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Executive Summary

Background

In Sri Lanka, young women are mostly absent in peacebuilding efforts at the community level. Despite growing evidence that youth are catalysts in promoting violent extremism and the recognition that youth have a key role to play in its prevention, the treatment of youth as a homogenous group, has further marginalised Sri Lankan young women from assuming a more central role in peacebuilding. Recent examples of Sri Lankan youth’s attempts to highlight seemingly apolitical issues such as environmental degradation has been met with swift government actions. Young women’s attempts to highlight specific issues, especially via electronic media, has also come into criticism by the public, which appear to be grounded on their gendered as well as ethno-religious identities. These dynamics have become further heightened in the backdrop of the Easter Sunday attacks of April 2019, the subsequent political changes effected through the Presidential and general elections and the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic since March 2020.

Considering the challenges faced by youth, particularly young women leaders, Search for Common Ground (Search), along with four implementing partners, implemented "Young Women as Drivers of Peace: Providing 360° Support to Emerging Women Leaders" project funded by the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (UNPBF) with a budget of USD 439,906.83. The pilot project was implemented from 5 December 2019 to 5 June 2021 in Batticaloa, Ampara, Puttalam and Kurunagala districts.

This pilot project fills a gap noted in peacebuilding initiatives in Sri Lanka, by specifically focusing on young women as potential peacebuilders in their own communities. The project activities were developed along three main outcomes:

- Acknowledging women as peacebuilders
- Putting power to determine peacebuilding outcomes in the hands of young women
- Understanding and scaling initiatives engaging young women leaders as positive change agents.

These outcomes are informed by the Youth 360 approach. The Youth 360 approach offers a holistic means of empowering youth by focusing on (1) collaborative conflict analysis; (2) project design and participatory grant making, and (3) youth-led activity implementation. The project therefore empowered emerging young women leaders to collaboratively identify local issues relating to peace and security, collectively design responses, and thereby, change the perspectives of community stakeholders about women as peacebuilders. The 125 identified young women leaders (YWLS) were mentored by 32 experienced women leaders selected from the project sites.

---

1 The approach is built around providing holistic support so that young people are in charge and are capacitated to be engaged in decision-making.
In addition, three young researchers were recruited to observe and document the leadership progression of the YWLs throughout the project cycle and thereafter to develop a document capturing the key learnings and challenges faced by the YWLs. The findings of this exercise were presented at a national stakeholder workshop held at the last quarter of the project cycle.

The Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA) was commissioned by Search to conduct this final evaluation to assess the progress towards achieving project goals based on the project design and strategy, document good practices, innovations and lessons learned, assess the adequacy and quality of partnerships between different stakeholders, and finally provide actionable recommendations for future programming.

**Methodological Approach**

The approach to the evaluation was informed by four OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Coherence and Efficiency and Sustainability. The evaluation was conducted using a mixed methods approach. During the inception phase, the evaluation team carried out a literature review about conflict dynamics, women’s leadership and their role in peacebuilding. A survey was designed and administered among the 125 YWLs who participated in the capacity building workshops as well as the small grants initiatives. A separate survey was also administered among the 32 mentors of the YWLs. In both instances, a target of at least 75 percent was intended and achieved for the sample. In addition, 48 Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) were also conducted with the programme staff of Search, the implementing partners (IPs), mentors, government officers and community members, and young men who had participated in small grants activities organised by the YWLs. In each district, two focus group discussions (FGDs) were also conducted with selected YWLs.

**Major Findings**

**Relevance**

Young women, mentors and the implementing partners found the project responded to the existent local needs especially in highlighting the potential role young women can play in community-led peacebuilding initiatives. The selected project sites have been directly affected by the civil war or had been sites for incitement of violence in the recent past, as seen in Kurunagala. With the exception of Kurunagala, experiences of some of the YWLs in all other districts pointed to the impact conflict dynamics have had on their lived experiences, especially since the Easter Sunday attacks of April 2019. However, by their own accounts, young women do not have (or are denied) access to public spaces and therefore, cannot play a proactive role in relation to peace and reconciliation work at the community level. By reaching out to young women who represent diverse socio-economic and educational backgrounds, the project afforded them opportunities to work collaboratively with other young women from different ethno-religious backgrounds to
consider how best to develop responses for conflict transformation. The active steps taken to include differently abled young women, as well as young women from an indigenous community is an example of the possibilities the approach afforded for inclusion.

The challenges young women encounter was well captured and addressed to a large extent, as described in the Theory of Change (TOC) which focused on enhancing access to resources, technical support and networks to enable young women to lead peacebuilding initiatives. While responding to the gaps in skills and knowledge are common to many other projects as well, the marked difference in this project was the opportunity for the YWLs to implement the small grant initiative themselves since young women had few opportunities to lead peacebuilding initiatives before. This was highlighted by all stakeholders interviewed including, the IPs, the mentors, and the government and community members. Placing power in the hands of the young women, through a gradual process, was useful as this allowed young women’s confidence to improve over time and gave adequate time for attitudes towards and perceptions about young women to change at the community level.

Effectiveness
All of the proposed activities were completed. This was despite the change in modality from a physical to a virtual setting. This is reflected in the achievement of the targets set out in the results framework. While some targets, related to participation of YWLs in the district-level exchange visits and participation of stakeholders in the national workshop have not been achieved, the progress made must be viewed in light of the impact COVID-19 had on adapting the project modality.

In terms of knowledge and skills on conflict resolution, YWLs have reported an improvement. Even though there were some challenges in terms of understanding key concepts such as the problem tree and conflict mapping, a high percentage of trained YWLs agree that their knowledge has increased since the training. This includes knowledge on conflict drivers (72 percent), conflict assessment tools (78 percent) and conflict resolution (83 percent). Furthermore, the knowledge and skills required to design project interventions also improved. 86 percent of YWLs believe that they have gained knowledge and skills on proposal development, 81 percent on setting targets for achievements and 73 percent believe they gained knowledge on developing budgets.

The YWLs successfully managed to implement the 20 small-grants initiatives, despite at times, having to redesign the project in a matter of days due to the sudden imposition of COVID-19 related restrictions in some places. The range of project activities implemented by the YWLs and the recognition of such initiatives by other adult stakeholders point to how young women can bring in a more nuanced approach to peacebuilding. The government officers and the community members, including young men, are impressed by the small-grants initiatives implemented by the YWLs with 83 percent endorsing that the leadership and engagement of YWLs has positively
contributed to resolving local issues or conflicts. Furthermore, at the national level, the participants of the dissemination workshop responded positively in terms of understanding the role young women can play regarding peacebuilding.

The project has also resulted in unintended consequences. The young researchers have become strong advocates of the potential role young women can play as peacebuilders at the community level. Their understanding of the role of YWLs has improved along with a keen understanding of what kinds of activities work or do not work to reach out to young women. Given that all three young researchers are currently engaged in development interventions, the potential for them to consider the inclusion of young women in peacebuilding activities was strengthened. Similarly, the inclusion of the organization ‘Association for the Hearing Impaired’ in Batticaloa in a small-grant initiative resulted in the Batticaloa District Secretary committing to support the Association. This is viewed as a major (unintended) step towards assisting the youth with hearing impairments in the district.

COVID-19 related restrictions directly affected the timeline of the project activities, as Sri Lanka went into a national lockdown in mid-March 2020, which coincided with the selection process for YWLs and mentors. Search and the IPs used this period to develop and finalise the training modules and plan for the trainings, while abiding by the health guidelines issued by the Government. However, this also weakened the momentum built with the newly selected YWLs as the capacity building activities could only be conducted once the restrictions were lifted. Since the activities followed in a sequential manner, whereby decision-making power was placed with the YWLs gradually, the window allowed to complete the small grants initiative was narrow. However, the measures adopted by Search – provision of mobile data cards, facilitating participation by encouraging those without smart devices or experiencing connectivity issues by getting them to the office of the IPs – were appreciated by the YWLs and mentors.

The YWLs were unable to establish strong linkages with government officials and community-led organizations, partly because mobility restrictions were in place, but also because no specific activities were geared towards linking the YWLs to youth networks or like-minded entities. Similarly, the exchange visits were only conducted virtually, thereby minimising the opportunities for cross-district relationships to be strengthened. However, among the YWLs, the WhatsApp groups continue to be a main form of communication among them, the mentors and the IPs.

Coherence and Efficiency
The project directly responds to UNPBF’s commitments in Sri Lanka, as spelled out in Sri Lanka’s Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP). It further complements specific projects that have been implemented in Sri Lanka which focused on enhancing the capacity of women to respond to conflict dynamics in diverse settings. For Search, this pilot project adds to a growing number of
projects that focus on women and empowering them to gain a stronger voice in political as well as civil society engagement.

The project activities are also built in a coherent manner to place decision-making power in the hands of the YWLs. This was ensured by building the leadership of the YWLs, followed by facilitating sessions where the conflict assessment was carried out in a collaborative fashion. This ensured that the young women had the necessary knowledge and skills first to respond to the contextual challenges. The decision-making power was then gradually strengthened by letting the young women develop the criteria for the selection of the small-grants. Hence, by the time of the implementation of the small grants, the young women had gained enough confidence to collaborate with government officials and community members to successfully conduct the activities.

Despite the impact of COVID-19 pandemic, the budget has been utilised efficiently. The savings made in direct costs point to the shift towards a virtual phase instead of residential workshops. Under the circumstances therefore, the utilisation of the funding has been satisfactory. Similarly, communication and coordination between Search and the implementing partners were found to be very strong and collaborative. This was partly warranted by the shift to a virtual mode for implementation which required constantly checking-in with the partners, for example, to clarify issues or collect relevant data.

**Sustainability**

The exit strategy hinges on YWLs having been able to establish strong relationships with government officials and community leaders. However, such relationship building has been limited, due to the prevailing pandemic situation. Even though government officials and other stakeholders have acknowledged the importance of working with young women, there is no clear avenue recognised on how existing resources can be capitalised by the YWLs to carry on their work.

The IPs and the YWLs remain hopeful of engagement, at least on an informal basis. This would be further strengthened since Search is presently initiating a short-term project on digital activism with the same group of YWLs. However, the project could have also considered how best to link these young women with existing sub-regional youth networks that would help anchor them in the medium-term.

In conclusion, despite the shift to a virtual mode minimising the possibilities for young women to continue to engage and highlight the potential role they can play in peacebuilding, the project has responded to the gaps young women encounter in attempting to participate at the community level. The evaluation has furnished some key recommendations, in response to the lessons learned and good practices identified.
Recommendations

- When working with hard-to-reach communities, issues of accessibility, the risks posed to young women to participate in project activities and how to respond to these needs must be clearly identified in the inception phase.
- A minimum standard regarding the inclusion of ethno-religious youth must be set up for each implementing partner to ensure that a diverse group of youth is included.
- Where differently abled, as well as socially marginalised youth, are encouraged to be included, the budget allocations must accommodate their specific needs especially in terms of the time, human resources, technical support and the digital devices that are required.
- In the future, more attention must be paid to how the youth can be systematically linked up with existing youth networks and/or community-led associations and help ensure that youth have some support to rely on, post-project.
- A longer duration for project implementation must be considered in the future. This would help establish linkages between the youth and like-minded entities.
- The learning document developed by the young researchers should be shared with the IPs and project beneficiaries in local languages.
- In the future, with the shift to virtual spaces, a centralised, cloud-enabled database can be established for data entry.
1. Background Information

1.1. Introduction

This report constitutes the final evaluation of a pilot project entitled “Young Women as Drivers of Peace: Providing 360° Support to Emerging Women Leaders” in Ampara, Batticaloa, Kurunagala and Puttalam Districts. It was implemented by Search for Common Ground (hereinafter Search) in Sri Lanka, along with four implementing partners (IPs), and funded by the UN Peacebuilding Fund (UNPBF)\(^2\) with a total budget of USD 439,906.83. The project was implemented from 5 December 2019 to 5 June 2021. The Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA) was contracted to conduct the final evaluation of this project between 24 May and 29 August 2021. The objective of this evaluation was to assess the extent to which the project met its intended peacebuilding objectives and results and to provide key lessons about successful peacebuilding approaches and operational practices on how to improve similar projects in the future.

1.2. Context

The importance of working with young women in relation to Sri Lanka’s peacebuilding process, especially at the community level, is underscored by the marginalisation of women and youth in the Sri Lankan peacebuilding processes. In the past, Sri Lankan women have only been sporadically “involved” in various stages of the peacebuilding process - during the pre-war period, the protracted civil war (1980 to 2009), the ceasefire period (2002 and mid-2006) and the post-war period (2009 onwards).\(^3\) Their ability to engage meaningfully in peacebuilding processes is stymied by the prevailing economic, political as well as social contexts.

The post-war phase has placed much emphasis on women’s economic wellbeing, rather than putting equal emphasis on their social and political empowerment and their participation in the peacebuilding process. Despite the lack of an enabling space, women in the North and East pressured the government for truth and accountability, particularly regarding the disappearances of family members and helped bring transitional justice issues to the domestic and international agenda.\(^4\)

The recent deterioration of a conducive environment for peacebuilding and civic activism bears a direct impact on women’s capacity to engage. In the absence of a constructive political solution to

---

\(^2\) Project-related documents can be accessed through the UN’s Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office site at http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/project/00119223


the long-drawn conflict, the issues at play continue to fester on the ground. The ‘legacy’ of these post-war actions is further complicated by changes that Sri Lanka has undergone particularly during the last two years. These include the Easter Sunday attacks which targeted religious institutions as well as leading city-hotels in Colombo in April 2019; the change in government as a result of the Presidential and General elections held in November 2019 and August 2020 respectively, and the spread of COVID-19 across Sri Lanka since mid-March 2020. The impact of these events has seriously impacted women’s civic engagement as well as their ability to engage in the economic and social spheres.

The shift in regime has renewed concerns regarding limitations to peacebuilding initiatives. In 2020, the Government of Sri Lanka (GoSL) withdrew from the resolution No 30/1. However, the member states of the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) voted against Sri Lanka in the most recent sessions, thereby holding the GoSL accountable to implement the transitional justice mechanism outlined in UNHRC resolution 30/1. These can have an indirect impact on raising tensions along ethno-religious lines, as the minority groups are perceived as anti-government. The fears are further heightened as the Government possesses a 2/3 majority in Parliament, which limits consensus-building to pass new bills. At the policy-level, among several changes instituted, has been the relegation of the Ministry of Women and Child’s Affairs to a state ministry, losing its cabinet-level portfolio after 23 years. The impact may be far-reaching as budgetary allocations, as well as human resources may be reduced.

Where young women’s participation is concerned, recent events have highlighted particular hurdles they encounter in the public sphere. The misogynistic and anti-Muslim sentiments which followed a young female contestant in a reality game show points to the lack of legitimacy young women encounter. Similarly, the ‘harassment’ faced by another female young contestant of the same programme by state institutions for raising the issue of deforestation in her community, (which borders Sri Lanka’s rainforest), points to the risks young women face in raising their voice or for being “seen” in the public sphere. Collective action by youth can also be viewed negatively. This was evident in the immediate dismantling of a youth-led mural highlighting the impacts of

---

5 Co-sponsored by the GoSL, the UNHRC Resolution No. 30/1, which made ambitious commitments to establish several transitional justice measures to promote reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka
8 In Sri Lanka’s version of “Who wants to be a millionaire”, the young woman became the first millionaire of that particular season. In the run-up to the penultimate tier of questions and her popularity with the public, increased levels of online harassment were noted which had clear undertones on the basis of her age, ethnic and gender identity.
environmental degradation, and points to how seemingly non-political activism can be deemed as a threat by the State. Therefore, challenging existing notions of ethno-religious and gender identities carry many risks for young people, particularly young women.

Young women’s capacity to engage has also been impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. The lockdowns and mobility restrictions have had a disproportionate impact on women. Emerging data indicates a rise in domestic violence and the resultant inability to access protection services during the lockdowns. More generally, the militarisation of the pandemic response has raised concerns and fears that marginalised and minority groups may be disproportionately targeted.

The locations selected for the implementation of the project have been directly affected by these dynamics. At times, they have been the sites for the incitement of violence, and thus are viable areas of study to understand the role young women can play in their communities in relation to conflict transformation. In Ampara, where Muslims account for 44 percent of the district population, there were a string of violent incidents in both 2017 and 2018, led by Sinhala Buddhist groups. This was further exacerbated after the Easter Sunday attacks. In Kurunagala, mobs attacked several mosques, torched dozens of shops and homes of Muslims in May 2019. It is also important to note the potential role played by Sri Lankan youth in this regard. A 2018 study indicates, 25 percent of Sri Lankan youth from four provinces (Northern, Eastern, Southern, and Central Provinces) believed that their peers are attracted to ideologies of violent extremism. A 2019 study revealed that, “most hate provoking sites target younger demographics”. The treatment of youth as a homogenous group, in districts where the majority is female, makes it difficult to ascertain the role young women play in such a context. So far, they have been conspicuously missing from the public space in response to these tensions.

In a context where young women are already marginalised and the potential role they can play in peacebuilding is limited to rhetoric, implementing actions to strengthen their capacities is important. Equipping young women with the necessary knowledge and tools and supporting the creation of a conducive environment can lend towards addressing some of these issues. It is within this context that the young women of Sri Lanka require support for gender-inclusivity in peace and security processes.

In light of this context, Search’s focus on young women as potential peacebuilders is important. This project recognises the role women and youth play, particularly in a post-conflict context in relation to peacebuilding and reconciliation, not only in personal/family circles, but also in their communities. It builds on the findings from a global study commissioned by the UN Security Council, which recognises the power of engaging women in peace towards the achievement of sustainable peace, economic recovery and helping to counter violent extremism, particularly in a post-war context\(^\text{16}\).

### 1.3. Background to the Project

The pilot project “**Young Women as Drivers of Peace: Providing 360° Support to Emerging Women Leaders**” adopted Search’s Youth 360 Approach, which focuses on three key phases to enhance and empower youth’s active participation in peacebuilding. These include (1) collaborative conflict analysis; (2) project design and participatory grant making; and (3) youth-led activity implementation\(^\text{17}\). This is informed by Search’s Common Ground Approach (CGA) which is a set of broad operating principles which guide and support Search’s work.\(^\text{18}\) The project aimed to empower emerging women leaders to collaboratively identify local issues relating to peace and security, collectively design responses, and thereby, change the perspectives of community stakeholders about women as peacebuilders.

The project’s Theory of Change (TOC), discussed later in the report, was; if emerging women leaders have access to resources, technical support and networks for peacebuilding that recognize young women's particular needs and the particular ways in which young people organise, and if they increasingly design, lead, and implement inclusive peacebuilding initiatives based on their own assessment of the context, then young women will be increasingly respected as positive agents of change, and the ability of communities to which they belong to transform conflict without violence will be increased, because inclusive and locally-driven peacebuilding approaches will ensure buy-in from all parties to the solution.

The project activities were designed and implemented along three key outcomes, namely;

- **Outcome 1**: Emerging women leaders have increased knowledge and skills to carry out a collaborative context assessment, and design and implement inclusive peacebuilding initiatives based on this assessment (**Acknowledging young women as peacebuilders.**)

- **Outcome 2**: Emerging women leaders have developed and implemented community-level peacebuilding initiatives leveraging local resources leading to increased peace dividends

---


\(^{17}\) The approach is built around providing holistic support so that young people are in charge and are capacitated to be engaged in decision-making.

in the target communities. *(Putting the power to determine peacebuilding outcomes in the hands of young women).*

- **Outcome 3**: Decision-makers and peacebuilding and governance organizations in Sri Lanka will have increased knowledge of the positive role emerging women leaders can play in peacebuilding initiatives in their communities and how to support them in leading community-level peacebuilding initiatives *(Understanding and scaling initiatives engaging young women leaders as positive change agents).*

These outcomes draw directly from the 360 approach, which is based on four key principles:

1. Placing (constructive) power in the hands of youth.
2. Working with the excluded youth and marginalized groups.
4. Enhancing young people’s collective impact on conflict systems, by supporting young people’s collaborative leadership across divides.  

The project activities were implemented in four districts (Batticaloa, Kurunagala, Puttalam, Ampara) through four local NGO partners - Sarvodaya (Batticaloa), Women’s Resource Center (Kurunagala), Muslim Women's Development Trust (Puttalam) and Muslim Women’s Research and Action Forum (Ampara).

The project’s primary target group included Young Women Leaders (YWLs) between 18-29 years and experienced mentors aged 38-55 years. The ethnic composition of participating YWLs included Sinhala (29.6 percent), Tamil (32.8 percent) and Muslim (37.6 percent) while the ethnic composition of mentors included Sinhala (32 percent), Tamil (27 percent), Muslim (38 percent) and others (3 percent). The project also had secondary target groups, consisting of men and boys from the community along with community leaders.

Designed to follow a sequential manner, the project activities included the identified YWLs receiving a series of training aimed at increasing their leadership skills, as well as their knowledge on identifying and analysing conflicts. The training intended to equip the YWLs with skills to design a suitable peacebuilding intervention based on their locally-rooted conflict analysis.

Additionally, a group of experienced women leaders were identified and trained as mentors to provide ongoing coaching and support to the YWLs, to help them build connections and networks with wider stakeholder groups within and beyond districts. To observe and document this process, a group of three young researchers were selected to “embed” themselves in the communities. The young researchers’ work was informed by the Search’s Youth-led Research approach. The young researchers’ observations and data collection culminated in the development of a learning

---


document, which provides an overview of the experiences gained through project implementation, the applicability of the Youth 360 approach to Sri Lanka and the key lessons learned through this pilot project. The key learnings from the project were shared at a national workshop hosted by Search at the end of the project cycle.

This evaluation seeks to understand whether the project activities, using the Youth 360 approach, were able to respond to these contextual issues and the specific challenges of young women in the selected districts. The lessons learned from this project and its approach can thus be used for future interventions.

2. Methodology

The section details the objectives and scope of the evaluation as well as the data collection tools, ethical considerations, and a reflection on the limitations of the evaluation process.

2.1. Evaluation purpose, objectives and scope

The main objectives of the evaluation are to:

1. Assess the progress towards achieving project goals based on the project design and strategy including areas where the project performed less effectively.
2. Provide actionable recommendations for future programming.
3. Document good practices, innovations, and lessons learned, if any, emerging from the project.
4. Assess the adequacy and quality of partnership and cooperation between different stakeholders.

The overall approach to the evaluation is informed by the OECD-DAC Criteria of Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Programming. As explained in the Terms of Reference (ToR), the proposed evaluation considered relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and coherence and sustainability as evaluation criteria. The specific evaluation questions in relation to these principles are drawn from the ToR itself. The evaluation matrix along with key research questions (Annexure IV) provides a more detailed account of the approach adopted.

---

2.2. Key Evaluation Questions

The evaluation was guided by the following Key Evaluation Questions clustered under relevance, effectiveness, coherence and efficiency, and sustainability.

Relevance
- To what extent is the project implementation modality (Youth 360 Approach) and the specific interventions relevant to the current conflict dynamics?
- To what extent has the modality and the intervention put power in the hands of emerging young women leaders to address the conflict/social issues in their communities?
- Were the project activities logically set to meet the needs of the emerging women leaders to promote their leadership and respond to gender equality in addressing conflict/social issues?
- How relevant were the project interventions considering the needs for building local structure and capacity, especially among emerging young women leaders, in resolving community-level conflicts?
- Did the project target the right group of participants (with the right set of strategies and activities) ensuring inclusivity of minority ethnic and religious groups? How was the targeting of YWLs achieved?

Effectiveness
- (TOC) Is there evidence that emerging women leaders have increased access to resources, technical support and networks for peacebuilding that recognize young women's particular needs in promoting their leadership and their equal participation in peacebuilding and addressing local conflict issues?
- (TOC) Is there evidence that emerging young women leaders have increased ownership and participation in designing, leading, and implementing inclusive peacebuilding initiatives as identified by their own conflict assessment?
- (TOC) Is there evidence that there is an increased sense of belongingness and respect for women as leaders/change agents in their respective communities (and beyond), particularly among their men counterparts?
- To what extent has this project been successful in increasing knowledge and skills of emerging young women leaders in carrying out context assessment at their respective districts/divisions?
- How has the project contributed to building capacities/skills of emerging young women leaders to independently design and implement inclusive peacebuilding initiatives based on the assessment?
- To what extent has the project been successful in enhancing networking and collaboration between emerging young women leaders and external stakeholders in the target districts?
● To what extent has this project contributed to enhancing the understanding and knowledge of community stakeholders and government actors about the real needs and roles of emerging women leaders?
● What are the unintended consequences of the project?
● What factors contributed to the achievement or non-achievement of objectives and results? What could have been done differently to make the project to be of higher quality and greater impact (i.e. gaps and solutions)?
● How effectively did the project adapt and respond to the challenges especially in the context of COVID-19?

Efficiency
● Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? Did the PBF-funded project provide value for money? Have resources been used efficiently?
● How was the coordination between SFCG and its partners in implementing the project?
● How well did the project team communicate with implementing partners, stakeholders, and project beneficiaries on its progress?
● What were the challenges in coordination if any, and how did SFCG and partners overcome them?
● How coherent were the activities implemented in achieving the goal/objectives set for the project?
● How well have inputs/means been converted into activities in terms of quality, quantity and time, and the quality of results achieved?
● How well did the project collect and use data to monitor results?

Sustainability
● What is the project sustainability and exit strategy/ies to ensure local ownership and continuity of the project initiatives among the local community?
● Is there any evidence that the role of YWLs and providing leadership in peacebuilding in the targeted districts will continue after the life of the project? (by the initiatives of YWLs or the district and divisional level government agencies and other stakeholders)

2.3. Evaluation Approach and Tools

The evaluation was carried out in three phases.

Phase 1: Inception

The evaluation team submitted the inception report, which included the context analysis, evaluation methodology, evaluation design, detailed evaluation work plan and draft data
collection tool/s. In addition, the evaluation team consulted project staff at Search to finalise the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed for this assignment.

As part of the desk review, the project proposal, results framework, quarterly progress reports submitted by the four district partners, Search’s mid-term and final reports submitted to UNPBF, the written documents submitted by the young researchers and the modules and guidelines of the trainings were reviewed. Although this activity commenced at the inception phase, it continued to be part of the data collection phase, to further refine the data collection tools and evaluation design as the evaluation progressed.

The team also concluded pilot tests of the survey with two mentors and four YWLs randomly selected from the four districts. While no changes were made to the survey questions, changes were made to the skip-logic of the survey to improve clarity. Given the small sample size and no changes being made to the questionnaire, the pilot test data was used towards the end-target. The KII question guides were tested on two selected staff members of the IPs (in Kurunagala and Batticaloa).

A one-day enumerator training was held prior to data collection. The training focused on familiarising the researchers with the pilot project, its objectives, the activities conducted under each of the outcomes and how the “logic” of the activities builds up to the idea of empowered young women leaders. Thereafter, data collection methods and tools, as well as ensuring collection of high quality data was discussed. The session was conducted over Microsoft Teams as a consequence of mobility restrictions due to the ongoing COVID-19 situation in the country.

**Phase 2: Data Collection**

In order to carry out this evaluation, CEPA used a mixed-methods approach, utilising both qualitative and quantitative data collection tools. The data collection process started in the last week of June and continued until the third week of July 2021.

**Qualitative Data Collection**

Considering the latest development in the COVID-19 situation in Sri Lanka, data was collected remotely through phone interviews, WhatsApp, Zoom and Google Meet. Search staff were instrumental in reaching out to the stakeholders to help ensure the data collection was completed within the specified time period.

The evaluation team interviewed project staff, district partners, key project stakeholders and beneficiaries to collect primary data using Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and Key Informant Interviews (KIIs).
Focus Group Discussions
FGDs among YWLs from the four target districts allowed for collective reflection and for consensus building which the survey is unable to capture. Given the diversity of the YWLs, two FGDs were proposed in each district, amounting to eight FGDs in total, which were successfully completed. In total 71 YWLs participated in the discussions (a detailed breakdown by geographical location and ethnicity are provided in Table 1 below). In addition to these discussions, the difficulty to find a convenient time to conduct a bi-lingual FGD in Ampara resulted in a small group discussion being held with the Sinhala-speaking YWLs from Ampara. The session was conducted over WhatsApp and included four Sinhala-speaking YWLs.

Table 1. Breakdown of participating YWLs in the FGDs by district and ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of YWL Participants</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FGD 1</td>
<td>FGD 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sinhala</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampara</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batticaloa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurunagala</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puttalal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Participants were chosen based on their primary language, ethnicity and geographical location. Each FGD was facilitated by an experienced team member of the evaluation team and documented by a note taker. Since using mobile (phone) data to access platforms such as Zoom is expensive, the evaluation team proposed and gained approval to reimburse some of the costs incurred by the YWLs. A nominal amount of 100 Sri Lanka Rupees (LKR) (0.50 USD)\textsuperscript{22} was provided to each participant, following their participation in the discussion.

Key Informant Interviews

\textsuperscript{22} Converted at the rate of 1 USD = 197.9 SLR as per Central Bank foreign exchange rate for 26 August 2021
A total of 48 KIIIs were conducted with stakeholders who have directly worked with the project. These included programme staff at Search, the three young researchers, staff of IPs, government stakeholders, mentors, community leaders as well as youth (male). A complete list of KIIIs conducted is provided in Annexure I.

**Quantitative Data Collection**

CEPA also conducted a survey among both YWLs and mentors from the four target districts. As the key target group of the project interventions, YWLs were provided an opportunity to consider their progress and experience of the project. By utilising a survey, quantitative measurements of these perceptions were collated through a representative sample. This also responds to the quantitative measurements required by some of the indicators mentioned in the project results framework. Similarly, as mentors were also targeted for specific training and they played a key role in supporting the YWLs, consensus regarding the effectiveness and relevance of the project were measured using this survey tool.

The evaluation team set out to achieve 75 percent of the total population/beneficiaries, including ensuring that 75 percent of respondents were reached at the district level as well. To achieve this, the survey was sent out to all YWLs and mentors who participated in the project, via their respective WhatsApp groups. In total, 80 percent of the YWLs and 84 percent of the mentors completed the survey. The number of respondents reached out to and the actual number who responded through the survey is listed below.

*Table 2: Number of YWLs and Mentors Reached*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young Women Leaders (n=125)</th>
<th>Sub-total</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Achieved (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ampara</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batticaloa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurunagala</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puttalam</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors (n=32)</th>
<th>Sub-total</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Achieved (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ampara</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batticaloa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The demographic details of the survey participants are available in Annexure II.

The questionnaire (Annexure VII) was constructed to include scale questions and were supplemented by open-ended questions to obtain values for indicators which required quantitative responses and complement the qualitative data collection. Once the questionnaire was approved at the inception stage, it was translated to the local languages of Sinhalese and Tamil, digitised and programmed into Kobo Toolbox and then shared virtually with the respondents.

The respondents were given a week to complete the survey via a link provided. At the end of the week, since the response rate was below 50 percent, two enumerators who were part of the evaluation team, conducted a follow up of those who had not responded. The enumerators proceeded to administer the surveys over the phone, for those who were unable to access or complete the survey due to connectivity issues. Following the submission, all respondents received an internet data card amounting to 100 LKR (0.50 USD) associated with the phone number they had used to access the survey platform. Similar to the FGD participants, this was to ensure that the cost of accessing the internet in order to complete the survey would not be a deterrent.

In addition to the data collected by the CEPA evaluation team, raw data generated by a survey conducted by Search in May 2021 among the participants of the small grants activities was included in the data analysis. This survey included a sample size of 340 out of a total population of 801. It included 177 males and 162 females, with one respondent not indicating their gender. Just over 50 percent of the participants were within the age range of 20-29 years, followed by the 10-19 age category (21 percent) and the 30-39 years category (8.8 percent). A considerable proportion (9.41 percent) had not indicated their age. The analysis informs outcome indicator 2c and the questions related to perception of the YWLs among community members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kurunagala</th>
<th>Puttalam</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 Other age categories included 40-49 (5.9 percent), 50-59 (3.2 percent) and 60 upwards (0.59 percent)
24 Percentage of community members who have been engaged through the women-led community-level peacebuilding initiatives attest that the leadership and engagement of emerging women leaders has positively contributed to resolving local issues or conflicts
Phase 3: Data Cleaning and Analysis

Qualitative Data Analysis

Qualitative data collected through FGDs and KIIs were in the form of interview notes. These were cleaned (i.e. double-checked for accuracy, gaps) and thereafter, anonymised. A master document was maintained by the evaluation team to track the progress of the interviews completed. A separate file was maintained which links the anonymized notes of the interviews with the respondents’ biographical data, ensuring that cross-references were completed with ease.

The cleaned qualitative data was then entered to the NVivo software for analysis. Major categories and themes for coding were developed on the basis of the larger categories of the evaluation criteria and broken down to sub-categories along the research questions of the evaluation.

Quantitative Data Analysis

The online survey was monitored on a daily basis in order to a). track the progress of surveys completed, b). document the phone numbers of respondents for reimbursement of data charges, c). to cross-check the respondents who had submitted the survey using phone numbers which were not in the original database provided to the evaluation team, and d). to ensure that all surveys were completed in their entirety.

This data was then moved to STATA to generate the necessary descriptive statistics, with charts and graphs created for illustrative purposes.

2.4. Limitations

Responses to the lack of access to smartphones and connectivity issues were considered at the start itself and this allowed for a representative sample to be reached. The decision to reimburse some of the costs of connecting to the internet was taken in this context. Utilising a platform (i.e. Zoom) more convenient and accessible to the YWLs was another measure adopted. The switch to conducting phone interviews to reach the target number of respondents was a measure that responded to some of these shortcomings. Similarly, connectivity issues affected participation in the FGDs, which hindered the flow of the discussion. Whenever participants experienced such issues, they were encouraged to engage in the discussion via the chat box on Zoom.

At times however, the inability to “see” and interact with the interviewer, made some respondents wary of speaking openly with the interviewers. Wherever such reservations were observed, it was noted in post-script, in the interview notes.
Some respondents of the survey could not submit the survey without assistance due to technical errors, such as their existing browser being incompatible with the survey platform, while some experienced connectivity issues. Furthermore, the lack of access to a smartphone was also noted as a limitation. In such instances, the enumerators conducted the survey over the phone once the evaluation team had confirmed with the mentor or the YWL of the need for assistance. Thereafter, a convenient time for the survey to be administered over the phone was agreed-upon by the enumerator.

2.5. Ethical Considerations and Maintaining Data Quality

To ensure confidentiality and anonymity, all interview notes were anonymised and any confidential information shared was removed. Consent to take notes of the interview were gained at the beginning of the interview. None of the respondents were under-aged and therefore, did not require securing parental permission. Where recording of interviews was allowed, the reasons for and use of this and the eventual deletion of the recordings were clarified. Transparency and accountability were maintained by sharing as much information as possible with the respondents and by answering their queries on the use and protection of data, as well as about CEPA’s role. All data collected was stored virtually in a protected folder that was only accessible by the evaluation team. Research Assistants were instructed to delete all notes and any recordings in their possession once it had been moved to the shared folder.

The evaluation team was particularly mindful of any tension that might arise due to virtual data collection. Attention was paid to put the respondents at ease and allowed the respondents to determine the date and time of the interview, which at times led to rescheduling of interviews. Unless explicitly asked to, the evaluation team did not reach out to any of the KII respondents during the evening hours. Where scheduling was challenging because of work and personal commitments, (i.e. with government officials), assistance was sought from Search and IPs to consider a different respondent.
3. Evaluation Findings

This chapter highlights the main findings in relation to the evaluation criteria. Each section concludes with a summary of the main findings.

3.1. Relevance

3.1.1: Response to External Shift

The pilot project was designed in the aftermath of the Easter Sunday attacks of April 2019. As such, the selection of the sites for the implementation of the pilot project reflects and responds to the conflict dynamics that have flared up in Sri Lanka, especially since the attacks. In Ampara, Batticaloa and Puttalam, YWLs as well as young researchers, mentors and the IPs pointed to the underlying tensions at the community level. The Muslim YWLs in particular, also indicated to the restrictions on mobility and the fear of harassment they faced in the aftermath of the Easter Sunday attacks. In contrast, the Kurunagala IP and the young researcher pointed to how YWLs’ preconceived notions about the conflict and inter-ethnic tensions were largely informed by the mainstream nationalist agenda that is popularly disseminated via traditional and social media. The inclusion of Kurunagala as a Sinhala-dominant district therefore, offered a counterbalance to the other districts which had been directly impacted by the war as well as the rise in anti-Muslim sentiments in the recent past. Notably however, young women’s participation in response to such conflict dynamics was absent.

The project was also responsive in terms of adaptation especially in the face of political changes. The change in government affected the relationship with Search’s government counterpart and required Search to consider how the project could be implemented within a space where cooperation was strained and new relationships had to be built. While this is a common experience for many non-governmental organisations (NGOs) operating in Sri Lanka, the project remained relevant in spite of these external political shifts.

The absence of concerted efforts by the government to engage youth in peacebuilding, makes this project highly relevant. It responds to a vacuum where conflict dynamics along ethno-religious lines remain unaddressed and young women have limited or no evident role to play. Similarly, with several organisations including the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), focusing its attention on addressing violent extremism/radicalisation among youth, the project has carved out a specific space where young women’s potential as peacebuilders is highlighted.

3.1.2. Project Design

The young women’s participation in the project design stage was minimal. This was mainly because of the application of the Youth 360 approach, which is pre-designed. Also, as Search has
pointed out in the Project Proposal, the pilot was building on Search and the IPs’ existing knowledge and observations that young women are largely marginalised. However, the project design did respond to the needs of young women.

According to the survey conducted among YWLs and their mentors, several fundamental issues that hinder young women’s active participation and leadership in community-level activities have been identified (see Figure 1). Lack of community awareness and knowledge on the importance of youth-led initiatives have been cited as challenges they encounter. The project’s underlying TOC has thus been able to capture some of these gaps adequately, especially in terms of enhancing access to resources as well as technical support and networks to help young women assume a leadership role in their communities.

When asked if the project had adequately responded to these challenges, 74 percent of the YWLs completely agreed while 22 percent somewhat agreed. Similarly, 55.5 percent agreed and 37 percent somewhat agreed when asked if the project adequately addressed these challenges.

The activities were designed in such a way that there was a logical build up to the achievement of the three outcomes. The project has had a positive impact on exposing as well as capitalising on the potential young women possess to assume leadership roles within their community. In the FGDs, YWLs articulated how the project enabled them to challenge the reservations voiced by their parents as well as the community members. These included reservations regarding engaging with an NGO and young women having to participate in activities that were taking place outside of their community. In general, the suitability of activities which would publicly showcase the role of young women had also been questioned by community members. The ability to counter these
reservations was honed as a result of their participation in the project and understanding the importance of participation for their own benefit.

With its emphasis on approaching conflicts not as a negative but rather a process that can be transformative, especially when individuals and groups work together to find means of addressing an identified issue, the CGA adopted by Search was relevant. By their own accounts, the YWLs lacked such opportunities to work together with other young women and reflect on the existing conflict dynamics. The project successfully managed to bring young people from different socio-economic backgrounds and multiple ethno-religious identities together to learn, practice and implement collaborative initiatives, through the workshops. Furthermore, emphasis was placed on working collaboratively on the problem tree and the stakeholder mapping exercise. This enabled the young women to work with peers who have different experiences of the conflict and thus learn through mutual sharing. These in turn, helped create a “safe space” for the YWLs to engage, communicate, and consider how to facilitate the resolution of community level conflicts.

Another key feature of the design was to gradually place decision-making power in the hands of the YWLs. They collaboratively developed the selection criteria for the small grants initiative and used this to assess the submitted project proposals. The mentors’ role was limited to providing guidance and advice when required by the YWLs and not vice-versa, which ensured that YWLs led the small grant project design. This was confirmed by the mentors who commented on the independence showcased by the YWLs in developing the project proposals. This helped place decision-making power gradually, in the hands of the young women.

Two concerns warrant mention, however. A gap in the design is the lack of concrete efforts to ensure that young women are included in community-level structures, even though networking was a key aspect captured in the TOC. These include community-based organisations (CBOs) and youth networks. Linking YWLs to existing youth networks - where available - or CBOs would have helped establish a mechanism for them to continue their participation in community-led peacebuilding initiatives. Since the YWLs were selected from a range of communities and locations, creating avenues for inclusion in respective communities can be challenging. Therefore, inclusion in a sub-regional level (i.e. at district or divisional secretariat level) youth network may have had a positive impact in their ability to gain a footing on these structures.

Secondly, while the design of the project responded to gaps in knowledge and skills, as well as in creating a space for young women to participate, closer attention could have been paid to the specific problems they experience, as young women in their daily lives. For example, this includes how to counter opposition they face from the community (as indicated below) as well as their families in attempting to participate in activities that highlight their role in the public.

*Lack of employment opportunities, being falsely judged for one’s behaviour/actions, and the discouragement that comes from society when one engages in a task, solely for being a young adult with inexperience are some of the common challenges faced by youth in a*
community. For example, when I was engaging in the project, I was told that it is not appropriate for girls to roam around by community members (Respondent 3, Focus Group Discussion 01, Puttalam district, 10 July 2021).

Furthermore, the selection of training centres, whether such centres were easily accessible and the problems young women face in using public transport to travel back and forth from these centres were some of the concerns that required immediate responses from the IPs. Hence, as pointed out by the YWLs themselves, it is important to give due consideration to these specific issues at the design stage as well.

3.1.3. Relevance of Targeted Groups

The project targeted young women from diverse socio-economic and ethno-religious backgrounds as participants. This is because young women are marginalised in community-led initiatives and lack membership in community-led organisations. To a large extent, this was achieved.

The project was successful, in reaching out to young women from diverse socio-economic backgrounds. Ethnic and religious identities, age and geographical representations were used as criteria to select the young women. Even though ethnic and religious identities were a common denominator used in selecting the YWLs and correspondingly, the mentors, in the case of Kurunagala, their inclusion could have been vastly improved.

I think, next time we could have more of a diverse group, representing all ethnic groups and religions. Because this time there was only one Muslim girl in the group, as I know. If not, we feel that it is only us who work towards peace, why shouldn’t others work towards peace and reconciliation. I got that feeling at certain times. So, I think that diversity is necessary. (Respondent 7, FGD-2, Kurunagala, 18 July 2021).

This is further iterated below, where the ethnic composition of the YWL group in the Kurunagala district is observed to be weak in comparison to the other districts.

Table 3: Number of YWLs by District and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Sinhala</th>
<th>Tamil</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ampara</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batticaloa</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurunagala</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puttalam</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Contact Details of YWLs database obtained from Search
The age range selected (18-29 years) corresponds to the general perception in Sri Lanka, about how “old” a young person is. Hence, this socially ascribed notion of youth is represented in the age range of the selected beneficiaries.

Additional considerations were observed to have been taken into account at the district-level in the composition of YWLs. For example, in Batticaloa, concerted efforts were initiated to include the most marginalised living within the district, including a young woman from an indigenous community, as well as hearing impaired young women. To aid the hearing-impaired YWL, a mentor who was proficient in sign language was also selected. This ensured that the YWL would have consistent support throughout the project cycle, instead of an interpreter who would be available only during training and activities.

The IP proactively sought to include these marginalised youth and was aided by their extensive volunteer networks which eased access to such communities. Such efforts are commendable since these young women are largely ignored in development processes. In terms of including socially marginalised groups therefore, Batticaloa district has set high standards. While the number of YWLs from these groups were minimal, their participation offers an example of how such marginalised groups can be included in future initiatives.

The educational level of the YWLs was not considered as a criterion when selecting participants. However, in districts such as Kurunagala, a majority of the YWLs selected had completed their Advanced Level Examination or were preparing to do so, with others currently engaged in undergraduate studies. The correlation between higher educational attainments and socio-economic status was pointed as both a shortcoming and a positive aspect in the case of Kurunagala:

\[ \text{A lot of participants were... well educated; like some were university students, some were from law faculties etc. Somehow, this project made them interested in community work} \]

(Young researcher, 03 July 2021)

The shortcoming was noted in terms of the lack of diversity in reaching out to young women from diverse, especially the lower socio-economic strata. At the same time, as noted above, the project tapped a group of young women whose aspirations are more attuned to educational and professional attainment which generally keeps them away from community engagement.

In addition to these basic criteria, IPs had also focused on those localities where they already had some presence. Since many of these districts are geographically spread out and are not easily accessible, this is acceptable as long as a representative group of YWLs was selected from these locations.

---

\[25\] The Advanced Level Examination is Sri Lanka’s General Certificate of Education if the final certification examination of senior secondary education. It is also considered a selection examination as this allows high performing students to gain access to the public university system (Source: Department of Education, Sri Lanka. Retrieved from https://doenets.lk/documents/statistics/V1_English.pdf)
It is also important to note that the decision to focus only on young women has been questioned, even by some of the YWLs. While it is important to note this, the positive discrimination principle applied here is important as young women, as indicated below, may unconsciously allow young men to assume the central role in leading community initiatives.

*I think it’s good that they focused on young women leaders. To explain with an example, a particular group, their initiative was a cultural tour; they went to a Hindu temple, a Buddhist temple and they planted Mango trees. It was great. When initiating this [the small grant initiative], they called for a group of volunteers and most of the volunteers were boys. So, on the day they were doing this tour, I observed, women automatically self-censored themselves* (Researcher, 01 July 2021).

To reach out to these marginalised groups, the IPs used several strategies. Existing networks and word-of-mouth were very effective, especially in the pre-COVID social context. While social media platforms were also used, their importance as a source of dissemination and outreach have only become more apparent since COVID-19 resultant movement restrictions were introduced. In general, word of mouth (72 percent) and instant messaging applications such as WhatsApp and Viber (28 percent) to disseminate information, especially among the younger population, were useful. Among the mentors, the district partners (63 percent) were most useful in disseminating information.

Relying on existing networks to share information about the project was a good strategy. By sharing adequate and accurate information about the IP, these intermediaries (i.e. government officials, community mobilisers), were able to allay some of the fears and concerns raised by the parents about the project and the participation of their daughter. Importantly, government representatives, especially the Women’s Development Officer (WDO) and the Grama Niladhari\(^ \text{26} \) (GN) were also relied upon, thereby, making them aware of the project and its outreach.

However, as has been noted in Batticaloa, in locations like Kattankudy, measures adopted to encourage young women’s participation was met with resistance. This also placed undue attention on the IP and its officers. With such efforts, the potential risks placed on the personal safety of the IPs far outweigh the benefits of inclusion.

According to the YWLs, the selection process adopted was unique, as this one-day session included not just an interview, but also a round of activities to gauge the capacity of the young women to work in a team and to problem-solve. For Sri Lanka, such selection processes are largely unconventional because it sets aside the normative understanding that educational qualification is an indicator of literacy and critical thinking. The selection was carried out not only by the IPs, but also included government officers such as the WDO and civil society activists.

---

\(^{26}\) A Grama Niladhari is the local-level government officer who oversees the civil administration related to the smallest administrative area known as the Grama Niladhari division. A collection of GN divisions make up the Divisional Secretariat division.
3.2. Effectiveness of the Programme Interventions

3.2.1. Project Achievements

Overall, most of the activities set out in the results framework were achieved satisfactorily. As indicated below (Table 4), certain key targets have been surpassed (i.e. Output indicators 2.1.2 and 2.2.1) whereas some others (i.e. Output indicators 1.1.2, 2.1.1 and 2.4.2) have not been fully achieved. In terms of output 1b, YWLs in the survey were asked specifically to mention if they had played a leadership role that was independent of this pilot project but corresponded to an issue identified in the context assessment. Considering that many of the activities were implemented in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, the inability to meet the targets is understandable.

What is noteworthy is that the YWLs successfully completed all the 20 small-grants initiatives, despite the challenges posed by COVID-19. Participation of community members, including youth, was also high: 801 against the estimated target of 600 (30 per event).

Table 4: A few selected output level indicators adopted from the Results Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators/Criteria</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Percentage of trained women who are able to share an example of when they have taken up a leadership role in engaging with other community and government stakeholders to address issues that have been identified in the collaborative context assessments.</td>
<td>60% of all participating emerging women leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output indicator 1.1.2.</td>
<td>Number of emerging women leaders trained on collaborative leadership and conflict transformation through the collaborative leadership and Common Ground Approach workshops</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 2.1.1</td>
<td>Number of experienced women leaders trained on coaching and mentoring skills to support and empower emerging women leaders to design and implement community-level peacebuilding initiatives</td>
<td>Target: 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 2.1.2</td>
<td>Percentage of trained women leaders that have conducted mentoring or coaching sessions</td>
<td>Target: at least 80% of the trained mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 2.2.2.</td>
<td>Number of community members participating in the women-led community-level peacebuilding initiatives</td>
<td>Target: 600 (30 per event)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 2.2.1</td>
<td>Number of women-led community level peacebuilding initiatives implemented by the emerging women leaders through a small grant</td>
<td>At least 04 per district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 2.4.2</td>
<td>Number of emerging women leaders participating in the cross-district networking and exchange visits (disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, religion, and district)</td>
<td>140 (04 exchange visits)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of improving the knowledge and skills of YWLs on conflict transformation, the project has been successful. A high percentage of trained YWLs agree that their knowledge on conflict drivers (72 percent), conflict assessment tools (78 percent) and conflict resolution (83 percent) has improved as a result of the training.

Among these, working through the conflict tree was seen as a useful exercise by YWLs in all four districts. With a few exceptions from among undergraduate students, a majority of the YWLs acknowledged that the training was the first time they had heard of the conflict tree tool. Since this required the young women to have a sound idea about conflict dynamics, many found the activity challenging but also fulfilling.

_We didn’t have much idea about peace and reconciliation before we joined this project, even about conflicts. Now we look at conflicts as an iceberg with several hidden aspects, we only notice like 1/6th of the issue, we cannot see the rest just like that. We learnt all that from the training and activities_ (Respondent 4, Focus Group Discussion, Kurunagala, 18 July 2021).

_They taught us the conflict tree by dividing it into three parts such as roots, stem, and branches. They taught us how the surface-level issues of a conflict have many underlying causes if we look deeply. The causes are similar to the roots in the tree. The branches denoted the consequences of a conflict and how more consequences will pop up when the tree or the conflict grows. Now, we have the knowledge of identifying the causes and consequences of any issue in society_ (Respondent 2, Focus group discussion -2. Ampara, 16 July 2021).

The YWLs found the stakeholder mapping exercise to be equally beneficial. The training compelled the young women to think beyond the traditional framework of what is meant by a conflict and the complexities of how stakeholders can pivot the direction of a conflict. YWLs also used the theory of the conflict tree and mapping in practice, especially when identifying an issue to be addressed through the small grants.

_Collaborative context assessment was a novel subject for them. It entailed areas of oversight and influential factors to a conflict and explained how stakeholders in power are involved in it. Earlier, they were not able to understand how powerful/strategic stakeholders can support reconciliation as well as deter peace from the communities. There were group activities during the workshop to help them identify it_ (Mentor, Ampara, 10 July 2021).
According to the YWLs and the mentors, inviting the mentors to be a part of this learning process was helpful – a fact confirmed by some of the IPs as well. Where mentors were present, they were able to assist the YWLs to unpack some of these technical terms and help them contextualise the conflict dynamics.

Although they [YWLs] could understand the basic concepts taught in conflict assessment, they found it difficult when analysing situations in detail. They were confused when categorizing examples under causes, consequences, etc. Due to this, the mentors worked with them to help them understand better (Implementing partner, Ampara, 11 July 2021).

While there were some concerns raised regarding the mentors attempting to ‘dominate’ over the YWLs, the IPs and Search staff stepped in to mediate and encourage the young women to lead the discussions. The use of the After Action Reviews (AAR), a process whereby the facilitators, the IPs, Search representatives and the young researcher reflected on the training and the challenges faced, has helped in addressing these concerns in real-time. This also helped the IPs and Search to ensure that the training activities were responsive to the needs of the YWLs, especially when these had to be conducted virtually.

**Ability to design and implement inclusive peacebuilding initiatives**

The highlight of the project for the YWLs was the small grants initiative and the process adopted to develop proposals that respond to the context assessments. Young women were afforded the opportunity to be a part of the selection process, thereby, allowing them to select the projects that responded most effectively to the principles of inclusive peacebuilding.

The training sub-component to enhance proposal-writing skills, budget development and development of indicators was key in helping the young women work towards initiating community-led activities. Through these sessions, 86 percent of YWLs believe they have gained knowledge and skills on proposal development, 81 percent on setting targets for achievement and 73 percent point to having gained knowledge on developing budgets. In districts like Batticaloa, when YWLs noted their challenges in developing a project proposal, Search and the implementing partners conducted additional sessions to bridge these gaps.

A key feature of the pilot project was to address the lack of confidence and trust that the community and at times family members had in young women’s ability to carry out interventions independently. This was achieved by allowing young women to manage the budgets of their small grant initiatives. Subsequent to this capacity building effort, Search was clear that young women would receive the funds to manage and utilise towards the project activities. The amount awarded per initiative ranged between 150,000 -200,000 LKR (758-1,010 USD).
At first, I had a big doubt as to how they entrusted us with a big amount as Rs. 150,000. I was also thinking about what we are going to do with such an amount and how to do it. Gradually [through capacity building], I got to know how to handle and allocate those funds towards the project. Now, we are capable of doing other funded projects even better than this one, using our experience (Respondent 2, Focus Group Discussion -2, Ampara, 16 July 2021).

The implementation of the small-grants projects by the YWLs far exceeded the expectations of Search, the IPs and the mentors. This was evident through the interviews, where the ability of the YWLs to independently develop and implement these projects and in some instances, change the project idea as a consequence of COVID-19 restrictions, were appreciated widely. A total of 20 projects were successfully completed and reflected a wide range of initiatives ranging from conducting visits to religious places, shramadana\(^{27}\) campaigns, raising awareness on non-violent communication and initiatives that focused on social cohesion through the use of music and visual arts.

Some of the projects implemented were quite ambitious. One such project entailed the production of a video about the importance of social cohesion by a group of young women who had no prior experience in such initiatives. While the undertaking was time-consuming, it also sent a strong message on mutual respect and understanding. The fact that the video was produced by a YWL group in Kurunagala, where anti-Muslim sentiment continues to fester, is important to acknowledge, as the YWLs reflected on young women’s own perceptions about the “other”\(^{28}\). Thus, the projects displayed the capacity young women possess to use both traditional and newer types of ideas to enhance community cohesion and collective action.

If someone organises such a programme, they don’t treat Tamil children equally, there is at least a little difference. But in this programme, it wasn’t like that. They treated us very well. We are so thankful for that (Community member, female, Kurunagala district, 15 July 2021).

Participation in this set of complementary activities had a positive impact on improving the capacity of the YWLs to lead the project independently. Their confidence in themselves to assume leadership at the community level has been improved. Data from the surveys indicates that 82 percent of the YWLs feel more confident in leading community-led efforts. Similarly, 85 percent of the mentors also believe that the young women’s confidence in participating in community-level activities has improved. The small grants initiatives also made visible the young women within their communities. While the training focused on individual knowledge and skills improvement, the small grants were also a public visibility of the young women and their leadership ability. By displaying their capacity to organise and lead initiatives, the YWLs were

---

\(^{27}\) A collective effort where communities offer labour in-kind for a common purpose that benefits everyone

\(^{28}\) The video is accessible via Search’s Facebook page at https://www.facebook.com/SFCGSriLanka/videos/408716613721651/
also able to counter the reservations expressed by some community members and their parents about the potential role they can play in their community.

**Enhanced collaboration and networking with external stakeholders**

The YWLs worked as a team, collaborating across geographical, ethno-religious and language divides. However, the networking and collaboration has not been fully effective due to various reasons. This is partly attributable to the mobility restrictions placed by COVID-19 health guidelines. For example, all the respective IPs were to make introductions to the project and link the YWLs with these external stakeholders, especially the government officers at the Divisional Secretariat level. However, these introductions happened over the phone, because of mobility restrictions whereas in-person meetings would have been beneficial.

Interviews with government officials who accepted the invitation and participated in the small grants initiatives indicate that for some, this was only the first time they had witnessed the YWLs in action. Those who had extensive knowledge about the project activities were those who had engaged with the project at different stages, especially by invitation of the IP.

*I know how many challenges were faced by the Rideegama [YWL] group. They had to change their plans several times, with COVID. But they didn’t give up. I think the project helped them to develop those qualities* (Government officer, Kurunagala district, 14 July 2021)

As indicated above, the WDO was consulted by the IP during the selection of the YWLs and therefore, was aware of the changes the YWLs had undergone. Similarly, the GN in Batticaloa was aware of Sarvodaya as the IP and the project activities under implementation. In general, officials are duly impressed by the “quality” of the events conducted as the events were well organised and had a clear message of social cohesion being promoted.

*Yes, it could be seen [evident] that these young people had put a lot of thought into the event. Even things like sticking to the time and agenda, they managed well…the idea behind it was also good since the message was to convey the importance of peace* (Government officer, Puttalam district, 23 July 2021).

Barring a few exceptions, the YWLs had a few opportunities to collaborate or network with these officials:

*Now, if there is something for the youth to lead, our GN contacts me. If there is something to organize, which GN should do, she assigns that to me. That’s a change I have noticed. Even if someone in my family visits GN for some work, she gives special attention, and support. And after the project, one of the physical education teachers asked me to inform them beforehand for future programmes, so that they can participate.* (Respondent 1, Focus group discussion, Kurunagala, 17 July 2021)
In terms of networking capacities, the exchange visits were designed to improve mutual understanding and respect across multi-ethnic, religious and language divides. Of the total 125 participating YWLs, only 50 participated in the virtual exchange visit. Of those surveyed, only 35 stated that they had taken part. Among those, 51 percent and 38 percent completely agreed and somewhat agreed respectively, that as a result of the cross-district networking and exchange visits, they have been able to expand networks with peers from other age groups, ethnicities, religions or people from other locations. This speaks to the potential for stronger networking, which had not been achieved fully due to COVID restrictions. Furthermore, there were also no concerted efforts undertaken to link the YWLs further beyond this.

The momentum gained by the YWLs through the small-grants initiative is diluted because of the inability to link them to stronger, more permanent networks of youth and women or to other peace and reconciliation-oriented networks.

*Besides the WhatsApp group, they do not have any other established association or club, although I do think this kind of network or association would be beneficial for society* (Mentor, Ampara district, 10 July 2021).

However, for networking activities to be effective and sustainable it is necessary to have a clear plan in place to identify possible actors who can help rather than discourage YWLs. For example, in Puttalam, attempts to highlight and also introduce the YWL groups to an existing Women’s Rural Development Society (WRDS) rendered negative reactions. It was observed that the young women were considered a threat to the existing status quo and the established power relations among these women’s groups. Even though only one such instance was noted in the project, it raises two important issues. Firstly, it indicates the success YWLs have had in establishing their presence and the possible role they can play in peacebuilding. Secondly, it shows how their presence can seriously undermine existing power dynamics which can also impact them negatively.

*Enhanced understanding and knowledge about potential role of young women*

In terms of enhancing the understanding and knowledge of community stakeholders about the potential role and needs of young women leaders, YWLs and mentors both believe positive attitudinal changes have been achieved, to some degree. 43 percent of YWLs strongly agreed that community members view their activities more positively whereas 48 percent of the mentors also believe that such changes have been noticeable among the community members. This is confirmed in the survey results conducted among community members who participated in the small grants initiative. Figure 2 indicates the number of community members who strongly agreed that women leaders can make an active contribution to peacebuilding, following the project activities.
The difference in opinion evident in the Batticaloa district could not be confirmed through the KIIs. Overall, the interviewed community members were generally positive about young women’s leadership role. The recognition of the role young women can potentially play in peacebuilding activities was evident in the KIIs as well. This was articulated by emphasising the importance of replicating the same project to include other young women as indicated below:

*Young women are not afforded a lot of opportunities so in these areas they have actually become backward, in terms of the role they can play in their community and even within their families. So it is important to work with them from a younger age and guide them right...This [process] must continue* (Religious leader/community member, Puttalam, 26 July 2021).

3.2.2. Promise of Longer-Term Results (via the Theory of Change)

In reference to the findings stated above in relation to how young women leaders were able to capitalise on the opportunities presented to them by this pilot project, this section reflects on three key questions regarding the TOC; whether there is evidence of,

i) Increased access to resources, technical support and networks,

ii) Increased ownership and participation in designing, leading and implementing peacebuilding initiatives and lastly,

iii) An increased sense of belongingness and respect for women as leaders/change agents in their respective communities (and beyond), particularly among their men counterparts.

Accessing resources that are not necessarily bound to the financial capacity of the YWLs, has been largely strengthened, considering their limited knowledge on how to access such resources prior to the project. Among the surveyed, 25 percent of the YWLs had used local resources to design and implement peacebuilding initiatives. Some of the local resources they have relied on for the
small grants initiatives include securing access to hall facilities (37 percent), labour-in-kind (26 percent), resource personnel (26 percent) and media support (16 percent). Young women also have relied on the traditional yet powerful community engagement tool of “shramadana”. To a large extent therefore, the assumption underlying the TOC regarding enhancing access to local resources as an important step is valid. However, securing technical support was met mostly with the assistance of the IPs and Search, pointing to the importance of being linked to the relevant sources via networks.

Among those surveyed, only 25 percent indicated they had led an activity (with the participation of community and government officials) independent of this project. Notably, the most common individuals to have reached out in terms of engaging further were religious leaders (60 percent) and local government officials (58 percent). To capitalize on these gains, external actors play an important role in extending support when required. The absence of their inclusion or the lack of youth-led initiatives in the community further points to the importance of ensuring that YWLs are linked to stronger networks. This would have enabled them to continue to learn, as well as seek technical assistance when required. The learnings from Puttalam in trying to introduce the YWLs to the WRDS further point to the attention required in identifying enabling actors who can support the YWLs as they can also be perceived as an emergent threat to the existing power dynamics.

In terms of the young women being viewed as change agents, the findings point to an increased awareness of self-worth among the YWLs. Among those surveyed, 98 percent agree that they feel confident to assume a leadership position in the community. Furthermore, 56 percent of the YWLs indicated that they were able to achieve their self-defined indicators of success through the small grants. Even though improvement of specific personal achievements (i.e. loss of fear and shyness to speak at a public forum) is difficult to measure in a survey, the FGDs allowed the opportunity for young women to reflect on some of these changes. Though not so clearly articulated as an assumption in the TOC, this perception of self-improvement is evidently a critical first step towards gaining recognition at the community level.

While the community members interviewed pointed to the important role young women can play, the opportunities to view the young women’s capacities were limited. Mostly because of COVID-19 restrictions, young women were not visible within their communities as they had few opportunities to convene and collectivise. They were also not “seen” assuming a leadership role until the small-grants initiative was hosted. Therefore, it is safe to assume that only those community members who participated in the small grants initiatives gained the chance to witness the potential for young women to lead and implement such community-level initiatives. Hence, while the assumption that designing and implementing projects will increase respect among community members is valid, for marginalised groups such as young women, more sustained efforts are necessary towards changing attitudes regarding the role they can play.

The assumptions underlying the TOC are valid as they respond to addressing the gaps young women encounter in attempting to engage but as has been pointed out, certain elements must be
better captured. Chief among them is acknowledging the importance of young women’s self-perception of empowerment as a precursor to community recognition. Similarly, a more nuanced approach to enhancing networking capabilities can be helpful. More importantly, the TOC must also consider the potential of YWLs to disrupt the existing power balances, especially as they gain more decision-making power to their own hands.

### 3.2.3. Unintended Results

The change in government meant the need for renewed relationship-building with the Office for Unity and Reconciliation (ONUR) – Search’s government counterpart. For example, Search sought ONUR’s assistance to secure a No-Cost Extension (NCE) to the project. However, by then, a new Board of Directors had been appointed. The Board stipulated a complete review of the project to be completed by ONUR before a decision to sign-off on the NCE was granted. Since such a process would have taken several months to complete, Search made a decision to manage all the activities within the existing timeframe. Considering the three-month delay for start-up, it is commendable that Search and the IPs successfully completed all the activities within the revised timeline.

In terms of unintended results, the continuous interactions with the YWLs have resulted in the young researchers becoming “champions” of the young women. In addition to further strengthening their research skills, the opportunities presented to observe the young women’s activities has given them insights to the role young women can play in the future, as well as on how to respond effectively to community resistance. While these have been captured in the learning document, the lessons learned and the experiences of working with YWLs, has the potential for spill over into their future endeavours. Again, how these experiences would shape the three researchers’ future activities is beyond the scope of the evaluation, but the changes in their attitudes were observed in the interviews conducted.

> Engaging in research for one and half years was a fruitful learning experience...The project itself was new, as we got an opportunity to observe and analyse peacebuilding initiatives as a third party. I was able to engage with the young women and learn about their future expectations and aspirations. I think the project also brought about a change in my own perspectives and thoughts while teaching the importance of including marginalised communities in societal activities (Young researcher, 11 July 2021).

The inclusion of the hearing-impaired youth in Batticaloa district has led to the unexpected positive result of the District Secretary being made aware of the Association for the Hearing Impaired, which represents the interests of the hearing-impaired in the district. While this logic is in the backdrop of the Youth 360 approach, the attention the project managed to bring on the Association and its work is important to note. Whether verbal commitments made by the District Secretary -
who has since been transferred from this position - would be realised is unclear. However, it also shows the potential these interventions hold in promoting inclusion, despite the challenges of adaptation.

In the course of the data collection, the presence of a transgender YWL was mentioned on several occasions. The inclusion of this individual within the programme was viewed positively by all concerned. The eventual dropout of the individual during the latter phase points to the unintended (negative) consequences projects may render by highlighting these identity markers too much. According to the IP, a contributory factor for drop out may have been the lack of sensitisation of IP staff on how to respond to the presence of a transgender participant. While the willingness of the young woman to be part of the project points to the enabling environment and inclusivity the project has established, addressing the particular needs of marginalised categories of individuals may require more sensitivity, especially in terms of sensitising all IPs including on how to conduct outreach with such vulnerable groups.

3.2.4. Covid-19: Effects and Adaptations

The project cycle coincided directly with COVID-19 induced “lockdown” which took the form of a nation-wide curfew. The first lockdown, which lasted three months, 29, resulted in delays to the timeline of activities. The unprecedented nature of the pandemic also meant that the project staff and participants lacked the necessary information about access to social media platforms, mobile internet data packages and access to devices among the selected young women leaders. Hence, communication with the identified YWLs was limited during this period.

During the implementation of the project, the chances to meet and collaborate together in-person were further limited because of COVID-19 related movement restrictions. To some extent, this limited the possibility the project presented to bring young people from different ethnic and religious backgrounds together in a physical space, thus, limiting their interaction to the virtual space.

The YWLs managed to redesign some of the small grants initiatives due to the sudden imposition of restrictions. For instance, YWL groups had to re-design the New Year celebrations that were organised, as well as reduce the presence of community members to ensure that the regulations were not violated. This external factor however, also ensured that the YWLs had to interact closely with the Public Health Inspector (PHI) and the GN. As all the IPs pointed out, assuming responsibility for any kind of an event under these difficult conditions was a heavy responsibility. Therefore, YWLs must be given due recognition for accepting and addressing this challenge.

29 The government-imposed curfew was eased at different times for different parts of the country.
The YWLs’ efforts were supported by the measures adopted by Search and the implementing partners. Search successfully shifted implementation of the project activities to a virtual space when required, despite the number of inherent structural challenges. For example, “data cards”\(^{30}\) were provided to young women leaders to enable access to social media platforms. Since Zoom was being used predominantly, technical support to YWLs and mentors on how to use these digital tools was necessitated. In general, a majority of the YWLs owned a smart device or had access to a smartphone through their parents. It was mentioned by the IPS that where a few of the YWLs did not have access to devices or experienced connectivity issues, they were invited to the IP’s office so that participation could be ensured.

During in-person workshops, young women and mentors were provided with sanitizers and facemasks. The workshop arrangements were organised around the principle of social distancing, thereby, reducing the probability of any of the participants being infected during the engagement. The measures adopted in response to COVID-19 were well-received by the YWLs and mentors. 57 percent of YWLs surveyed and 30 percent of mentors surveyed strongly agreed that the support extended was adequate. The lack of smartphones or digital devices and the connectivity issues may have been strongly felt by both the mentors and the YWLs, reflected in their perceptions about the support given.

3.3. Coherence and Efficiency

This section focuses on issues that affected the efficiency and coherence of the project. These include utilisation of the funds, communication and coordination between the multiple entities, and the YWLs and mentors, as well as coherence of the activities implemented in terms of the project goals and objectives.

3.3.1. Efficiency

Utilisation of funds

As a pilot project, the project provided value for money. When the budget is considered in terms of the timeframe (18 months) and the geographical coverage of four districts and four IPs and the implementation of the Youth 360 approach in its entirety, the funds have been well-spent. The expenditure in relation to the budget has satisfactorily met the minimum thresholds set by UNPBF with regard to Monitoring and Evaluation (6.95 percent achieved in comparison to the expected minimum expenditure of 5 percent of total budget) as well as Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment. In line with the project goal, the latter records a rate of over 98 percent. Overall,

\(^{30}\) To ease access to internet facilities, all mobile phone service providers in Sri Lanka offer pre-paid data which can be bought at retail shops. These are commonly known as data cards and provide a wide variety of options for consumers.
the project achieved a delivery rate of 87 percent, which is acceptable, given the changes the project had to undergo.

The underspending is related to activities that were changed to a virtual mode. Cross-district exchange visits is underspent by approximately 42 percent of the total budgeted amount and only 46 percent of budget for the national workshop was spent. On the other hand, the funds allocated for the small grants initiatives (activities that were successfully concluded in a physical setting) were able to satisfactorily reach closer to the budgeted amount. The underspending noted (about 25 percent of the budgeted amount) in terms of Activity 1.1.1. - selection of young women leaders - indicates there is space to strengthen and broaden the selection process, especially by strengthening outreach activities.

Overall, the project managed to sustain the interest of 125 young women leaders and the support of 32 mentors who worked on a voluntary basis. When considered in terms of the external contextual factors that were at play and the adoption of the Youth 360 Approach, the budget has been efficiently spent.

As indicated previously, what is also significant is how well Search and the district IPs adapted the project implementation plan in the face of the COVID-19 lockdown and restrictions. This national lockdown period was effectively used by Search to focus on developing the related course material for the planned training sessions. At the same time, Search had taken steps to revisit the project implementation plan and consider implementation via digital means.

The initial delay in start-up impacted the implementation timeline. This was keenly felt by the YWLs and mentors – in the original plan, the time allocated for the small grant initiative was 3 months. In the new plans, this was reduced to less than a month. This underscores the importance of a NCE, which could not be secured. At the same time however, while the NCE would have granted more time for the YWLs, whether this would have also facilitated the holding of in-person events is doubtful given the sudden imposition of COVID-19 restrictions.

Even though some of the budget allocations indicated a saving as a result of the shift to a remote mode of project implementation, the commitment required by the human resources was quite demanding and high. The lack of staff or adequate number of staff to manage the project was a common shortcoming experienced by all IPs. The lack of a dedicated programme officer to manage only this project or at least two officers to manage the YWLs and the mentors and the coordination and organisation of the events, appears to have placed undue pressure on the existing staff. This was an underlying concern raised by both Search and the IPs. The response on the part of Search – again partly informed by COVID-19 restrictions – was to reassign some of the tasks to the M&E Manager. Since he was geographically closer to the two districts in the Eastern province, he was
able to step in and provide support to the IPs. Staff turnover was an issue, particularly in Kurunagala.

**Coordination and Communication**

The strong relationship between Search and the implementing partners at the district-level is a key highlight of this project. In spite of or because of the COVID-19 induced restrictions, regular meetings were held with the IPs to discuss progress and next steps. However, as the context in the different districts were also evolving independent of one another, all the officers attached to this project proactively sought to engage at times, on a daily basis. This was a major factor in ensuring that the activities were all successfully completed within the tight time frame. It also allowed for some form of coherence to be maintained in terms of timing of the implementation in four project sites. The flat hierarchy that Search has adopted, especially in facilitating discussions between Senior officers, such as the Director of Programmes and the district partners, is appreciated by the implementing partners.

While communication on programme-related work was high, meeting the compliance requirements of the donor and Search was reported to be challenging. Common problems noted by all IPs included challenges they faced in meeting the compliance requirements for financial reporting. The need to submit the same document on multiple occasions, the process of collecting quotations, developing contracts for external resource personnel and the submission of reports by them, added pressure on the existing staff. Even though Search had held collective as well as one-to-one meetings, the IPs still struggled. This led to i) delays in YWLs receiving their funds (in Batticaloa) and ii) creating unnecessary tensions regarding fund utilisation.

Search established a high degree of communications with the YWLs. YWLs were able to reach out to and rely on the respective Search staff member for advice and further information as the need arose. This is reiterated in the survey findings which record that 77 percent of YWLs surveyed completely agree/somewhat agree (49 percent and 28 percent respectively) that the coordination from the IP helped them to implement the project activities in a timely manner. In addition to this, 86 percent of YWLs completely believe/somewhat believe (47 percent and 39 percent respectively) that the communication with mentors and IPs was adequate to help them implement the project activities. Similar sentiments were expressed by the majority of the mentors surveyed as well.

This level of interactions may also have been enabled by the use of social media platforms such as the dedicated WhatsApp groups of the YWLs. The fact that Search and the IPs proactively engaged with these young women on a regular basis is commendable.
3.3.2. Coherence of Activities in Achieving Goals and Objectives

This pilot project complements UNPBF’s work in Sri Lanka. It directly responds to the focus placed on youth and gender in the Sri Lanka Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP)\(^{31}\), especially in terms of promoting the three pillars of action in relation to youth – participation, prevention and partnership. The project also showcases how youth can be capacitated to play a preventative role in relation to violent extremism, as highlighted by a study funded by the UNPBF. Moreover, the pilot project adds to UNPBF’s commitment in Sri Lanka to strengthen the role of women in peacebuilding. To a large extent, this pilot project builds on the recently concluded project “Participation of Youth and Women in the Peacebuilding Process”, which was implemented in the Northern, Eastern, Southern, Central, and North-Western provinces of Sri Lanka in 2020. It echoes this project’s aims to empower women and youth with a greater understanding of peacebuilding issues and catalyse their participation and engagement in governance and decision-making processes and responses related to sustaining peace.

For Search, the pilot project complements the existing and previous projects implemented by Search in relation to women and peacebuilding. Some of the districts selected for the Women in Learning and Leadership (WILL)\(^ {32}\) project aimed at enhancing elected women leaders' relationship with their constituents overlap with those selected for this project. The IP in Kurunagala managed both projects, leading a few of the elected women leaders to be linked to this pilot project as mentors. Search’s ongoing Women and Girls Empowered (WAGE)\(^ {33}\) complements this pilot project the most. Its focus on developing Collaborative Action plans and the establishment of WILL clubs in districts which also include Ampara and Kurunagala, strengthens women’s capacity to work as a collective.

Both Search and IPs agree that the activities were built logically to help achieve the stated goals and objectives of the project. The activities of the CGA approach can be stand-alone activities but when taken together, they build a momentum towards supporting the young women to assume more responsibilities and leadership. There was a sequential and gradual progress building towards each of the outcomes and thereafter, towards the primary objective and goals. For example, the first step was to strengthen team-building. Young women were afforded an opportunity to meet and network with the rest of the YWLs and focus on team building exercises, albeit while practicing social distancing.

---


\(^{32}\) A project implemented by Search with the support of Sri Lankan Local Government Authorities (FSLGA) to strengthen the voices of Sri Lankan women in shaping political decision-making. (Retrieved from [https://www.sfcg.org/women-in-learning-and-leadership-will/](https://www.sfcg.org/women-in-learning-and-leadership-will/))

Phase II of the training prepared the YWLs to consider their local contexts and conflict dynamics. The introduction to developing a project proposal and change matrix helped the young women in this process. The opportunity to develop the selection criteria for the small projects and to make decisions using this criterion helped place more decision-making power in the hands of the YWLs. Implementing the small grants initiatives therefore, was duly supported by these preceding activities. As has been noted previously, the lack of coherence was mostly in relation to linking the experience-sharing exchange visits with targeted activities to help the YWLs connect to other sub-regional youth-led networks and existing community level entities.

**Efficient use of Inputs for High Quality Outputs**

There is a general agreement that the activities conducted were of high quality, especially the small grants initiatives and the training modules. As indicated previously, the AARs were instrumental in critically analysing what worked and what did not work during the training. Since these discussions were documented, it offers key insights to how problems were identified and solutions offered to respond to any gaps noted in the quality of the training.

Adequate information was provided in a manner that was easy to understand. This is in reference to both the workshop modules as well as the documents shared with the implementing partners and YWLs. The development of the course modules was carried out through a collaborative process. Inputs from IPs were initially sought to develop the specific modules related to the training, but the process was led by Search team.

Two issues warrant mentioning: Phase I of the training was more activity-oriented, as indicated in the agenda and the training module. Since this was also related to leadership, activity-based approaches have worked well, to help YWLs apply leadership skills. However, during Phase II, in relation to conflict dynamics, the training module was considered too “heavy” for the YWLs to absorb, as reflected in the observation below:

> Understanding context assessment was one difficulty for young women leaders. But I have to admire their commitment, they were really engaged. Because at one point I thought they would disengage considering the gravity of that content and how it was presented. I wish it was presented in a simplified manner, a simplified language. (Researcher, 01 July 2021)

During the FGDs in all four districts, some of the YWLs as well as the IPs confirmed that the conflict tree and the stakeholder mapping were difficult to grasp in one sitting. Hence, there were repeated requests made for more training to refresh the knowledge gained as well as sharpen skills related to conflict assessments. There is no doubt that a considerable amount of time was spent on developing the modules and adapting them to suit the needs of the YWLs. Translating complex
conflict related issues to be easily absorbed by the YWLs who are from different educational backgrounds therefore, require more consideration.

Secondly, the modules in Sinhala and Tamil have room to be further simplified. The highly technical terminology used to describe key makes it difficult for participants to retain the knowledge and to offer explanations. This was evident during the KII s and in discussions with YWLs as well as in translating the survey questionnaires to Sinhala and Tamil. YWLs in Batticaloa also pointed to the use of English terms to explain project management components by the resource personnel.

It is also noteworthy that Search proactively sought to engage with facilitators who were generally younger in age and therefore, could more easily relate to the YWLs as well. But concerns were also raised by an IP that such a decision can compromise the quality of the training. For instance, in some instances, linking specific activities to the issue being discussed was not strong enough. However, as noted in the KII s, these were rectified through discussions with the facilitator and Search. Nevertheless, for a project that focused on youth-led initiatives, these measures are apt for adoption.

Collection and Use of Data to Monitor Results

A key feature of the project is the selection of young researchers. Even though the idea of “embedding” the researchers with the YWLs in the districts had to be reconsidered due to COVID-19 restrictions, the researcher’s role remained mostly unchanged. Although they were contracted as independent researchers, their scope of work was largely determined by Search:

> Search had this specific learning document structure. So, we kind of knew what kind of data we were going to gather. They also had a couple of templates. One template to record our observations in the field. And we were also given a very comprehensive orientation, before everything (Young researcher, 1 July 2021).

The learning document developed by the researchers is an important and useful output developed in the course of the project. This report documents the aspects of the Youth 360 approach that worked and did not work and also highlights the key challenges encountered, the lessons learned and ways forward, should the pilot project be replicated elsewhere.

During project implementation, data regarding specific activities was collected by both the IPs and the young researchers in a timely manner. While there were delays in conveying the data collected from the field, this is not surprising as the focus would have been on ensuring the smooth transition to virtual platforms for implementation. Search has made good use of its systems and the data collected have been inputted into their centralised database, minimising challenges of access and communication with the Search head office.
The narrative report template for the IPs was developed as a simple format. It captures the background and context, the progress of the activities for the quarter, and the challenges and lessons learned. It may have been more useful to use a slightly modified/revised template for the final report. This could have been more reflective and critical of the 18-month project. While Search may have been concerned about easing the burden on the partners, especially given their own capacity constraints, a more reflective report would have helped highlight the learnings and the processes adopted during a project cycle that was largely defined by the unexpected shift to a virtual mode for implementation.

3.4. Sustainability

This section assesses how far the project has considered sustainability concerns and the extent to which the YWLs will continue to assume a leadership role and gain more ownership over community-level peacebuilding initiatives beyond the project duration.

3.4.1. Project Exit Strategies

Within the Youth 360 approach, the assumption is that the gradual build-up in improving knowledge and skills and culminating in the small grants initiatives would give enough impetus for young women to assume a leadership position within their own networks/community. To a large extent, these expectations have been difficult to be realised, because of the COVID-19 context.

The rush to complete the project activities within the original timeframe has prevented a more thoughtful approach being considered on how to ensure that the momentum gained as a result of this project is continued. As a KII with a Search representative pointed out, the main concern was ensuring that activities implemented were of a high standard; this has taken attention away from considering the sustainability measures that should have been adopted. However, as one of the IPs pointed out, the risk of a sudden exit is that it creates distrust about the process adopted.

Although this is an outlier, it is important to note the lack of information shared about the project closure with the Sinhala speaking YWLs in Ampara. Their small grant activity had to be cancelled because of the COVID-19 restrictions. At the time of data collection, they still remained hopeful of conducting the event and were largely unaware of the end to the project.

A concern for the young women would also be in securing funds to initiate community-level activities. What types of funds or seed grants are available for young women to make use of? How can further information on these funding opportunities be accessed? What resources are required in order to secure such funding? These are some of the key questions that would be raised by community members and other stakeholders when the YWLs want to pursue these plans. This
further underscores the importance of linking YWLs with some potential funding sources or highlighting alternative means of implementing initiatives at the community level.

### 3.4.2. Local level ownership

In terms of continuation, there is genuine interest in the need to continue to support the YWLs at the local level and to ensure that the relationships with this group of young women is sustained in some form. For almost all IPs, the concern arises from the lack of funding and the limited time and human resources at their disposal to proactively seek ways to keep the young women engaged.

The only exception is the Batticaloa district partner, Sarvodaya, which has a wide network of volunteers. The IP is willing to include the YWLs as part of their volunteer cadre and thereby, help them play an active role in their respective communities. These kinds of concrete linkages are largely missing in the other districts and therefore, can leave the young women unanchored.

Even though the government officials held a positive outlook on the promise that YWLs would assume a leadership position in their respective communities, enabling spaces for the youth to be involved in peace and reconciliation efforts are limited. This is partly because of the lack of such initiatives by the government. A similar sentiment was also expressed by the mentors interviewed during the KIIs. The potential they have witnessed in the young women to independently carry out peace and reconciliation activities is relatively high. However, they too expressed reservations about the ability of the YWLs to lead initiatives on their own without support to sustain the momentum gained.

The young women are also keen to carry on this work. However, as mentioned previously, the limited opportunities to network and establish a footing within the community level processes may prove that they are unable to exploit their newly acquired skills effectively. As indicated in the effectiveness section, the knowledge and skills gained can be used if the opportunities are presented.

It must be noted however, that Search has secured funding to continue some form of engagement with the YWLs. As the data collection for the evaluation was in the final phase, Search staff was reaching out to the YWLs through their respective WhatsApp group, seeking an opportunity to link up with the young women. The focus of this short-term project is to create an enabling environment for young women to actively participate in online counter-hate speech campaigns. The YWLs will receive online trainings on hate speech and will be further connected through virtual cross-district networking programmes. The planned activities offer a sound build-up to how this group of young women learned to engage and participate through digital platforms. Notably, it also responds to concerns raised by some YWLs in Puttalam and Ampara about the negative sentiments expressed at them via social media about their active participation in community-level
initiatives. It would be valuable to monitor how well the young women leaders proactively assume a role within this new initiative.

4. Lessons Learned

The Youth 360 pilot project was implemented under extenuating circumstances which led to a rethinking of the implementation modality. However, COVID-19 related conditionalities were not the only aspect that the project had to contend with. Given that this was a pilot project, the contextual factors that can encourage or deter the implementation of a project with a primary focus on young women can render mixed results. Some of the key lessons learned through this process in the last 18 months are highlighted below.

1. **Highlighting a particular vulnerable group more than required will have counter-productive results**
   The implications of particular local contexts and how these would impact women’s participation must be given more consideration. Case in point: the attempt to reach out and include young women in Kattankudy. While it is commendable that the IP paid attention to this particular locality, the mode of Youth 360 may not be suited to this particular context. Similarly, not being sensitized on how to work with the LGBTQI individuals, by the IP’s assessment, may have had a negative impact on the transgender YWL’s participation. Placing undue attention and highlighting vulnerable groups becomes counter-productive for their personal security and safety.

2. **For the programme to be inclusive and representative, it is important not to treat young women as a homogenous group**
   The pilot project showcases the benefits of including under-represented and marginalized young women as found in Batticaloa. The evident challenges of including youth with disabilities has been well-addressed in the case of Batticaloa. The inclusion of mentors who were proficient in sign language enabled the young women to participate in the project activities with minimum disruptions. The positive experiences of the YWLs point to the potential of inclusion of youth with disabilities.

3. **Identifying and working with key actors in the community including parents/spouses and religious leaders during the inception phase is required to address some of the tensions young women face in attempting to participate**
   The implementation of the Youth 360 approach in Sri Lanka worked on the evidence-based argument that young women are side-lined and not afforded opportunities to engage in peace and reconciliation at the community-level. These included the pressure placed on parents by other community members to prevent young women from participating or as was noted in Puttalam, the continued pressure placed on some young women over social
media. Identifying key actors within the community who can champion and advocate on behalf of the young women’s participation would help to ease some of the challenges young women encountered. Furthermore, intra-familial tensions also arise independent of community pressure. Several young women had to negotiate with their parents in order to participate in the project. By ensuring greater awareness of the project at the inception phase, these tensions can be mediated/addressed better.

4. **In working with young women who have had few opportunities to participate, sustained engagement through training opportunities over a longer duration is more effective**

   The general criteria applied in the selection process rendered a representative group constituting the excluded majority. However, working with the excluded majority also means managing expectations. With little exposure to training or awareness on conflict dynamics, YWLs required more time to absorb tools such as the conflict tree and understand how to develop a change matrix. As was illustrated in the case of the YWLs in Kurunagala, knowledge of Sri Lanka’s own three-decades conflict was poor, therefore, such gaps in knowledge too have to be filled. To do so, a more sustained effort where the capacity building activities respond to these gaps in knowledge was found to be useful.

5. **Engaging marginalized or hard-to-reach groups without longer term support mechanisms in place will be less effective to ensuring sustainability**

   This pilot project has helped highlight the role young women can play at the community level towards conflict transformation. While some YWLs continue to engage proactively with government officials and community leaders, introductions and linking them to support mechanisms in the form of youth networks or local-level community organizations can help the young women to continue their participation.

6. **Switching to digital platforms without adequate understanding of the ITC knowledge of participants, connectivity issues and access to devices will not be successful**

   Search and the IPs had to switch to virtual platforms as the principal means of engagement as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and the resultant mobility restrictions. The switch to digital platforms showed how important it was to possess information regarding connectivity issues as well as the ITC knowledge of the YWL. With the former, the problem is compounded when connectivity via the phone is also challenging. Ownership and access to devices was also varied. While the project responded adequately to these gaps, the potential success of projects implemented via digital platforms can be lessened when adequate information is absent.

7. **For IPs, fulfilling the compliance requirements of an international organization without adequate capacity building is challenging**

   Search and the IPs are bound by the compliance and reporting regulations of the donor. While this is not the first time the IPs have worked with an international NGO, the level of
documentation required and confusion about financial reporting led to delays in the transfer of funds to the YWLs in Batticaloa district. Without building the capacity of the relevant personnel of the IPs by Search even where such IPs have worked with Search before, project activities run the risk of being delayed.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1. Conclusions

The adoption of the Youth 360 approach to Sri Lanka is relevant in terms of reaching out to young women who are largely excluded from community-led processes. They lack access to community-led processes for multiple reasons, including parental pressure and the lack of legitimacy/recognition from the community as possible change agents. By directly addressing the gaps in knowledge and skills, especially regarding conflict analysis and transformation as a precursor to supporting the young women to initiate a community-level peacebuilding initiative, the project has responded to individual as well as structural-level challenges young women encounter. Equally important is the fact that young women have been afforded opportunities to engage across ethno-religious divides and thus, learn the value and the possibility to work collaboratively.

This pilot project therefore, was rightly targeted at young women whose access to public spaces as well as opportunities to participate and assume leadership in community-led processes are largely curtailed. In a context where conflict dynamics at the local level continue to fester, the intervention has successfully tapped into young women and shown how they can assume leadership in responding creatively to these conflict dynamics. Hence, the pilot project has the potential to be replicated elsewhere. Given the need to consider local conflict dynamics, the presence of IPs who have experience in working with youth or young women and the degree of oversight required by Search, implementing at the same scale would be more appropriate and manageable.

5.2. Recommendations

In light of the findings of this evaluation, several recommendations are proposed for consideration. These could be used to further improve and replicate the pilot project.

- Prior to outreach aimed at young women, it is important that hard-to-reach communities are identified in terms of accessibility, the risks posed to young women in attempting to participate in project activities and the capacity of the project intervention to respond comprehensively to these shortcomings, especially in terms of the duration of the project. In designing training workshops, discussions etc., this entails providing ample time to allow young women to use public transport and return home before dark. The venues
chosen for such events must be centrally located, easily accessible and within a reasonable
distance. Where possible, a financial allocation to allow hiring of a vehicle for groups of
YWLS to travel together must be considered.

- In response to the shortcomings noted in some districts, inclusion of minority ethnic and
religions groups must be guaranteed in all districts. The need to include a representative
group that reflects the ethnobiological composition of the project site (in this case the
district) must be a minimum standard set for IPs by Search.

- Selection criteria of project beneficiaries must be developed to ensure inclusion of
differently-abled as well as socially marginalised young women. The budget implications
of such inclusion (i.e. time, human resources, technical support, digital devices required)
must also be considered and included to encourage the IPs in this regard.

- Where hard-to-reach/vulnerable groups - specifically sexual and gender minorities - are
targeted, sensitise implementing partners as well as fund recipient staff on how to mobilise
without compromising the beneficiaries’ personal safety, integrity and sense of identity. It
is recommended that Search partners with one of several local NGOs which are currently
working with sexual and gender minorities, to customise sensitisation and awareness
programmes for the IPs and Search staff.

- As parental pressure on young women is high, it is very important that the project
intervention carries out targeted awareness campaigns/efforts aimed at the parents of the
young women during the inception phase of the project. This should aim to ease the
concerns parents have about the project and the benefits to be gained by allowing young
women to participate.

- The success of the small-grants initiatives hinges on the youth being afforded opportunities
to enhance their knowledge and skills. In future programmes also therefore, rather than as
a mutually exclusive activity, small grants initiatives must be anchored as part of a
programme that logically builds towards youth being capacitated to initiate such projects
at the community level.

- Future projects must consider how to link up young women beneficiaries with existing
youth networks or community-led associations and/or link them and their mentors with the
project activities and actors of other projects implemented by the donor, funds recipient or
project partners.

- Future initiatives must consider a longer duration for the project cycle especially in relation
to enhancing networking capacity of the youth. Time is required for the implementers to
map and identify potential networks that would aid the youth in the medium-term and
thereafter, to introduce measures to be adopted in order to strengthen this linkage. This
would also help the IPs to consider the potential for any backlash against youth and
consider possible mitigation measures to counter such negative reactions. For the youth,
more time would enable them to consider working collectively to initiate peacebuilding
activities independent of the project and help them secure their own funding and other
resources for implementation.
- In future projects, implementing partners must ensure that the project’s end date is clearly communicated to all beneficiaries, including the mentors, young women leaders and any government officials and community members who participated in the project. The IPs must encourage collective discussion of the exit strategy and possible next steps.

- It is recommended that project teams give due consideration to the benefits and pitfalls in engaging through digital platforms with young women in the medium to long-term. It is not advisable to use this as a solution in response to reaching out to young women who have restricted or limited access to public spaces. Rather, the potential for young women to support each other through social media platforms and counter online harassment they experience in trying to assume a more active role in community activities must be strengthened.

- IPs must receive more capacity building to meet compliance regarding financial reporting. A needs assessment can take place at the IP selection phase so that specific gaps can be addressed as per the donor and the funds recipient’s requirements.

- As noted, buy-in from government officials for sustained support is challenging because of the lack of state funds and project activities that can include youth. However, future projects can consider possible stakeholders such as the National Youth Services Council and its affiliates at the local level as a potential actor to support the youth.

- In terms of M&E, the use of a centralised database to collect data must be encouraged among all IPs. Given the shift to a virtual sphere, the use of a protected cloud system can be encouraged so that data entry is eased for all IPs and Search can extract the data in real-time.

- The use of young researchers to document the progress of such youth-led initiatives, culminating in the development of the learning document, must be considered in future programming. As an external actor but embedded within the process, the young researchers are well-placed to observe as well as interact with the youth.

- It is recommended that in the future, the learning document developed by the young researchers as well as the regular monitoring and evaluation reports are made accessible to the IPs and project beneficiaries via dissemination events, specifically in local languages. Easing access to the learnings can lead to better planning and the design of new projects.
6. Appendices

Annexure I: List of KII and FGD Participants

Key Informant Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Project</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colombo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Programme staff</td>
<td>Kiruthika Thurairajah</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saummya Amarasinghe</td>
<td>Snr Programme Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sadaath Mohammed Ismail</td>
<td>Programme Manager - M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>Neranjan Maddumage</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hakkani Majeed</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chathurika Senevirathna</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Batticaloa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District partner</td>
<td>Mr. Rasika Geethanga</td>
<td>Director – Operations (Sarvodaya Shanti Sena)</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Keshayini</td>
<td>Project Coordinator (Sarvodaya Shanti Sena)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>S. Selvamalar</td>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selvika Sahathevan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thilaga Ramanan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt or non-govt stakeholder</td>
<td>Z. Hussain</td>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Kajatheeban</td>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.Thivakar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>Akeel</td>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azeem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kurunagala</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District partner</td>
<td>Sumika Perera</td>
<td>Executive Director (Women Development Centre)</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>Priyangi Jayakodi</td>
<td>Project Coordinator (Women Development Centre)</td>
<td>Puttalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>Neoma Perera</td>
<td>Elected official – Pradeshiya Sabha</td>
<td>Puttalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>Wasanthi Dissanayake</td>
<td></td>
<td>Puttalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>Ranjani</td>
<td>CBO Representative</td>
<td>Puttalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt or non-govt stakeholder</td>
<td>Ms. Yamuna</td>
<td>Women’s Development Officer</td>
<td>Puttalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Mr. Hasitha</td>
<td></td>
<td>Puttalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Mr. Supasan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Puttalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>Ms. Sushikala</td>
<td>Principal of Daham School</td>
<td>Puttalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District partner</td>
<td>Ms. Juwariya Mohideen</td>
<td>Executive Director – Muslim Women’s Development Trust</td>
<td>Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District partner</td>
<td>Ms. Fathima Shafnaz</td>
<td>Project Coordinator – Muslim Women’s Development Trust</td>
<td>Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>M.N. Irfana Beham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>Hairulla Khan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>Fathima Rameeza</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>S. Fathima Shareeka</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt or non-govt stakeholder</td>
<td>Principal - School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>W. Asrik</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>V. Thillad Arshad</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>A.W. Azeesha Begam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>Buddhhiyagama Thero</td>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>Bisliya Bhutto</td>
<td>HR Activist</td>
<td>Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District partner</td>
<td>Ms. Faizun Zakariya</td>
<td>Executive Director (Muslim Women's Research and Action Forum)</td>
<td>Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District partner</td>
<td>Faizun Zakariya</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ampara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Puttalam**

**Ampara**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Zaf Wazniya</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td>(Muslim Women's Research and Action Forum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Hafeela</td>
<td>Field officer – AMP</td>
<td>(Muslim Women's Research and Action Forum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>T. K. Pathirana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. M. J. Farwin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Jenitha</td>
<td>Government officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt or non-govt stakeholder</td>
<td>S. Sivajini</td>
<td>Grama Niladhari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Vivek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.A.Afrin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community people</td>
<td>A.L. Naserkani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.L.S.Sameena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annexure II: Demographic Breakdown of Quantitative Survey Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young Women Leaders</th>
<th>Ampara</th>
<th>Batticaloa</th>
<th>Kurunagala</th>
<th>Puttalam</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinhala</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors</th>
<th>Ampara</th>
<th>Batticaloa</th>
<th>Kurunagala</th>
<th>Puttalam</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinhala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Annexure III: List of Documents Reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Action Reports – SFCG</td>
<td>28th May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Details of Mentors, Partner Organizations, SFCG Project Teams, YWLs, Researchers and Consultants</td>
<td>28th May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Modules of Leadership and CGA Training, Mentorship Training</td>
<td>28th May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Reports and Final Reports by Partners</td>
<td>2nd June 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Researchers’ Reports</td>
<td>28th May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Document Agenda</td>
<td>28th May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Narrative Report</td>
<td>6th August 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Details – UNPBF Project</td>
<td>28th May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Report</td>
<td>6th August 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Results Framework</td>
<td>28th May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Proposal</td>
<td>28th May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biannual Report</td>
<td>17th July 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth 360 Capacity Development Guide</td>
<td>28th May 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annexure IV: Evaluation Matrix

### Evaluation matrix as per the evaluation criteria and key research questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Sub research questions</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Indicators (if available)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>To what extent is the project implementation modality (Youth 360° Approach) and the specific interventions relevant to the current conflict dynamics?</td>
<td>What aspects of the Youth 360 project respond to the dynamics concerning women’s role in peacebuilding and reconciliation? Does the project and its interventions correspond to the needs of young women’s active involvement in the peacebuilding reconciliation process?</td>
<td>Mentors, Programme staff at Search and district partners, Young women Leaders, Local stakeholders</td>
<td>KII s, FGDs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent has the modality and the intervention put power in the hands of emerging young women leaders to address the conflict/social issues in their communities?</td>
<td>Are the project interventions designed to build the capacity of young women leaders to take constructive power in their hand at local level? Has this project been able to build the conflict resolution capacity of young women leaders? Are there any examples of YWLs taking proactive leadership roles in addressing conflict issues in their community?</td>
<td>Mentors, YWLs, District partners, Government stakeholders</td>
<td>KII s, Survey</td>
<td>1a. % of participating emerging women leaders with increased knowledge and skills on collaborative leadership and conflict transformation (data disaggregated by age, ethnicity, location) 1b. % of trained women who are able to share an example of when they have taken up a leadership role in engaging with other community and government stakeholders to address issues that have been identified in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>collaborative context assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the project activities logically set to meet the needs of the emerging women leaders to promote their leadership and respond to gender equality in addressing conflict/social issues?</td>
<td>YWLs, District partners, Mentors, Search staff, Project documents</td>
<td>KII, Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How were these challenges addressed through the project?</td>
<td>YWLs, District partners, Mentors, Search staff, Project documents</td>
<td>KII, Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is it important to promote leadership among young women (in comparison to men)?</td>
<td>Community members, District partners, Search staff, Government officers</td>
<td>KII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How relevant were the project interventions considering the needs for building local structure and capacity, especially among emerging young women leaders, in resolving community-level conflicts?</td>
<td>District partners and Search staff, Community members, YWLs</td>
<td>KII, FGDs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How responsive were local structures to encourage young women to leadership positions?</td>
<td>District partners and Search staff, Community members, YWLs</td>
<td>KII, FGDs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What avenues has the project introduced to allow YWLs to assume a leadership position?</td>
<td>District partners and Search staff, Community members, YWLs</td>
<td>KII, FGDs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the project target the right group of participants (with the right set of criteria)?</td>
<td>District partners, Reports of district partners, Mentors, Search staff</td>
<td>KII, Quarterly Reports, 1.1.1 Number of emerging women leaders identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies and activities ensuring inclusivity of minority ethnic and religious groups? How was the targeting of YWLs achieved?</td>
<td>Who was potentially left out?</td>
<td>District partners Q Reports Mentors Search staff</td>
<td>KIs Quarterly Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Is there evidence of YWLs having increased access to resources?</td>
<td>YWLs</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TOC)</td>
<td>Is there evidence of YWLs having increased access to technical support?</td>
<td>YWLs</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there evidence of YWLs having increased access to networks?</td>
<td>YWLs</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are some of the key issues identified in the conflict assessment? Did the Conflict assessment help the YWLs to identify their projects?</td>
<td>YWLs Community members</td>
<td>Survey FGDs KII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>2.a. # of participating emerging women leaders who have leveraged (can cite actual examples and facts) local resources to design and implement peacebuilding initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peacebuilding initiatives as identified by their own conflict assessment?</td>
<td>Is there evidence of YWLs leading peacebuilding initiatives independent of the project?</td>
<td>Community members YWLs</td>
<td>FGDs Survey Indicator 2.c. % of community members who have been engaged through the women-led community-level peacebuilding initiatives attest that the leadership and engagement of emerging women leaders has positively contributed to resolving local issues or conflicts (disaggregated by gender, age, ethnicity, and religion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC) Is there evidence that there is an increased sense of belongingness and respect for women as leaders/change agents in their respective communities (and beyond), particularly among their men counterparts?</td>
<td>How have community members’ outlook changed in relation to the YWLs? Do YWLs feel that there is a shift in community perception towards them? What do the male community members (men and Boys) think about women leadership and their leadership role? To what extent has YWLs’ outlook changed in relation to the role they can play as change agents?</td>
<td>Community members YWLs</td>
<td>FGDs Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has this project been successful in increasing knowledge and skills of emerging young women leaders in carrying out context assessment at their respective districts/divisions?</td>
<td>What specific knowledge was gained by YWLs in context assessment? What additional Conflict assessment skills were gained by the YWLs? What was the quality of the conflict assessment report produced by the selected YWLs?</td>
<td>YWLs and mentors</td>
<td>FGDs Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the project contributed in building capacities/skills of emerging young women leaders to independently design and implement inclusive peacebuilding initiatives based on the assessment?</td>
<td>YWLs, Mentors, YWLs Mentors</td>
<td>Survey, FGDs, KIIs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the specific knowledge and skills gained by YWLs in project design and implementation? How have they been applying the knowledge and skills in establishing their leadership in the community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the project been successful in enhancing networking and collaboration between emerging young women leaders and external stakeholders in the target districts?</td>
<td>Reports (Search and District partners) District partners Mentors YWLs</td>
<td>Document analysis, KIIs, FGDs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What specific activities were implemented to link YWLs with external stakeholders? Have the YWLs formed new alliances or networks to lead peacebuilding initiatives?</td>
<td>District partners Mentors, YWLs Other stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have these activities helped/not helped to enhance networking and collaboration?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has this project contributed to enhancing the understanding and knowledge of community stakeholders and government actors about the real needs and roles of YWLs?</td>
<td>Reports (Search and District partners) District partners Search</td>
<td>Document analysis, KIIs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What specific activities have been implemented to highlight the real needs and roles of YWLs?</td>
<td>District partners YWLs Government and other stakeholders Community members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have these activities helped/not helped?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emerging women leaders?</td>
<td>What are the unintended consequences of the project?</td>
<td>Were there any results generated by the projects (both positive and negative) that were not foreseen at the beginning of the project?</td>
<td>Search District partners Community members Mentors, YWLs</td>
<td>FGDs KII's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors contributed to the achievement or non-achievement of objectives and results? What could have been done differently to make the project to be of higher quality and greater impact (i.e. gaps and solutions)</td>
<td>What are the key lessons learnt?</td>
<td>Search District partners Reports</td>
<td>KII's Quarterly reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In hindsight, what measures could have increased project quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Search District partners Reports</td>
<td>KII's Quarterly reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effectively did the project adapt and respond to the challenges especially in the context of COVID-19?</td>
<td>What are the challenges due to COVID-19?</td>
<td>Search District partners Mentors YWLs</td>
<td>KII's Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What measures were taken to address this?</td>
<td>Search District partners Mentors YWLs</td>
<td>KII's Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What more could have been done?</td>
<td>Search District partners Mentors , YWLs</td>
<td>KII's Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td><strong>What is the project sustainability and exit strategy/ies to ensure local ownership and continuity of the project initiatives among the local community?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What are the exit strategies adopted?</strong></td>
<td><strong>District partners, Search Reports</strong></td>
<td><strong>KII</strong>s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How do these help/not help long term sustainability?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reports from Search/district partners</strong></td>
<td><strong>KII</strong>s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is there any evidence that the role of YWLs and providing leadership in peacebuilding in the targeted districts will continue after the life of the project? (by the initiatives of YWLs or the district and divisional level government agencies and other stakeholders)</strong></td>
<td><strong>What evidence can YWLs provide about continuing to assume a leadership position in the community?</strong></td>
<td><strong>YWLs District partners Other stakeholders</strong></td>
<td><strong>FGDs Survey KII</strong>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What evidence can other stakeholders provide regarding proactively engaging with YWLs?</strong></td>
<td><strong>YWLs District partners Other stakeholders</strong></td>
<td><strong>FGDs Survey KII</strong>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Was the project implemented smoothly as planned without any hurdles?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project documents (Budget and financial reports)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Document analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Methodologies</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the PBF project provide value for money? Have resources been used efficiently?</td>
<td>Search, District partners</td>
<td>KII(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was the impact of COVID-19 on project implementation? Did the project provide value for money? Were the human and financial resources enough for the smooth implementation of the project? How efficiently were the human and financial resources mobilized?</td>
<td>Search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was the coordination between SFCG and its partners in implementing the project? How well did the project team communicate with implementing partners, stakeholders, and project beneficiaries on its progress? What were the challenges in coordination if any, and how did SFCG and partners overcome them?</td>
<td>Search, District partners, YWLs, Mentors</td>
<td>KII(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did Search and partners work in project implementation? What was the communication and coordination mechanism? Were there any challenges? If yes, how were they addressed (or not)</td>
<td>Search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How coherent were the activities implemented in achieving the goal/objectives set for the project?</td>
<td>District partners Search Mentors</td>
<td>KII(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well did the activities respond to the achievement of these?</td>
<td>District partners Search, Mentors</td>
<td>KII(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well have inputs/means been converted into activities in terms of quality, quantity and time, and the quality of results achieved?</td>
<td>How effectively were the inputs mobilized to accomplish outputs and outcomes?</td>
<td>District partners Search</td>
<td>KII s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the quality of the products produced by the partners/project team?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well did the project collect and use data to monitor results?</td>
<td>What was the role of the researchers?</td>
<td>Researchers Search, District partners Project documents</td>
<td>KII s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the tools used for data collection?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Researchers Search District partners Project documents</td>
<td>KII s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How were the self-identified indicators used?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Researchers Search District partners Project documents</td>
<td>KII s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was the data and results shared with the beneficiaries?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Researchers Search District partners Project documents</td>
<td>KII s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annexure V: Results Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators/Criteria</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Data Collection Tool</th>
<th>Data Analysis Methods</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>% of participating emerging women leaders with increased knowledge and skills on collaborative leadership and conflict transformation (data disaggregated by age, ethnicity, location)</td>
<td>30% increase from pre-test value</td>
<td>Survey among emerging women leaders Please refer to Q 3.4, Q 3.5</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis These are designed as a self-perception about increased knowledge and skills and not as testing knowledge from the modules.</td>
<td>74.5% (aggregate value of two questions) Q3.4 – 66% Age 15-19 - 72.73% 20-24 - 67.64% 25-29 - 63.64% 30-34 – 40% Ethnicity Sinhala - 67.74% Tamil - 66.67% Muslim - 64.1% Location Ampara - 76.19% Batticaloa - 60.87% Kurunagala – 64% Puttalam - 64.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3.5 – 83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>15-19 – 81.82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-24 – 83.87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-29 – 86.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-34 – 60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sinhala – 83.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tamil – 83.33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim – 82.05%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ampara – 76.19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Batticoloa – 86.96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kurunagala – 84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Puttalam – 83.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 1b | % of trained women who are able to share an example of when they have taken up a leadership role in engaging with other community and government stakeholders to address issues that have been identified in the collaborative project | 60% of all participating emerging women leaders | Survey among emerging women leaders Refer Q. 3.7 | Quantitative analysis | Assumption: the indicator refers to activities outside of the small grants | 25% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output indicator</th>
<th># of emerging women leaders identified</th>
<th>Reports of Search; district partners</th>
<th>Descriptive statistics</th>
<th>145 (Source: the 2nd qtr narrative reports) (Disaggregated data not mentioned in the reports)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of emerging women leaders trained on collaborative leadership and conflict transformation through the collaborative leadership and Common Ground Approach workshops</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Reports of Search; district partners</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>130 (Due to double counting, reporting the lower number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of women leaders who participated in collaborative context assessment</td>
<td>60% (84 no.s)</td>
<td>Reports of Search; district partners; Participation sheets</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>130 (Source – “other details – UNPBF project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of participating emerging women leaders who indicate agreement with the</td>
<td>80% of those who participated in</td>
<td>Survey Refer 4.3</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis</td>
<td>It is unclear what is meant by “activity sector”. 60.5% (of 38 YWLs who had received and read the document)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome indicator 2.a</td>
<td># of participating emerging women leaders who have leveraged (can cite actual examples and facts) local resources to design and implement peacebuilding initiatives.</td>
<td>50% of the total 140</td>
<td>Survey among emerging women leaders Refer Q 3.9</td>
<td>Requires clarity for inclusion in the questionnaires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption: this indicator refers to peacebuilding initiatives other than those supported through the Youth 360 project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local resources defined as labour, funds/collection s and community networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Indicator 2b</td>
<td>% of emerging women leaders who achieve their self-defined indicators of success through the small grants (disaggregated by age, ethnicity, and religion)</td>
<td>50% of the total 140</td>
<td>Survey among emerging women leaders Refer Q 3.11</td>
<td>This is a self-identification of reaching own milestones. Similar question is being asked from mentors in survey – will be used as validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Sinhala 41.94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamil 70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim 56.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Buddhism 38.46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindu 69.57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Islam 56.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Indicator 2c</td>
<td>% of community members who have been engaged through the women-led community-level peacebuilding initiatives attest that the leadership and engagement of emerging women leaders has positively</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Survey conducted by Search among community members</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Output Indicator 2.1.1

# of experienced women leaders trained on coaching and mentoring skills to support and empower emerging women leaders to design and implement community-level peacebuilding initiatives (disaggregated by age, ethnicity, and religion)

Target: 50

Search and district partner reports; Participants’ list(s)

Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 60</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sinhala</td>
<td>50.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>28.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>32.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgher</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>55.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>30.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>32.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38 (Source: “other details – UNPBF project)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Indicator 2.1.2</th>
<th>% of trained women leaders that have conducted mentoring or coaching sessions (disaggregated by age, ethnicity, and religion)</th>
<th>Target: at least 80% of the trained mentors</th>
<th>Survey among mentors Q. 4.1.</th>
<th>Quantitative analysis</th>
<th>96.3% (Since the number is very high, disaggregating derives percentages close to 100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 2.2.1</td>
<td># of women-led community level peacebuilding initiatives implemented by the emerging women leaders through a small grant</td>
<td>At least 04 per district</td>
<td>Reports of Search; district partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kurunagala – 5 Puttalam – 5 Batticaloa – 6 Ampara – 4 (Source: “other details – UNPBF project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output indicator 2.2.2</td>
<td># of community members participating in the women-led community-level peacebuilding initiatives (disaggregated by gender, age, ethnicity, and religion). Baseline: 0</td>
<td>At least 30 persons per event</td>
<td>Reports of district partners; KIIs with district partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>As this is post-event, the disaggregation can only be provided if the reports already include this information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Output Indicator 2.3.1 | # of emerging and experienced women leaders participating in the mentorship session (disaggregated by age, location, ethnicity, religion) | At least 120 | Survey among YWLs (Q. 4.4) and mentors (refer Q 4.1 and 4.2) | Quantitative analysis | YWLs – 99
Mentors – 24 |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| Output Indicator 2.3.2: | % of emerging women leaders who attest that the coaching sessions have supported them to succeed in developing community-level inclusive peacebuilding initiatives. (disaggregated by district, age, and ethnicity) | Target: 75% from the total women participating in the small grant initiatives | Survey among emerging women leaders (refer Q 4.5) | Quantitative analysis | YWL – 83%
Age
15-1981.82%
20-2487.1%
25-2977.27%
30-3460%
Ethnicity
Sinhala 80.65%
Tamil86.67%
Muslim82.05%
Location
Ampara 80.95%
Batticaloa 82.61%
Kurunagala 80%
Puttalam 87.1% |
| Output Indicator 2.4.1 | # of cross-district networking and exchange visits conducted (disaggregated by age, ethnicity, and religion) | Target 04 | Reports of the Search; district partners | Descriptive statistics | No. of visits – 5
(Source: “Other details – UNPBF project)
Data for disaggregation unavailable |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Indicator 2.4.2</th>
<th># of emerging women leaders participating in the cross-district networking and exchange visits (disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, religion, and district)</th>
<th>140 (04 exchange visits)</th>
<th>Reports of the Search; district partners</th>
<th>Descriptive statistics</th>
<th>Disaggregated data can only be provided if such data has been collected by the district partners.</th>
<th>No. of YWLs – 70 (Source: “Other details – UNPBF project)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 2.4.3</td>
<td>% of emerging women leaders who state that the cross-district networking and exchange visits have expanded their networks with peers from other age groups, ethnicities, religions, or locations</td>
<td>70% from participating emerging young women in the cross-district networking and exchange visits.</td>
<td>Survey among emerging women leaders (refe r Q 3.20)</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>51% (of YWLs who took part in this component)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Indicator 3a</td>
<td># of power holders from the target districts (identified through the collaborative context assessments) who have started developing partnerships with emerging women</td>
<td>Target at least 2 of those identified</td>
<td>Survey among emerging young women (3.23)</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (Source: Narrative Report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
leaders to advance community-level peacebuilding initiatives. (disaggregated by gender, age, ethnicity, religion, and position)

| Indicato
r 3 b | # of decision-makers and peacebuilding and governance institutions who have expressed an interest to build on the knowledge generated through the project. (disaggregated by gender, age, ethnicity, and religion) Baseline: 0 | At least 02 | Reports of Search KII with Search | Descriptive statistics |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Output Indicato
r 3.1.1 | # of learning sessions held to document best practices | At least 1 in each district | Reports of Search KII with Search | Descriptive statistics | 4 (Source: Narrative report) |

Output Indicato
r 3.1.2 | # of learning papers produced and disseminated. | 01 | KII with Search Review of documents | Descriptive statistics | 1 (Source: Narrative report) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Indicator 3.1.3.</th>
<th># of closed-door donor meetings among key peacebuilding donors conducted</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>KIs with Search Reports of Search</th>
<th>Descriptive statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 3.2.1</td>
<td>% of participants who attest that they have a better understanding of the role emerging women play to advance peace and reconciliation as a result of their participation in the final workshop. (disaggregated by gender, age, ethnicity, and religion)</td>
<td>60% participating in the final workshop</td>
<td>Post-test conducted by Search</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 3.2.2</td>
<td># of participants in the final workshop (disaggregated by age, gender, ethnicity, religion, district)</td>
<td>Target 120</td>
<td>Search reports</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post-test conducted by Search**

**Quantitative analysis**

88% (Source: Final workshop with stakeholders post event feedback results)

Data for disaggregation is unavailable
Annexure VI: Question guides (Qualitative)

Key Informant Interviews

1. For Search Staff

Semi-structured interview guide for the final evaluation

Thank you for meeting with us today. Given your involvement in the project, we are interested in hearing about your experiences and how well the stated objectives of the project were met and if not, why.

There is no right or wrong answer and any responses shared as part of this interview will not be used to identify you to maintain confidentiality. However, your institutional affiliation will be captured. We will use your insights and the others to identify general trends and patterns about the project and then share these findings with Search and the donor.

The interview is expected to last approximately an hour to 90 minutes. Before we begin, do you have any questions or need any further clarifications?

Control information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/ Institution</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note-taker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General

1. Can you tell us about your role within the project and how long you have been with the project?
2. How do you know about the Youth 360 approach? Did you receive any orientation or training?

Relevance:

3. What are the current conflict dynamics affecting women’s role in politics, peacebuilding and reconciliation prevalent in the project sites?
   a. How does the youth 360 approach respond to these conflict dynamics?
   b. How were the needs of YWLs identified? Did they get an opportunity to provide inputs in the process?
   c. Does this project address the leadership needs of young women leaders?
4. Why was it important to focus on young women’s leadership (in comparison to young men)?
5. How responsive were the local structures in encouraging young women to leadership positions?
   a. Were you able to create new avenues for young women to assume leadership positions?

6. What were the criteria used to select the particular sites for the intervention?
   a. Are they formerly war-affected? Any other criteria/reasons?

7. How did you ensure YWLs were selected as envisioned by the project design? What were the criteria used to select the emerging women leaders?
   a. Age category
   b. Ethnic identity
   c. Religion
   d. Any other? (educational level, marital status)

8. What were the criteria used to select the mentors?
   a. Regional representation
   b. Sector-wise/thematic expertise
   c. Age
   d. Experience in peacebuilding work
   e. Any other (probe)

9. Why was it important to include the mentors? How was their role envisaged within the project?

10. How was the selection of the researchers conducted?
    a. Why was it important to use young researchers? How was their role envisaged within the project?

11. How did the project respond to the context related changes – i.e. COVID 19 induced lockdowns?
    a. Can you provide some examples?
    b. How were these issues taken up within the project design?

Effectiveness

12. How has the project increased young women’s access to local resources, technical support from local agencies and organizations and networking opportunities for collective efforts and initiatives for local level peacebuilding and reconciliation? Can you cite some examples?

13. How have these access and opportunities benefitted YWLs to enhance their leadership needs to contribute to peacebuilding and reconciliation?

14. What evidence is there of young women having increased ownership and participation in designing and implementing peacebuilding initiatives?
    a. Are these activities that are related to the conflict assessment?

16. Following their participation in the project, do you think there is an increased sense of agency among YWLs?

17. In your view, were the selected young women aware of the conflict drivers around them?
    a. How do you think the context assessments and the training responded to their knowledge gap?
b. What specific skills have been improved in this regard?
c. Is there anything more you feel that should have been done?

18. How effectively did the YWLs manage their small grants initiatives?
   a. Is there anything more you feel should have been done?

19. What kind of networking and collaboration were the emerging women leaders engaged in before this intervention?
   a. How did the project help them to enhance their networking skills and abilities?
   b. Were they able to create or participate in any networks that provided more opportunities to establish their role in peacebuilding?
   c. Is there anything more you feel should have been done?

20. At the start of the project, what were the responses/reactions of community members/GoSL officials towards the project and the specific focus on young women?
   a. At the end of the project cycle, have you seen a change in these relationships? Can you give us an example?

21. Have you had any indication that there is increased recognition of the role of young women in their communities?
   a. Can you provide some examples?

22. With regard to engagement with Government officials:
   a. Is there any indication of positive feedback in terms of engaging with young women?

23. In your view, what were some of the unintended results of the project?

24. What are some of the key lessons learned during this project?

25. Looking back, what are some of the factors that affected implementation of the project?
   a. What was done to mitigate these factors/issues?
   b. What could have been done differently?

26. The project cycle coincided with the COVID-19 induced lockdowns. Can you explain to us how the project implementation was re-configured at this stage?
   a. What was the process adopted (meetings with district partners, reworking the project activities)
   b. What were some of the issues that were considered in shifting to a virtual mode?
   c. How was the possible impact on emerging women leaders taken into consideration?
   d. How were health and safety issues taken up for consideration?
   e. How did the role of the researchers and the implementation of the small grants change/adapt to this new context?
   f. In hindsight, were the key challenges identified addressed adequately?

Sustainability

27. What are the project exit strategies, if any?
   a. How do these help OR not help long term sustainability?
   b. Should other alternatives be considered?

28. What specific measures have the project considered for the momentum among the young leaders to be continued?
29. Have you seen any kind of evidence to indicate that YWLs will continue to assume a leadership position in relation to peacebuilding work?
30. Have you seen any kind of evidence from community members or government stakeholders indicating their ownership over the initiative and their willingness to engage with YWLs?
31. To what extent do you think the partner organizations have been strengthened to continue to implement this type of work in the future?
32. Is there any indication that the project initiatives will be continued post-project?

Coherence and Efficiency:
33. How was the project implemented vis-a-vis project implementation plan? What were the challenges and how did you adjust the plan?
34. With regard to the budget
   a. How were the proposed activities implemented within the budgetary limits? Do you believe that it produces value for money?
   b. How was the budget spread across the project duration?
   c. When external challenges were experienced, how was the budget adjusted accordingly to meet the desired outcomes?
      i. Was there flexibility in this regard?
      ii. Were outputs/activities revised accordingly?
35. On staffing
   a. Was/is staffing adequate for the implementation of the project objectives?
   b. Was training provided on the 360 approach? Was this adequate?
   c. Did you lose staff during the course of the project cycle? How was this addressed?
36. Was the time allocated for implementation adequate?
   a. How did you respond to changes in timelines, especially during COVID19?
   b. The project was designed for an 18-month duration. In hindsight, was the time adequate to smoothly implement all the planned activities?
37. Coordination and collaboration:
   a. How coherent were the project activities in achieving project goals and objectives?
   b. To what extent did Search and the implementing partners coordinate during implementation of the project?
   c. What are some of the factors that facilitated/hindered coordination between Search and the implementing partners? How did you overcome the challenges?
38. Data and reporting
   a. Were the reporting formats etc. adequate to capture the progress of the activities?
   b. How was the data gathered by the researchers used to inform the project activities?
   c. How was the change matrix used by the emerging women leaders used in the project?
   d. Has there been a sharing of the results so far with the beneficiaries of the training?
39. How effectively were the inputs mobilised to accomplish the outputs and outcomes?
   a. What were the quality of the products produced by the partners/project team?
District Partners

Semi-structured interview guide for the end of project evaluation

Thank you for meeting with us today. The Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA) has been commissioned by Search for Common Ground to conduct this end of project evaluation for the project “Young Women as Drivers of Peace: Providing 360° Support to Emerging Women Leaders in Ampara, Batticaloa, Kurunagala and Puttalam Districts”.

Given your involvement in the project, we are interested in hearing about your experiences and how well the stated objectives of the project were met and if not, why. As you know, the Search and UNPBF anticipate that the learnings from this evaluation will feed into other future work as well.

There is no right or wrong answer, and any responses shared as part of this interview will not be used to identify you by name or organization so that we can maintain confidentiality. We will use your insights and the others to identify general trends and patterns about the project and then share these findings with Search and the donor.

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

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Control information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/ Institution</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note-taker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General

1. Can you tell us about your role within the project and how long you have been with the project?
2. Were you aware of the Youth 360 approach before the start of this project?
   a. What kind of training did you receive?
   b. Were there aspects that required adjustments/adaptation?

Relevance:
3. What are the current conflict dynamics affecting women’s role in politics, peacebuilding and reconciliation prevalent in the project sites?
   a. How does the youth 360 approach respond to these conflict dynamics?
   b. How were the needs of YWLs identified? Did they get an opportunity to provide inputs in the process?
   c. Does this project address the leadership needs of young women leaders?
4. Why was it important to focus on young women’s leadership (in comparison to young men)?
5. How responsive were the local structures in encouraging young women to leadership positions?
   a. How well was the project able to create new avenues for young women to assume leadership positions?
6. What are some of the key challenges young women face in engaging in peacebuilding work?
   a. How do the features of the Youth 360 approach respond to these challenges?
   b. Were there aspects that required adjustments/adaptation?
   c. Do you know to what extent young women were involved in the design stage?
7. What were the criteria used to select the particular sites for the intervention?
   a. Are they formerly war-affected?
   b. Any other criteria/reasons?
8. How did you ensure YWLs were selected as envisioned by the project design? What were the criteria used to select the emerging women leaders?
   a. Age category
   b. Ethnic identity
   c. Religion
   d. Any other?
9. What were the criteria used to select the mentors?
   a. Regional representation
   b. Sector-wise
   c. Age
   d. Experience in peacebuilding work
   e. Any other (probe)
10. Why was it important to include the mentors? How was their role envisaged within the project?
11. How was the selection of the researchers conducted?
   a. Why was it important to use young researchers? How was their role envisaged within the project?
12. How did the project respond to the context related changes – i.e. COVID 19 induced lockdowns?
   a. Can you provide some examples?
   b. How were these issues taken up within the project design?

Effectiveness
13. How has the project increased young women’s access to local resources, technical support from local agencies and organisations and networking opportunities for collective efforts and initiatives for local level peacebuilding and reconciliation? Can you cite some examples?

14. How have these access and opportunities benefitted YWLs to enhance their leadership needs to contribute to peacebuilding and reconciliation?

15. What evidence is there of young women having increased ownership and participation in designing and implementing peacebuilding initiatives?
   a. Are these activities that are related to the conflict assessment?

17. Following the project activities, do you think the YWLs feel empowered to carry on similar work?

18. In your view, were the selected young women aware of the conflict drivers in Sri Lanka or even in their own communities?
   a. How do you think the context assessments and the training responded to their knowledge gap?
   b. What specific skills have been improved in this regard?
   c. Is there anything more you feel that should have been done?

19. How effectively did the YWLs manage their small grants initiatives?
   a. Is there anything more you feel should have been done?

20. What kind of networking and collaboration were the emerging women leaders engaged in before this intervention?
   a. How did the project help them to enhance their networking skills and abilities?
   b. Were the YWLs able to create or participate in any networks that provided more opportunities to stake their role in peacebuilding?
   c. Is there anything more you feel should have been done?

21. At the start of the project, what were the responses/reactions of community members/GoSL officials towards the project and the specific focus on young women?
   a. At the end of the project cycle, have you seen a change in these relationships? Can you give us an example?

22. Have you had any indication that there is increased recognition of the role of young women in their communities?
   a. Can you provide some examples?

23. With regard to engagement with Government officials:
   a. Is there any indication of positive feedback in terms of engaging with young women?

24. In your view, what were some of the unintended results of the project?

25. What are some of the key lessons learned during this project?

26. Looking back, what are some of the factors that affected implementation of the project?
   a. What was done to mitigate these factors/issues?
   b. What could have been done differently?

27. The project cycle coincided with the COVID-19 induced lockdowns. Can you explain to us how the project implementation was re-configured at this stage?
a. What was the process adopted (meetings with Search, reworking the project activities)
b. What were some of the issues that were considered in shifting to a virtual mode?
c. How was the possible impact on emerging women leaders taken into consideration?
d. How were health and safety issues taken up for consideration?
e. How did the role of the researchers and the implementation of the small grants changed/adapted to this new context?
f. In hindsight, were the key challenges identified addressed adequately?

Sustainability
28. What are the project exit strategies, if any?
   a. How do these help OR not help long term sustainability?
   b. Should other alternatives be considered?
29. What specific measures have the project considered for the momentum among the young leaders to be continued?
30. Have you seen any kind of evidence to indicate that YWLs will continue to assume a leadership position in relation to peacebuilding work?
31. Have you seen any kind of evidence from community members or government stakeholders indicating their willingness to engage with YWLs?
32. To what extent do you think your capacity has been strengthened to continue to carry on this type of work in the future?
   a. Is there any indication that the project initiatives will continue post-project?

Coherence and Efficiency:
33. How was the project implemented vis-a-vis project implementation plan? What were the challenges and how did you adjust the plan?
34. With regard to the budget
   a. How were the proposed activities implemented within the budgetary limits?
   b. How was the budget spread across the project duration?
   c. When external challenges were experienced, how was the budget adjusted accordingly to meet the desired outcomes?
      i. Was there flexibility in this regard?
      ii. Were outputs/activities revised accordingly?
35. On staffing
   a. Was/is staffing adequate for the implementation of the project objectives?
   b. Was training provided on the 360 approach? Was this adequate?
   c. Did you lose staff during the course of the project cycle? How was this addressed?
36. Was the time allocated for implementation adequate?
   a. How did you respond to changes in timelines, especially COVID19?
   b. The project was designed for an 18-month duration. In hindsight, was the time adequate to smoothly implement all the planned activities?
27. Coordination and collaboration:
   a. How coherent were the project activities in achieving project goals and objectives?
   b. To what extent did your organisation coordinate with Search during implementation of the project?
   c. What are some of the factors that facilitated/hindered coordination with Search? How did you overcome the challenges?

38. Data and reporting
   a. Were the reporting formats etc. adequate to capture the progress of the activities?
   b. How was the data gathered by the researchers used to inform the project activities?
   c. How was the change matrix used by the emerging women leaders used in the project?
   d. Has there been a sharing of the results so far with the beneficiaries of the training?

39. How effectively were the inputs mobilised to accomplish the outputs and outcomes?
   a. What were the quality of the products produced by the partners/project team?
3. For Mentors

Semi-structured interview guide for the end of project evaluation

Thank you for meeting with us today. I/we have been commissioned by Search for Common Ground to conduct this end of project evaluation for the project “Young Women as Drivers of Peace: Providing 360° Support to Emerging Women Leaders in Ampara, Batticaloa, Kurunagala and Puttalam Districts”.

Based on your involvement and role within the project, we would like to use this opportunity to interview you, in order to capture your views, perceptions and feedback on the project and how it helped/not helped to encourage young women to participate in peacebuilding initiatives on the ground.

Any comments and responses shared by you will not be used to identify you by name, so that we can maintain your confidentiality. The findings from interviews with yourself and other identified stakeholders will be used to glean out general trends and the final report would be shared with Search and the donor.

The interview will last between 45-60 minutes. If you choose to, you may terminate your participation at any point of the interview. Before we begin, do you have any questions or need any further clarifications?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Control information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional affiliation (if any)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note-taker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background:

1. Can you tell us about yourself and your interests?
2. How did you get involved in this project?
   a. Why was this of interest to you?
   b. What value did you foresee in encouraging the participation of emerging women leaders?
   c. When you were approached, what kinds of challenges did you envision?
3. What was your role as a Mentor?
   a. Have you done this kind of work before? (i.e. mentoring young leaders, training etc.)
   b. What kind of training did you receive as part of this project?
   c. Was this useful? What other aspects would you have liked to have more training on?

Relevance

4. What are some of the key challenges young women in your area face in terms of engaging in peacebuilding activities/initiatives?
   a. How did the features of the Youth 360 approach respond to young women’s conditions/experience to get involved in peacebuilding work?

5. From your understanding, why is there a need to focus on young women?

6. Was the project able to capture the diversity in your district in terms of young women’s ethnic, religious identities and any other factors?
   a. Who may have been potentially left-behind?

7. From your understanding, were the sites selected for the intervention suitable?

Effectiveness

8. How has the project increased young women’s access to local resources, technical support from local agencies and organizations and networking opportunities for collective efforts and initiatives for local level peacebuilding and reconciliation? Can you cite some examples?

9. How have these access and opportunities benefitted YWLs to enhance their leadership needs to contribute to peacebuilding and reconciliation?

10. What evidence is there of young women having increased ownership and participation in designing and implementing peacebuilding initiatives?
    a. Are these activities related to the conflict assessment?

11. Following the project activities, do you think there is an increased sense of agency among YWLs?

12. In your view, were the selected young women aware of the conflict drivers in Sri Lanka or even in their own communities?
    a. How do you think the context assessments and the training responded to their knowledge gap?
    b. What specific skills have been improved in this regard?
    c. What do you think of the quality of the report produced?
    d. Is there anything more you feel that should have been done?

13. What specific knowledge and skills did the YWLs gain about project design and implementation?
    a. How effectively have the YWLs used these to implement their small grants initiatives?
    b. Is there anything more you feel should have been done?
14. What kind of networking and collaboration were the emerging women leaders engaged in before this intervention?
   a. How did the project help them to enhance their networking skills and abilities?
   b. Were they able to create or participate in any networks/alliances that provided more opportunities to stake their role in peacebuilding?
   c. Is there anything more you feel should have been done?

15. At the start of the project, what were the responses/reactions of community members/GoSL officials towards the project and the specific focus on young women?
   a. At the end of the project cycle, have you seen a change in these relationships? Can you give us an example?

16. Have you had any indication that there is increased recognition of the role of young women in their communities?
   a. Can you provide some examples?

17. With regard to engagement with Government officials:
   a. Is there any indication of positive feedback in terms of engaging with young women?

18. In your view, what were some of the unintended results of the project?

19. What are some of the key lessons learned during this project?

20. Looking back, what are some of the factors that affected implementation of the project?
   b. What was done to mitigate these factors/issues?
   c. What could have been done differently?

21. The project cycle coincided with the COVID-19 induced lockdowns. Can you explain to us how the project implementation was re-configured at this stage?
   d. What was the process adopted (meetings with district partners, reworking the project activities)
   e. What were some of the issues that were considered in shifting to a virtual mode?
   f. How was the possible impact on emerging women leaders taken into consideration?
   g. How were health and safety issues taken up for consideration?
   h. In hindsight, were the key challenges identified addressed adequately?

Sustainability

22. What are the project exit strategies, if any?
   a. How do these help OR not help long term sustainability?
   b. Should other alternatives be considered?

23. What specific measures have the project considered for the momentum among the young leaders to be continued?

24. Have you seen any kind of evidence to indicate that YWLs will continue to assume a leadership position in relation to peacebuilding work?

25. Have you seen any kind of evidence from community members or government stakeholders indicating their willingness to engage with YWLs?
26. To what extent do you think the partner organizations have been strengthened to continue to carry on this type of work in the future?
27. Is there any indication that the project initiatives will continue post-project?

Coherence and Efficiency:

28. Was the time allocated for implementation adequate?
29. Coordination and collaboration:
   c. How coherent were the project activities in achieving project goals and objectives?
   d. To what extent did Search and the implementing partners coordinate with you to make sure mentoring could happen?
4. Other stakeholders (including GoSL officials) who were engaged in the project

Semi-structured interview guide for the end of project evaluation

Thank you for meeting with us today. I/we have been commissioned by Search for Common Ground to conduct this end of project evaluation for the project “Young Women as Drivers of Peace: Providing 360° Support to Emerging Women Leaders in Ampara, Batticaloa, Kurunagala and Puttalam Districts”.

Based on your involvement within the project, we would like to use this opportunity to interview you, in order to capture your views, perceptions and feedback on the project and how it helped/not helped to encourage young women to participate in peacebuilding initiatives on the ground.

Any comments and responses shared by you will not be used to identify you by name, so that we can maintain your confidentiality. The findings from interviews with yourself and other identified stakeholders will be used to glean out general trends and the final report would be shared with Search and the donor.

The interview will last between 45-60 minutes. If you choose to, you may terminate your participation at any point of the interview. Before we begin, do you have any questions or need any further clarifications?

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Control information:

| Organisation/ Institutional affiliation (if any) |  
| Designation |  
| Date of interview |  
| Contact information |  
| Name of interviewer |  
| Note-taker |  

Background

1. Can you tell us about your work and responsibilities?
2. How did you participate in this project?
3. Was there a specific role for you in the project, if yes, what was it?

Relevance

4. In general, what are some of the key challenges young women face in your area in terms of engaging in peacebuilding activities/initiatives?
a. How do the features of this Search-run project respond to those challenges?
b. How did the project highlight the needs and roles of the YWLs?
5. How relevant was the project considering the leadership needs of young women leaders in the target districts?
6. From your understanding, why is there a need to focus on young women (as opposed to young men)?
7. From your understanding, were the sites selected for the intervention suitable? Can you please explain?
8. From your understanding, are the selected YWLs inclusive? Do they represent the composition in terms of ethnicity, religion etc.?
9. To what extent do the young women leaders feel ownership and interest in this project?

Effectiveness

10. What activities were initiated by the project team to link you with the YWLs?
   a. Were these successful? Should they be changed in the future?
11. In your view, have the young women’s knowledge on conflict drivers increased as a result of this project? (Can you give us an example)
12. In your view, has the young women’s participation in community level activities increased as a result of this project? (Can you give us an example)
13. In your view, has the young women’s networking and access to resources improved as a result of this project? (Can you give us an example?)
14. In your view, has the young women’s knowledge about services they can access and government officials increased as a result of this project? Can you provide some examples?
15. In your view, are the young women leaders now confident about their ability to be involved in conflict transformation at the community level?
   a. Is there any such evidence emerging from the communities?
16. At the start of the project, what was your response/reaction towards the project idea?
   a. What are some of the positive aspects you liked? What are some of the reservations you had?
   b. At the end of the project cycle, have you seen a change in these responses? Can you please explain.
17. In your view, have these young women formed new networks/alliances to carry on their peacebuilding work?
   a. Can you give some examples?
18. Have you or any other government/community-based organisation developed a mechanism to engage or encourage the participation of the YWLs in future peacebuilding activities?
19. Have you had any indication that there is increased recognition of the role of young women in their communities?
   a. Can you provide some examples?

Efficiency:
20. Coordination and collaboration:
   a. To what extent did the implementing partner coordinate with you during the implementation of the project?
   b. Was the information adequate enough?
   c. What are some of the factors that facilitated/hindered coordination between you, the women leaders and the district partner?

Sustainability

21. Did you observe any project exit strategy?
22. Looking forward, to what extent do you believe the emerging women leaders have been capacitated to carry on this work?
23. Have there been any discussions about continuing similar work? Or opening up opportunities for young women to be included in such peacebuilding activities?
24. What would you like to see happen so that the work can continue?
25. What would you recommend that the project does differently, if they are to carry out similar work?
5. Youth and Community Members

Thank you for agreeing to participate. We are representing the Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA) which has been commissioned by the Search for Common Ground (Search) to conduct a study to understand how the activities under the project “Young Women as Drivers of Peace: Providing 360° Support to Emerging Women Leaders in Ampara, Batticaloa, Kurunagala and Puttalam Districts” have been implemented and what lessons we can take away from this intervention.

We really appreciate your taking time to talk with us. You have been selected for this interview because you were part of the project initiatives that the emerging women leaders initiated at the community level.

We would really appreciate it if you could share with us your thoughts on how this process of engagement took place at the community level and what you thought about it.

There are no right or wrong answers and please feel free to ask for clarifications. We will take notes from this interview with your permission but they will not identify you by name so that your anonymity is protected.

Before we proceed, are there any questions you would like to ask us first?

----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Introduction:

1. Can you tell us your name, your age and where you are from and also what you are doing these days?

Relevance:

1. Let’s start this conversation by asking a rather interesting question. In your community, how do you define a young person?
   a. Age wise (probe: age range)
   b. Marital status
   c. Anything else?
2. Are there any societies or associations at the community level which are youth-focused?
   a. If yes, can you explain what they are, what they do?
3. In general, in the community level organisations, are young women given an opportunity to participate?
   a. Are they able to become office bearers?
   b. If not, why do you think this is?
4. In your experience, what are some of the key challenges young women face in participating in any community level activities?
   a. Social
   b. Institutional
5. In your opinion, is it important to encourage women to assume leadership positions?
a. Why?

6. Do you think the project has helped improve women’s ability to assume leadership positions?
   a. Can you please explain?

7. Considering the project, when and from whom did you first hear about it?
   a. Did you know any of the young women who were part of the project?
   b. Has this kind of a project ever been done in your community before?
   c. During the project cycle, what kind of role did you expect to play? What role did you end up playing in this process?

8. From your understanding, was the project intervention suitable to improve the role of young women in community peacebuilding activities? Can you please explain?

9. What kind of support did the emerging women leaders receive from:
   a. Community members?
   b. Government officials?

10. In your view, have the young women’s participation in community level activities increased as a result of this project?

11. In your view, has the young women’s networking and access to resources improved as a result of this project?

12. In your view, has the project increased young women’s capacity to assume a leadership position?
   a. Have you seen any evidence of young women taking a leadership role outside of the project work?

13. Have you had any indication that there is increased recognition of the role of young women in their communities?
   a. Can you provide some examples?

14. In your view, are government officials more aware of the young women’s participation now?

15. Since the start of the project, what are some of the key changes you have seen in the emerging women leaders?
   a. Can you give some examples?

16. At the start of the project, what was your response/reaction towards the project idea?
   a. What are some of the positive aspects you liked? What are some of the reservations you had?
   b. At the end of the project cycle, have you seen a change in these responses? Can you give us an example?

17. From your personal experience and from what you have seen already, what do you think about young women taking a leadership role in your community?

18. What were some of the unintended consequences of the project?

19. In your experience, what were some of the major challenges the young women faced in carrying out these activities?
   a. What kind of support could you provide in this regard (give examples)

Efficiency:
20. Was the time allocated for implementation adequate?

Sustainability

21. Going forward, to what extent do you believe the emerging women leaders can carry on similar work at the community level? Is there a mechanism in place to help them?

22. Have you had discussions with them about doing joint work or including them in other community CBOs etc?

23. What are some of the key things you learned from being part of this process?

24. Given another opportunity, what kind of changes would you like the project to consider?
   a. Probe: who should be included/excluded
   b. Types of intervention
   c. Training etc.
**Focus Group Discussions**

**Young Women Leaders**

**Interview guide for the end of project evaluation**

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this Focus Group Discussion. We are representing the Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA) which has been commissioned by the Search for Common Ground (Search) to conduct a study to understand how the activities under the project “Young Women as Drivers of Peace: Providing 360° Support to Emerging Women Leaders in Ampara, Batticaloa, Kurunagala and Puttalam Districts” that has been implemented and what lessons we can take away from this intervention.

We really appreciate your taking time to talk with us. You have been selected for this discussion because you were part of the project initiatives as emerging young women leaders.

We would really appreciate it if you could share with us your thoughts on how this process of engagement took place at the community level and what you thought about it.

There are no right or wrong answers and please feel free to ask for clarifications.

With your permission, we would like to record this conversation. It would only be used for the analysis of the information you give us which will not be attributed to your identity. We will anonymize all the information so that nobody can trace it back to you.

Before we proceed, are there any questions you would like to ask us first?

----------------------------------------

**Introduction:**

1. First let us introduce ourselves and afterwards, can each of you introduce yourself by giving us your name, your age and where you are from and also what you are doing these days?

Relevance:

1. Let’s start this conversation by asking a rather interesting question. In your community, how do you define a young person?
   a. Age wise (probe: age range)
   b. Marital status
   c. Anything else?
2. From your understanding, are there any specific issues that young people face in your community?
   a. Among these, are there particular issues that young women face?
3. Are there any societies or associations at the community level which are youth-focused?
   a. If yes, can you explain what they are, what they do?
   b. Do you know why they were established?
4. In general, in the community level organisations, are young women like yourself given an opportunity to participate/to speak up?
a. Are you able to become an office bearer?
b. If not, why do you think this is?

5. In your experience, what are some of the key challenges young women face in participating in any kind of activities that happen?

6. Considering the project, when and from whom did you first hear about it?
   a. What were your initial thoughts about the project?
   b. Did you know any of the young women who were part of the project?

7. What made you want to join the project?
   a. What did you expect to gain out of the project?
   b. How did you reach out to the project?
   c. What was the process to select you as a young woman leader?

8. During the project cycle, what kind of role did you anticipate playing?
   a. What role did you end up playing in this process?

9. From your understanding, did the project intervention suit your needs? Can you please explain?

10. What kind of support did you receive from
    a. The district partners?
    b. The mentors?
    c. Search?
    d. Community members?
    e. Government officials?

11. In your view, how has this project helped you:
    a. To improve knowledge about conflict assessments?
    b. To improve your understanding of project management?
    c. To improve collaboration with others in the community?
    d. Can you please explain your answer

12. Can you mention three important things you learned from the training? And why are they important?

13. What types of small grants activities have you organized? What did you achieve with reference to women leadership and their participation in peacebuilding and reconciliation?

14. In relation to the small grants and interventions
    a. What were some of the challenges faced?
    b. How were these mitigated?
    c. How did the interventions respond to the context assessment?

15. What did you think about the exchange visits?
    a. Have you been able to establish new networks/means to continue to engage in peacebuilding work?

16. Looking back, what are some of the key lessons you learned from the overall project?

17. Looking back, what would you do differently, if you had the opportunity?
    a. Is there anything more you feel should have been done through the project?

18. In your experience, what were some of the major challenges you faced in participating in all these different activities?
a. What kind of support and by whom, would have helped you, in this regard (give examples)

19. At the start of the project, what were the responses/reactions of the community in general about this project?
   a. At the end of the project cycle, have you seen a change in these responses? Can you give us an example?

20. Since the start of the project, what are some of the key changes you have seen in yourselves?
   a. Can you give some examples?

21. In your view, what were some of the unintended results of the project?
   b. Positive results
   c. Negative results

22. Looking back, what are some of the factors that affected the implementation of the project?
   a. What could have been done differently?

Efficiency:

23. Was the time allocated for implementation adequate? Were you able to complete the task within the timeframe given to you?

24. How did you produce value for money from the seed grants fund?

25. Was there adequate coordination between you and the
   a. district partners
   b. researchers
   c. mentors
   d. Search?

Sustainability

26. Going forward, to what extent do you believe you can carry on similar work at the community level?

27. Do you have any specific plan to continue similar initiatives independently after the projects are completed?

28. Do you believe the local government, political actors and male community will encourage YWLs in the future?

29. What are some of the key things you learned from this process?

30. Given another opportunity, what kind of changes would you like the project to consider?
   a. Probe: who should be included/excluded
   b. Types of intervention
   c. Training etc.
**Annexure VII: Survey Tool (Quantitative)**

**Survey Questions**

**Young Women Leaders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Type</th>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. General Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Age</td>
<td>Integer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Telephone Number</td>
<td>Integer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.3. Ethnicity            | Single select | 1. Sinhalese  
2. Tamil  
3. Muslim  
4. Burgher  
5. Other (Specify)     |           |
| 1.4. Religion             | Single select | 1. Buddhism  
2. Hinduism  
3. Islam  
4. Christianity  
5. Other (Specify)     |           |
| 1.4a. Other               | Text          |                                                                               | If (1.4) = ‘5’ |
| 1.5. District             | Single select | 1. Ampara  
2. Batticaloa  
3. Kurunagala  
4. Puttalam          |           |
| 1.6. DS Division          | Text          |                                                                               |           |
| **2. Relevance**          |               |                                                                               |           |
| 2.1. Please select the activities you participated in through this project (choose all that is relevant to you) | Select multiple | 1. Collaborative leadership and CGA workshops  
2. Training programme on conflict assessment  
3. Collaborative Conflict assessment  
4. Mentorship sessions  
5. Small grants programme  
6. Exchange programmes |           |
| 7. | Learning, dissemination and consultations |
| 8. | National workshop |

### 2.2. How did you hear about the Young Women Leaders project?

Select multiple (Up to 3)

1. WhatsApp/ Viber
2. District partner
3. Social media (Eg: Facebook, Twitter, Instagram)
4. Word of Mouth (relative, friends, someone in the village)
5. Other (Specify)

### 2.2a. Other

Text

If (2.2) = ‘5’

### 2.3. Do you agree that the project rightly selected young women leaders inclusive of all ethnic and religious groups?

Single select

1. Completely agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Neutral
4. Somewhat disagree
5. Completely Disagree

### 2.4. I wanted to become a part of the young women leaders because

Select multiple

1. I wanted to increase my knowledge about conflict drivers and assessments
2. I want to participate in community-driven activities more
3. I wanted to learn from others
4. I wanted to learn how to implement projects, etc.
5. Other (Specify)

### 2.4a. Other

Text

If (2.4) = ‘5’

### 2.5. Some of the challenges I have faced in trying to engage in community-led activities are

Select multiple (Up to 3)

1. We are not invited to participate
2. We are not aware of the activities that take place in the community
3. My family (i.e. parents) do not wish me to take part in such activities
4. We don’t have the necessary knowledge on how to engage
5. Community members do not like us to take part in activities
6. I feel shy to speak up/take part in community activities
7. We do not have youth-led initiatives which would help us to engage
8. Language barriers
9. Other (Specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.5a. Other</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>If (2.5) = ‘9’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single select</td>
<td>6. Completely agree</td>
<td>7. Somewhat agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single select</td>
<td>10. Completely Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. Effectiveness**

| 3.1. After taking part in this project, my knowledge about the 30-year conflict in Sri Lanka has improved | Single select | 1. Completely agree |
| 3.2. After taking part in this project, my knowledge on what drives conflict in our own community has improved | Single select | 2. Somewhat agree |
| 3.3. After taking part in this project, my knowledge about conflict assessment tools has improved | Single select | 3. Neutral |
| | | 4. Somewhat disagree |
| | | 5. Completely Disagree |
3.4. After taking part in this project, my skills on how to use conflict assessment tools has improved

| Single select | 1. Completely agree  
| 2. Somewhat agree  
| 3. Neutral  
| 4. Somewhat disagree  
| 5. Completely Disagree |

3.5. After participating in the training, my knowledge on conflict resolution and leadership has increased

| Single select | 1. Completely agree  
| 2. Somewhat agree  
| 3. Neutral  
| 4. Somewhat disagree  
| 5. Completely Disagree |

3.6. After the training, I am now confident I have the skills to resolve problems arising in the community

| Single select | 1. Completely agree  
| 2. Somewhat agree  
| 3. Neutral  
| 4. Somewhat disagree  
| 5. Completely disagree |

3.7. Since the training and apart from the small grant, I led an activity with other community members and government officers on an issue identified in the conflict assessment

| Single select | 1. Yes  
| 2. No |

3.8. If yes, what was the issue?

| Text | If (3.7) = ‘1’ |

3.9. Did you use local resources for this?

| Single select | 1. Yes  
| 2. No |

3.10. What local resources were you able to rely on during the implementation of this initiative?

| Single select | 1. Labour-in-kind (Shramadana)  
| 2. Community funds  
| 3. Community collections  
| 4. Hall facilities  
| 5. Media support  
| 6. Resource personnel  
| 7. Other (Specify) |

3.10a. Other

| Text | If (3.10) = ‘7’ |

3.11. The indicators we developed to

| Single select | 1. Completely agree  
<p>| 2. Somewhat agree |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.12. Are you currently part of any new network(s) that bring(s) together women leaders to promote peace in the community?                                                                                   | Single select         | 1. Yes  
2. No                                                                                                                                     |
| 3.13. During the COVID-19 pandemic, what additional support was extended to complete project activities?                                                                                                    | Multiple select       | 1. Mobile data cards  
2. Digital devices (Phones, tablets, etc.)  
3. Knowledge on how to use online platforms (technical support)  
4. Reimbursement for additional phone calls made  
5. Monthly data allowance  
6. Sanitary products (Masks, sanitizer, etc.)  
7. No additional support  
8. Other (Specify)                                                                 |
| 3.14. The support extended helped us to continue with project activities                                                                                                                                 | Single select         | 1. Completely agree  
2. Somewhat agree  
3. Neutral  
4. Somewhat disagree  
5. Completely disagree                                                                                                                      |
| 3.15. During the Covid-19 travel restrictions/lockdowns, participating in the online project activities was challenging due to                                                                                                                                 | Multiple select       | 1. Connectivity issues  
2. Unfamiliarity with technical devices  
3. Feeling shy to speak in online platforms  
4. Unengaging training sessions  
5. No challenges encountered  
6. Other (Specify)                                                                                                                             |
| 3.15a. Other                                                                                                                                                                                              | Text                  | If (3.15) = ‘6’                                                                 |
| 3.13a. Other                                                                                                                                                                                              | Text                  | If (3.13) = ‘8’                                                                 |
3.16. Implementing the small grant project positively institutionalized our leadership role in the community

|---------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------------|

3.17. Government officials after participating in our small grants activities started to consult us in various issues related to peace and development

|---------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------------|

3.18. Implementing the small grant project positively changed attitudes towards us among other youth

|---------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------------|

3.19. If you could not take part in the small project, what was the reason?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select multiple</th>
<th>1. Could not implement because of COVID-19</th>
<th>2. The allocated time was insufficient</th>
<th>3. The proposed project was not chosen</th>
<th>4. Did not receive the necessary funding at the right time</th>
<th>5. Do not know</th>
<th>6. Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.20. As a result of the cross-district networking and exchange visits, I have been able to expand networks with peers from other age groups/ethnicities/religions or people from other locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single select</th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
<th>2. No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.21. If you could not participate in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple select</th>
<th>1. Could not implement because of COVID-19</th>
<th>If 2.1='6’ is not selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| exchange visits, what was the reason? | 2. The allocated time was insufficient  
3. Do not know  
4. Other |
| 3.22. Have community leaders or government officials reached out/are engaging with you to collaborate on other initiatives? | Single select | 1. Yes  
2. No |
| 3.23. If yes, who was it? | Single select | 1. Government officials (Grama Niladhari/Samurdhi officer/District secretary)  
2. Elected officials (MP, Council members)  
3. Community Mediation Board  
4. Religious Leaders  
5. Village level societies (RDS, WRDS)  
6. Producer Societies (Govi Sanvidana, Deewara Samithi)  
7. Village elites  
8. Estate managers  
9. Other |
| 3.24. What kind of project is this? | Text |
| 3.25. The Collaborative Context Assessments (select all that apply): | Multiple select | 1. Helped me analyse the current conflicts in our areas  
2. Helped me identify root causes of the conflict  
3. Helped me utilise tools learned (conflict analysis tools, conflict tree, stakeholder mapping, connectors and dividers, etc.)  
4. Helped me identify indicators and outcomes for |
| 3.26 What knowledge and skills did you gain about project design and implementation (select all that apply) | Multiple select | 1. How to define the objectives of the project  
2. How to define the impact of the project  
3. How to define targets of the project  
4. How to define indicators of success  
5. How to create a project timeline  
6. How to develop a project budget  
7. How to create a risk mitigation plan  
8. Other |
|---|---|---|
| 3.27. Looking back, what are some of the changes you think would have helped you to be more successful? | Multiple select | 1. More hands-on training and coaching  
2. More time for community-led mobilizations and activities  
3. More opportunities to present our work  
4. More exchange visits  
5. Other |

### 4. Efficiency and Coherence

| 4.1. Has the final outcome document of the collaborative context assessment been shared with you? (if No, go to Q 4.4) | Single select | 1. Yes  
2. No |
|---|---|---|
| 4.2. If yes, have you read the final outcome document of the | Single select | 1. Yes  
2. No |

If (4.1) = ‘1’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative Context Assessment?</th>
<th>Single Select</th>
<th>If (4.2) = ‘1’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.3. If yes, do you agree with what was said in the document? | Single select | 1. Completely agree  
2. Somewhat agree  
3. Neutral  
4. Somewhat disagree  
5. Completely disagree |
| 4.4. The number of coaching/mentorship sessions I participated in were | Single select | 1. None  
2. 1-3 sessions  
3. 4-6 sessions  
4. More than 6 sessions |
| 4.5. How much did the coaching sessions help in the design and implementation of the project? | Single select | 1. Very helpful  
2. Somewhat helpful  
3. Neutral  
4. Somewhat unhelpful  
5. Not helpful at all |
| 4.6. Some of the challenges we encountered in implementing the small grants and initiatives are | Multiple select | 1. Not enough time  
2. Not a lot of support from others in the community  
3. Language barriers  
4. Difficulties to organise because of COVID-19 restrictions  
5. Not enough funds  
6. Not enough help from the mentors  
7. Not enough help from the district partners  
8. Other |
| 4.7. Were the funds for small grants activities provided on time? | Single select | 1. Yes on time  
2. No, quite late  
3. Yes, with slight delay  
4. Did not get at all |
| 4.8. The coordination from the district partner helped us to implement the project activities in a timely manner | Single select | 1. Completely agree  
2. Somewhat agree  
3. Neutral  
4. Somewhat disagree  
5. Completely disagree |
4.9. Communication with mentors and district partners was adequate to help us implement the project activities


**5. Sustainability**

5.1. After having completed the project activities, what are your plans?


5.2. I feel confident to assume a leadership position in the community on peacebuilding activities

## Survey Questions
### Mentors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Type</th>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. General Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Age</td>
<td>Integer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Telephone Number</td>
<td>Integer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4a. Other</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>If (1.4) = ‘5’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6. DS Division</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. How did you hear about this project?</td>
<td>Select multiple (Up to 3)</td>
<td>1. WhatsApp/ Viber 2. District partner 3. Social media (Eg: Facebook, Twitter, Instagram) 4. Word of Mouth (Relatives, colleagues, peers) 5. Communication from Search or its partners 6. Others (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1a. Other</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>If (2.1)=’6’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2. Please select the activities you participated in through this project (choose all that are relevant to you)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Select multiple</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Collaborative Leadership and CGA workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Training programme on conflict assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Training of trainers programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Training Coaching and mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Context assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Small grants programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exchange programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mentorship programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Learning, dissemination and consultations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. National Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2a. Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Completely agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Somewhat disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Completely Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3. The project has selected the appropriate target group as YWLs in an inclusive manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select multiple (Up to 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Young women are not invited to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. They are not aware of the activities that take place in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Their families (i.e. parents) do not wish for them to take part in such activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. They don’t have the necessary knowledge on how to engage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Community members do not like them to take part in activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. They feel shy to speak up/take part in community activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. There are no youth-led initiatives which would help them to engage
8. Language barriers
9. Other (Specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4a. Other</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>If (2.4) = ‘9’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.5. The measures taken by the project adequately addressed these challenges | Single select | 1. Completely agree  
2. Somewhat agree  
3. Neutral  
4. Somewhat disagree  
5. Completely Disagree |

3. Effectiveness

| 3.1. After taking part in the TOT and other training activities of the project, my knowledge about how to mentor young people has improved | Single select | 1. Completely agree  
2. Somewhat agree  
3. Neutral  
4. Somewhat disagree  
5. Completely Disagree |
| 3.2. After taking part in this project, my skills on how to mentor/coach young women has improved | Single select | 1. Completely agree  
2. Somewhat agree  
3. Neutral  
4. Somewhat disagree  
5. Completely Disagree |
| 3.3. Since I started working with the young women leaders, I have seen an improvement in how they practice skills on conflict assessment | Single select | 1. Completely agree  
2. Somewhat agree  
3. Neutral  
4. Somewhat disagree  
5. Completely Disagree |
| 3.4. Since I started working with the young women leaders, their knowledge on project management has improved | Single select | 1. Completely agree  
2. Somewhat agree  
3. Neutral  
4. Somewhat disagree  
5. Completely Disagree |
| 3.5. By the end of the project, I have observed that the young women’s confidence in | Single select | 1. Completely agree  
2. Somewhat agree  
3. Neutral  
4. Somewhat disagree |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.6. By the end of the project, I have observed that the young women’s confidence in participating in community-level activities has improved | 1. Completely agree  
2. Somewhat agree  
3. Neutral  
4. Somewhat disagree  
5. Completely Disagree |
3.10. Was the small grants project implemented by the YWLs at the village level?

| Single select | 1. Yes
| 2. No |

3.11. If no, why was it not implemented?

| Multiple select | 1. Could not implement because of COVID-19
| 2. The allocated time was insufficient
| 3. The proposed project was not chosen
| 4. Did not receive the necessary funding at the right time
| 5. Do not know
| 6. Other |

If (3.10)=’2’

3.12. Implementing the small grant project positively changed attitudes towards the young women leaders in their community

| Single select | 1. Completely agree
| 2. Somewhat agree
| 3. Neutral
| 4. Somewhat disagree
| 5. Completely disagree
| 6. I don’t know |

3.13. Implementing the small grant project positively changed attitudes towards the young women among government officials

| Single select | 1. Completely agree
| 2. Somewhat agree
| 3. Neutral
| 4. Somewhat disagree
| 5. Completely disagree
| 6. I don’t know |

3.14. Implementing the small grant project positively changed attitudes towards the young women among other youth

| Single select | 1. Completely agree
| 2. Somewhat agree
| 3. Neutral
| 4. Somewhat disagree
| 5. Completely disagree
| 6. I don’t know |

3.15. Were the YWLs able to participate in the exchange visits?

| Single select | 1. Yes
| 2. No |

3.16. The cross-district networking and exchange visits have expanded the YWLs’ networks with peers from other age groups.

| Single select | 1. Completely agree
| 2. Somewhat agree
| 3. Neutral
| 4. Somewhat disagree
| 5. Completely disagree
<p>| 6. I do not know |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.17. Have community leaders or government officials reached out to</td>
<td>Single select</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>If (3.17) = ‘1’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engage with the young women leaders on new initiatives?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. I do not know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18. If yes, who was it?</td>
<td>Single select</td>
<td>1. Government officials (Grama Niladhari/Samurdhi officer/District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>secretary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Elected officials (MP, Council members)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Community Mediation Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Religious Leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Village level societies (RDS, WRDS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Producer Societies (Govi Sanvidana, Deewara Samithi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Village elites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Estate managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19. What kind of project is this?</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20. The Collaborative Context Assessments (select all that apply);</td>
<td>Multiple select</td>
<td>1. Helped young women leaders analyze the current conflicts in their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Helped young women leaders identify root causes of the conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Helped young women leaders utilize tools learned (conflict analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tools, conflict tree, stakeholder mapping,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.21. What knowledge and skills were gained by young women leaders in project design and implementation? (Select all that apply)

| Multiple select | 1. How to define the objectives of the project |
| 1. How to define the impact of the project |
| 2. How to define the impact of the project |
| 3. How to define targets of the project |
| 4. How to define indicators of success |
| 5. How to create a project timeline |
| 6. How to create project budget |
| 7. How to create a risk mitigation plan |
| 8. Other |

4. Efficiency

| Single select | 1. Yes, on time |
| 2. Yes, with slight delay |
| 3. Yes, some of them |
| 4. No, had to cancel them |

4.1. Were you able to conduct coaching/mentoring sessions with the young women leaders as planned and without delay or challenges?

| Single select | 1. None |
| 2. 1-3 sessions |
| 3. 4-6 sessions |

4.2. The number of coaching/mentorship
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3.</td>
<td>If you were unable to conduct any sessions, can you indicate why it was difficult?</td>
<td>Single select</td>
<td>If (4.2)=’1’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Connectivity issues (phones not working)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Cannot access the communities because of COVID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Did not have enough time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Young leaders were not interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Language barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.</td>
<td>Some of the challenges I found when mentoring the young women leaders were</td>
<td>Multiple select</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Difficulties in not being able to meet them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Not having enough time to nurture their skills/talents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Lack of eagerness on the part of the young women leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. I was too busy to give them a lot of attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. The COVID-19 situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.</td>
<td>The indicators developed to measure the success of the young women leaders’ progress were achieved</td>
<td>Single select</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Somewhat agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Somewhat disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Completely disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.</td>
<td>The coordination from the district partner helped us to implement the project activities in a timely manner</td>
<td>Single select</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Somewhat agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Somewhat disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Completely disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.</td>
<td>Communication with district partners was adequate to help us implement the project activities</td>
<td>Single select</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Somewhat agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Somewhat disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Completely disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5. Sustainability

### 5.1. After having completed the project activities, what are your plans?

| Single select | 1. Continue mentoring  
2. Continue my usual work  
3. Explore how to engage with YWLs  
4. Explore how to continue engagement with the implementing partners  
5. Not sure  
6. Other |

### 5.2. Looking back, what are some of the biggest lessons you have learned from this project?

| Multiple select | 1. How to mitigate conflicts  
2. How to mentor young women  
3. How to do project management online  
4. How to work with multi-religious and ethnic communities  
5. Other |

### 5.3. Looking back, what are some of the changes you think would have helped you to be more successful?

| Multiple select | 1. More hands-on training and coaching for mentors  
2. More opportunities for us to connect with the young leaders  
3. More time to nurture the relationships with the young leaders  
4. Other |
Annexure VIII: Evaluation Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference

Final Evaluation of the Project:

“Young Women as Drivers of Peace: Providing 360° Support to Emerging Women Leaders in Ampara, Batticaloa, Kurunagala and Puttalam Districts”
Search for Common Ground

Search is an international conflict transformation NGO that aims to transform the way individuals, groups, governments and companies deal with conflict, away from adversarial approaches and towards collaborative solutions. Headquartered in Washington DC, USA, and Brussels, Belgium, the organization has 52 field offices in over 30 countries in Africa/Asia/Middle East and the USA. Search designs and implements multifaceted, culturally appropriate and conflict-sensitive programs using a diverse range of tools, including media and training, to promote dialogue, increase knowledge and determine a positive shift in behaviors.

Search for Common Ground (Search) Sri Lanka seeks to recruit a local consultancy firm with experience in evaluation and research of peacebuilding projects to conduct a high quality final evaluation of the Project “Young Women as Drivers of Peace: Providing 360° Support to Emerging Women Leaders in Ampara, Batticaloa, Kurunagala and Puttalam Districts” funded by the UN Peacebuilding Fund (UNPBF).

1. Context

Decades of war have created deep divisions and mistrust among Sri Lankan communities. Despite major peacebuilding gains in recent years, including institutional strengthening, commencing a transitional justice process and fast-tracking resettlement, the underlying issues and causes that initially triggered the conflict—such as limited representation and participation of women, youth, and ethnic minorities in peacebuilding and governance—remain largely unresolved. This situation is evident from the heightened
inter-ethnic and inter-religious tensions following the Easter Sunday attacks in 2019, which exposed and sharpened the deep divides that continue in Sri Lanka. Kurunagala, Puttalam, Ampara, and Batticaloa, which were each in their own way still grappling with the effects of the civil war, became the scene of attacks on Easter Sunday and have been hot spots for violent incidents since, including torching of Muslim-owned businesses, desecration of religious sites, and violent riots. The attacks have brought new conflict drivers to prominence and increased vulnerabilities for several communities.

This volatile environment disproportionately affects the women in these communities, many of whom depend only on themselves, with at least 25% of the households being female-headed households across the four districts. This situation reinforces their existing vulnerabilities which include lack of information on missing relatives, displacement from their land, economic deprivation, psychological trauma, and vulnerability to sexual violence and exploitation. For instance, the highest rate of intimate-partner violence was reported from Kilinocchi and Batticaloa in the north and east. Since the Easter bombings, Muslim-Sinhala tensions have risen sharply.

While women are uniquely affected, they are also uniquely positioned to bridge these divides.

Women’s visibility in community activities is remarkably higher than that of men at the local level. However, Sri Lanka’s entrenched patriarchal system means that there is a lack of space and opportunity for all women to speak up and participate in governance and peacebuilding. Women face a lack of recognition, support, and appreciation from spouses and family members. There is uneven distribution of family responsibilities and women often bear the brunt of household duties and childbearing. Formal peace structures such as the District Reconciliation Committees and Interfaith Forums provide minimal space and opportunity for women and young people to participate. Even where institutions boast a reasonable level of representation of women such as in the Transitional Justice and Reconciliation Consultative Task Force, the Office for Missing Persons, and the Office of Reparation, the composition was not representative of women and tended to be the more affluent, older or urban women. Socio-economic and cultural barriers, such as restrictions on movement, negative perceptions about women who speak up, and traditional perceptions on employment appropriate for women - often linked to


34 https://www.helvetas.org/downloads/empowering_women_in_community_leadership_and_political_participation.pdf
gendered religious values, prevent women from taking an active role in formal and informal peace structures\textsuperscript{35,36}

Young women, who are often very active at the community level through informal groups, are disengaged from formal governance and peacebuilding processes.\textsuperscript{37} While they recognize the need for a peaceful society, they either do not feel empowered to contribute or they lack understanding of how they can contribute.\textsuperscript{38} During the 30-year civil war and insurgencies, women were at the forefront of demanding an end to the war and were involved in peacebuilding efforts including conducting joint conflict analysis, early warning, preventive action plans and advocacy for non-violent solutions.\textsuperscript{39} Their focus in the last 10 years shifted to supporting transitional justice and economic and constitutional reforms due to a shift in international donors’ attention in these spheres, a perception that the end of the war brought peace to the country and there was no further need to invest in peacebuilding and a perception that the transitional justice process was a process for Tamil people only, which caused disengagement from other ethnic groups.\textsuperscript{40} Due to this shift, young women have not been exposed to peacebuilding tools, such as joint conflict analysis, preventive action plans and interest-based advocacy, and hence lack the capacities to design and implement community-led peacebuilding initiatives. Furthermore, they do not have the capacity, networks, and connections to mobilize resources for peacebuilding, more so because these young women are often part of informal groups which donors struggle to support because of stringent financial regulations. They have not had access either to resources through the donor community or capacity building from in-country senior women activists to support their participation in peacebuilding. This group faces double discrimination, both due to the patriarchal system which looks negatively on independent women in leadership positions and a culture which denounces the agency of young women. Heightened inter-ethnic tensions demonstrate the need to refocus investments on conflict transformation, which bridges ethnic and religious divides, including supporting critical peacebuilding skills, tools, and capacity for women, especially young women who are new to this space, to advance community-level peaceful co-existence.\textsuperscript{41}

**Impact of COVID-19**

\textsuperscript{37} https://www.cfr.org/event/progress-toward-parity-global-gains-womens-political-participation-0
The outbreak of the COVID-19 virus has had a significant impact on the smooth implementation of the project’s activities. The approach adopted by this project relies on inperson engagement with the Young Women Leaders (YWLS) to develop their skills, build trust among them in order for them to analyze issues in their community and to collaboratively design initiatives to address them. This was to be backed by a mentorship program that responded to the needs of the young women and to support their chosen initiatives. The mobility restrictions imposed as a result of COVID-19 (including strict curfews and lockdown measures) and the resulting psychological, economic and personal stresses placed on both the young and experienced women leaders (as well as the project’s district partners) slowed down implementation significantly. It was also agreed that moving all training activities online would compromise the original vision for the project and affect the level of engagement and buy-in among both young and experienced women leaders. In discussion with PBF Secretariat, the project team therefore agreed to wait until in-person activities were a possibility again, but to reconsider moving activities online should this be unavoidable. Therefore, with some delays the trainings were completed in person in between the different waves of Covid 19. However, as the project was unable to receive a no cost extension that would have given some additional months for project activities, the youth led activities were redesigned from 3 month activities to one month activities. The current third wave of Covid has also meant that the planned exchange programs which would have allowed for cross district interaction were shifted to a virtual exchange.

2. The Project

In order to address the above gap and promote women’s leadership in Sri Lanka, Search is implementing a pilot project Youth 360, which is a new approach to enhance emerging women leaders’ contributions to peacebuilding. This project is funded by the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (UNPBF), and the total budget allocated for the project is $439,906.83. The project period is from 5th December 2019 to June 5th 2021.

Youth 360 is a multifaceted approach consisting of four main activity streams: (1) capacity development process; (2) collaborative conflict analysis; (3) project design and participatory grant making; (4) youth-led project implementation. Project activities were designed in a sequential manner which took the young women leaders through a series of workshops aimed to increase their leadership skills as well as their knowledge on identifying and analyzing conflicts. The trainings equipped the young women with a skill set to then design a suitable peacebuilding intervention based on their conflict analysis. In keeping with objective of the 360 approach the young women themselves then defined their own success metrics in terms of the change they envisaged in their communities through the implementation of their small grants. As part of the overall approach a group of experienced women leaders were trained to coach and support the young women leaders, careful not to takeover but to facilitate and mentor the young women as well as to network with a wider group of stakeholders. A group of young researchers were embedded in each location to observe the overall process and identify key learnings related to the 360 approach and to produce a lesson learnt document. The culminating event is a final workshop which will bring together

42 For further details on Youth 360 Please refer to https://www.sfcg.org/youth-360/
43 Ibid
policy makers and other CSOs engaged in youth development in which the learnings and the experience of the 360 approach would be shared, with the objective of increasing the understanding of how youth, particularly young women should be supported to become agents of peace. A more detailed table is available in the Annex.

The three key outcomes of this project are:

Outcome 1: Emerging women leaders have increased knowledge and skills to carry out a collaborative context assessment, and design and implement inclusive peacebuilding initiatives based on this assessment ("Acknowledging young women as peacebuilders")

Outcome 2: Emerging women leaders have developed and implemented community-level peacebuilding initiatives leveraging local resources leading to increased peace dividends in the target communities. ("Putting the power to determine peacebuilding outcomes in the hands of young women")

Outcome 3: Increased knowledge among decision-makers and peacebuilding and governance organizations in Sri Lanka of the positive role emerging women leaders can play in peacebuilding initiatives in their communities and how to support them in leading community-level peacebuilding initiatives. ("Understanding and scaling initiatives engaging young women leaders as positive change agents")

Through these outcomes, the project aims to empower emerging women leaders to collaboratively identify local issues relating to peace and security, collectively design responses, and thereby change the perspectives of community stakeholders about women as peacebuilders.

This project is being implemented in four districts (Batticaloa, Kurunagala, Puttalam, Ampara) through four local NGO partners - Sarvodaya (Batticaloa), Womens Resource Center (Kurunagala), Muslim Women's Development Trust (Puttalam) and Muslim Women's Research and Action Forum (Ampara). The project target group included young women leaders aged 18-29 years and experienced mentors aged 38-55 years. The ethnic composition of participating women leaders included Sinhala (31%), Tamil (31%) and Muslims (39%) while the ethnic composition of mentors included Sinhala (32%), Tamil (27%), Muslims (38%) and others (3%). The number of women leaders, mentors and the small grants implemented by those women leaders is presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Young Women Leaders</th>
<th>Mentors</th>
<th>Seed Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ampara</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batticaloa</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Project’s Theory of Change

**IF** emerging women leaders have access to resources, technical support, and networks for peacebuilding that recognize young women's particular needs and the particular ways in which young people organize, and **IF** they increasingly design, lead, and implement inclusive peacebuilding initiatives based on their own assessment of their own context, **THEN** young women will be increasingly respected as positive agents of change, **AND** the ability of communities to which they belong to transform conflict without violence will be increased, **BECAUSE** inclusive and locally-driven peacebuilding approaches will ensure buy-in from all parties to the solution.

### 4. Evaluation Purpose

The evaluation is being conducted pursuant to the requirements of the monitoring and evaluation plan articulated in the original project document, approved by the United Nations Secretary General’s Peacebuilding Fund in New York, USA.

The findings and observations of the evaluation will be used by the staff of UNPBF, Search, implementing partners, and other relevant stakeholders to assess the overall achievement of the project with special reference to its theory of change, overall goal, objectives and outcomes. The evaluation should be carried out based on the OECD DAC Evaluation Criteria and the corresponding Key evaluation Questions as specified in Section 6 of this TOR. The findings of the evaluation will also be important for Search to refine its pilot Youth 360 approach for future application and adaptability.

Other development organizations that support young women leaders as change agents in peacebuilding may also find the observation and findings of the assessment useful when considering the design and implementation of their own peacebuilding strategies and endeavors.

### 5. Goal and Objectives of Study

The goal of this evaluation is to assess the extent to which the project met its intended peacebuilding objectives and results. It will also provide key lessons about successful peacebuilding approaches and operational practices, inform how to improve similar projects in future, as well as highlight areas where the project performed less effectively than anticipated. In that sense, this project evaluation is equally about accountability as well as learning. The main objectives of the evaluation are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Puttalam</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kurunagala</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Assess the progress towards achieving project goals based on the project design and strategy, including areas where the project performed less effectively.
2. Provide actionable recommendations for future programming.
3. Document good practices, innovations, and lessons learned, if any, emerging from the project.
4. Assess the adequacy and quality of partnership and cooperation between different stakeholders.

6. Key Questions of the Study

Drawing from the OECD-DAC Criteria for Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Programming, the evaluation has identified the following key evaluation questions under evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, coherence, and efficiency.

Relevance

- Response to external shifts: To what extent the project implementation modalities (Youth 360° Approach) and the specific interventions are relevant to the current conflict dynamics and its impact in terms of putting power in the hands of emerging young women leaders to address the conflict/social issues in their community in the selected districts in Sri Lanka?
- Project design: Were the project activities logically set to meet the needs of the emerging women leaders to promote emerging young women’s leadership and gender equality in addressing conflict/social issues in the target districts?
- How relevant were the project interventions considering the needs for building local structure and capacity, especially among emerging young women leaders, in resolving community-level conflicts?
- How was targeting the emerging young women leaders achieved? Did the project target the right group of participants with the right set of strategies and activities ensuring inclusivity of minority ethnic and religious groups?

Effectiveness

- (TOC) Is there evidence that emerging women leaders have increased access to resources, technical support and networks for peacebuilding that recognize young women's particular needs in promoting their leadership and their equal participation in peacebuilding and addressing local conflict issues?
- (TOC) Is there evidence that emerging young women leaders have increased ownership and participation in designing, leading, and implementing inclusive peacebuilding initiatives as identified by their own conflict assessment?
- (TOC) Is there evidence that there is an increased sense of belongingness and respect for women as leaders/change agents in their respective communities (and beyond), particularly among their men counterparts?
- What are the project achievements vis-a-vis the results framework? To what extent the project has been successful in achieving the objectives and outcomes desired by the project design?
  - To what extent has this project been successful in increasing knowledge and skills of emerging young women leaders in carrying out context assessment at their respective districts/divisions?
How has the project contributed in building capacities/skills of emerging young women leaders to independently design and implement inclusive peacebuilding initiatives based on the assessment?

To what extent this project has been successful in enhancing networking and collaboration between emerging young women leaders and external stakeholders in the target districts?

To what extent has this project contributed to enhancing the understanding and knowledge of community stakeholders and government actors about the real needs and roles of emerging women leaders?

What are the unintended results of the project, if any?
What factors contributed to the achievement or non-achievement of objectives and results? What could have been done differently to make the project to be of higher quality and greater impact (or what were the weaknesses/gaps of the project)?
How effectively did the project adapt and respond to the challenges especially in the context of COVID-19 and how did it affected the project implementation and achieving desired results? How gender sensitive were the COVID-19 adaptation plans and strategies?

Sustainability

What is the project sustainability and exit strategy/ies to ensure local ownership and continuity of the project initiatives among the local community, especially emerging young women leaders?
Is there any indication that the young women leaders’ role and providing leadership in peacebuilding in the targeted districts continue after the life of the project, either by the initiatives of women leaders themselves or the district and divisional level government agencies and other stakeholders?

Coherence and Efficiency

Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? Did the PBF project provide value for money? Have resources been used efficiently?
How was the coordination between SFCG and its partners in implementing the project? How well did the project team communicate with implementing partners, stakeholders, and project beneficiaries on its progress? What were the challenges, if any, and how did SFCG and partners overcome them?
How coherent were the activities implemented in achieving the goal/objectives set for the project?
How well inputs/means have been converted into activities in terms of quality, quantity and time, and the quality of results achieved?
How well did the project collect and use data to monitor results?

4. Geographic Locations

The final evaluation will be conducted in the districts of Kurunagala, Puttalam (North Western Province), Batticaloa, and Ampara (Eastern Province). The data collection is expected to be in-person under the current COVID-19 situation. However, if there is an increase in COVID cases and the government imposes travel restrictions, the data collection will be done through online mode.
5. Methodology and Data Collection Tools

The evaluation will be summative and should employ a mixed-method approach whereby discussions and surveys with key stakeholders provide/verify the substance of the findings. Proposals submitted by prospective consultancy firms should outline a clearly explained mixed-method approach of data collection and analysis, clearly noting how various forms of evidence will be employed and how the data collected using various tools will be triangulated. Proposals should be clear on the specific role each of the various methodological approaches plays in helping to address each of the evaluation questions. The qualitative and quantitative data can be collected using the following tools.

**Review of existing literature/documents:** A desk review of available literature related to young women’s participation in peacebuilding and conflict resolution, UN Security Council Resolution on Youth, Peace & Security 2250, project proposal, MEL plan, data collected for the learning and best practices document by the young researchers, activity reports, training modules, policy documents, etc. will be conducted to understand what has been studied, analyzed, and recommended so far in order to promote gender equality in peacebuilding leadership and institutional development, in general.

**Survey:** A sample survey will be conducted in all four districts with YWLs. The sample size will be determined once we have verified the list of available participants. The total number of emerging young women leaders is roughly 134. The consultancy firm is expected to calculate sample size for both groups separately using 95% confidence level and 5% margin of errors. This is (tentatively) expected to generate a sample of size of 100 emerging women leaders.

However, this may change once we have the final set of data of the participants of the YWLs.

**Focus Group Discussion (FGD):** Data will also be collected using focus groups discussion with young women leaders and community members and youth leaders who participated in the small grant initiatives of YWLs using a pre-designed focus group discussion guide. 12 FGDs (two FGDs with YWLs in each district and one FGD with community members and youth leaders in each district).

**Key Informant Interviews (KIIs):** A set of KIIs will be conducted with selected key informants such as Search’s project team, four partners, selected mentors in four districts, district secretaries, divisional secretaries, young women leaders, youth service officers and young researchers and will be agreed between consultancy firm and Search team. The KIIs will be conducted using semi-structured interview tools. Search will provide the respondents for KIIs list. At least 30 interviews should be done in four districts and the selected firm can suggest the most appropriate persons for these discussions.

As indicated, the evaluation should use both quantitative and qualitative tools and methods for data collection, analysis and presentation. Information triangulation (using different methods) should be used to guarantee that the evidence supporting any conclusion drawn is representative of the situation. The
survey can be conducted to confirm the indicators prescribed in the MEL plan, while FGDs and KIIs will be used to obtain detailed qualitative perspective on the success of the project. Both FGDs and KIIs can play a useful role in verifying quantitative data and providing valuable context in order to understand the findings from quantitative surveys.

Three young researchers are working closely with the emerging leaders throughout the project process to document best practices through a learning paper. These researchers were hired through a call for applications inviting young people (18-29) with experience of peacebuilding and research and/or evaluations. This approach builds on Search’s extensive experience leading youth-led research and leverage Search’s Youth-Led Research toolkit. The learning will inform other youth-led and women-focused initiatives within Search and will be disseminated through the Global Coalition on Youth, Peace, and Security in which Search, UN-PBSO, and UNOY Peacebuilders, are co-chairs.

The mode of field level data collection will be determined based on the present COVID-19 crises and related developments in the next few weeks. In order to manage the situation, the guiding methodology has been proposed in two ways, Plan A and Plan B.

**Plan A**

All field level data collection will be in-person if there is no travel and meeting restrictions form the government. In this case, the consultancy firm team will travel to all four districts and organize interviews with participants and stakeholders in person.

**Plan B**

If the COVID-19 pandemic worsens and there will be travel and meeting restrictions and partial or complete lock down will be imposed by the government in the targeted districts, the data collection needs to be done applying an alternative strategy as there is no room for postponing this evaluation. In this case, the consultancy firm is expected to adapt the methodology to include an online survey among the target women leaders and online or remote interviews using (relevant and applicable) techniques including:

1. Google forms/Survey Monkey
2. WhatsApp/Viber/Skype calls
3. Telephone calls

Once the consultancy firm is selected, a joint assessment of the context will be made and a decision on methodology will be taken. The consultancy firm is expected to consider both methodological approaches and include two budget proposals. Search and local partners will coordinate to provide the phone, email, or other means of communication to reach all identified respondents for the surveys and interviews.

**6. Deliverables**

**Desk Review:** The selected consultancy firm is required to carry out desk review of the past literature, project reports, monitoring data, and other relevant documents and include that review in the inception report that sets the context analysis for the relevance of the project in the current context. During the final report writing process, the detailed desk review could be annexed and a succinct summary will be integrated into the context analysis section.
**Inception Report:** Inception report with evaluation design and work plan should be completed within 10 days of the signing of the contract. The inception report should have detailed literature review, including available project documentation, methodological approach, sampling method (locations and scope), and data collection tools (both qualitative and quantitative) to capture the information and data mentioned in key evaluation questions. The inception report and the data collection tools/questions should be approved by the Search DM&E Team and the UNPBF technical team.

**First draft of the evaluation report:** The consultancy firm should submit the first draft of the evaluation report analyzing and integrating both qualitative and quantitative data. The report is subject to Search review. The review and feedback may be of multiple rounds depending on the quality of the report. All the raw data collected and photographs taken during the evaluation should be handed over to Search, Sri Lanka.

**Final evaluation report:** The report should be written (and fully edited) in English (maximum 35 pages), with adequate attention given to presentation of findings and recommendations.

and consist of:

- Title page and other initial pages
- Table of contents
- Executive summary that includes context summary, brief project introduction, methodological approach, key findings, and recommendations
- Current context analysis vis-à-vis the analysis during the baseline period
- Project introduction including the goal, objectives, expected results, summary activities
- Evaluation methodology, detailed explanation of sample size calculation, and distribution across locations, gender, and ethno-religious identity
- Evaluation findings, analysis, and conclusions. The findings section will have subchapters to cover the evaluation criteria and key research questions. This is the core of the evaluation report. Every finding has to be supported by evidence.
- Strategic and activity-focused recommendations. Each recommendation should be directly linked to the evaluation findings.
- Appendices, which include, research instruments, list of interviewees, bibliography, and consultancy firm’s brief biography

The final evaluation report should be approved by the Search and UNPBF technical team.

**Logistical Support**

The consultancy firm will be responsible for organizing their own logistics for data collection (vehicles, fuel, and drivers), and this must be budgeted into the study. No Search staff member will be available to support data collection.
Search and partners will also share the following documents/data with the consultancy firm: background materials including the project proposal and results framework, progress reports, modules/session plans developed for the project, monitoring data contact information of the participating young women leaders, young researchers for contacting them for interview.

6. Ethical Considerations

The consultancy firm must clearly outline key risks of conducting the study and the steps to assure Do No Harm, conflict sensitivity and inclusion principles (ie. gender, age, ethnicity, religion, etc.). In addition, the evaluation will be based on gender and human rights principles and adhere to the UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Code of Conduct.

7. Data Quality Assurance and Management

Proposals submitted must clearly define methods for assuring the data is recorded and stored in a high-quality and ethical manner.

8. Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/output</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction meeting with Search Sri Lanka</td>
<td>24th May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review and submission of the inception report</td>
<td>2nd June 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize the inception report</td>
<td>10th June 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot test to data collection tools</td>
<td>10th June – 16th June 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools modification and translation</td>
<td>17th June – 22nd June 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>22nd June 21st July 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the first draft</td>
<td>6th August 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and resending of the above draft to the consultancy firm</td>
<td>12\textsuperscript{th} August 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the final draft report</td>
<td>18\textsuperscript{th} August 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and resending of the final report with the comments from UNPBF and Search to the consultancy firm</td>
<td>24\textsuperscript{th} August 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the final edited version of the report along with other relevant documents</td>
<td>29\textsuperscript{th} August 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Budget

The total budget available for this study is maximum of Rs. 2.5 Million (approx. 13,000 US$). A detailed budget should be annexed to the submitted proposal, including daily rates for personnel, and costs related to data collection (per the total number of people sampled, sites for collection, etc.), analysis, and production of deliverables. However, priority will be given to a lower budget with higher quality of technical proposal.

9. Requirements of Consultancy firm

This applies to the whole team proposed and NOT the Team Leader only). It is essential that the team includes a Gender specialist along with other required members, as necessary.

- Experience of undertaking project evaluations in conflict transformation and peacebuilding in the last two years and having an excellent understanding of the Sri Lankan conflict context.
- Strong knowledge and experience of gender sensitive analysis and experience.
- Strong understanding gender dynamics and women’s leadership issues and challenges within the Sri Lankan context.
- Demonstrated experience in mixed-method and interdisciplinary approaches, data collection tools (such as survey, KII/IDIs, and FGDs), and analysis techniques (both qualitative and quantitative)
- Knowledge in conflict-sensitive data collection and reporting
- Good analytical and writing skills, and the ability to clearly present findings, draw practical conclusions, and develop lessons learned
- Fluency in English required and the applicant team should have working knowledge in both Sinhala and Tamil languages
- Ability to travel to the field for data collection and cross-checking the data, unless there is travel restrictions
- Ability to meet deadlines and respond to requests and feedback provided timely and appropriately
- Familiarity and experience working with the UN agencies, funds and programmes, as well as the UNPBF, is an advantage;

In addition, the consultancy firm is required to respect the following Ethical Principles:
• **Comprehensive and systematic inquiry:** The consultancy firm should make the most of the existing information and the full range of stakeholders available at the time of the review. The consultancy firm should conduct systematic, data-based inquiries. He or she should communicate his or her methods and approaches accurately and in sufficient detail to allow others to understand, interpret and critique his or her work. He or she should make clear the limitations of the review and its results.

• **Competence:** consultancy firm should possess the abilities and skills and experience appropriate to undertake the tasks proposed and should practice within the limits of his or her professional training and competence.

• **Honesty and integrity:** The consultancy firm should be transparent with the contractor/constituent about any conflict of interest, any change made in the negotiated project plan and the reasons why those changes were made, any risk that certain procedures or activities produce misleading review information.

• **Respect for people:** The consultancy firm respects the security, dignity, and self-worth of respondents, program participants. The consultancy firm has the responsibility to be sensitive to and respect differences amongst participants in culture, religion, gender, disability, age, and ethnicity.

### Selection Criteria

Consultancy firm proposals will be selected for:

1. The relevance and quality of proposed methodology to the goal, objectives, and research questions for the project, conflict sensitivity approaches, and quality control measures.

2. Qualifications of the team members of the consultancy firm. The applicant is expected to propose a team leader, gender specialist, data analyst, and enumerators (number only).

3. The proposed budget in relation to proposed methodology, deliverables, and team.

4. Timeline for proposed activities. Overall time frame for the evaluation will be three months.

### Applications

Interested candidates should send:

a) Short cover letter explaining how the applicant meets the qualifications, experience and skills requirements (no more than 1 page)

b) Detailed technical proposal including a methodology and data collection tools with the justification along with detailed budget-including data collection and analyses, transport, accommodation, etc.

c) Provide up-to-date CV of all team members and their specific roles in the assignment

d) A sample work from previous similar assignment within the last three years

e) Email them to sfcgprocurementsri@sfcg.org by 12th May 2021

Applications/proposals which do not abide or are furnished with the above-mentioned information and documents will be rejected.

Only shortlisted candidates will be contacted for the selection process.
Payment Schedule:
After signing the contract: 30%

After submission of the first draft of the report: 30%

After submission of final report: 40%

Please note that Search Sri Lanka has the sole rights to modify/temporarily stop/terminate the contract based on the donor decision/prevailing COVID-19 situation.

For any inquiry on this combined evaluation you can write to srilanka@sfcg.org with Mohammed Sadaath, msadaath@sfcg.org, in copy.

Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output #</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>140 emerging women leaders selected; two two-day collaborative leadership and common ground approach workshops conducted</td>
<td>By applying the knowledge and skills, the YWLs are collectively involved in identifying the conflict, root causes of the conflict, parties/stakeholders involved and identify the potential entry points for the intervention to resolve the identified conflict. The YWLs designed their intervention based on the issue identified through the conflict assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>One collaborative context assessment conducted per district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>50 experienced women leaders selected; one training on coaching and mentoring organized</td>
<td>The YWLs who participated in the conflict assessment implemented suitable initiatives relevant to the context/conflict with the financial inputs from the project. The implemented initiatives were supported through the mentoring of trained experienced women leaders. The YWLs assessed the changes of small grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Small grants per district disbursed and reported on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Mentorship sessions conducted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Cross-district networking and exchange visits organized each engaging 10 participants from each district initiatives based on their own change matrix.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>One learning paper developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>One national-level final workshop conducted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enhance the understanding and awareness among policy makers and authorities by sharing experience and learning of small grant initiatives on the positive role of young women leaders played in small grant initiatives in the communities. Enabled the network and future partnership with particular stakeholders and this means to be an important capstone to the whole project.