



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FINAL REPORT

MID-TERM REVIEW

CONNECTING REGIONAL ECONOMIES  
(CORE) PROJECT IN SRI LANKA

August 2010

# **FINAL REPORT**

## **MID-TERM REVIEW**

### **CONNECTING REGIONAL ECONOMIES (CORE) PROJECT IN SRI LANKA**

**Conducted for USAID/Sri Lanka by:**

**James Walker, Senior Economic Advisor, USAID/ME/TS**

**Stephen Silcox, Senior Enterprise Development Advisor,  
USAID/EGAT/EG**

**Mohammad Rafeek, Agro-Economist**

**August 23, 2010**

#### **DISCLAIMER**

The authors' views expressed in this document do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
Table of Contents	i
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Acronyms/Abbreviations	iv
Executive Summary	v
Introduction	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Background</li><li>▪ Project Objective and Description</li><li>▪ Objectives of the Mid-Term Review</li><li>▪ Assessment Methodology</li></ul>	
Findings	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Competitive Agricultural Value Chains</li><li>▪ Increased Productivity of New Value Chain Participants</li><li>▪ Workforce Development</li><li>▪ Enabling Environment</li><li>▪ Project Management</li><li>▪ Monitoring &amp; Evaluation and Reporting</li></ul>	
Conclusions and Lessons Learned	10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Competitive Agricultural Value Chains</li><li>▪ Increased Productivity of New Value Chain Participants</li><li>▪ Workforce Development</li><li>▪ Enabling Environment</li><li>▪ Project Management</li><li>▪ Monitoring &amp; Evaluation and Reporting</li></ul>	
Recommendations	13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Competitive Agricultural Value Chains</li><li>▪ Increased Productivity of New Value Chain Participants</li><li>▪ Workforce Development</li><li>▪ Enabling Environment</li><li>▪ Project Management</li><li>▪ Monitoring &amp; Evaluation and Reporting</li></ul>	
Final Remark	15

## **Annexes:**

- A. Scope of Work
- B. Persons Contacted and Interviewed
- C. Schedule and Itinerary of Review Team
- D. List of Documents Reviewed

## **Acknowledgements**

The Review Team would like to express its sincere thanks to a number of persons who have facilitated this assessment.

First and foremost, we would like to thank Bandula Nissanka, the project COTR, for arranging for the assessment and for his guidance and assistance in making this review a reality. He prepared the scope of work for the assessment, selected and arranged for the team to come to Sri Lanka, and accompanied the team on their travels throughout Sri Lanka.

We would also like to thank other members of the USAID/Sri Lanka Office of Economic Growth for their assistance and advice on the assessment. These include the Office Director, Gerald Andersen, and Daniel Lee and Timothy Ong. Anna De Silva provided critical assistance in arranging logistics for the team, both in Colombo and in the field and Salma Peiris also contributed to the effort. We also wish to thank the USAID drivers for our field trip, Velo and Dhammika, who succeeded in reaching hard-to-find rural villages and who brought us safely to our hotels each night and back to Colombo. Other staff members in the Executive and Controllers Offices also provided important and timely assistance. We also appreciate the attention paid to the team's debriefing on the assessment by the Mission Director, Rebecca Cohn.

The assessment benefited greatly from the briefings and meetings with the AECOM and Nathan Associates CORE project staff in order to better understand the strengths and constraints of the project. The Chief of Party (COP), Melani Schultz, and the Deputy COP, Pradeep Liyanamana were extremely helpful in arranging for meetings with the various parties involved in the project and provided important insights on project implementation both at the beginning of the assessment and after the team's field trip. Project staff in headquarters and in regional offices was also very helpful in providing background information and documents relative to the project that permitted the team to make observations and arrive at conclusions regarding the project.

We would also like to thank the representatives of the various private sector companies and organizations that have partnered with CORE to achieve project objectives. They provided essential information that allowed us to better understand the relationships between them and the CORE staff and the farmer beneficiaries of the project.

Finally, we would like to thank the numerous farmers with whom we met during our field trip to various parts of Sri Lanka for their willingness to spend time with us discussing the workings of the project and sharing their opinions on how the project could be improved.

## List of Acronyms/Abbreviations

AECOM Int'l	Prime Contractor – CORE Project
CORE	Connecting Regional Economies Project
GSL	Government of Sri Lanka
HQ	Headquarters
ICT	Information Communications Technology
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
LTTE	Liberation Tigers of Tamil Elam (Tamil Tigers)
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
Nathan Associates	Subcontractor – CORE Project
RCO	USAID Regional Contracting Officer
SME	Small and Medium Enterprise
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government

# Executive Summary

## Background

CORE was designed to contribute to USAID/Sri Lanka's Assistance Objective of "Increased private sector led growth in former conflict areas," and its corollary Intermediate Results of "Private sector investment in former conflict areas increased" and "Private sector productivity enhanced in former conflict areas." Specifically, CORE seeks to address the disparity in economic development between the conflict-affected Eastern Province and the bordering provinces of North Central and Uva, on the one hand, and the rest of Sri Lanka, on the other hand. This is accomplished through an integrated approach: one that extends value chains broadly and deeply into the grassroots level; one that gives individuals the skills and knowledge they need to participate as entrepreneurs and workers in value chains; and one that improves the business environment to enable value chains to achieve greater competitiveness.

The CORE project has five Components:

- To support livelihood development for vulnerable populations at the household level
- To promote the competitiveness of agriculturally based value chains
- To enhance the productivity of newly engaged value chain participants
- To address workforce needs generally and for specific groups
- To promote a good business enabling environment

As an overarching program principle, CORE strives to bring the three different ethnic groups (Sinhalese, Tamil, Muslim) together to work on areas of common interest, ranging from joint training programs to business development opportunities.

The three-year \$13.5 million contract for CORE was awarded to AECOM International Development with an effective date of February 1, 2008 through January 31, 2011. Due to delays in the start of project implementation, the base period of performance for the contract is in the process of being modified to October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2011. Currently, AECOM is implementing the Year 2 CORE Work Plan covering October 1, 2009 – September 30, 2010. Since almost all the Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in the Eastern Province have now been resettled from the camps and integrated into mainstream economic activities, USAID is in the process of a component and budget realignment of the contract to reduce support to livelihood-specific activities under Component 1 and realign funds to the Grants component and to Component 2. This action is awaiting approval by the Contracting Officer.

The objectives of this Mid-Term Review of the CORE project were threefold:

- To undertake a formative assessment of the project to gauge progress made in the implementation of planned activities toward reaching stated goals and objectives,
- To assess the wider project context to validate project assumptions and results indicators against the reality on the ground, based on actual CORE implementation experience to date, and
- To make recommendations for adjustments and calibration of assumptions and results indicators, as warranted.

## **Key Conclusions and Lessons Learned**

- Overall progress in meeting project objectives and indicators appears to have been good.
- Progress in meeting specific project indicators has been uneven, with the delay in project implementation causing some problems and differing results from different partners causing others.
- The process for the establishment of targets for project indicators has not always been transparent and consultative.
- A number of the value chains appear to be achieving positive results, considering that this is largely a project focusing on agricultural production by farmers and a year and a half is short time period for such projects to achieve lasting results.
- Due to the demand driven nature of the project and based on private sector demand/requirements the project has many value chain projects and partners scattered across a wide geographical area in Sri Lanka.<sup>1</sup>
- Project reporting appears to be overly laborious and includes extraneous data for which the team could see no obvious need. It is not clear how much of this is due to USAID requirements and how much was due to decisions by the contractor.
- Most of the partners appear to be capable agri-businesses and are sincerely interested in the success of their projects with CORE, but those projects where the partners have taken more interest in monitoring the implementation of project efforts have benefited from that closer interest.

---

<sup>1</sup> However, AECOM contends that this helped the project to achieve their targeted number of beneficiaries.

## **Key Recommendations**

- Reduce the number of value chain activities and work with fewer partners and in fewer areas, based on experience to date with the partners and farmers in order to maximize success. Focus on the former conflict areas and less on bordering areas and focus on partners who have proved to be more reliable and interested in project outcomes. This could also result in a reduction in the target number of beneficiaries.
- Continue to work with successful agriculture value chains, but increase value chain and workforce development activities in sectors other than agriculture with good potential. This can result in higher paying jobs through added value of products and services.
- Give preference to groups of farmers who have good prospects for organization and who have some natural leaders since those farmers who are better organized and have good business skills tend to do better than those without those attributes.
- Analyze the viability of specific crops in areas suggested by project partners before investing in assistance to those partners and related farmers/beneficiaries.
- Utilize existing private sector business service providers as much as feasible.
- CORE should include in policy reforms that are critical to the broader regional enabling environment and the rebuilding of the economies of the conflict-affected areas, including provincial tax and expenditure policies, trade liberalization, reduction of business regulations, etc.
- Promote workforce development by supporting programs that require longer-term training for higher paying jobs and not necessarily linked to employment in the short-term.
- Consider reducing project beneficiary targets and develop new indicators that focus on value chain development, such as investment, firm sales, exports, etc.
- Short-term training may not be adequate for rural farmers to adopt technologies/techniques being introduced by the project, especially in the East. In the absence of a strong extension network and limited capacity of certain private sector partners, the project may want to consider strengthening extension efforts with existing project beneficiaries.

## **FINAL REMARK**

The Review Team believes that the CORE project is on the right track and has made considerable progress over the past year and a half. It is ready to enter a “take-off” stage where many of its activities should begin to succeed and achieve the results intended. The team believes that the results in the next year and a half should demonstrate that the project should be extended for the option years, but that decision should be made no later than the middle of year three. This would ensure continuity of the activities and productive relationships with the private sector if the project shows further evidence that positive results are being achieved.

# INTRODUCTION

## Background

Building on the Mission's successful economic growth and humanitarian assistance portfolios, Connecting Regional Economies (CORE) seeks to address Sri Lanka's current economic growth issues through the lens of the deteriorating conflict environment in the country. While recognizing that the solution to Sri Lanka's conflict lies clearly in the political realm, USAID believes that economic growth programming can contribute to building social and economic security to help establish conditions conducive to a political solution.

Prior USAID assessments concluded that inequitable distribution of economic development benefits has helped fuel the current conflict. To address these disparities and make a positive contribution to creating space for a political solution, the CORE project has sought to expand economic activity in and around the post conflict areas in Sri Lanka's North and East, and in strategic areas on the border of the post conflict areas.

Over the past fifteen years USAID/Sri Lanka has assisted in the development of the country's agribusiness and services sectors through three main initiatives: TIPS, AgEnt (FY1992-2000) and The Competitiveness Program (FY 2001-2006). Each of these programs resulted in several successes, laying the groundwork for increased competitiveness of Sri Lanka's private sector. AgEnt was a collaborative effort between USAID and Oregon State University with the purpose of generating employment and income growth through the development and expansion of private agro-based enterprises. Building on these accomplishments, The Competitiveness Program (TCP) focused its efforts on eight main clusters: coir, rubber, gems and jewelry, ceramics, tourism, tea, spices and ICT. The project worked through Apex bodies made up of representatives from all sectors of the industry value chain.

The three-year \$13.5 million contract for CORE was awarded to AECOM International Development with an effective date of February 1, 2008 through January 31, 2011. Due to delays in the start of project implementation, the base period of performance for the contract is in the process of being modified to October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2011. Currently, AECOM is implementing the Year 2 CORE Work Plan covering October 1, 2009 – September 30, 2010.

CORE is providing technical assistance and training to accomplish the objectives of the program. In addition, CORE includes a flexible grants-under-contracts program to support public-private partnerships, small-scale infrastructure, business development services, support to associations, chambers of commerce and others to promote peace-building economic growth activities. Grants can be up to \$250,000 per grant in order to ensure that a variety of grant activities are funded in the target areas.

## **Project Objective & Description**

CORE was designed to contribute to USAID/Sri Lanka's Assistance Objective of "Increased private sector led growth in former conflict areas," and its corollary Intermediate Results of "Private sector investment in former conflict areas increased" and "Private sector productivity enhanced in former conflict areas." Specifically, CORE seeks to address the disparity in economic development between the Eastern Province and bordering North Central and Uva Provinces compared to the rest of Sri Lanka. This is accomplished through an integrated approach: one that extends value chains broadly and deeply into the grassroots level; one that gives individuals the skills and knowledge they need to participate as entrepreneurs and workers in value chains; and one that improves the business environment to enable value chains to achieve greater competitiveness.

The CORE project has five Components:

1. Support livelihood development for vulnerable populations at the household level, especially women and children in conflict-affected and -strategic areas. This component is envisioned as a first step in the process of restoring economic activity to war-torn populations, and will assist those most directly impacted by the escalating conflict in the East to participate in livelihood activities, such as creating their own small businesses, building towards their eventual participation in CORE value-chain development activities and access to new markets.
2. Promote the competitiveness of agriculturally based value chains that offer or have the potential to offer sources of income for traditionally neglected groups located in target areas. The CORE proponents may also suggest other non-agricultural value chains.
3. Ensure that groups located in target areas benefit from participation in selected value chains. This will involve the promotion of win-win relationships between value chain actors. This will address power imbalances as well as equitable access to the resources needed to participate viably in selected value chains, i.e. finance, business services, infrastructure, and ICT (to improve access to markets, market information, business skills and other information on the "outside world").
4. Implement a workforce development strategy that benefits groups located in rural, target areas and that is driven by the needs of selected value chains.
5. Promote a business enabling policy environment that will allow businesses in target areas to grow and become sustainable.

As an overarching program principle, CORE strives to bring the three different ethnic groups (Sinhalese, Tamil, Muslim) together to work on areas of common interest, ranging from joint training programs to business development opportunities.

A recent assessment of the current social, economic and political environment of development activities in the targeted regions and project performance to date have led to a proposed component and budget realignment in Year 2 of CORE. Two years ago, when CORE was developed, the situation in Sri Lanka was vastly different than it is today, especially in the Eastern Province. At that time, there was a large number of IDPs still located in camps waiting to be resettled and conflict was still present in the country. The post-tsunami development environment focused on revitalizing livelihoods of the affected populations and a significant portion of the funds were invested in livelihood related activities in the agriculture, microfinance and vocational training sectors.

Today, almost all the Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in the Eastern Province have been resettled from the camps and attempts are being made to integrate them into mainstream economic activities since conflict, for the most part, has been terminated. As such, the project is proposing, with support from the USAID technical office, a component and budget realignment to reduce support to livelihood-specific activities under Component 1 and realign funds to the Grants component and to Component 2. USAID experience had demonstrated that the current activities under Component 1 would be more effective if they were integrated with agriculturally based value chain development programs under Component 2.

## **Objectives of the Mid-Term Review**

The objectives of this Mid-Term Review of the CORE project were threefold:

- To undertake a formative assessment of the project to gauge progress made in the implementation of planned activities toward reaching stated goals and objectives,
- To assess the wider project context to validate project assumptions and results indicators against the reality on the ground, based on actual CORE implementation experience to date, and
- To make recommendations for adjustments and calibration of assumptions and results indicators, as warranted.

## **Assessment Methodology**

Prior to the arrival of the Washington-based USAID team members, USAID/Sri Lanka sent a number of project related documents for review. Other documents were received from both USAID and CORE project staff during the course of the assessment.

Upon arrival in Colombo, the team attended a presentation by the CORE Project staff for the USAID Mission that described the status of project implementation. The team met with the COP and Deputy COP of the project during a lunch meeting immediately after that presentation. The team had two meetings with CORE partners with offices in Colombo in the afternoon.

The next day, the team left on a one-week field trip to the Moneragala, Trincomalee and Anuradhapura regions for interviews with CORE regional staff from their offices in Ampara, Trincomalee and Anuradhapura, CORE partner companies and organizations, and farmers participating in CORE value chain projects.

In order to obtain a reasonable picture of the strengths and weaknesses of project implementation, the team engaged in a random sampling of over forty farmers engaged in project activities. The team split into two smaller teams of two persons each in order to cover more territory and interview more farmers. The team also met with a total of seven of the companies which have partnered with CORE in the regions where the farmer site visits took place and had extensive interviews with company representatives responsible for the cooperative effort with the CORE project. During all of these interviews, both farmers and partners provided frank and open discussions of project implementation issues. The team purposely did not invite the CORE staff to accompany them on these visits in order to have unbiased conversations with the partners and beneficiaries of the value chain activities.

During the course of the field trip, team members had much time to interact with the project COTR and to get his views and observations about project progress and issues. When the team arrived back in Colombo, discussions were held with other staff members of the USAID Economic Growth Office to get their opinions on the project and other economic growth projects as well. It should be mentioned that both Jim Walker and Steve Silcox had previously experience with USAID economic growth projects in Sri Lanka over the past ten or more years and this permitted them to consider the relationships and activities of those projects with the CORE project and other ongoing USAID projects in the economic growth area. Mohamad Rafeek, the local consultant team member, provided both cultural and agronomic insights on issues observed in the field and how the project fits within the broader context of agriculture and agro-processing in Sri Lanka.

After returning from the field trip, the team also held an extensive three-hour meeting with CORE HQ staff to review our findings from the field trip and to receive their comments and observations on those findings. This was very helpful in receiving a more complete picture of project implementation issues and constraints and gave the team a more balanced understanding of project successes and weaknesses.

The Review Team presented its findings, conclusions and recommendations at a debriefing at the USAID mission on Monday, June 7, 2010 at which the Mission Director, her special assistant and staff members of the Economic Growth Office were present.

The lists of persons contacted and interviewed, documents reviewed, schedule and itinerary of the Review Team, as well as the scope of work for this assessment can be found in the annexes of this report.

# FINDINGS

## Competitive Agriculture Value Chains

- Many partners have invested considerable effort and money in their value change linkages with farmers, but some have had less direct involvement in project implementation.
- CORE at the time of the assessment is engaged in ten projects with ten partners in various locations, has signed agreements for 4 new projects with two new and two existing partners, and five new projects are in the planning stage. These new projects will support approximately 4,500 new beneficiaries.
- Most of the crops being produced are for the domestic market, either as commodities or for processing by the project partners. Some of the processed products are for export.
- Some of the projects experienced problems with inputs, farmer selection and land areas selected were not appropriate for some crops.
- CORE's organization of the farmer associations was viewed by the partners as a major contribution to the success of the projects and helps the farmers to negotiate.
- Crop and location selection is dependent upon the partners and, in one case, a government official strongly recommended adding some areas to project activities that were not particularly well suited for the crop being planted.
- Agriculture/livestock/dairy production is at its early stages with crops either having no harvest or only having obtained one harvest season to date and the milk and juice factories that will buy the farmers produce are not yet completed.<sup>2</sup>
- With the improvements in the business environment in the East, year two and three projects in pipeline seem to be more investment oriented projects and include larger cost share grant allocations.

---

<sup>2</sup> This comment refers to the project activities visited by the assessment team. AECOM and Nathan Associates observed that other dairy processors were operating factories at less than capacity due to a shortage of milk supplies. They stated that there is considerable competition in the dairy industry now and the processors are constrained by inefficiencies and structural problems in the milk value chain.

## **Increased Productivity of New Value Chain Participants**

- Training provided to value chain participants has been done by partners, private sector organizations or government agencies with support from CORE.
- Most farmers interviewed expressed satisfaction with the quality of the training.
- It appeared that those farmers with irrigated land (either via canals or tube wells) had significantly greater production than those depending on rain.
- Most financing seemed to be coming from partners or non-CORE related financial institutions although CORE is currently working on financial linkages with various financial institutions.
- Increased productivity frequently comes from better quality seeds, plants, livestock and technology provided largely by the partners.
- Increased production can reduce the cost of collection by the partners by providing scale efficiencies.
- It will require at least several more seasons and, in some cases, more consistent extension support to firmly establish a sustainable relationship between the farmers and the partners.
- Partners that focus on increased quality and quantity of products can facilitate increased farmer productivity and incomes.

## **Workforce Development**

- Component 4 began in March 2009 with the completion of an Assessment and Workforce Development Strategy that focused on providing technical training driven by the needs of selected agricultural value chains. This training is being counted as workforce development even though it does not lead to jobs per se and is not usually counted as workforce development.
- In Year 1 CORE sponsored in collaboration with its partners, private sector, and government agents technical agricultural training to increase productivity (typically one or two day sessions) to 1,281 farmers and business basics training to 189 farmers.
- The Workforce Development Strategy also calls for training programs that develop skills needed by jobs for vulnerable beneficiaries, such as youth and disabled women, where possible. In Year 2 workforce development training

programs were initiated that were to be demand-driven, with a high potential for employment with the private sector, including internship programs to link trainees and private sector employers.

- The CORE Performance Monitoring Plan of December 2008 set Year 2 targets of 500 persons participating in these USG funded workforce skill development programs and 250 persons obtaining employment or higher wages as a result of participation in these programs. While the number of persons in training was not changed from 500, the year 2 target was later increased to 600 employed in internships in private sector employers. USAID reportedly increased these following a Jobs Fair that attracted many employers and job seekers but resulted in few job and training applicants. Furthermore, only 110 persons have participated in workforce skills training, with some 75 persons obtaining paid internships in the tourism (40), supermarkets (22), and boat building (13).
- The reluctance of youth and others to seek workforce skills training leading to private sector jobs is due to cultural factors, their reluctance to accept the anticipated low wages that training may lead to, unwillingness to leave the local area for what are perceived as low wages in the western Sri Lanka, compared to post tsunami inflated wages in the Eastern Province, and their preference for higher wages abroad.
- To deal with these issues, CORE has initiated a program with Job Envoy to train for jobs abroad in construction, hospitality, etc., that is expected to send 50 persons a month for employment abroad for a total of approximately 500 beneficiaries.
- CORE staff considers value chain and workforce development in the ICT, tourism, logistics and construction sectors to have good potential.
- USAID requires that all current workforce development programs be directly linked to immediate specific jobs, which excludes some activities with longer term potential.

## **Enabling Environment**

- USAID has directed project staff to work exclusively on policy reforms at the value chain level. There was limited potential for policy reform during the conflict with the LTTE. The review team was told that economic policy reform activities by other donors have also been limited. Government engagement of the private sector in policy formulation has been generally lacking.
- Given the overall unfavorable policy reform environment, most of the CORE work done on this component has been limited to assessments of sector issues in CORE selected value chains.

- CORE has identified the following six regulatory or government procedural issues that adversely affect selected agricultural value chains: 1) Inadequate allocation of veterinarians for animal population; 2) Little support by wildlife range offices in newly resettled areas in Trincomalee to resolve conflicts between humans and wildlife; 3) Difficulties of gaining access to long-term leases on State land; 4) Potential impact on the livestock industry of a ban on cattle slaughter; 5) Lack of artificial insemination technical services provided by government; and 6) Lack of transparent policy to access land for pasture cultivation.
- CORE has produced brief analyses of these issues, presented them in meetings with private and local government officials, but little or no discernable reform has yet been initiated by the relevant government authorities.
- Lack of land title is an overriding problem in both land usage and collateral for finance, particularly on land in the East that has been resettled.
- Business registration is considered cumbersome for investment in the target areas and CORE has initiated efforts to establish a more efficient registration process in the East.
- USAID has limited project staff access to senior level government officials. CORE interactions with the government officials have been at or below the secretary level. However, authority to approve reforms resides in a few senior ministers, not at lower levels.
- A recent CORE study advises that major policy reforms are essential for successful integration of the post-conflict areas into the western Sri Lankan economy. A broad range of policy reforms is recommended, including transferring some tax and expenditure control to provincial governments, property rights reform, foreign trade liberalization, agriculture research and extension reform, improved access to microfinance, etc. The proposed policy reforms go well beyond CORE's current focus on governmental procedures and regulations affecting its selected value chains.

## **Project Management**

- Project expenditures are generally under budget except for the transportation line item. This is not unusual given that the project has been underway for a relatively short time period and developing the agricultural value chains and training programs in multiple locations has been time consuming. However, the project has successfully met beneficiary targets in the first year.
- With some limited exceptions, project staff appears to be qualified and capable. The management team is very strong, is well informed about the multitude of

project activities and associated issues, and communicates and interacts very effectively with their staff.

- Problems with approval of budget changes by the RCO have limited the project's ability to respond adequately to changing circumstances on the ground.
- There may be a need for more staff at the regional level to deal with the USAID's recent push toward increased focus on local small business development.
- The evaluation team received some criticism of the project from some partners for delayed inputs and approvals, but partners were overwhelming supportive and satisfied with CORE efforts to link partners with farmer associations.

## **Monitoring and Evaluation and Reporting**

- CORE's Performance Monitoring Plan published in December 2008 proposed an overly complex plan for project data generation and reporting. It included ambitious performance targets for year 1 and year 2. The Plan proposed the collection of many performance indicators from quarterly surveys of beneficiaries.
- The CORE Quarterly Reports have provided a reasonably clear picture of the project's performance; however the reports seem to be excessively detailed and do not adequately discuss project problems and potential solutions. For example, the significant shortcomings of delivery of project inputs for dairy farmer beneficiaries were not adequately documented. Furthermore, there is an excessive reporting on beneficiary receipt of project services and inputs (training, plants, cows, sheds, etc.), with limited documentation and analysis of the resulting impacts on productivity, sales and income impacts.
- The detailed Quarterly Report tables, including Table 3. Major Results and Achievements in Quarter; Table 12. Activities During Quarter Towards Fulfilling Deliverables in the Year Workplan; and Appendix H. Inventory List produce limited useful information compared to the Report's description and analyses on Overall Accomplishments and project Components. Their development uses considerable CORE staff time that could be put to more productive use.
- CORE has initiated a comprehensive database on its website to present and analyze project performance. However, the database is still under development at this time and this limits the analysis of project implementation issues. The data files and database functions appear to require considerable more programming and data entry to make the database fully functional and useful for program analyses.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED**

### **Competitive Agricultural Value Chains**

- Overall progress in meeting project objectives and indicators appears to have been good.
- Progress in meeting specific project indicators has been uneven, with the delay in project implementation causing some problems and differing results from different partners causing others.
- A number of the value chains appear to be achieving positive results, considering that this is largely an agricultural production by farmers project and a year and a half is short time period for such projects to achieve lasting results.
- Due to the demand driven nature of the project and based on private sector demand/requirements, the project has many value chain projects and partners scattered across a wide geographical area in Sri Lanka.
- Most of the partners appear to be sincerely interested in the success of their projects with CORE, but those projects where the partners have taken more interest in monitoring the implementation of project efforts have benefited from that closer interest.

### **Increased Productivity of New Value Chain Participants**

- Interviews with a sample of over forty farmers engaged in project value chains demonstrated significant productivity increases and corresponding increases in income for some, but not all.
- Crop and location selection is dependent upon the partners and, in one case, a government official intervened to force the project to work with some beneficiaries who were not well suited for the crop planted.
- Farmers who had the advantage of irrigated land appear to have achieved higher production increases than those depending upon rainfall.
- As could be expected, some crops and value chains were more successful than others. The maize project near Trincomalee suffered from both bad weather conditions as well as government interference in the selection of beneficiaries. A number of the black gram farmers appeared to have experienced higher yields and incomes as a result of the organizing efforts of the project, which permitted them to negotiate for better prices for their crop.

- Again, as could be expected, some farmers appeared to be more diligent than others and exhibited better business skills. These farmers were more successful than others in achieving productivity gains and corresponding income increases.

## **Workforce Development**

- Workforce training was initially focused on technical production issues for farmers linked to selected value chains. In year 2 a modest workforce development program was initiated that was linked to follow-on internships with private sector employers. However, the opportunities for significantly expanding these internship programs may be limited.
- Non-agricultural job seekers face severe difficulties with few job openings, and are generally unprepared for the job market with their limited educational and skill levels, unrealistic wage expectations, unwillingness to relocate within Sri Lanka, and possibly unrealistic expectations concerning the costs and benefits of employment abroad.
- CORE supported workforce development programs have had limited success placing trainees in local jobs. Given the low levels of training and education, more intensive workforce training and education may be required before the trainees become employable.
- The Job Envoy program is expected to generate employment for some 50 trainees a month for up to 500 total trainees, but the human costs associated with work abroad may be not well understood.

## **Enabling Environment**

- CORE has provided very minimal resources to analyze and promote reforms needed to reduce the economic dislocation of the target areas with the more prosperous western regions of Sri Lanka.
- The enabling environment issues addressed by CORE have little potential impact on the regional economy outside the selected value chains. The selected issues do not deal with enabling environment policy reforms that are needed to promote broad-based growth and are usually included in USAID economic growth reform programs.
- USAID has encouraged CORE to limit itself to value chain issues as result of the unfavorable environment for policy reform that has only recently begun to improve.

- CORE's recent assessment of policy issues points to a number of policy issues that it could consider addressing.

## **Project Management**

- CORE project managers are competent professionals who would welcome more continued constructive collaboration with USAID in developing policies to resolve implementation issues and strengthen project performance.
- Although some USAID staff expressed concerns regarding the number of CORE project staff in CORE HQ, the team believes that there are necessary project implementation functions that can only take place in Colombo and that the quality of the staff performing those functions would suffer if the project attempted to conduct those functions from regional field offices.<sup>3</sup>

## **Monitoring and Evaluation and Reporting**

- Project reporting appears to be overly laborious and includes extraneous data for which the team could see no obvious need. It is not clear how much of this is due to USAID requirements and how much due to decisions by the contractor.
- The process for the establishment of targets for project indicators has not been fully transparent and consultative in some cases.
- The Performance Plan's proposed collection of a wide array of data appears to have been overly ambitious and has overwhelmed the CORE M&E staff, leaving limited time for analysis of program impacts and problems.
- Performance targets for year 1 for value chain linked beneficiaries appear to be reasonable, with an estimated 44,769 for year 1 beneficiaries compared to the target of 4,500 beneficiaries. However, reaching the year 2 target may call for excessive beneficiary growth, given that year 1 beneficiaries will continue to need services and other inputs in year 2. Other targets appear arbitrary and excessive, especially for those gaining employment as a direct result of workforce development.

---

<sup>3</sup> The USAID/Sri Lanka Economic Growth Office commented that (a) CORE overspent significantly in the first year due to a lack of cost control; however, this was corrected in the second year after discussions with USAID and (b) Other projects have been successful in hiring staff in regional offices, possibly due to higher salaries than the CORE project pays its staff.

- The targets for productivity, sales, and income gains appear to be arbitrary. The analyses of these outcome indicators does not rely on control groups that have not participated in CORE programs, hence gains in outcomes may erroneously be attributed to CORE rather than other outside influences. In addition, it is not clear that calculations for outcome gains adequately deduct for prior production foregone as a result of the new CORE supported production replacing original production.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Competitive Agriculture Value Chains**

- Continue to work with successful agriculture value chains, but increase value chain and workforce development activities in sectors other than agriculture with good potential. This can result in higher paying jobs through added value of products and services.
- Work with fewer partners and in fewer areas, based on experience to date with the partners and farmers in order to maximize success. Focus on the former conflict areas and less on bordering areas and focus on partners who have proved to be more reliable and interested in beneficiary income gains.
- Verify both that the end market for specific crops or products is viable and that the partner has sufficient experience in the crop or product selected when providing assistance to specific partners.

### **Increased Productivity of New Value Chain Participants**

- Analyze the viability of specific crops in areas suggested by project partners before investing in assistance to those partners and related farmers/beneficiaries.
- Consider the prospects for irrigated land on specific partner projects versus the prospects for rain fed agriculture and make judgments about support accordingly.
- Give preference to groups of farmers who have good prospects for organization and who have some natural leaders since those farmers who are better organized and have good business skills tend to do better than those without those attributes.

### **Workforce Development**

- CORE should attempt to develop workforce development programs with other sectors which may require higher skill levels, including ICT, construction, health

care, education, etc. that may require more training and/or education over longer time periods before trainees become employable. Training should be de-linked to requirements for immediate jobs.

- Workforce development skill training should be considered for some of the agri-businesses that are linked to local farmers. As a result, some local beneficiaries may be able to fill job positions in agri-business processing.
- Increase value chain and workforce development activities in sectors other than agriculture with good potential.
- Promote workforce development by supporting programs that require longer-term training for higher paying jobs.

## **Enabling Environment**

- CORE should devote more resources to analyzing and promoting enabling environment reforms.
- CORE should target policy reforms that are critical to the broader regional enabling environment and the rebuilding of the economies of the target areas, including provincial tax and expenditure policies, trade liberalization, reduction of business regulations, etc.
- USAID should encourage and facilitate a broader and more effective CORE policy reform agenda and access to relevant government policy makers.

## **Project Management**

- Reduce the number of value chain activities and focus them in fewer areas, preferably in post conflict areas rather than border areas, and capitalizing on partners who have been more successful.
- Utilize existing private sector business service providers as much as possible, including local SMEs where feasible.

## **Monitoring and Evaluation and Reporting**

- Prioritize finalizing CORE's database and data collection procedures so that project performance and problems can be more effectively analyzed.

- Reduce extraneous tables in the Quarterly Reports so they can focus on clear project discussions and analysis of problems and solutions.
- Project targets should be based on realistic assumptions of further changes and collaboratively determined by USAID and CORE staff with no need to involve the RCO who has limited project relevant on-the-ground information.
- Consider reducing project beneficiary targets and develop new indicators that focus on value chain development, such as investment, firm sales, exports, etc.

## **FINAL REMARK**

The Review Team believes that the CORE project is on the right track and has made considerable progress over the past year and a half. It is ready to enter a “take-off” stage where many of its activities should begin to succeed and achieve the results intended. The team believes that the results in the next year and a half should demonstrate that the project should be extended for the option years, but that decision should be made no later than the middle of year three. This would ensure continuity of the activities and productive relationships with the private sector if the project shows further evidence that positive results are being achieved.

## **Annex A**

### **SCOPE OF WORK** Mid-Term Assessment of CORE Project

#### **1.0 Background**

Building on the Mission's successful economic growth and humanitarian assistance portfolios, the COntecting Regional Economies (CORE) project seeks to address Sri Lanka's current economic growth issues through the lens of the deteriorating conflict environment in the country. While recognizing that the solution to Sri Lanka's conflict lies clearly in the political realm, USAID believes that economic growth programming can contribute to building social and economic security to help establish conditions conducive to a political solution.

Prior USAID assessments concluded that inequitable distribution of economic development benefits have helped fuel the current conflict. To address these disparities and make a positive contribution to creating space for a political solution, the CORE project will seek to expand economic activity in and around the conflicted areas in Sri Lanka's North and East, and in conflict-strategic areas on the border of the conflict.

Over the past fifteen years USAID/Sri Lanka has assisted in the development of the country's agribusiness and services sectors through three main initiatives: TIPS, AgEnt (FY 1992-2000) and The Competitiveness Program (FY 2001-2006). Each of these programs resulted in several successes, laying the groundwork for increased competitiveness of Sri Lanka's private sector. AgEnt was a collaborative effort between USAID and Oregon State University with the purpose of generating employment and income growth through the development and expansion of private agro-based enterprises. Building on these accomplishments, The Competitiveness Program (TCP) focused its efforts on eight main clusters: coir, rubber, gems and jewelry, ceramics, tourism, tea, spices and ICT. The project worked through Apex bodies made up of representatives from all sectors of the industry value chain.

The three-year \$13.5 million contract for CORE was awarded to AECOM International Development with an effective date of February 1, 2008 through January 31, 2011. Due to delays in the start of project implementation, the base period of performance for the contract has been modified to October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2011. Currently, AECOM is implementing the Year 2 CORE Work Plan covering October 1, 2009 – September 30, 2010.

#### **1.1 Program Objective**

CORE was designed to contribute to USAID/Sri Lanka's Assistance Objective of "Increased private sector led growth in former conflict areas," and its corollary Intermediate Results of "Private sector investment in former conflict areas increased" and "Private sector productivity enhanced in former conflict areas." Specifically, CORE seeks to address the disparity in economic development between the conflict-affected Eastern Province together with the conflict bordering North Central and Uva Provinces and the rest of Sri Lanka. This is accomplished through an integrated approach: one that extends value chains broadly and deeply into the grassroots level; one that gives individuals the skills and knowledge they need to participate as

entrepreneurs and workers in value chains; and one that improves the business environment to enable value chains to achieve greater competitiveness.

The CORE program has five Components:

1. Support livelihood development for vulnerable populations at the household level, especially women and children in conflict-affected and -strategic areas. This component is envisioned as a first step in the process of restoring economic activity to war-torn populations, and will assist those most directly impacted by the escalating conflict in the north and east to participate in livelihood activities, such as creating their own small businesses, building towards their eventual participation in CORE value-chain development activities and access to new markets.
2. Promote the competitiveness of agriculturally based value chains that offer or have the potential to offer sources of income for traditionally neglected groups located in conflict-affected and -strategic areas. The CORE proponents may also suggest other non-agricultural value chains.
3. Ensure that groups located in conflict-affected and -strategic areas benefit from participation in selected value chains. This will involve the promotion of win-win relationships between value chain actors. This will address power imbalances as well as equitable access to the resources needed to participate viably in selected value chains, i.e. finance, business services, infrastructure, and ICT (to improve access to markets, market information, business skills and other information on the "outside world").
4. Implement a workforce development strategy that benefits groups located in rural, conflict-affected and -strategic areas and that is driven by the needs of selected value chains.
5. Promote a business enabling policy environment that will allow businesses in conflict-affected and -strategic areas to grow and become sustainable.

As an overarching program principle, CORE strives to bring the three different ethnic groups (Singhalese, Tamil, Muslim) together to work on areas of common interest, ranging from joint training programs to business development opportunities.

A recent assessment of the current social, economic and political environment of development activities in the targeted regions and project performance to date have led to a component and budget realignment in Year 2 of CORE. Two years ago, when CORE was developed, the situation in Sri Lanka was vastly different than it is today, especially in the Eastern Province. At that time, there was a large number of IDPs still located in camps waiting to be resettled. The post-tsunami development environment focused on revitalizing livelihoods of the affected populations and a significant portion of the funds were invested in livelihood related activities in the agriculture, microfinance and vocational training sectors.

Today, almost all the IDPS in the Eastern Province have been resettled from the camps and have integrated into mainstream economic activities. As such, there was a component and budget realignment to reduce support to livelihood-specific activities under Component 1 and realign funds to the Grants component and to Component 2. USAID experience had demonstrated that

the current activities under Component 1 would be more effective if they were integrated with agriculturally based value chain development programs under Component 2.

## **1.2 Expected Results, Indicators, and Targets**

Based on CORE Work Plans, specific annual targets have been established by results indicator for the overall Program. The CORE COTR, Mr. Bandula Nissanka, will provide the necessary details and documentation to the Evaluation team.

These targets are incorporated into CORE's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan. Progress toward targets is monitored regularly. As necessary and to reflect changing CORE operating conditions, adjustments to targets are made in revisions to the CORE Annual Work Plan, in consultation with USAID and Sri Lankan counterparts.

## **1.3 Implementation Strategy**

CORE will provide technical assistance and training to accomplish the objectives of the program. In addition, CORE will include a flexible grants-under-contracts program to support public-private partnerships, small-scale infrastructure, business development services, support to associations, chambers of commerce and others to promote peace-building economic growth activities. Grants will be up to \$250,000 per grant in order to ensure that a variety of grant activities are funded in the target conflict-affected and -strategic areas.

## **2.0 Objective of Mid-Term Review**

The objective of this assignment is to carry out a Mid-Term Review of the CORE project. Specifically, the evaluators will undertake a formative assessment of the project to gauge progress made in the implementation of planned activities toward reaching stated goals and objectives. Additionally, the evaluators will assess the wider project context to validate project assumptions and results indicators against the reality on the ground, based on actual CORE implementation experience to date. The latter should be done with a view toward making recommendations for adjustments and calibration of assumptions and results indicators, as warranted.

## **3.0 Scope of Work**

The tasks listed below under the scope of work (SOW) are minimum requirements for this assignment. The evaluators may add additional tasks that further strengthen the expected results of this assignment.

1. Prior to arrival in Sri Lanka, the evaluators should send a list of required documents to the CORE COTR, Mr. Bandula Nissanka, at the following email address: [bnissanka@usaid.gov](mailto:bnissanka@usaid.gov). USAID will make every effort to gather requested documents and make them available prior to the beginning of assignment to enable timely review of program data and information.
2. Hold a preliminary meeting with the USAID/Sri Lanka COTR and other key staff of the Mission's Economic Growth team to ascertain a thorough understanding of the assignment requirements and to brief the USAID Mission Director and key staff on the approach and

procedures to be taken to carry out the Mid-Term Review, as well as to discuss concerns and suggestions for pursuing appropriate lines of assessment inquiry.

3. Hold meetings with Sri Lankan counterparts and partners to discuss project accomplishments and areas for improvement.

4. Undertake data gathering and analysis, as appropriate, including review of project documents, site visits, interviews, individual and group discussions, gathering of primary data, review of primary and secondary data, as well as other means of gathering a comprehensive variety of program data and information from a broad and diversified perspective. Review of project documentation, including but not be limited to, USAID project documents, CORE project documents, work plans, monitoring and evaluation plan, project reports and supporting data and information, relevant project monitoring, internal project management information systems, and so on.

5. Based on data and information gathered during fieldwork, conduct preliminary analyses of same to produce a quantitative and qualitative assessment of the CORE program from all relevant perspectives. Data analysis should focus on yielding meaningful output and outcomes data and information to provide an in-depth understanding of program progress, challenges faced, if and how problems were resolved, pending issues, necessary changes and directions, as required, and so on.

6. During the field research, prepare a discussion paper on preliminary findings to discuss with USAID/Sri Lanka staff, Sri Lankan counterparts and CORE staff, addressing key findings and issues, and preliminary recommendations. The discussion paper shall be produced in English and must be submitted at least 24 hours prior to discussions at a debriefing meeting to be held with above concerned parties. Take note of comments and observations made during the debriefing meeting regarding key findings and preliminary recommendations to be considered in the drafting of the full Mid-Term Review report. The debriefing meeting is the final phase of the fieldwork.

7. Prepare a draft of the Mid-Term Review report. The draft report shall address progress made toward reaching stated project goals and objectives, as well as to validate project assumptions and results indicators against the reality on the ground, based on actual CORE implementation experience to date. To the extent possible, comments and observations made by USAID/Sri Lanka, Sri Lankan counterparts and/or CORE should be taken into consideration in the drafting of the full draft report. Where such comments and observations deviate from evaluators' findings and opinions, appropriate explanatory notes should be provided, registering differing opinions. The draft report should respect standard format and be clearly written to include an Executive Summary, Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and appropriate annexes.

8. Make specific recommendations in the complete draft report to guide and enable USAID/Sri Lanka, Sri Lankan counterparts and the CORE team to take appropriate actions to ensure that the project attains all set goals and objectives within the established timeframe and resources allocated. Recommendations should be both of project implementation nature as well as looking deeper into the project context, appropriateness of current results indicators vis-à-vis actual experience on the ground, and so on.

9. The draft Mid-Term Review report shall be submitted to USAID within seven workdays after departure of the expatriate members of the evaluation team from Sri Lanka.

10. USAID/Sri Lanka will review and collect comments and inputs from all key parties and submit these to the evaluators within five workdays of reception of the draft Mid-Term Review report.

11. Upon receiving the USAID/Sri Lanka comments and inputs, the evaluators shall finalize the report within five workdays and submit an electronic version of the final Mid-Term Review report in English.

#### **4.0 Expertise Required**

To carry out the proposed assignment, the following expertise is required:

(1) Team Leader: Economist and Evaluation Specialist or related educational background with at least ten years experience in international development and proven experience in conducting project and program evaluation of donor-funded private sector development projects and programs. Proven experience in leading teams of consultants on short or long-term assignment is required. Prior work experience in Sri Lanka is highly desirable. Jim Walker of ME/TS in USAID/Washington will serve in this position.

(2) Senior Enterprise Development Specialist with at least seven years experience in international development (preferably in export oriented projects) and proven experience in carrying out project and program evaluation of donor-funded private sector development projects and programs. Prior work experience in Sri Lanka is highly desirable. Stephen Silcox of EGAT/EG in USAID/Washington will serve in this position.

(3) Local Evaluation Specialist: Economist, social scientist or related educational background with at least five years experience in private sector development projects and programs. Prior experience participating in donor-funded private sector projects or programs evaluation is highly desirable. Familiarity with agriculture sector projects is highly desirable. Professional command of English and fluency in Sinhala and Tamil are required.

#### **5.0 Duration of Assignment**

The services for the proposed assignment are required for approximately six weeks, beginning on/about May 17, 2010. Fieldwork will begin on/about May 24, 2010 and is estimated to take about three weeks in Sri Lanka to prepare the discussion paper and hold a debriefing on the key findings and preliminary recommendations. Other workdays shall be spent reviewing background documents and preparing the draft and final assessment report. The assignment, including all deliverables, is to be completed no later than June 25, 2010.

## Estimated Timeline and Level of Effort (LOE)

<b>Task</b>	<b>Responsible*</b>	<b>Duration (workdays)</b>
Review background documents and other preparation	TL, ES	2 days
Travel to Sri Lanka	TL, ES	2 days
Preliminary meeting with USAID/Sri Lanka team	TL, ES, LES	½ day
Meetings with Sri Lankan counterparts	TL, ES, LES	½ day
Data gathering and analysis, including key informant interviews, site visits, observation	TL, ES, LES	7 days
Preparation of discussion paper, preliminary analysis/recommendations	TL, ES, LES	1 days
Debrief meetings/Presentation of key findings and preliminary recommendations to USAID/Sri Lanka, Sri Lankan counterparts, other key stakeholders	TL, ES, LES	1 day
Depart Sri Lanka	TL, ES	2 days
Preparation of draft report (due within 7 calendar days from departure)	TL, ES, LES	3 days
Comments collected and sent to evaluation team	USAID	5 days
Finalization of report (due within 5 calendar days after comments received)	TL, ES	2 days
<b>LOE for TL</b>		<b>21 days</b>
<b>LOE for ES</b>		<b>21 days</b>
<b>LOE for LES</b>		<b>13 days</b>

\* Team Leader (TL), Enterprise Development Specialist (ES), Local Evaluation Specialist (LES)

## 6.0 Location of Assignment

Fieldwork will be conducted in Eastern Province, North Central, and Uva Provinces where CORE projects are located. A final list of locations to be visited will be determined through consultations with USAID/Sri Lanka and CORE staff. The discussion paper shall be prepared in Colombo and debriefing of key findings and preliminary recommendations shall be conducted in Colombo. Preparation of the draft and final assessment report shall be prepared in the home offices of the evaluation team.

## 7.0 Deliverables

Deliverables to be provided during the course of the Mid-Term Review assignment and before the contract ending date are:

- Discussion Paper with key findings and preliminary recommendations shall be submitted during the fieldwork, on/about June 2, 2010.
- Draft Mid-Term Review report shall be submitted within seven days after departure of the expatriate members of the evaluation team, on/about June 11, 2010.

- Final Mid-Term Review report to be submitted within five days after the receipt of the comments on the draft report, but by no later than June 25, 2010.

The final evaluation report shall not exceed 20 pages, excluding attachments. The final evaluation report shall be structured as follows:

- Title page
  - Name of project being evaluated
  - Country and location of project
  - Name of the organization to which the report is submitted.
  - Names and affiliations of the evaluator(s)
  - Date
- Table of Contents
- Acknowledgements
- List of Acronyms
- Executive Summary of 1-3 pages

Summarize essential information on the subject being evaluated, the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, methods applied and major limitations, the most important findings, conclusions and recommendations in priority order.

- Introduction

Describe the project/program/theme being evaluated. This includes the problems that the interventions are addressing; the aims, strategies, scope and cost of the intervention; its key stakeholders and their roles in implementing the intervention.

Summarize the evaluation purpose, objectives, and key questions. Explain the rationale for selection/non selection of evaluation criteria.

Describe the methodology employed to conduct the evaluation and its limitations if any.

Detail who was involved in conducting the evaluation and what their roles were.

Describe the structure of the evaluation report.

- Findings and Conclusions

Presentation of findings and conclusions will be based on the Evaluation Objectives and Purpose (above) as well as a format best suited to the actual findings.

State findings based on the evidence derived from the information collected.

Conclusions should be substantiated by the findings and be consistent with the data collected.

They must relate to the evaluation objectives and provide answers to the evaluation questions.

They should also include a discussion of the factors contributing to program outcomes, including both enabling factors and constraints.

- Recommendations

Formulate relevant, specific and realistic recommendations that are based on the evidence gathered, findings and conclusions.

- Annexes
  - Statement of Work
  - List of document reviewed
  - List of Persons Contacted and Interviewed

## **8.0 Reporting**

The assignment is to be carried out under the supervision of by Mr. Bandula Nissanka, CORE COTR. Mr. Gerald Andersen, Director, Office of Economic Growth, USAID/Sri Lanka will provide overall supervision of the assignment.

## **9.0 Special Provisions**

Costs: EGAT/EG and ME/TS will cover the costs of the salaries and related items for Stephen Silcox and Jim Walker, respectively. USAID/Sri Lanka will pay the costs for travel from the USA for Stephen Silcox and Jim Walker, as well as per diems and local travel and other related costs, through a Travel Authorization. The USAID/Sri Lanka office will directly contract the Local Evaluation Specialist.

Logistical support: USAID and CORE will provide office space and local transportation within Sri Lanka. The evaluation team shall be responsible for ensuring transportation to and from Sri Lanka, and laptop computers. Printing and photocopying support will be provided by USAID and the CORE project.

Workdays ordered: A total of up to 21 workdays each for the Team Leader and the Evaluation Specialist are estimated for this Mid-Term Review assignment. A six-day workweek is authorized during fieldwork.

## **ANNEX B**

### **PERSONS CONTACTED AND INTERVIEWED**

#### **USAID/Sri Lanka**

Rebecca Cohen, Mission Director  
Gerald Andersen, Director, Office of Economic Growth  
Bandula Nissanka, Contract Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) for CORE  
Daniel Lee, Deputy Director, Office of Economic Growth  
Timothy Ong, Economic Growth Officer

#### **CORE Project Implementing Staff**

##### AECOM Head Office

Melani Schultz, Chief of Party  
Pradeep Liyanamana, Deputy Chief of Party  
Tina Jayaratnam, Finance Manager/Program Specialist  
Alex Ponweera, Senior Grants Manager  
Zara Cader, Value Chain Services Manger  
M. K. Nandesena , Value Chain Service Leader  
Savanthi Karunasundera , M&E Manager  
Chandra Vitanage, Senior Work force Development Manager  
Tania Brunn, Director, Outreach & Operations

##### Regional AECOM Office, Ampara

A.Arun Eroshan, Monitoring and Evaluation Field Manager  
Mohamed Niyas, Communication and Out Reach manager  
Anura Weerasekarae value Chain manager  
K.Priyanthe Agri-business Manager  
Nesharaja Thingamajig, Work Force development Manager

##### Regional AECOM office, Trincomalee

Tambirajah Neshraasha, Work force Development Manager  
Aravinthan Sandiradasa, Value Chain Service Manager  
W.M.S.Wijesinghe, Marketing/Agri-Business Manager  
N. Sureshkumar, M&E Field Manager

##### Regional AECOM office, Anuradapura

T. M. Rizvi, Value Chain Service Manager  
Rukmeny, Workforce Development Manager

## **CORE Partners**

### Jay Kay Marketing Services (Pvt) Limited

Roshani Jayasundera-Moraes, Executive Vice President  
Nihal Senerath, Senior Manager-Sourcing  
Charitha Subasinghe, Vice President – JKH Group CEO

### AgStar Seeds(Pvt) Ltd

Prasad Weerasekara, Director /COO  
D.B.Weerathunga, Director Consultant

### Alli Company, Pasyala

M. M. Illian Riluwan, Director

### Anoma Agro Based Product Ltd

Mr.Wiajasiri, Director (Project)  
Kingsley Bernard (Group Director)

### Adamjee & Lukmanjee & Sons Ltd.

Ms. Manisha Samarajeewa, Executive Director

### EOAS

D.A.Perera, Managing Director  
Rohan Medawatte , Field Officer

### Daya Group of Companies

D. T. Kingsley Bernard, Group Director  
Wijayasiri Wickramasinghe, Director, Special Projects  
Ranjith Fernando, Director, Merchandising

### Pelwatte Dairy Ltd.

Mr. Wickramage, Deputy General Manager  
Mr. Rajaguru, Manager Milk Procurement and Dairy Development

## **Farmers/Project Beneficiaries**

### Papaya Project Farmers

Sarath Jayaweera, Mahagama, Sevenagala  
Karunaratne,Mahagama,Sevenagala  
Indika Pushpakumara,#42,Mahagama, Sevenagala  
M. Suneetha, Sevenagala Junction, Sevenagala  
Gamini Sarath, Sevenagala Junction, Sevenagala  
Ariyasekara, Sevenagala  
Piyasena, #84,Sevenagala  
Walaka, #30, Sevenagala  
Indica, #70, Sevenagala

Pradeep #86, Sevenagala  
Ravinda Sampath, #300, Sevenagala

Dairy Project Farmers

S.H.L. Siripala, Demodarayaya, Horabokka, Uva Province  
B.G.Gamini Perera, Demodarayaya, Horabokka, Uva Province  
D.M.Dayaratne Demodarayaya, Horabokka, Uva Province,  
D.M.Dammika Rosiny, Demodarayaya, Horabokka, Uva Province  
H.M.Premaratne, Demodarayaya, Horabokka, Uva Province  
H.M. Seneviratne, Demodarayaya, Horabokka, Uva Province  
H.M. Jayasena, Demodarayaya, Horabokka, Uva Province  
D.M. Amaradasa, Demodarayaya, Horabokka, Uva Province

Maize Project Farmers

Susil Kumara,#106, Mahadivulwewa, Theka piyawara  
D.G. Wimalasiry, #13, Mahadivulwewa, Theka piyawara  
M.G.Seneviratne, #173, Mahadivulwewa, Theka piyawara  
M.D.Thissa Wijeratne, Mahadivulwewa, Theka piyawara  
G.K.Jayaweera, Mahadivulwewa, Theka piyawara  
A.M,Abesinha Banda, Mahadivulwewa, Theka piyawara  
Nalini Munasinge, Komarankadawela  
K.M.D.Jayasinghe Komarankadawela  
K.Somapala, Komarankadawela

Vetevier Project Farmers,

S.Chandirawathy, Bogoda, Tandirimale  
Nimal Jayakody, Tandirimale, Dematmalgama  
Priyanthe Wijeweera, Tandirimale, Dematmalgama  
Martin Sena, Tandirimale, Dematmalgama  
KumuduPiyadarsany, Tandirimale, Dematmalgama

Black Gram Project Farmers

H.A.Sumathy Pala #55, Kiralpityawa  
Mahidaratne # 43, Kiralpityawa  
J.M.Nandasiri Banda, # 37 Mahawilachchiya  
Chandirapala, #51, Mahawilachchiya

## **Annex C**

### **Schedule & Itinerary of Evaluation Team**

Saturday, May. 22, 2010

- Jim Walker & Steve Silcox arrive in Colombo

Sunday, May. 23, 2010

- Day- off Colombo Cinnamon Grand Hotel

Monday, May. 24, 2010

- Inbriefing meeting with CORE HQ and USAID Staff
- Lunch meeting with CORE Project Management
- Meeting with Jay Kay Marketing
- Meeting with Agstar (Pvt) Ltd.

Tuesday, May. 25, 2010

- Travel to Sevenagala, Moneragala District
- Meeting with Ampara CORE Project Staff
- Visit Papaya farmers, Sevenagala

Wednesday, May 26, 2010

- Travel to Pelwatte, Moneragala
- Meeting with Pelwatte Diaries (Pvt.) Ltd.
- Meeting with dairy Farmers

Thursday & Friday, May 27, & 28, 2010

- Reading background documents during local holiday, Trincomalee

Saturday, May 29, 2010

- Meeting with Trincomalee CORE project Staff
- Meeting with Maize Farmers in Gomarankadawala
- Travel to Anuradhapura

Sunday, May 30, 2010

- Day off at Palm garden village, Anuradhapura

Monday, May 31, 2010

- Meeting with Vetevier farmers at Tandirymalee
- Meeting with Black gram farmers at Dematamalgama
- Meeting with Anuradhapura program staff

Tuesday, June 1, 2010

- Travel to Colombo
- Meeting with Alli Company, Pasyala
- Meeting with Adamjee, Lukmanjee and Sons Company

Wednesday, June 2, 2010

- Meeting with Anoma Agro based Product Ltd, Pepiliyana
- Meeting with EOAS Company, Ratmalana

Thursday, June 3, 2010

- Work at USAID Office

Friday, June 4, 2010

- Meeting with AECOM HQ staff

Saturday and Sunday, June 5 & 6, 2010

- Drafting of presentation to USAID

Monday, June 7, 2010

- Debriefing at USAID office

Tuesday & Wednesday, June 8, 2010

- Drafting of report

Thursday, June 10, 2010

- Jim Walker and Steve Silcox depart Sri Lanka

## **Annex D**

### **LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

- USAID/CORE Quarterly Report VI ( Jan. 2010 to Mar. 31, 2010) AECOM International
- USAID/CORE Quarterly Report V ( Oct.2009 to Feb.28, 2010) AECOM International
- USAID/CORE Assessment of Horticulture in Eastern, Uva, and North Central Provinces of Sri Lanka, AECOM International, November, 2009
- USAID/CORE Assessment of Aquaculture and Inland Fisheries in Eastern Sri Lanka, AECOM International, August 2009
- USAID/CORE Marine Fisheries Sector Assessment in Eastern Sri Lanka, AECOM International, August 2009
- USAID/CORE Tourism Sector Assessment in Eastern Sri Lanka, AECOM International, November 2009
- USAID/CORE Micro Finance Sector Assessment in Eastern Sri Lanka, AECOM International, June 2009
- USAID/CORE Dairy Sector Assessment in Eastern Sri Lanka, AECOM International, August, 2009
- USAID/CORE Logistic Sector Assessment in Eastern Sri Lanka, AECOM International, September, 2009
- USAID/CORE Grants Program Manual
- USAID/CORE Quarterly Report (Year 1 Oct. 1,2008 – Sep. 30,2009 including quarterly report iv, July 1, 2009- Sept. 30, 2009, AECOM International
- USAID/CORE and Agstar Seed (Pvt.) Ltd, Memorandum of Understanding, June 17, 2009
- USAID/CORE and ALLI Company (Pvt.) Ltd, Memorandum of Understanding, June, 17, 2009
- USAID/CORE, and Anoma Agro Based Products (Pvt.) Ltd, Small Grant Agreement, March, 25. 2009
- USAID/CORE, Performance Monitoring Plan, December 2008.
- USAID/CORE Final Year 1 Work Plan, Jan.1, 2009 – Sep. 30, 2009, AECOM International, Dec. 2008

USAID/CORE and EOAS Small Grant Agreement, Feb. 26, 2009

USAID/CORE and Adamjee & Lukmanjee & Sons, Ltd., Small Grant Agreement, July, 27, 2009

USAID/CORE and Anoma Agro Based Products (Pvt) Ltd, Small Grant Agreement,  
Modification, Oct. 29, 2009

USAID/CORE Project Year 2 Workplan

USAID Mid-Term Review of the Morocco New Business Opportunities Project, Stephen C.  
Silcox, May 2008

**U.S. Agency for International Development**

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20523

Tel: (202) 712-0000

Fax: (202) 216-3524

**[www.usaid.gov](http://www.usaid.gov)**