful plastic and polythene recycling venture in operation; The main implementer has taken the project to Galle district and has started his own recycling factory
11	Conservation & sustainable use of natural resources thru' appropriate participatory mgmt (Bibile Conservation Zone Mgmt Task Council)	Conservation Area Management Committee	(Moneragala); -Fire protection measures within Nilgala Forest area; -Identify bee-collectors in Nilgala, train them for systematic bee- keeping in homesteads	Medicinal resources of Nilgala project conserved to some extent through provision of alternate income generation activities such as home gardening.	1,993,341	Awareness on importance of Nilgala Forest created; Bee-keeping in homestead introduced; Forest fire minimised; People are env-friendly
12	Kuruwita Pradeshiya Shaba & Kuruwita Prison Associated Waste Recycling Project - Phase 2	Kuruwita Pradeshiya Shaba		Successful SWM project in operation in partnership with the prison inmates	1,941,109	Garbage dumping in open areas minimised by proper disposal & recycling; Prisoners engaged in IGA; Recycling and reuse of waste for farming by communities encouraged
13	Galkulama Integrated Environment Management Programme (Galkulama Ekabadda Parisarika Kalamanakarana Wedasatahana) Phase 1	Women's Savings Effort-Wilpotha	-100 families in Galkulama village will increase their income by 20%, through env- friendly livelihoods around the restored tank; -Implement a catchment mgmt programme by the community; -Maximise water use and increase the plant population in the tank catchment area	Kahatakulama tank restored and Kajuwatte pond constructed for multiple uses (socio- economic benefits and environmental conservation)	1,980,825	Responsibility sharing, stakeholder participation & sense of ownership in tank created among community; CBO/FO empowered to gain skills, increase income levels & protect built assets and the environment
14	Urban School Biodiversity Garden	The Biodiversity Programme Royal College Colombo 07	training of teachers & students; establishing of biodiversity resource centre/ butterfly garden	established Educational trip to Horton Plains done as planned to enhance the knowledge on different types of ecosystems.	374,939	Nature trees/plants/ nature trials established; Butterfly identification boards, feeding plants established to maintain attractive school environs
15	Conservation Knuckles through informed	Dumbara Surakinno		Info centres in Pitawala patana, Riverstein & Atanwela function		Environ-friendly measures taken and popularising

	Ecotourism		awareness creation and introducing eco-friendly alternative livelihood for them; Develop the area as a tourism destination	Posters/ brochures prepared through project funds; plants raised by the community sold to visitors		devices like posters, brochures & leaflets distributed for wide publicity and people have started income generating activities like raising plants for sale etc.
16	University of Moratuwa based Integrated Recycling Project.	Nature Team- University of Moratuwa	Implementation of a proper SWM orogramme within university premises; encourage university community to separate waste in disposal; and make aware of its importance	With regular awareness creation, solid waste management system in the University had improved.	476,055	Garbage dumped in the university premises reduced by proper disposal of recyclable waste; recycled & reused among the community
17	Recycling Polythene and Plastic Solid Waste in order to Reduce Environmental Pollution while Opening Means for Income Generation for Low Income Families	Seth Sevana Foundation	Reduction of environmental pollution; creating an additional income to community by SW recycling; Pallet production to meet demand; Enhanced awareness about pollution among different segment of population	in operation.	2,257,435	Low-income families have found IG activity by collecting waste Polythene; Pallet production expanded with the installation of new machinery; Local people aware of the project activities
18	Conservation of Ecosystems within the Vegetation Zone (RUK) through community participation	Biodiversity Conservation Task Force (BCTF)	-Facilitate conservation of natural resources in 35 km long vegetation zone through BCTF -Stop env damages; Awareness creation on env protection related laws & formation of suitable forum	Awareness programmes completed. Reed-based handicraft production introduced to selected women of the area.	630,494	27 branch societies registered to work on the selected themes
19	Supporting informed advocacy in sound environmental management	Institute of Environmental Professionals (SL)	-Links between environmental professionals strengthened through pro-active advocacy & capacity building -High quality env research & standards facilitated, contributory to influencing decision - making at the highest level; Raising awareness on env —issues among various stakeholders	6 discussion fora and the annual convention held. Small group discussions on selected environmental topics were held on a regular basis, and code of ethics for environmental professionals was adopted by membership. Data base and the web site developed.	1,566,748	Small group formation, newsletter issued; Publication of Journal delayed; E-newsletter to be issued as a resourceful
20	OPENING DOORS: Raising Environmental Consciousness Amongst	Susitha Wadana Samithiya	Extend experience of SWM in raising env consciousness amongst under-privileged school children in	Programmed for pre-school children, activities planned for Ordinary Level students and for	1,897,846	Training, exhibition, awards, seminar series conducted; Excursion

	Under-privileged School Children.		Helboda area	middle school children completed.		visits for school children facilitated;
21	Composting of Municipal Solid Waste in Weligama Urban Council area (Phase 2) (Extension to No.6 above)	Weligama Urban Council	Introduction of recycling UC solid waste for separation & compost making; -Hands-on training programme for small & medium local authorities in Sri Lanka; -Income/employment generation for UC and local unemployed	Composting pad has been extended by 2500 sq m; personal safety equipments were provided to labourers who are responsible for sorting. A green house constructed in the plantation section of the project site. Co-composting with seepage in operation.	1,408,000	SW disposed by recycling & composting to generate income & employment from waste recycling, integrated farm & sales outlet; UC has established the most effective demonstration, which has provided a learning ground
22	Establishment of Ten Forest Parks in Schools of Polonnaruwa District (Phase 2) (Extension to No. 1 above)	District Planning Office Polonnaruwa in Collaboration with 10 selected schools	-Training workshops on home gardening, shadow plants cultivation and compost making.	Assistance provided to strengthen the environmental units of the 10 schools. School children have been encouraged to compost school waste (degradable mater); herbal gardens established in all 10 schools; Exchanged visits among 10 schools were carried out to share the lessons from phase I and 2 of the project; Art competition held.	1,424,496	Schools have established their developed environment Units; Forest parks developed into beautiful school gardens; Students led by principal and teachers are concerned about adopted conservation measures; Sharing of experience among schools have been effective.
23	Galkulama Integrated Environment Management Programme (Galkulama Ekabadda Parisarika Kalamanakarana Wedasatahana) Phase 2	Women's Savings Effort-Wilpotha	-Continuation of the Phase 1 project activities benefitting over 100 farm families; -Maximise water use to cultivate 100 paddy plots and 30 upland farms, and increase the plant population in the tank catchment area	Tank reservation planted with 2000 plants. Eco friendly (wattle) sales centre constructed to sell organic agricultural produce, handicrafts and local sweet meats. Model home garden established.	798,500	CBO/FO empowered to gain skills, increase income levels & protect built assets and the environment; all project-induced assets are sustained as a result of efficient CBO's management
24	Biodiversity Conservation through Environmental Education Campaign in the Buffer Zone Communities around Protected Areas, Extension of the planting and educational program II (Phase 2 of No. 5 project above)	United Society for Harnessing of Solar Power	-Raise awareness on values of environ / ecosystems among school children, farmers & local decision-makers; -Awareness on economic benefits through conservation & sustainable environ mgmt practices; Increase people's participation for park management in the buffer-zone; -Information dissemination on lessons learnt	Replication of Phase 1 activities in 6 more schools. Thirteen nurseries have been established by the community and have raised 30,000 plants belonging to 23 species. These were planted in the tank reservation to strengthen the reservation plantation.		Environmental Education Associations formed in all participating schools; Indigenous plant nurseries established; Green-belts in Buffer-Zone (BZ) established by villagers; Monitoring of elephant movements BZ is carried out

:	25	Restoration of natural habitats in village tank ecosystem in the dry zone, Anuradhapura District (Phase 2)	Sewalanka Foundation	children to restore the landscape & habitats of the tank ecosystem; -Protect wildlife population & biodiversity to ensure productivity; -Impart skills to women for local cottage industries using local raw materials	16 ladies trained in reed based handicraft production, and an exhibition of their products held. A market centre for these products established in the DS office, Nochchiyagama. Demarcation of reservations of 5 tanks completed.	, ,	Community mobilised for the restoration of habitat in a tank ecosystem; tank restored & enriched with plant species; Raw materials for cottage industries assured; home gardening, env-friendly habitats/tank reservation /pond construction achieved
:	26	Rural Economic Strengthen by Conservation and Promotion of Traditional Roots and Yam Varieties.	Community Development Centre	-Establish a new model village for protecting traditional roots & yams; -Establish a processing and sales centres for value-added roots & yams productions	100 farmer families trained and practicing traditional and new technologies of yam cultivation. Publication on traditional and new recipes.	1,094,500	100 farm-plots in an area of 31 acres established; Organic farming systems introduced; 80% of FOs formed successful
:	27	Landscape Development Project Lady Ridgeway Hospital (LRH) at Borella	Lady Ridgeway Hospital for Children		Successful butterfly garden established.		A beautiful Nature park is established near ward 1 &2; The park has turned into a habitat for around 55 butterfly species; Hospital authority has taken steps to replicate this successful model to other spaces (wards) of LRH and nearby other health premises like MRI.
:	28	Conduct of the Nature Diaries Programme in 2008.	Sri Lanka Association for the Advancement of Science	Programme among school children	Nature Diaries Programme completed193 schools covering 3,816 students (in 10 districts)	272,000.00	A successful nature diaries programme conducted in 193 schools throughout the country creating a demonstration impact
[29	To create awareness of biodiversity conservation among the local community, students and environmentalists with a view to achieving sustainable maintenance of the IFS Popham Arboretum Dambulla, as a refuge for	Ruk Rakaganno	conservation among the local	Several awareness programmes for students and local community.	208,410.00	Publication on "Survey of Fauna in Dambulla Arboretum" prepared and published; Interest has been raised by other scientific personnel to conduct research into their particular subjects;

local dry zone fauna and flora.			Arboretum – a suitable ecosystem to be maintained.

Note: Eight projects visited by the consultant during March 4 – 15, 2010 are highlighted in grey.

Source: Individual Project Documents, Progress Reports (2006 – 2009) & Field Visits of the Consultants in March 2010.

ANNEX 2: LIST OF PERSONS/ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED AND SITES VISITED (RECS) March $1-20,\,2010$

	March 1 – 20, 2010	
Name	Designation & Organisation	Location
IUCN Officials (National & Fiel	d level Officers)	
1. Mr. Asanka Abeykoon	Coordinator, Business & Biodiversity Programme & RECS	IUCN Office, Colombo
2. Ms. Kumudeni Ekaratne	Sr. Programme Officer, Central Resources Management Group	IUCN Office, Colombo
RNE Officials		
3. Mr. J. H. Bandula	Senior Programme Officer, Royal Netherlands Embassy (RNE)	RNE Office, Colombo
Implementing Partners- Comp Groups	oonent A (Environmental Agenda for Private Se	ctor) - CSR and FSC
4. Ms. Renuka Rodrigo	Director, FCCISL / SMED	FCCISL Office, Colombo
5. Dr. R.M.S.K. Ratnayake	Director, Environmental Pollution Control, CEA	CEA Office, Colombo
6. Mr. C.D. Vidanage	Sr. Workforce Dev. Program Manager, CCC/EMS	AECOM Office, Colombo
7.Mr. Lionel Weerasinghe	Group Manager, RPC	LANKEM Office, Colombo
8. Mr. Chamara de Silva	General Manager, CKT Apparel PVT Ltd. Hidramani Group	Yatiyana, Agalawatta
9. Mr. Dilan Sanjeewa	Environmental Executive, CKT Apparel PVT Ltd. Hidramani Gp	Yatiyana, Agalawatta
10. Mr. D.M.S.S. Devapriya	Technical Operation Manager, CIC Seeds Private Ltd.	CIC Farm, Polonnaruwa
11. Mr. Amal Piyathilake	Managing Director, Environment Friendly Service Station.	M.S. MW. Anuradhapura
12. Mr. J.M.S. Pushpakumara	Production Manager/Modern Food Factory- Desiccated Coconut	Rabawewa, Wariyapola
13. Mr. R.S. Kulathunga	Sr. Deputy Conservator of Forest, Forest Department	Bathttharamulla
Implementing Partners- Comp Grants	onent B (Community Component (Civil Society org	ganizations) – CCSF
14. Mr. Sarinda Unambuwa	CEO/Managing Director, Linea Aqua Pvt. Ltd.; (Bundala Park)	Giridara, Kapugoda
15. Mr. Ajith Nishantha	Secretary, Bundala Urumaya Surakeeme Sanvidanaya	Bundala National Park
16. Mr. Jayantha Kumarasiri	Director, Ronesha Polimeyar Industry Pvt. Ltd	Katana & Galle
17. Ms. Seewwandhi Owitigala	Manager, Ronesha Polimeyar Industry Pvt. Ltd	Katana

18. Ms. H.H.A.D, Karu			
Menike	ınawathi	President, Wilpotha Women's Savings Effort	Wilpotha, Puttalama
19. Dr. Athula Wijesun	ndara	Doctor LRH, Butterfly Garden, Implementing Partner	LRH, Colombo
20. Ms. P.A.P.M. Pana	agoda	Secretary, Kuruwita Pradeshiya Sabha	PS Office, Kuruwita
21. Ms. K.D. Dishna N	layani	Development Officer, District Planning Secretariat	DS Office, Polonnaruwa
22. Mr. P.K. Weerakoo		Principal, P/M/ Bisobandara Maha Vidyalaya, Medirigiriya	Medirigiriya, Polonnaruwa
23. Ms. H.M. Nirosha Kumarihamy		Development Assistant, Urban Council, Weligama	UC, Weligama
Implementing Partne	ers- Compon	ent C (Policy and Communications Component) - Media & Others
24. Mr. Nalaka Gunaw	vardene	Director & CEO, TVE Asia Pacific	TVEAP Office, Nugegoda
25. Mr. Sena Peiris		Director, National Cleaner Product Centre (NCPC)	Narahenapita, Colombo
National Steering Co	mmittee Me	mbers	
26. Ms. Shereen Sara	nasuriya	Sr. Programme Officer, UNDP/GRF	UNDP, Colombo
27. Mr. R. Mahesh Jal	tota	Assistant Director, Pollution Control Division, CEA	CEA Office, Colombo
Sites Visited:			
	a Tank at Ka	ımmandaluwa Village, Wilpotha Women's Savings E	ffort, Wilpotha
1. Kahatakulam Puttalama	imeyar Indus	mmandaluwa Village, Wilpotha Women's Savings E try Pvt. Ltd, Polythene Collection Centre at Katana, a	
Kahatakulam Puttalama Ronesha Poli Factory at Da	imeyar Indus adalla, Galle		•
Kahatakulam Puttalama Ronesha Poli Factory at Da Butterfly Gard	imeyar Indus adalla, Galle den at Lady F k, Removal of	try Pvt. Ltd, Polythene Collection Centre at Katana, a	and PP-Recycler
Kahatakulam Puttalama Ronesha Poli Factory at Da Butterfly Gard Bundala Park Weligaththa,	imeyar Indus adalla, Galle den at Lady F k, Removal of Hambantota Recycler Fac	try Pvt. Ltd, Polythene Collection Centre at Katana, a Ridgeway Hospital (LRH), Colombo f invasive plants by Bundala Urumaya Surakeeme Sa tory Site, Integrated Organic Farm & Sales Outlet at	and PP-Recycler anvidanaya, Bundala,
Kahatakulam Puttalama Ronesha Poli Factory at Da Butterfly Gard Bundala Park Weligaththa, Solid Waste Furban Council	imeyar Indus adalla, Galle den at Lady F k, Removal of Hambantota Recycler Fac sil, Weligama	try Pvt. Ltd, Polythene Collection Centre at Katana, a Ridgeway Hospital (LRH), Colombo f invasive plants by Bundala Urumaya Surakeeme Sa tory Site, Integrated Organic Farm & Sales Outlet at	and PP-Recycler anvidanaya, Bundala, Weligama, Managed by
 Kahatakulam Puttalama Ronesha Poli Factory at Da Butterfly Gard Bundala Park Weligaththa, Solid Waste I Urban Counc Solid Waste I Sabha 	imeyar Indus adalla, Galle den at Lady F c, Removal of Hambantota Recycler Fac sil, Weligama Recycling & (Arry Pvt. Ltd, Polythene Collection Centre at Katana, a Ridgeway Hospital (LRH), Colombo f invasive plants by Bundala Urumaya Surakeeme Satory Site, Integrated Organic Farm & Sales Outlet at Compost making site at Kuruwita Prison, managed both the Polonnaruwa District; Seewali Model Jr. Schoo	and PP-Recycler anvidanaya, Bundala, Weligama, Managed by y Kuruwita Pradeshiya
 Kahatakulam Puttalama Ronesha Poli Factory at Da Butterfly Gard Bundala Park Weligaththa, Solid Waste I Urban Counc Solid Waste I Sabha Nature Parks coordinated b 	imeyar Indus adalla, Galle den at Lady F c, Removal of Hambantota Recycler Fac cil, Weligama Recycling & C at Schools in	Arry Pvt. Ltd, Polythene Collection Centre at Katana, a Ridgeway Hospital (LRH), Colombo f invasive plants by Bundala Urumaya Surakeeme Satory Site, Integrated Organic Farm & Sales Outlet at Compost making site at Kuruwita Prison, managed both the Polonnaruwa District; Seewali Model Jr. Schoo	and PP-Recycler anvidanaya, Bundala, Weligama, Managed by y Kuruwita Pradeshiya I & Bisobandara MV,
1. Kahatakulam Puttalama 2. Ronesha Poli Factory at Da 3. Butterfly Gard 4. Bundala Park Weligaththa, 5. Solid Waste I Urban Counce 6. Solid Waste I Sabha 7. Nature Parks coordinated b 8. Green Factor	imeyar Indus adalla, Galle den at Lady F c, Removal of Hambantota Recycler Fac il, Weligama Recycling & C at Schools in by DPS-Polor ry - CKT Appa Friendly Serv	Arry Pvt. Ltd, Polythene Collection Centre at Katana, a Ridgeway Hospital (LRH), Colombo f invasive plants by Bundala Urumaya Surakeeme Sutory Site, Integrated Organic Farm & Sales Outlet at Compost making site at Kuruwita Prison, managed but the Polonnaruwa District; Seewali Model Jr. Schoonnaruwa	and PP-Recycler anvidanaya, Bundala, Weligama, Managed by y Kuruwita Pradeshiya I & Bisobandara MV, Hidramani Group
1. Kahatakulam Puttalama 2. Ronesha Poli Factory at Da 3. Butterfly Gard 4. Bundala Park Weligaththa, 5. Solid Waste Furban Counce 6. Solid Waste Fabha 7. Nature Parks coordinated b 8. Green Factor 9. Environment Anuradhapur	imeyar Indus adalla, Galle den at Lady F c, Removal of Hambantota Recycler Fac sil, Weligama Recycling & C at Schools in by DPS-Polor ry - CKT Appa Friendly Serva	Ridgeway Hospital (LRH), Colombo f invasive plants by Bundala Urumaya Surakeeme Solory Site, Integrated Organic Farm & Sales Outlet at Compost making site at Kuruwita Prison, managed be n the Polonnaruwa District; Seewali Model Jr. Schoonnaruwa arel PVT Ltd at Yatiyana, Agalawatta, Managed by Integrated PVT Ltd At Yatiyana, Agalawatta,	and PP-Recycler anvidanaya, Bundala, Weligama, Managed by y Kuruwita Pradeshiya I & Bisobandara MV, Hidramani Group
1. Kahatakulam Puttalama 2. Ronesha Poli Factory at Da 3. Butterfly Gard 4. Bundala Park Weligaththa, 5. Solid Waste I Urban Counce 6. Solid Waste I Sabha 7. Nature Parks coordinated b 8. Green Factor 9. Environment Anuradhapur 10. CIC Seed Pro	imeyar Indus adalla, Galle den at Lady F c, Removal of Hambantota Recycler Fac cil, Weligama Recycling & C at Schools in by DPS-Polor ry - CKT Appa Friendly Sen a coduction Farr nsit Home —	Arry Pvt. Ltd, Polythene Collection Centre at Katana, a Ridgeway Hospital (LRH), Colombo f invasive plants by Bundala Urumaya Surakeeme Satory Site, Integrated Organic Farm & Sales Outlet at Compost making site at Kuruwita Prison, managed by In the Polonnaruwa District; Seewali Model Jr. Schoonnaruwa arel PVT Ltd at Yatiyana, Agalawatta, Managed by Invice Station at the city of Anuradhapura, supported by Integrating and the city of Anuradhapura, supported by Integrating and the city of Anuradhapura, Supported by Integrating and Information Centre at Ud-Walawe, Supported	and PP-Recycler anvidanaya, Bundala, Weligama, Managed by y Kuruwita Pradeshiya I & Bisobandara MV, Hidramani Group y FCCISL/ACCI,

Note: Field Visits were made during the period 1 -15 of March, 2010

ANNEX 3: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE FINAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT ON RAISING ENVIRONMENTAL CONSCIOUSNESS IN SOCIETY (RECS)

1. INTRODUCTION

The RECS project started effectively in June 2006 with intended duration of 2 1/2 years. The project was granted extension and implementation completed on 31 December 2009. An external evaluation is required as per the agreement.

The purpose of the external evaluation is to provide an assessment of the performance and impact of the project after the completion of implementation. Such evaluation is a condition in the contract, articles 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7

The evaluation also envisages an assessment of the performance of the RECS project and its interface with the civil society and the private sector during project implementation. It will entail a comparison of the original project objectives with the activities and outputs delivered, leading towards achieving anticipated results.

For the purpose of the evaluation, the project document, LFA, Output Monitoring Matrix, and the all half-year progress report/inception report would be reviewed. Discussions with the relevant IUCN management, The Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, relevant private sector institutions (CCC, CSR Sub-committee of the CCC and FCCISL) and other important consortium partners such as FCCISL, EDB and SLSI will be held. Samples of field activities will also be examined.

2. BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT

The objectives of the programme largely comply with the Sri Lankan environment policy, with focus on strengthening regional/local initiatives, participation of civil society, private sector and awareness building of environmental considerations into the development process. To achieve these objectives through a set of interventions the Raising Environmental Consciousness in Society (RECS) Project was introduced. The following were the specific immediate objective identified under the project:

- Performance with respect to conservation and sustainable development by the corporate sector, mostly represented by the FCCISL and the CCC, strengthened and improved as the engine of development in the country;
- A system of supportive financial resources institutionalized to assist civil society activities that can guide policy and practices in sustainable directions; and
- The media, namely television and newspapers, harnessed as a vehicle for policy-related multistakeholder engagement of civil society actors with decision-makers, and for promoting broad-based education of the general public.

The World Conservation Union, Sri Lanka (IUCNSL) and the Government of The Netherlands have signed an Agreement on 16th June 2006, to implement the RECS project, which consists of three main components.

(1) The Environment Agenda of the Private Sector - strengthening and improving the performance of the corporate sector with respect to conservation and sustainable development. The expected final results as envisaged during project design under this component are:

- A baseline survey on CSR levels and benchmarks for CSR improvement in selected industries;
- An Environmental Business Leaders' Forum within the FCCISL and/or the CCC
- Improved timber export results through FSC certification;
- Improved environmental knowledge in small and medium-scale enterprises;
- Environmental certification for industrial clusters;
- Sharing of information between entrepreneurs, NGOs and Government on replicable models demonstrating CSR, NEQS, environmental audits, advisory and consultancy services, trade and sustainable development, and capacity building initiatives (publications, website, informal discussions);
- Policy Debates leading to environmentally friendly decision making;
- Publication of case studies for sharing of lessons learned.
- (2) The Environmental Consciousness of Local Communities institutionalized financial supporting system to local level environmental activities. It is envisaged that a Community Conservation Support Fund (CCSF) be set up as an effective financing window for local level community based organizations and other civil society organizations to access to required small scale grants on a sustainable basis. The key final outputs in this component will be:
- Establishment and full subscription of funds for the proposed CCSF, its management structures including the National Steering Committee and procedures (in keeping with the Local Environmental Fund)
- Successful rounds of soliciting proposals, selecting them, and funding promising activities (at least 30 during the first two years)
- An institutional arrangement for capacity development of CBO members in initiating local level environmental action (Part of community empowerment) by the end of programme with support from similar programmes (UNDP/IFAD etc)
- Holding lesson-sharing roundtables (at least 06 during the last two years of the project) among fund recipients;
- Publishing at least 03 reports in print and electronic media capturing and synthesizing the lessons learned in terms of successful local and community-based sustainable development projects and programmes.

(3) Promoting a broad based public awareness campaign

In this component the following final results are envisaged:

- A series of televised roundtables will be produced on thematic areas to educate the public on current sustainable development issues. 12 thematic television programmes, one hour each, will be made available on a bi monthly basis.
- A series of news articles appearing on the print media on environment and development in Sri Lanka

- Convene a forum of consultations and policy roundtables involving lawyers, public representatives and policy makers to debate policies and regulations, their impacts on chosen subjects.
- Facilitate open debates convened by the National Committee of IUCN members bringing the Government and NGO sectors into a common platform of discussion
- Sponsor financial and technical assistance to at least 06 civil society representatives from Sri Lanka to participate in regional and global policy discussions.

3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Specific tasks are: Assessment of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of RECS activities using appropriate sampling of the activities undertaken

3.1 Assessment of the organizational effectiveness in implementing and monitoring RECS

- Assessment of the arrangement for the implementation of RECS
- Assessment of the human resources capacity
- Assessment of the operational resources available in carrying out project activities

3.2 Assessment of effectiveness

- Assessment of progress on private sector (CCC, CSR Sub-committee of the CCC, FCCISL etc) involvement/ co-operation in environmental activities
- Assessment of progress made on FSC certification.
- Assessment of progress on CCSF and its activities including selection criteria and approval process.
- Assessment of progress in funding empowerment, advocacy and capacity building of NGOs/CBOs.
- Assessment of progress in broad based public awareness campaigns and information dissemination and exchange of knowledge aimed at the improvement of the environment
- To what extent the interventions of the RECS contribute to address the environmental issues
 experienced by the target group (the public), which needs to be explained with specific
 examples.

3.3 Assessment of the efficiency

Assessment of progress towards achieving immediate objectives

3.4 Assess quality of project implementation strategy and of project monitoring

 Assess the fulfilment of the supervision requirements of the RECS project with regard to implementation and monitoring.

3.5 Assessment of relevance

• To what extent can we determine if the project was a good idea/intervention given the situation it was set up to address?

3.6 Assessment of sustainability

- Is there evidence that there will be continued positive impact as a result of the project once it has finished? Why or why not?
- What should be done differently to ensure continued positive impact after the project life

3.7 Assessment of the consortium approach of the project and the leveraging ability of the project

- Assessment of support provided by consortium partners in the effective implementation of the project
- Assessment of the leveraging abilities of the various sub-projects and determination of whether they have played a catalytic role in generating interest from stakeholders

4 REPORTING

- A draft report with an executive summary should be available at the end of the mission for comments at a meeting where IUCN and RNE are present.
- The final report should be submitted in English (two copies) within one week after the draft report is discussed.

The consultant will closely cooperate with IUCN and the Royal Netherlands Embassy (Environmental sector).

5. PERIODS AND DURATION OF THE EVALUATION

The mission will take place during 15th February to 15th March 2010. (20 man days)

ANNEX 4: QUESTIONNAIRE GUIDELINES USED FOR INTERVIEWS

FINAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT ON RAISING ENVIRONMENT CONSCIOUSNESS IN SOCIETY (RECS)

COMPONENT A - THE ENVIRONMENTAL AGENDA OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR

A. General Information

1.	Name of the Implementing Agency	
2.	Title of Project/s undertaken;	
	Its/their location/s (address, place & district)	
3.	Description of intervention Strategy or Approach	
4.	Experience in this field by main agency / its Sub-	
	contractor (No. of years);	
5.	Name & Position of respondent	
6.	Date of Interview	

B. Interview Guidelines

1. Project initiation & inputs a) How was the project concept initiated? b) Who did the specific project document? c) Main problem/issue addressed? d) Expected initial targets & benefits? e) Proposed main project inputs? f) Target group/s or areas (who & Number) 2. Project formulation & finalization a) How was it formulated & finalized? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 3. Funding assistance a) Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b) If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during	B. I	nterview Guidelines	
a) How was the project concept initiated? b) Who did the specific project document? c) Main problem/issue addressed? d) Expected initial targets & benefits? e) Proposed main project inputs? f) Target group/s or areas (who & Number) 2. Project formulation & finalization a) How was it formulated & finalized? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 3. Funding assistance a) Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b) If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation		Question	Answer / Comment
b) Who did the specific project document? c) Main problem/issue addressed? d) Expected initial targets & benefits? e) Proposed main project inputs? f) Target group/s or areas (who & Number) 2. Project formulation & finalization a) How was it formulated & finalized? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 3. Funding assistance a) Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b) If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation	1.	Project initiation & inputs	
c) Main problem/issue addressed? d) Expected initial targets & benefits? e) Proposed main project inputs? f) Target group/s or areas (who & Number) 2. Project formulation & finalization a) How was it formulated & finalized? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 3. Funding assistance a) Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b) If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation	a)	How was the project concept initiated?	
d) Expected initial targets & benefits? e) Proposed main project inputs? f) Target group/s or areas (who & Number) 2. Project formulation & finalization a) How was it formulated & finalized? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 3. Funding assistance a) Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b) If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation	b)	Who did the specific project document?	
e) Proposed main project inputs? f) Target group/s or areas (who & Number) 2. Project formulation & finalization a) How was it formulated & finalized? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 3. Funding assistance a) Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b) If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation	c)	Main problem/issue addressed?	
f) Target group/s or areas (who & Number) 2. Project formulation & finalization a) How was it formulated & finalized? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 3. Funding assistance a) Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b) If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation	d)	Expected initial targets & benefits?	
2. Project formulation & finalization a) How was it formulated & finalized? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 3. Funding assistance a) Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b) If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation	e)	Proposed main project inputs?	
a) How was it formulated & finalized? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 3. Funding assistance a) Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b) If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation	f)	Target group/s or areas (who & Number)	
b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 3. Funding assistance a) Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b) If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation	2.	Project formulation & finalization	
c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 3. Funding assistance a) Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b) If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation	a)	How was it formulated & finalized?	
how)? 3. Funding assistance a) Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b) If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation	b)	Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify;	
 3. Funding assistance a) Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b) If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation 	c)	Finalization and decision on submission (who &	
a) Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b) If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation		how)?	
assistance? b) If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation	3.	Funding assistance	
 b) If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation 	a)	Was the proposal meant only for IUCN	
negotiated & their response? c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation		assistance?	
c) Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation	b)	If not who are the other agencies/ donors	
etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation		negotiated & their response?	
d) Implementation modalities identified? 4. <u>Project Implementation</u> a) Responsible parties for implementation	c)	Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line	
4. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation		etc.) and agreed implementation schedule?	
Responsible parties for implementation	d)	Implementation modalities identified?	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4.	Project Implementation	
b) Any planned activities changed during	a)	Responsible parties for implementation	
	b)	Any planned activities changed during	
implementation (by quantity, time, fund etc)?		implementation (by quantity, time, fund etc)?	
c) If yes please describe?	c)	If yes please describe?	
d) What were the constraints faced during	d)	What were the constraints faced during	

	implementation? (HR, capacity, delays etc)	
e)	What actions were taken to resolve them?	
5.	Coordinating & Monitoring mechanism	
a)	What was the monitoring action carried out?	
b)	What parties involved in monitoring?	
c)	Was the monitoring mechanism adequate in your	
	opinion?	
d)	What was the coordination mechanism followed?	
e)	If not what could have been done differently?	
6.	Project outputs	
a)	What are the main project outputs?	
b)	Type/ No. of training/skills given to implementers	
	or knowledge gained	
c)	Type/No. of machines/equipments/tools received	
d)	Nature / type of nature conservation/income	
	generation activities started/ mobilized	
e)	Actual disbursement of money (Amount & time)	
f)	Relevance of the project/s to IUCN or project's	
	mandate?	
7.	Project outcomes/results & impacts	
a)	What are the visible changes took place with the	
	completion of the project	
b)	How the trainings / skills acquired are utilized to	
	enhance the project performance of implementer	
c)	To what extend the equipment / tools made use	
	of to enhance the delivery of targeted	
	benefits/services?	
d)	Changes in income level of beneficiaries after	
	the project/ income generating activities were	
	introduced (no. of families, % increased etc)?	
e)	Any other negotiations made or linkages built as a	
	result of the intervention? (specify)	
f)	Were you able to sustain and replicate the	
	project-induced benefits? (if yes please describe)	
g)	What are your proposal (if any) to implement a	
	similar project in a different way for better	
	results?	
h)	Your general conclusions on the overall project	
	performance and impact?	
C. 9	Specific Questions for other project collaborator	s (if any) or Support Agencies
1.	How was the collaboration with partners initiated?	
2.	The process involved in collaborating IUCN \slash	
	main partner	
	The process involved in collaborating IUCN /	

3.	What are the benefits received to strengthen your agency/ office and its staff?	
4.	The nature and kind of relationship built with the collaborated partners	
5.	What support you received to enhance environmental / health promotional activities in the area?	
6.	In your opinion what the major strengths of the programme?	
7.	What the major weaknesses of the assistance programme?	
8.	What are your proposals for designing and implementing a similar kind of programme in a different way for better results?	
Ob	servation / Comments by the interviewer / consultant:	

COMPONENT B - THE ENVIRONMENTAL CONSCIOUSNESS OF LOCAL COMMUNITIES

A. General Information

1.	Name of the Partner Organization	
2.	Title of Project and its location (address, place &	
	district)	
3.	Area of Intervention	
4.	Experience in this field (No. of years)	
5.	Name & Position of respondent	
6.	Date of Interview	

B. Interview Guidelines

7. Project initiation & inputs a) How was the project concept initiated? b) Who did the concept paper? c) Main problem/issue addressed? d) Expected initial targets & benefits? e) Proposed main project inputs? f) Target group/s (who & Number) 8. Project formulation & finalization a) How was it formulated & finalization b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 9. Funding assistance a. Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b. If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c. What was the response by IUCN? d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation (by quantity, time, fund etc)?
a) How was the project concept initiated? b) Who did the concept paper? c) Main problem/issue addressed? d) Expected initial targets & benefits? e) Proposed main project inputs? f) Target group/s (who & Number) 8. Project formulation & finalization a) How was it formulated & finalizatio? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 9. Funding assistance a. Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b. If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c. What was the response by IUCN? d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
b) Who did the concept paper? c) Main problem/issue addressed? d) Expected initial targets & benefits? e) Proposed main project inputs? f) Target group/s (who & Number) 8. Project formulation & finalization a) How was it formulated & finalized? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 9. Funding assistance a. Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b. If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c. What was the response by IUCN? d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
c) Main problem/issue addressed? d) Expected initial targets & benefits? e) Proposed main project inputs? f) Target group/s (who & Number) 8. Project formulation & finalization a) How was it formulated & finalized? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 9. Funding assistance a. Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b. If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c. What was the response by IUCN? d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
d) Expected initial targets & benefits? e) Proposed main project inputs? f) Target group/s (who & Number) 8. Project formulation & finalization a) How was it formulated & finalized? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 9. Funding assistance a. Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b. If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c. What was the response by IUCN? d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
e) Proposed main project inputs? f) Target group/s (who & Number) 8. Project formulation & finalization a) How was it formulated & finalized? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 9. Funding assistance a. Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b. If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c. What was the response by IUCN? d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
f) Target group/s (who & Number) 8. Project formulation & finalization a) How was it formulated & finalized? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 9. Funding assistance a. Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b. If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c. What was the response by IUCN? d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
8. Project formulation & finalization a) How was it formulated & finalized? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 9. Funding assistance a. Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b. If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c. What was the response by IUCN? d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
a) How was it formulated & finalized? b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 9. Funding assistance a. Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b. If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c. What was the response by IUCN? d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
b) Any outside assistance sought? If yes specify; c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 9. Funding assistance a. Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b. If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c. What was the response by IUCN? d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
c) Finalization and decision on submission (who & how)? 9. Funding assistance a. Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b. If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c. What was the response by IUCN? d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
 9. Funding assistance a. Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b. If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c. What was the response by IUCN? d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
 a. Was the proposal meant only for IUCN assistance? b. If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c. What was the response by IUCN? d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
 b. If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their response? c. What was the response by IUCN? d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
their response? c. What was the response by IUCN? d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
 c. What was the response by IUCN? d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
 d. Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
agreed implementation schedule? e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
e. Implementation modalities identified? 10. Project Implementation a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
a) Responsible parties for implementation b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
b) Any planned activities changed during implementation
(by quantity, time, fund etc)?
(by quartity, tittle, tuttu etc):
c) If yes please describe?
d) What were the constraints faced during
implementation?
e) What actions were taken to resolve them?
11. <u>Coordinating & Monitoring mechanism</u>
a. What was the monitoring action carried out?
b) What parties involved in monitoring?
c) Was the monitoring mechanism adequate in your

	opinion?	
d)	What was the coordination mechanism followed?	
e)	If not what could have been done differently?	
12.	Project outputs	
a.	What are the main project outputs?	
b)	Type/ No. of training/skills given or knowledge gained?	
c)	Type/No. of machines/equipments/tools received?	
d)	Nature / type of nature conservation/income generation	
	activities started?	
e)	Actual disbursement of money?	
f)	Relevance of the project to IUCN / Project's mandate?	
13.	Project outcomes/results & impacts	
a.	What are the visible changes took place in your	
	agency?	
b)	How the trainings / skills acquired are utilized to	
	enhance the performance of your agency?	
c)	To what extend the equipment / tools made use of to	
	enhance the delivery of targeted benefits/services?	
d)	Changes in income level of beneficiaries after the	
	project/ income generating activities were introduced	
	(no. of families, % increased etc)?	
e)	Any other negotiations made or linkages built as a result	
	of the intervention? (specify)	
f)	Were you able to sustain and replicate the project-	
	induced benefits? (if yes please describe)	
g)	What are your proposal (if any) to implement a similar	
	project in a different way for better results?	
h)	Your general conclusions on the overall project	
	performance and impact?	
C. :	Specific Questions for other project collaborators	(if any) or Support Agencies
1.	How was the collaboration with partners initiated?	
2.	The process involved in obtaining the IUCN assistance?	
3.	What are the benefits received to strengthen your	
	agency/ office and its staff?	
4.	The nature and kind of relationship built with the	
	collaborated partner NGO/CBOs?	
5.	What support you received to enhance environmental /	
	health promotional activities in the area?	
6.	In your opinion what the major strengths of the	
	programme?	
7.	What the major weaknesses of the assistance	
	programme?	

8.	What are your proposals for designing and implementing a similar kind of programme in a different way for better results?	
Obs	servation / Comments by the interviewer / consultant:	

QUESTIONNAIRE GUIDELINE FOR FIELD INFORMATION

No. C - For Members of the National Steering Committee / IUCN & RNE stakeholders

A. General Information

1.	Name & Position of respondent	
2.	Name of the Agency	
3.	a) No. of years in the present position/agency	
4.	b) No. of years in the present project and/or in this subject	
5.	Your main responsibility in your present place of work	
6.	Your responsibility involvement in the present project	
7.	Date of Interview	

B. Interview Guidelines

	Question	Answer / Comment
8.	Project initiation & inputs	
a.	Were you involved from the inception of the project?	
b)	If yes in what capacity, since when and total duration?	
c)	If not when was your involvement started & total duration?	
d)	How was the project initiated?	
e)	Who were the main stakeholders for the project initiation?	
f)	Expected initial targets & benefits (in summary)?	
g)	Proposed main project inputs?	
h)	Target group/s or areas (who & approx. number)	
14.	Project formulation & finalization	
a.	How was the Project Document formulated & finalized?	
b)	Who by?	
c)	Any expert advice sought? If yes specify;	
d)	What was the submission & approval procedure followed?	
e)	Any changes while implementation?	
f)	If yes what and why (specify)?	
15.	Funding assistance	
a.	Was the proposal meant only for RNE assistance?	
b)	If not who are the other agencies/ donors negotiated & their	
	response?	
c)	Approval process (proposal/ budget, time-line etc.) and	
	agreed implementation schedule (period)?	
d)	Implementation modalities identified / agreed upon?	
16.	Project Implementation	
a.	Responsible parties for implementation	
b.	Any planned activities changed during implementation (by	
	quantity, time, fund etc)?	
C.	If yes please describe?	
d.	What were the constraints faced during implementation	
	(HR, capacity, delays etc. from the part of Imp. Agencies)?	

f)	What actions were taken to resolve them?
17.	Coordinating & Monitoring mechanism
a)	What was the monitoring action carried out (at national &
	project level)?
b)	What parties involved in monitoring (RNE/IUCN/NSC/IA)?
c)	Was the M&E mechanism adequate in your opinion?
d)	Was the coordination mechanism followed adequate?
e)	If not what could have been done differently?
f)	Were you directly involved in Monitoring & Coordination at
	the project / sub-project/ activity level?
18.	Project outputs
a)	Were all expected project objectives / outputs achieved in
	your opinion?
b)	If not what are the gaps, drawbacks encountered & why?
c)	Type/ No. of training/skills given to implementers or
	knowledge imparted to project implementing partners?
d)	Type/no. of technology / machines, equipments, tools and
	other services provided?
e)	Actual disbursement of funds (amount, time duration etc)
	to different agencies?
19.	Project outcomes/results & impacts
a)	In your opinion, what are the visible changes took place
,	with the completion of the project activities in general?
b)	Your views on how the trainings / skills provided utilized to
-,	enhance the project performance of implementers
c)	To what extend the technology/ equipment / tools made use
-,	of to enhance the delivery of targeted benefits / services
d)	Changes in income level of beneficiaries after the project/
u,	income generating activities were introduced (in general)?
e)	Do you know of any other negotiations made or linkages
٥,	built as a result of the intervention? (specify)
f)	In your capacity, were you able to intervene in sustaining
',	and replicating the project-induced benefits? (if yes please
	describe)
g)	What are your proposal (if any) to implement a similar
9)	project in a different way for better results?
h)	Your general conclusions on the overall project
11)	performance and impact?
	performance and impact:

ANNEX 5: RECS – A PHOTOGRAPHIC PRESENTATION OF PROJECT STATUS (CCSF)

1. Establishment of Ten Forest Parks in Schools of the Polonnaruwa District





2. Elimination of Cactus and *Prosopis juliflora* from the Bundala National Park





3. Composting of Municipal Solid Waste in Weligama Urban Council Area





4. Community based awareness building and promotion of sustainable Solid Waste Management practices – Katana & Galle





5. Kuruwita Pradeshiya Shaba & Kuruwita Prison Associated Waste Recycling Project





6. Galkulama Integrated Environment Management Programme – Wilpotha, Puttalum













RECS – Project Status – Component A (Private Sector-led Projects of FCCISL)

1. CIC – Seeds Production Factory at Hinguraggoda – Polonnaruwa





2. Environmental-friendly Service Station at Anuradhapua





3. Modern Food Factory: Recycling of Waste water of Desiccated Coconut Production Factory, at Rabawewa - Wariyapola





RECS - Project Status - Component A (Private Sector-led Projects of FCCISL)

1. CIC – Seeds Production Factory at Hinguraggoda – Polonnaruwa





2. Environmental-friendly Service Station at Anuradhapua





3. Modern Food Factory: Recycling of Waste water of Desiccated Coconut Production Factory, at Rabawewa - Wariyapola



