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Executive Summary

Background:

The Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA) conducted the final evaluation of the project “WILL – Women in Learning and Leadership: Strengthening Women’s Voice and Participation in Political Decision-Making in Sri Lanka” which was implemented by Search for Common Ground (Search) and funded by the European Union. The project was conceptualised with the aim of strengthening women’s voice and participation in political decision-making in Sri Lanka, in partnership with the Federation of Sri Lankan Local Government Authorities (FSLGA), the Affected Women Forum (AWF) from Akkaraipattu in Ampara, the Women’s Resource Centre (WRC) from Kurunegala and the Women Development Centre from Jaffna and Women’s Development Centre from Badulla. The project was implemented with two key objectives; to strengthen women’s voice and participation in political and civic life and to involve the media in the transformative process. In fulfilling these objectives, activities under three clusters were implemented: capacity building and networking and advocacy for women leaders and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs); collaboration between women political leaders and local communities to develop response strategies to constituents’ needs; and media engagement.¹

Objectives of Evaluation:

The final evaluation was carried out to assess:

- The relevance of the theory of change and project design.
- The project’s contribution to achieve the objectives as defined in the project logframe and the progress markers of the outcome mapping process.
- The immediate impact of the project and longer-term results that are likely to emerge from the project’s achievements.
- The sustainability of the project’s outcomes/impact.
- To draw lessons learned from the project to use this to inform future programme designs and potentially follow up phases.

The project has also built in a gender lens to assess how intersectional identities of women political leaders were considered and how well these were addressed through the project’s activities.

Methodology:

The evaluation used both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis. Key Person Interviews (KPIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were conducted in all four districts (Ampara, Badulla, Jaffna, and Kurunegala) where the project was implemented. A survey was also carried out to complement the qualitative methods. A desk review of project documents has also informed the analysis. The qualitative data was analysed using a thematic content analysis method, and the quantitative data was analysed using a

descriptive statistical analysis method. Both qualitative and quantitative data have been triangulated and presented in a manner that ensures robustness.

Findings:

Relevance

The project was largely relevant to the local context in which it was implemented as it directly aligned with the political realities of the time. Similarly, it addressed the priorities of beneficiaries, as well as skills gaps by way of capacitating Elected Women Leaders (EWLs) and women leaders of Civil Society Organisations (CSOLs) on various fronts, which are highlighted in detail in the report. However, some of the assumptions (about EWLs and CSOLs) upon which the project was implemented were found to be incorrect by the beneficiaries. These assumptions related chiefly to EWLs having similar financial resources and enough time to engage in politics. In relation to the latter, the EWLs emphasised that the added responsibility of household chores, coupled with the non-consideration of plausible assumptions - such as how party politics may affect or impede cohesion between EWLs - affected the project’s relevance. On a positive note, the project adapted to external shocks created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and maintained its relevance throughout its duration. The project was also successful in creating community and ground-level engagement between local councils and community members.

Effectiveness

The project increased and enhanced the capacities of both EWLs and CSOLs in collaborative leadership, financial literacy, proposal formulation, public speaking, and networking, by incorporating scorecards and needs assessments when working with community members. The scorecard activity, while not fully completed, has proved to be effective in creating an opportunity for EWLs and CSOLs to work together, as well as for introducing the value of feedback and accountability. However, the inability to create meaningful cooperation between CSOLs and EWLs was seen as a challenge to achieving results. According to CSOLs in Kurunegala, the EWLs proceeded to work on their own after getting help from CSOLs to conduct the scorecard activity, which led to a division between the two groups. While CSOLs in other districts are trying to leave their differences behind, their faith in the EWLs has not been restored completely. These tense feelings were seen to be reciprocal and negatively affected the collaboration. The effectiveness of the training could be seen through the sensitising of male journalists on gendered reporting. The sensitivity of project implementers and trainers and their competence ensured that the project was effective.

The change in modalities (from onsite to online) ensured that the effectiveness of project activities was maintained throughout. While the visibility gained through journalists was positive (with a new gender sensitised approach to reporting), the social media campaign lacked traction which limited the project’s visibility. The lack of organic reach of the social media campaign, the absence in cross-posting between the Vote Women SL page and Search’s main page, and challenges in relation to the lack of time to carry out the social media campaign were identified as reasons for this lack of traction.
Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment

In evaluating “measurable changes” in gender equality and empowerment, the evaluation team relied on FGDs, KPIs, and survey results, for there was no formal framework in place to measure such changes. The qualitative data shows that there is a noticeable increase in levels of confidence and empowerment amongst EWLs as they are now more forward, vocal, and present during council proceedings. This was achieved mainly through the training on gender sensitivity and political literacy.

Gender sensitised male journalists could also be seen as a factor in paving the way for gender equality. However, creating a meaningful approach to gender equality was hampered by the absence of male counterparts of EWLs within the project. The beneficiaries themselves expressed their concerns at the absence of men in the activities and its negative impact on gender equality. Whilst the project took steps towards empowering women, the structural (patriarchal) constraints in different regions proved to be obstacles to women’s empowerment and gender equality.

The cultural and religious sensitivity of the trainers ensured non-discrimination within the training and helped impart the same attitudes to the trainees as well, except one instance wherein a trainer was perceived to be insensitive to gender and its iterations. There were also instances of discrimination when EWLs who were directly elected to the local council discriminated against those who were elected through the quota system. Moreover, discriminatory ideas regarding socially marginalised individuals (queer individuals and individuals with disabilities) were evident amongst some stakeholders, as they expressed that socially marginalised individuals did not have a place in the project due to lack of capacities or cultural perceptions about them. The beneficiaries also revealed that the project’s expectations and approaches to transformation of how gender is perceived and performed by the beneficiaries were too grand; such comments were especially made in relation to the exclusion of elected male officials and the prevalent patriarchal/structural constraints in the local regions.

Efficiency

There has been no revision in the total grant amount and the project managed to make large savings of EUR 37,832. These savings and the contingency amount of EUR 5,427 were effectively repurposed in augmenting personal costs, managing increased training costs, increasing allocations for sub-grant schemes, and reallocating funds for effective participation by the beneficiaries. All the project partners agreed that the project’s funds had been properly and adequately managed. The EWLs, CSOLs, and journalists’ capacities were increased sufficiently to achieve the expected results and objectives of the project. While the trainers involved in the project were largely praised by the beneficiaries for having changed the training material to suit the needs and capacities of different members, the beneficiaries were not satisfied with the way in which the scorecard activity was conducted, for they found the material to be too complicated and tedious. Overall, the capacity of trainers, district partners and the project team (Search) was adequate to achieve the project results, and the support received from the project team (material and human resource support) was praised by stakeholders.
Impact
The project has contributed in promoting processes of self-actualisation, self-confidence, and self-worth amongst the EWLs, as they are now more capable within their roles. The project’s decision to continue WILL Clubs has also led to its sustained activity beyond the project’s life cycle. The gender sensitivity training given to male journalists has also positively impacted the EWLs. In addition, the EWLs and CSOLs now seem to be more attuned to the needs of their communities, especially those of women (for instance, issues of sexual and gender-based violence). However, the direct impact of the project on community members could have been better if the scorecard activity was implemented when planned, and the EWLs had the financial resources to implement their proposals, thus creating a positive impact in the community.

Sustainability
There is a likelihood that the project’s initiatives will be sustained beyond its life cycle through the networks established between CSOLs, EWLs, and journalists, the creation of WILL Clubs, and the knowledge and skills gained by the beneficiaries. Regarding long-term improvement of outcomes generated through the project’s interventions, the beneficiaries were sceptical, and their conception of was shaped by the failure to complete the scorecard activity. Divisions created by party politics could be another factor impacting the sustainability of the project’s outcomes. The beneficiaries stated that continued engagement with the project or one of a similar nature would be necessary to continue with their work as EWLs and to receive further training for capacity building. The WhatsApp groups consisting of different beneficiaries can also be seen as method of ensuring the sustainability of the project’s initiatives. The lack of youth involvement in the project was seen as an obstacle to achieving sustainability, as the project’s outcomes need to be carried on by CSOLs and EWLs, who are also closer to retirement age.

Good Practices, Challenges and Lessons Learnt
The beneficiaries identified the networks created between them through the WILL Clubs as good practices, as the networks would be an aid to further capacity building and fulfilling their duty towards members of the community. The training and learnings were also appreciated as they had enhanced their abilities to function as EWLs and CSOLs. The beneficiaries also commented the participatory approach adopted by the trainers as it ensured that individuals could benefit from the training at their own pace without being left behind.

The project faced many challenges in terms of implementing the Community Accountability Tool due to constraints in the project timeline. The inability to complete the community scorecard activity and implement the EWL’s proposals was also seen as a waste of effort by many beneficiaries, although they did appreciate the learnings achieved from it. The divisions created by party politics amongst beneficiaries, and the lack of timely identification of further learning and training opportunities were also presented as challenges for the smooth implementation of the project.
Overall Conclusions

The findings revealed that the many of the successes of the project could be attributed to the increased capacities of the EWLs and CSOLs through training on project proposal writing, gender sensitivity, greater familiarity with the Local Council Act, collaborative leadership, and media engagement. The project’s relevance and effectiveness was mainly seen through the increasing confidence displayed by EWLs when speaking at council proceedings, the informed interaction with community members, and the networks created between the CSOLs, EWLs and journalists and their approach to work which incorporated the gender sensitivity training. Instances of gender mainstreaming and direct impacts was seen in the EWLs’ processes of self-actualisation and increased levels of empowerment as women and professionals. The newly formed networks and the WILL Clubs have also greatly benefitted the project by allowing it to sustain the achieved outcomes beyond its natural life cycle.

Recommendations

- Organise Interventions targeted at potential candidates and aspiring women political leaders so that they are equipped with knowledge, skills, and self-confidence to enter into the council. Creating opportunities to increase the fiscal management skills of the EWL’s will further empower other women in defying barriers at future elections.
- Actively involve those from socially marginalised communities (including persons with disabilities and LGBTQI+ communities) so that they too are empowered and encouraged to enter into politics.
- Include male counterparts in some components of the project (just as male journalists were included) to ensure that at least the mindset of some can be changed in order to facilitate a conducive environment for women political leaders. Similarly, build capacities of the male counterparts of EWLs in financial and political literacy, whilst training them on gender sensitivity to improve gender equality.
- Factor in party politics at the design stage so that the project could build in activities to create awareness and address the divisions from the onset.
- Account for different educational levels of the beneficiaries and provide foundational trainings when and if necessary.
- Introduce the Community Scorecard activity in similar projects in the future, with better planning for implementation in place.
- Design activities such as team building to ensure better coordination between EWLs and members of CSOs, and strengthen the relationship and networks between them.
- Include a formal gender responsive framework to measure gender equality and empowerment. For instance, the UN Women’s Gender Results Effectiveness Scale (GRES).
- Build the social media campaign from the onset of the project and have a clear social media strategy.
- Formally register WILL Clubs as associations and build it into similar projects, in order to further ensure sustainability of project outcomes.
• Ensure that future projects have a longer implementation period so that activities could be completed to benefit communities, as well as ensure that mechanisms such as the Community Scorecard can be established.

• Implementing a Training of Trainers (TOT) element so that EWLs themselves can support and provide capacity development and other training to new EWLs.
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1. Background Information

- **Project title:** WILL – Women in Learning and Leadership: Strengthening Women's Voice and Participation in Political Decision-Making in Sri Lanka
- **Donor:** European Union
- **Length of project:** 2 years and 6 months (including a 6-month extension)
- **Geographic locations of the project:** Ampara, Badulla, Jaffna, Kurunagala
- **Overall objective (goal) of the project:** Strengthen Sri Lankan women’s voices and participation to positively influence political decision-making processes
- **Specific objectives of the project:**
  - 1) to strengthen women’s voice and participation in political and civic life, and
  - 2) to involve the media in the transformative process, in particular by challenging stereotypes.
- **Expected results of the project:**
  - (O1.1) Local women led Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and locally elected women have enhanced knowledge and skills in non-adversarial advocacy, positive leadership, and networking, to create opportunities to engage with local and national government actors around issues relevant to their local constituencies.
  - (O1.2) Women political leaders and local communities have strengthened their collaboration to understand the needs of their constituencies and develop response strategies.
  - (O1.3) Local media actors have increased capacity and engagement to challenge negative stereotypes and enable positive attitudes towards women’s roles in decision-making
- **Groups targeted in the project:** Elected Women Leaders (EWLs), Civil Society Women Leaders, and Journalists
- **Major activities that are planned:**
  - **Activity stream 1:** capacity building and networking and advocacy for women leaders and CSOs.
  - **Activity stream 2:** collaboration between women political leaders and local communities to develop response strategies to constituents’ needs.
  - **Activity stream 3:** media engagement.

1.1. Introduction

The Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA) conducted the final evaluation of the project “WILL – Women in Learning and Leadership: Strengthening Women’s Voice and Participation in Political Decision-Making in Sri Lanka” implemented by Search for Common Ground (Search). This report presents the findings of the evaluation which assessed the following components: the project design and its relevance for the context in which the project was conducted; whether the needs of the beneficiaries were sufficiently addressed by the project activities; the effectiveness and efficiency with which the intended project outcomes were achieved; the impact created by the project in terms of the immediate effects of the project, effects which can be predicted in the long run, and both intended and unintended outcomes and results; and the likelihood of the
outcomes to sustain themselves. Moreover, a focused gender lens was used to identify the project’s impact on gender equality, women’s empowerment, and non-discrimination. The report also presents the best practices, challenges and lessons learnt during the implementation of the project and makes recommendations for future interventions of this nature.

The evaluation was conducted between July and September 2022. CEPA adopted a mixed methods approach; both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis were used to conduct the evaluation. Key Person Interviews (KPIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were conducted in the four districts in which the project was implemented; Ampara, Badulla, Jaffna and Kurunagala. In complementing these qualitative methods, a survey was carried out with the Elected Women Leaders (EWLs) and women Civil Society Organisation Leaders (CSOLs) who participated in the project. This evaluation is also informed by a desk review of the project documentation.

1.2. Project Overview

The project implemented from January 2020 to July 2022 (including a 6-month extension) by Search was funded by the European Union under its ‘Enhancing Community Service Organisations’ Contribution to Governance and Development Process in Sri Lanka’ programme. The theory of change that underpins the project assumes that “if local women CSO leaders and locally elected women leaders increase their capacity to participate in decision-making in a way that is more accountable to their local constituencies; if elected women leaders enhance their collaboration with their local communities; if the local media actors increase their capacity to challenge negative stereotypes and enable positive attitudes towards women’s role in decision making; and if the public is aware of the positive role women can play in policy decision-making and democratic processes, then local women organisations and locally elected women leaders can improve their effective participation in local policy decision making and in the overall democratic processes.” Based on these assumptions, the project was designed through a consultative process with key stakeholders involved, including the Federation of Sri Lankan Local Government Authorities (FSLGA), and elected women leaders who were involved in previous projects. The project was implemented in partnership with the FSLGA, Affected Women’s Forum (AWF) from Akkaraipattu in Ampara, Women’s Resource Centre (WRC) from Kurunegala, Women Development Centre from Jaffna and Women’s Development Centre from Badulla. The project was implemented with two key objectives in mind:

1. To strengthen women’s voice and participation in political and civic life;
2. To involve the media in the transformative process, in particular by challenging stereotypes.

The programme sought to strengthen the participation of women led CSOs and elected women leaders (EWLs) in political decision making by way of capacity building, networking, community dialogues, and positive media portrayals. To this end, 160-200 elected women leaders (EWLs) from selected local authorities from the four target districts of Jaffna, Ampara, Kurunegala, and Badulla were chosen. Apart from the target

---

2 From the Project Document - Annex A.2 – Grant Application Form – Full Application
group. 50-60 members of CSO referred to as CSO leaders in the project (CSOLs) from the selected districts also directly benefited from the project. To fulfil the second objective of the project, 45-55 local journalists (mainly male) were included in the project to function as allies to the elected women leaders. To achieve the earlier mentioned objectives of the project, Search implemented the activities grouped in the following three clusters (please see Annex 1 for a table containing full details of activities):

1. Activity Stream 1: Capacity building and networking and advocacy for women leaders and CSOs.
2. Activity Stream 2: Collaboration between women political leaders and local communities to develop response strategies to constituents’ needs; and

Activity Stream 1 included components such as training women CSO members in professional development, providing sub-grants to women’s CSOs (district partners of the project) to ensure sustainability, forming Women in Learning and Leadership Clubs (WILL Clubs), and advocacy and networking activities with a view of building capacity. Activity Stream 2 included EWL–led Needs Assessment and Resource Mappings. Activity Stream 3 focused on capacity building in media engagement through the provision of media fellowship opportunities, conducting roundtables between local journalists and women leaders, radio productions, social media campaigns, and gender sensitive training for journalists.

1.3. Context Analysis

Sri Lanka is still very much a patriarchal society with heteropatriarchal values entrenched within many facets of society and its functioning. The notions that men are superior to women and that gender and sexuality are limited to cisgender heterosexuality are still prevalent within society, and most citizens operate with these negatively impacted norms internalised within them. Such norms are further normalised and reinforced through processes of socialisation from a young age; and is particularly observed within the education system which continues to reinforce the idea that boys are stronger than, and superior to girls. These societal norms of gender are further reinforced and espoused through the institutional set up of the country whereby the legislation and judiciary exert control over women and their corporeality through laws and policies which govern their autonomy, right to land, inheritance, marriage and divorce and reproductive rights, among many other facets. This reinforces the perspective that women from a young age are required by society to prioritise the needs of others first, especially that of men. Thus, shrinking the space available for women to put themselves and their needs first and empower themselves as well as other women and minorities. This cis–male–first approach goes beyond the culture and traditions of the country and is reflected within processes of governance and legislature as well. Although the 1978 constitution guarantees fundamental rights for and non–discrimination towards women, Sri Lanka is yet to pass the Women’s Rights Bill. Even though international conventions put in place are ratified to ensure rights of women, such as the Convention on the Elimination of

---

4 Ibid.
All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), they are not yet incorporated into the national legislation. In addition to the alarming lack of political representation by women, the submission by NGOs to the CEDAW Committee Review of Sri Lanka (2015) outlines specific instances of prejudice and discrimination perpetuated against women in politics by their male counterparts. Both these factors contribute to the larger issue, namely that issues concerning women are not raised at decision making levels as there is an inadequate representation of women to raise these issues, and men at legislative levels are not sensitised to the concerns of women. This has resulted in a deprioritising of matters pertaining to discrimination against women, and is a key motivation behind efforts of facilitating and capacitating women’s political participation in Sri Lanka. The lack of female representation has only exacerbated further with a continued decline in women’s political participation and the removal of key cabinet level portfolios dedicated to the subjects pertaining to women and children in recent years.

Although provisions are made to ensure equality for women and increased women’s participation within civic and political spaces, the proposed and adopted measures have not achieved any significant changes thus far. Despite representing 52 percent of the total population in the country, political participation, and representation of women in political institutions has remained significantly low in the years since Sri Lanka achieved independence, with little change even since the end of the armed conflict in 2009. In 2020, only 5.3% (12 out of 225 legislators) in the Sri Lankan parliament were women. In a move widely lauded as regressive, the cabinet ministry portfolio on the subject of women and children was relegated to a state level portfolio without stand-alone status. In an effort to address this inequity, in 2016, an amendment to the Local Authorities Election Act introduced a 25 percent mandatory quota for women to enter local government which saw an increase in female representation in the next local government election (in 2018) from 89 to 2300 women. Despite the gender quota introduced in 2016 at the local government level, its effectiveness cannot be fully measured unless the structural and societal barriers to political participation for women are understood and addressed. A report for the Ministry of Child Development and Women’s Empowerment and the United Nations Development Programme, identified that fewer women choose a career in politics due to socio-cultural, and psychological barriers; patronage networks; and economic/financial limitations. Despite the quota system being in place, the International Foundation for Electoral Systems determines that Sri Lanka continues to face serious barriers to political representation and the country continues to record among the

---


lowest in the world for the percentage of women in national legislatures. Supporting this statement, the report cites that the most recent parliamentary elections held in 2020 resulted in just over 5 percent of elected women representatives being elected to parliament. The report identifies that electoral system structure, political party frameworks, weak political finance regulations, discrimination in the media, and violence against women in elections (VAWE) continue to act as barriers to entry despite the quota system being in place. The combination of these factors reiterates the need to ensure that women who do choose politics or leadership positions have the necessary skills and capacities required to lobby for their desired positions, and once recognised, are able to operate within a context that is gender-responsive to ensure continued engagement. Improved gender equality in decision making contexts has the potential to create ripple effects and benefits for all. Studies have also shown that female politicians are more likely to favour spending on health, unemployment, and social security than their male counterparts, which reduces gender inequalities. Similarly, women political leaders in villages were more likely to invest in priorities for women, like drinking water and road improvement, for they understand and share similar experiences, reiterating the value of elected women officials.

The opportunity for change in roles and responsibilities for women within a deeply patriarchal society comes with its own challenges in terms of navigating multiple burdens and exploitative conditions. It is equally important to keep in mind that in decision-making capacities, women are not a homogenous group, rather, they have distinct needs and experience unique challenges which need to be recognised and addressed, depending on their social and cultural context. An overwhelming emphasis in both gender studies and gender-based advocacy in Sri Lanka thus far has been focused on women. It is, however, recognised through evidence conducted globally that any attempts to improve gender equality through the empowerment of women socially, economically, and politically is not sustainable without the full and meaningful participation of men and boys (Connell, 2005) as partners and allies. Another force of transformative progress to this end, is the media. This was rightly identified by this project, as the media was included in strengthening women’s participation in civic and political spaces. As the Frankfurt School argues, the media functions as a means for the popular culture to transmit ideological messaging vis-à-vis the culture industries, and although the audiences are not passive as the Frankfurt School claims to be, the media often relies on images and narratives which either contest or reproduce the dominant discourse and ideologies, instances of the latter

---


13 Ibid.


16 Refer footnote 14.

being more frequent.\textsuperscript{18} The dominant ideology which governs gender and gendered relations, i.e., heteropatriarchy, can then be reproduced within the media as well. This can be addressed through a critical approach to media and media literacy, whereby journalists can be given the capacity to question the \textit{neutrality} and \textit{normalcy} of their work.\textsuperscript{19} It is within this context that the WILL project was designed and implemented with the overall aim of strengthening Sri Lankan women's voices in political decision-making at all levels.


\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
2. Methodology

2.1. Objectives of the Evaluation

The evaluation was carried out to assess the project using chosen OECD-DAC criteria\(^{20}\) and additional criteria agreed upon with Search:

1. **Relevance** – The relevance of the theory of change and project design as well as the relevance of the Project intervention in the local context.
2. **Effectiveness** – To assess the project contribution to achieve the objectives as defined in the project logframe and the progress markers of the outcome mapping process.
3. **Efficiency** – The efficiency of resource use.
4. **Impact** – To assess the immediate impact of the project including what longer-term (intended and unintended) results are likely to emerge from the project’s achievements.
5. **Sustainability** – The sustainability of the project’s outcomes.
6. **Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination** – How intersectional identities of women political leaders were considered and how well these were addressed through the project’s activities, in addition to determining how the project responded to existing barriers to the participation of women in political decision-making.
7. **Good Practices, Challenges and Lessons Learned** – To draw lessons learned from the project and use them to inform future programme designs and potential follow up phases.

The evaluation questions were developed based on the key areas indicated above (and in the TOR). The table in Annex 2 provides the evaluation matrix containing the evaluation questions, the details of the methods of data collection and the data sources for each (sub)evaluation question.

**Target Zones** – The evaluation was conducted in the locations where the project was implemented: Ampara, Badulla, Jaffna and Kurunagala, and with stakeholders based in Colombo.

**Timeframe** – The evaluation was conducted from June 2022 to September 2022.

2.2. Data Collection

**Method** – A mixed methods approach was utilised to carry out the evaluation combining qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. Four main data collection tools were used for the evaluation:

**Data Collection Activities and Target Groups:**

1. Desk review of the project documents and other relevant reports and material.

---

2. KPIs with identified stakeholders including the project team, donor, leadership of partner CSOs, consultants and trainers involved in the project.

3. FGDs with elected women leaders, members of CSO organisations, community members (constituents) from each of the four districts and journalists trained through the project.

4. A survey conducted with elected women leaders and members of CSO organisations.

The discussions that took place during KPIs and FGDs supplement the initial knowledge gained from reviewing the project documents, by delving into the experiences, needs, impacts, and sustainability of the project interventions, to determine if changes have occurred with regard to effective political participation and decision-making among women leaders. The participants provided valuable insights to the evaluators, which helped determine the lessons learnt and draw up recommendations for improvement that can be incorporated in future interventions.

2.2.1. Desk Review

A review of the existing project documents were conducted prior to developing the data collection tools and submitting the inception report. The documents reviewed included the grant application, log frame, interim report, quarterly progress reports of CSO partners, activity documents, communications, research, training material, financial report and baseline survey data and reports. A further literature review on the subject matter was also conducted and informed the context analysis section. For a full list of documents reviewed see Annex 3. The evaluators also drew information and experiences from previous similar studies and assessments, and institutional knowledge, and understanding of the subject to further contextualise and build upon the analysis.

2.2.2. Key Person Interviews (KPIs)

Seventeen semi-structured interviews were conducted with the following groups of stakeholders:

- Key project personnel and leadership of Search Sri Lanka.
- A representative from the European Union.
- Leadership of partner CSOs: Federation of Sri Lankan Local Government Authorities (FSLGA), Affected Women Forum (AWF) – Ampara, Women’s Resource Centre (WRC) – Kurunagala, Women’s Development Centre (WDC) Jaffna and Badulla.
- Consultants and Trainers.

The table below gives a breakdown of the number of interviews conducted:
### Table 1: Number of interviews conducted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPI Type</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultants and Trainers</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Kurunagala, Ampara, Jaffna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Team</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total no. of KPIs</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Annex 4 for the full list of stakeholders interviewed.

### 2.2.3. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)

11 FGDs were conducted across the four districts where the project was implemented with EWLs, CSOLs and community members involved in the needs assessment component of the project. Two online FGDs were conducted with journalists who were involved in the project. The composition of the FGDs were as follows:

### Table 2: Composition of FGDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of FGD Participants</th>
<th>District/Language</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EWLs</td>
<td>Ampara/Tamil</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Badulla/Sinhala</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaffna/Tamil</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kurunegala/Sinhala</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO Members</td>
<td>Ampara/Tamil</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Badulla/Sinhala</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaffna/Tamil</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kurunegala/Sinhala</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituents</td>
<td>Ampara/Tamil</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Badulla/Sinhala</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 The district partner from Badulla was not reachable for an interview, however the FGDs conducted in Badulla with EWLs and CSOLs makes up for the lack of this specific interview.
The EWLs and CSO members who participated in the FGDs were selected by CSO partners in the four districts. The constituents were invited by EWLs to participate in the FGDs. The journalists who participated in the FGDs were selected by the evaluators representing a mix across district, language and type of media outlet they work for (see Annex 3 for FGD participant list). The data collected from the FGDs were used to validate as well as to complement the survey data.

### 2.2.4. Self-Administered Survey

The self-administered survey entailed a link shared to the survey that the beneficiaries were initially supposed to complete themselves. However, since the response was low, enumerators were trained to conduct the survey over the phone. The following is a breakdown of the number of responses from the survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Composition of the survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of persons called</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of respondents refusing to take part in the survey</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of respondents consenting to be surveyed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of EWLs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of CSOLs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EWLs by District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSOLs by District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badulla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaffna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurunegala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWLs by Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinhala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs by Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinhala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demographic details of survey respondents can be found in Annex 7.

**Sampling**: The minimum samples were arrived at based on the respective population size of 160 EWLs and 65-70 CSO members, confidence interval of 95%, and a margin of error of 5%.

\[
n' \equiv \frac{n}{1 + \frac{z^2 + \hat{p}(1 - \hat{p})}{2^2n}}
\]

Based on this calculation, and for the analysis to be statistically significant, it was necessary to capture a minimum of 113 EWLs and 40 CSO members via the proposed quantitative component of the evaluation.

**Implementation of the survey**: The data was collected virtually using KoBoToolbox. The survey tools were translated into local languages and subsequently digitised through KoBoToolbox. In-built validation techniques and automated error checks in KoBoToolbox ensured minimum errors in data collection and minimum data loss, and was faster and easier to track and analyse.

**Data Collection Tools** – The data collection tools (see annex 8 and 9) were developed by the evaluation team after the desk review was conducted during the inception stage. It was further refined after feedback from Search was received. The tools were translated into Sinhala and Tamil.

---

22 KoBoToolbox is a field-tested platform that allows the collection of high-quality data using mobile phones, tablets, or computers. It is a software that CEPA frequently uses.
2.3. Data Analysis

Qualitative Data Analysis

All data collected was cleaned and analysed using the thematic content analysis method, where major categories and themes for coding were developed based on the larger categories of the evaluation criteria and broken down into sub-categories along the evaluation questions.

All qualitative tools and the data collected (through FGDs and KPIs), took the form of notes of the meetings. These were not necessarily transcripts but extensive notes that captured the nuances and the key aspects of the discussions. These were cleaned (i.e., double-checked for accuracy and gaps) and thereafter anonymised. Interviews conducted in Sinhala and Tamil were translated to English prior to the analysis.

Quantitative Data Analysis

The survey tools were developed as an extension to the baseline survey conducted in 2020 to analyse temporal changes that have taken place ex-ante and ex-post. Quantitative databases were signed off by competent staff to ensure completeness of the data and its adequacy for data analysis. Data was cleaned prior to analysis and descriptive statistical analyses were generated subsequently using the STATA statistical package. The Technical Advisor cross-checked the information for greater accuracy. The data bases were anonymised to ensure confidentiality of data collected and to ensure respondent safety.

2.4. Evaluation Team

Lead Evaluator – Natasha Palansuriya (Senior Research Professional at CEPA): Natasha gave oversight to the entire research/evaluation process and was involved in all aspects from designing data collection tools, data collection, qualitative data analysis and writing reports.

Qualitative Research Team –

- Thamindri Aluvihare (Senior Research Professional at CEPA): involved in designing data collection tools, conducting KPIs in English and Sinhala, qualitative data analysis and writing.
- Shaneendra Amarasinghe (Junior Research Professional at CEPA): involved in designing data collection tools, conducting KPIs and FGDs in English and Sinhala, qualitative data analysis and writing.
- Minuri Perera (Junior Research Professional at CEPA): involved in conducting FGDs in Sinhala.
- Imam Adnan (Research Assistant): Involved in conducting FGDs in Tamil.
- Kugan Tharshini (Research Assistant): Involved in assisting in conducting Tamil FGDs and note taking.
- Arapy Umashankar (Research Intern): Assisting in conducting English and Tamil KPIs and note taking and transcribing all interviews.
Quantitative Research Team –

- Minuri Perera (Junior Research Professional at CEPA): Developing survey tool, digitising and implementing quantitative data analysis, writing and presentation of quantitative data.
- K Romeshun (Advisor; External Consultant): Gave oversight to and reviewed quantitative data collection tools and analysis, and presentation of data.
- Achinthya Kalinga, Nadeesha Indumali, Annsista Reginald (Enumerators): conducted the survey over the phone in Sinhala and Tamil.

Gender was considered in the composition of the team; for FGDs, in particular, where a female was always present amongst the team so that the women beneficiaries would feel comfortable talking about sensitive issues. Similarly, language proficiency was considered, so that data collection could be conducted in the local languages, which the beneficiaries and stakeholders preferred, and in order to obtain the best quality data.

2.5. Limitations

Access to self-administered surveys – Challenges were faced when sharing the self-administered surveys online with the respondents. Connectivity issues experienced during the baseline survey may have exacerbated amidst the concurrent energy crisis, as a result constraining beneficiaries’ access to the self-administered survey. Since the self-administered survey did not reach the targeted number, four enumerators were trained to conduct the survey over the phone. Another limitation that was also observed with regards to the survey was that respondents tended to overstate their answers due to the nature of the survey being perception based. This limitation was addressed by triangulating with secondary data available with Search.

Drawing generalisations from qualitative data: it is cautioned that qualitative data is not generalisable. However, the depth of the data collected through the qualitative data collection tools was used constructively in the evaluation, and the quantitative data collected through the survey validates and complements the qualitative data where possible. The validity of the collected data and their subsequent analysis was further ensured through processes of triangulation (taking into consideration the findings of KPIs, FGDs, and the survey, and presenting findings to the Search team) and reflexivity on the evaluators’ part.

2.6. Ethics and Quality Assurance

2.6.1. Conflict Sensitivity

Since the evaluation was conducted in a conflict-affected context which also has ongoing political tensions, and since the topic itself is politically sensitive, the evaluation used a conflict sensitive approach (do-no-harm approach) from the onset, i.e. from the inception stage to data collection and analysis, and finally the reporting stage. This approach ensured that the evaluators understood the context within which they were operating.
and were sensitive to the local context in language and behaviour, in order to minimise negative impacts and maximise the positive impacts\(^{23}\) of the evaluators’ presence in the said localities.

2.6.2. Confidentiality

The importance of anonymity and confidentiality was emphasised before beginning the data collection process. Although the FGDs and KPIs were recorded, the data was anonymised. All raw notes and recordings have been stored separately and securely, and the recordings were deleted after the evaluation was completed. The databases of quantitative data were anonymised to ensure confidentiality of data collected and to ensure respondent safety. When presenting the data only the participants designation/organisation/location has been used in order to maintain anonymity in the report.

2.6.3. Informed Voluntary Consent

Complete information on the purpose of the evaluation and how the data will be used was explained to participants, and their verbal consent was ensured before proceeding with interviews and FGDs.

The survey included a section clarifying the purpose of the evaluation and how data will be used prior to displaying the question. The next question was on whether participants would like to continue with the survey. The answers to the question determined whether the survey was continued over the phone or not.

2.6.4. Right to refuse or withdraw at any time

The participants had the right to refuse and withdraw from participating in the evaluation at any time.

2.6.5. Quality Assurance

CEPA has an established Research Quality and Learning (RQL) process which was adapted to suit the needs of this assignment. This has ensured that the quality standards required by Search were met in producing the outputs. CEPA’s detailed RQL guideline can be accessed here. Based on these guidelines, CEPA ensured compliance with quality assurance measures at multiple levels in the process of carrying out the evaluation as follows:

*Design and methodology:* CEPA provided a clear explanation of the methods and tools used including the rationale for the methodological choices in the Inception Report which was approved by Search. Constraints and limitations were made explicit (including limitations applying to interpretations and extrapolations; robustness of data sources, etc.).

*Reliability/quality of data:* For primary data collected, trial runs were done to check the indicators and tools for suitability. CEPA ensured that the primary data is of good quality by having experienced staff members

collect the data. They supervised, trained, and worked closely with the Research Assistants who assisted in collecting the data. The data was collected in local languages to ensure better data quality. For the survey, enumerators were trained and supervised to collect the data over the phone. CEPA staff conducted spot checks and call backs to check on whether the enumerators had been in touch. The data was also triangulated to ensure robustness of data.

*Analysis and reporting of findings*: The conceptual frame (evaluation matrix) set up for the study guided the data management and analysis. The team consisted of both qualitative and quantitative researchers who could carry out internal checks and quality reviews on the framework, the data generation, management, and interpretation. The final report was internally reviewed prior to the review conducted by Search. The information has been proofed and checked for readability and overall flow.
3. Evaluation Findings

3.1. Relevance

| EQ 1.1 To what extent do the assumptions which guided the project design hold up to date? If not – how has the change in the assumptions impacted the realisation of results? |

Validity of Theory of Change

The assumptions that guided the project design were valid in the specific political context and timeline (immediately following Local Government elections), specifically in relation to the theory of change. These assumptions assumed that if women increase their capacity to participate in decision making, and increase their collaboration with local communities, CSO and media actors, and if media actors openly challenge negative stereotypes and focus on the positive aspects of women in politics, and the public are aware of the role of EWLs, then local women organisations and locally elected women leaders can improve their effective participation in local policy decision-making and in the overall democratic processes. These assumptions, made through the theory of change, led to the improvement in how the EWLs engage in their political careers, specifically in relation to self-actualisation. However, the project would have benefitted from incorporating some additional overarching assumptions at the design stage. This would have allowed the project to more effectively address some of the wider issues in the domain of Women in Politics. Some of these gaps are discussed below.

Assumptions Regarding Barriers to the Entry into Politics

The assumptions made in relation to the beneficiaries were limited to EWLs. From a project design point of view, the implementers had not taken into consideration the barriers to entry. As elaborated in the context analysis, despite the quota system being in place, barriers to entry continue to severely impede women’s political participation. As per the report for the Ministry of Child Development and Women’s Empowerment and the United Nations Development Programme, socio-cultural and psychological barriers, as well as patronage networks and financial limitations impede women’s political participation. This exclusion of a set of assumptions may have also led to the exclusion of young women who intend to actively participate in politics but are unable due to structural and cultural barriers to entry, and was reflected in the lack of young women participating in the programme. Including these barriers in the assumption would have created an opportunity to increase the capacity of EWL’s with fiscal management skills and also empower others in defying similar barriers.

---

24 The political and security situation in Ampara, Jaffna, Badulla, and Kurunegala remains favourable enough to allow implementation of project activities; Participants are able to travel from their homes to the locations where the activities take place; Women remain committed to the action and do not decide to discontinue their participation or drop out permanently; Women have time and energy to engage in political life in addition to their existing family, household and income generating activities; Women who run as political candidates for elected posts have similar financial resources at their disposal for running a campaign; There is no opposition from conservative community leaders to the participation of women in this action; Elected women leaders are interested to further their knowledge and skills in order to better serve their constituents and through this profile themselves as effective leaders to the general public; Men and women are willing to listen to what women politicians have to say and journalists are able to impact the media content.

25 Refer footnote 10
barriers in future elections. While the non-inclusion of young women was beyond the control of the implementers, as the project focused on elected representatives and EWLs were few in number, it has resulted in impeding the continuity of the project outcomes as many of the representatives engaged in the project declared their intention to retire at the end of the term and make way for younger women representatives. Incorporating barriers to entry as an assumption at the designing stage would have capacitated EWLs to mobilise, facilitate and empower future participation by young women in the electoral process.

Assumptions Made About Women’s Ability to Participate in Politics

The EWLs and CSOLs acknowledged that some of the assumptions made regarding their roles as both women and professionals were correct (such as their ability to carry on with political life alongside household and care duties). However, in further conversation with the beneficiaries, it was evident that some assumptions, for example the assumption that they have similar financial resources as other male candidates, did not hold true in project design and implementation. This assumption is problematic as it ignores the hardships women often face due to heteropatriarchal structures in place when entering politics. In fact, during the KPI with the Search team, it was revealed that the assumption may have been included there by mistake. Nevertheless, the EWLs disagreed with this assumption as can be seen from the quotes provided below. It was also clear that no attempts had been made to address the lack of financial backing when entering politics through the project.

"In nominations, male leaders have more of a chance at winning the election because they don’t face financial and domestic responsibilities like we do" (FGD, EWL, Kurunegala).

"Some assumptions - such as EWLs have similar finances to run election campaigns and/or time to engage in politics like their male counterparts were wrong" (FGD, EWL, Badulla).

“I entered politics without receiving any payment for my work. We didn’t receive any money or cooperation from our party either” (FGD, EWL, Ampara).

“Actually, men have no additional burdens, and therefore, they can allocate time for politics. But when it comes to us women, we have so many burdens and responsibilities. So, we set aside time for politics even though we face many obstacles due to those burdens and responsibilities” (FGD, EWL, Jaffna).

Perceptions about EWLs who Entered into Politics Through the 25 percent Quota System

Another assumption which was not considered during the design stage of the project was the negative connotations associated with the EWLs who entered office through the 25 percent quota system. According to these EWLs, the negative perceptions hampered their participation at council proceedings and even in fulfilling their duties. These perceptions were held by other EWLs too, and therefore affected the beneficiaries’ participation in the project. Another factor which affected the EWLs’ decision to take part in the project and work on behalf of their constituents was party politics; although the majority of EWLs claimed that they could
work with each other notwithstanding party politics. Concerns raised by CSOLs also revealed that party politics was a hindrance to the overall objective of the project:

“So, the collective leadership approaches were defeated by the influence of party leaders and their orders to EWLs from their party” (FGD, CSOL, Jaffna).

EQ 1.2. Does the intervention address the short and long-term priorities and needs of the EWL and CSO targeted by the project?

Addressing Short Term and Long-Term Priorities of Beneficiaries

Responses to the question of whether the short and long-term priorities and needs of the beneficiaries were addressed were overwhelmingly positive, with 81 percent of EWLs and 73 percent of CSOLs completely agreeing that their needs were met. Figures 1 and 2 below illustrate the needs of the EWLs and CSOs that were addressed through the project.

Figure 1: Needs identified by EWLs
Elected women leaders from Kurunegala, who were interviewed, said “we told them what we needed and they delivered the training which we required” (FGD, EWL, Kurunegala).

**Non-Involvement of Direct Beneficiaries in the Design Stage**

A concern raised by EWLs and CSOLs during FGDs, as well as the District Partners highlighted their non-involvement of direct beneficiaries in the design stage of the project. According to these interviewees, non-involvement created a disconnect between the needs of the beneficiaries and constituents and the project’s overall goals:

“When they do projects and design them, they should get our input on the matter. They should meet with us and inform us and get our input” (FGD, EWL, Kurunegala).

Discussions with Search revealed that whilst they did have extensive consultations with local stakeholders including women’s organisations, government officials, and women political leaders who were part of previous projects, the direct beneficiaries of this particular project were not consulted as they had not been identified by that point. Therefore, the direct beneficiaries of the project could not have been part of the local stakeholders who were consulted prior to the designing of the project.

**EQ 1.3. To what extent did the project activities directly address the leadership needs of the target group?**

**Addressing Leadership Needs of EWLs and CSOs**

The FGDs with the CSOLs and EWLs revealed that the project and its activities helped them improve their leadership qualities, particularly through the trainings conducted to capacitate them. Perhaps the biggest achievement in terms of leadership was the change in beneficiaries’ perceptions of and attitude towards leadership. In fact, 99 percent of EWLs and 96 percent of CSOLs surveyed, responded that their perceptions
regarding leadership changed after taking part in the project (see figures 3 and 4). The graphs below illustrate perceptions on leadership prior to and after the training whereby both EWLs and CSOLs display significant positive improvement. The beneficiaries now understand leadership as a collaborative process and role, and it is reflected in their words:

“It also taught us that we do not necessarily need to raise money to be a true leader. There is a misconception that to be a leader we need to build roads or bridges” (FCD, EWL, Badulla).

Figure 3: Perceptions regarding leadership among EWLs

![Figure 3: Perceptions regarding leadership among EWLs](image)

Figure 4: Perceptions regarding leadership among CSOLs

![Figure 4: Perceptions regarding leadership among CSOLs](image)
Addressing the gaps in collaboration between EWLs and CSOs

The project was able to identify a current gap in the local political system whereby there is a lack of collaboration between CSO actors and women political leaders. However, the way in which the project implementers had approached the dynamic between the CSOLs and the EWLs, and the subsequent designing of the project activities and the trainings, were identified to be inherently problematic, and may have contributed to the existing divisions between the two groups. For example, the activities designed for the EWLs and CSOLs seem to have mainly taken place within their own silos. The evaluation team is aware of some shared trainings between the CSOLs and the EWLs (communication, media engagement, social media, etc.) and the inability to conduct more due to the nature of the trainings and the ways in which they catered to different beneficiaries. However, the evaluators feel it may have been in the best interest of both the project implementers and the beneficiaries if the trainings had been designed to increase collaboration and cooperation between the two groups. The perceptive barriers such as generations of internalised misogyny that has created an unhealthy competition between women in (or who aspire to be in) positions of power could have been addressed through increased engagement between the two groups.

The assumption about the lack of social standing of the EWLs (especially those who entered through the quota system) further led to separated training for CSOLs and EWLs and may have even affected the power dynamics between the two groups. Avoiding this would have increased the collaboration between the two factions – something which is currently absent within the local political system.

The CSOLs in Kurunegala mentioned that efforts to create cooperation between them and EWLs could have been better: they claimed that they felt abandoned by the EWLs as the project was progressing:

"Even if we do like to work with them, they don’t like to work with us. When we get to the final stage of a project, they leave us behind so that they can take the credit for the work done" (FGD, CSOL, Kurunegala).

Other reasons for such a lack of cooperation between the two groups, according to the CSOLs can be attributed to EWLs’ becoming fearful that CSOLs would enter into politics with the training they have now received, the EWLs’ lack of experience and involvement in working with the community, CSOLs’ self-perceived superiority in skills, and EWLs’ being divided by party politics when working with the community. Despite these differences brought up by CSOLs in Kurunegala, CSOLs in other districts are putting in the effort to improve relations between them and the EWLs for the benefit of the communities.

Engagement With the Community and Ground Level

The trainers involved in the project believed that the contents of the project were suited for the needs of the beneficiaries within the contexts in which they operated. The trainers were mainly impressed with the capacity building exercise in relation to local councils and the gender sensitivity training provided for male journalists.
According to one trainer, the capacity building of the EWLs not only helped them as individuals, but the entirety of local councils and the constituents, since much of ground and community level engagement happens through the local council and the trainings provided the local councils with capable members.

“The good thing about Sri Lanka is that they made use of local councils. Local councils are of no use to Sri Lanka, though. However, it still has a use to the ground level and community level engagement, and this happened through this project” (KPI, Trainer).

**Addressing the Negative Reporting of Women in Politics**

Considering the gender sensitivity training for male journalists, the trainer believed that it managed to address one factor concerning the barriers to entry into and exit from politics faced by EWLs:

“The relevance they made with gender, journalism, and EWLs was very interesting. It is often overlooked – one of the reasons as to why women shy away from politics is because of the media backlash they face, when they join politics; it is both a root cause and contributory factor” (KPI, Trainer).

It also, to a small degree, addressed the exclusion of male elected officials from the project, i.e. by sharing the burden of promoting gender equality and empowerment between EWLs, CSOLs, and male journalists.

**3.2. Effectiveness**

**EQ 2.1 - Were the overall objective, specific objectives, results, and indicators adhered to as stated in the project’s documents?**

The project has, to a great extent, been able to achieve its objectives, results and indicators through the activities that were implemented, with the exception of some activities that were delayed due to COVID-19 restrictions. The capacity building activities for EWLs and CSOs and activities that increased networking and collaboration led to the achievement of objective 1 by strengthening women’s voice and participation in political and civic life. The gender sensitive training done for journalists, and the opportunities created for EWLs and journalists to improve their relationship to a great extent contributed to the achievement of objective 2. The project was able to achieve most targets set through the project indicators, which are presented in annex 5. The activities and how it has contributed to achieving the indicators and overall objectives of the project are explained in detail below:

**Capacity Building of EWLs and Women CSOLs**

The contents of the Professional Development Trainings were in line with what the project aimed to achieve by capacitating EWLs and CSOs. For CSOs, the project aimed to increase their knowledge and skills in coaching, mentoring, and positive leadership (indicator 1.1.1). For EWLs the project aimed to increase their knowledge and skills in collaborative leadership and collective impact (indicator 1.1.4). To achieve this a series
of training sessions were conducted by experienced trainers. The training conducted for CSOLs were 1) coaching, mentoring, and positive leadership; 2) resource mobilisation, participatory needs assessments, and scorecards; 3) effective communication, community outreach, media, and non-adversarial advocacy. The training conducted for EWLS were 1) collaborative leadership and collective impact; 2) resource mapping, mobilisation strategies, and participatory needs assessment; 3) communication, self-profiling, and engaging the media. Despite showing sufficiently positive participation by EWLS and CSOLs in the overall project activities, the survey findings indicate that ‘Training in communication, self-profiling and engaging in the media’ was the least attended training by EWLS, and ‘Mutual accountability dialogue’ was the least attended by CSOLs, as shown in graphs below.

Figure 5: Project activities participated by EWLS
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Figure 6: Project activities participated by CSOLs

![Graph showing project activities participated by CSOLs]

The effectiveness of project activities has been rated somewhat effective or highly effective by both EWLS and CSOLs with neither group attributing project activities to be ineffective (see Figure 7).
Knowledge Increase of Beneficiaries

The survey results show that 95 percent of women CSOLs perceived that their own knowledge and skills in areas covered by the training sessions have increased. Similarly, 89 percent of EWLs perceived that their knowledge and skills in collaborative leadership and collective impact had increased. The following quotes from an EWL reiterates this further:

“It also taught us that we do not necessarily need to raise money to be a true leader. There is a misconception that to be a leader we need to build roads or bridges. But during COVID-19, when people were truly helpless, we were able to help them out even with small things like dissemination of information regarding vaccination roll outs and by helping out health sector officials that were in charge of the vaccination process” (FGD, EWL, Badulla).

“The leadership qualities we learnt and the appreciation we got from the community for practising them in our work are so memorable [to me]” (FGD, EWL, Jaffna).

Success of Participatory Approach to Trainings

The evaluation revealed that these trainings were effective especially because they used a participatory approach to training. This in turn enabled even those with lower education levels to be able to engage and learn:

“Oh actually, we did not plan a top-down approach and it was designed as very participative training which was also recommended by the management team” (KPI, Trainer)

For example, sometimes the same training used for EWLs was adapted and conducted differently for CSOLs because the trainers identified that generally the CSOLs had more experience and knowledge regarding the
field of human rights and women’s rights. So, the training for the CSOLs focused on how to use their skills to promote and support EWLS to achieve their goals. Similarly, for both EWLS and CSOLs, engaging teaching methods such as stories and games were incorporated by trainers:

“When doing the project proposal activity, we had to do a mission where we had to cut a hole in an A4 sheet and slide through it. I won that mission and it was very memorable to me” (FGD, EWL, Badulla).

Effectiveness of Advocacy Trainings

It was observed that CSOLs and EWLS were making use of the ‘non-adversarial and issue-based advocacy’ training effectively. For instance, after the training on advocacy, the CSOLs organised advocacy events in their relevant districts which culminated in an advocacy event in Colombo. Moreover, in Jaffna an advocacy paper was published and handed over to the chairpersons of pradeshiya sabhas, copies were also sent to the party leaders through the EWLS. However, the beneficiary CSOLs suggested that in-person advocacy training would have been more impactful, as the trainings were conducted online due to mobility restrictions during the pandemic.

Women-led Needs Assessments and Resource Mappings

In order to develop collaboration between EWLS, CSOs and local communities and to develop response strategies to constituents’ needs, the project introduced the Needs Assessment and Resource Mapping Activity—a common training programme for EWLS, CSOs and selected community members/leaders. The Activity was held in all four districts with an 83 percent participation rate. The training enabled the beneficiaries to identify the needs of their communities, and categorise and prioritise the needs that should be submitted to the local authority. Moreover, the EWLS were able to learn about the mapping resources available to implement projects based on the needs of the communities. Through this component the beneficiaries were also trained on using a tool called ‘Community Scorecard’. The Community Scorecard is a community-based monitoring tool that assesses services, projects, and government performance by analysing qualitative data obtained through discussions with the community (actual users of the service) termed as ‘Community Accountability Dialogues’. Although the Community Scorecard was not fully implemented as planned (due to various challenges that are discussed in section 3.7), the project was able to take the first steps towards introducing this tool that promotes feedback and accountability to the beneficiaries.

Through the Needs Assessment and Resource Mapping Activity, the EWLS gained skills in independently preparing project proposals based on the (actual) needs of the community. From the survey conducted as part of this evaluation, 91 percent of the CSOs and 83 percent of the EWLS perceived that their knowledge and skills in resource mobilisation, participatory needs assessments, and scorecards had increased (indicator 1.1.2 and 1.1.5). A district partner’s comment demonstrates this further:

---

"During the meetings following the training we were able to observe the improvements while they [EWLs] were presenting their own [community’s] need assessments" (KPI, District Partner).

Attesting to the needs assessment’s success, EWLs had the following responses:

"We were able to identify the dire needs of the communities as well as to identify activities that will generate benefits to a maximum number of people" (FGD, EWL, Badulla)

"Now we are doing many things for the village; like I mentioned earlier, by constructing 50 houses, providing electricity by contacting various authorities which are responsible for getting work done in that village" (FGD, EWL, Jaffna).

Training on Gender Sensitive Reporting for Journalists

The project identified that there was negativity surrounding how the media reported about women in politics. Therefore, there was a significantly large component introduced to engage journalists through the project. The evaluators found this to be a unique contribution of the project; not only in terms of sensitising journalists to gender perspectives but also in creating a strong network between journalists and the EWLs. This section will discuss the former point whilst EQ 2.4 in this section will discuss the latter.

The overall objective of the training was to sensitise journalists from the four districts about reporting on political and other sensitive issues regarding women (indicator 1.3.1). The training covered topics such as the concept of ‘gender’ – the difference between gender and sex, gender norms, gender stereotyping, and gender and media. This is possibly the first time some of the journalists had received training on these topics. The training also contributed to changing the writing style of most of the journalists interviewed to incorporate a more gender sensitive approach. For example, one journalist interviewed, stated the following:

"We are highlighting in our writings that women should take part in future elections and women should participate in politics. So, the usual style of writing which focuses on news about the male counsellors was changed a lot... actually it was a turning point in our writings" (FGD, Journalist)

WILL Clubs

Another aspect that led to the achievement of project objectives was the Women in Leadership and Learning Clubs (WILL Clubs), considered a major achievement of the project by all stakeholders and beneficiaries interviewed. WILL Clubs are an organised platform for EWLs, CSO members/activists and journalists to engage, learn and network. Whilst the project aimed to establish 16 WILL Clubs through this project, it exceeded this target; 24 WILL Clubs were inaugurated across the project districts (6 clubs in each district). Furthermore, the findings from the survey reveal that 90 percent of EWLs have attributed sustainable learning and exchange via WILL clubs to be a factor that facilitated their effective participation in local governance processes.
EQ 2-2 - What were the factors that led to the achievement or non-achievement of results?

Factors that led to achievement of results

The capacity building component of the project was successful because Search, their partners and trainers seemed to have been sensitive to the local context in designing and conducting the training. Therefore, the training sessions were targeted to be contextual and were adjusted depending on the language and culture of the beneficiaries. From discussions with beneficiaries, it was evident that the project implementers were also sensitive to personal circumstances and cultural differences. This was evidenced by the fact that they gave allowances for spouses to accompany the women when training was outside the districts, and women were also allowed to bring children to trainings/meetings to ensure they could participate. Additionally, to ensure that the training was relevant, the trainings were designed only after conducting a needs assessment.

Challenges in Achieving Results

However, there were also other challenges that may have prevented the project from achieving its intended outcomes, especially in relation to strengthening the networks and working relationships between EWLs and CSOLs. Despite the sustained platforms provided by WILL Clubs, some district partners interviewed were under the impression that cooperation between EWLs and CSOLs was not achieved as expected as there appeared to be some tensions between the two groups (this is discussed in detail in section 3.1.; EQ1.4). This meant that the women were not able to work cooperatively to achieve the objectives of the project. This challenge was partly attributed to perceptions of CSOLs as being superior (in terms of knowledge and experience) to EWLs, the poor communication between EWLs and CSOLs towards the end of the project, and the fact they were not able to complete the Community Scorecard activity that would have ensured that they worked closely together.

“By the time the activities kicked started, budgets were already confirmed in local government. We had no idea about the provisions made available to us. Only the EWLs were aware of the provisions. So, when we made budgets for our proposals, we really had no idea how much to set aside for proposed activities.” (FGD, CSOL, Kurunegala).

The sincerity of the motivation of some beneficiaries were questioned by few district partners who cited it as a barrier to the effective implementation of project activities. It was identified that some of the beneficiaries participated for financial compensation and were motivated by financial benefit rather than skills development, which was an impediment for full collaboration in some activities.
Adapting to Pandemic Restrictions

The project implementers excelled in adapting to challenges that impeded the smooth progression of the project. The COVID-19 pandemic, perhaps the most unexpected challenge during the implementation of the project, was handled well by the project implementers.

Whilst the project timeline was affected due to the pandemic and the implementation of some activities were affected by way of time and operational modalities, Search managed to address the changes in implementation without fully compromising on the project deliverables. This was done by moving the implementation of some activities to virtual platforms. Whilst this worked for activities such as training, dialogues and advocacy events, some activities such as the Scorecard and submitting proposals (designed post-needs assessment by EWLs) in time for local council budget approvals were severely affected due to mobility restrictions. Therefore, the activities that needed to be physically implemented had to be postponed, impacting the time available to successfully implement the activities.

According to the EWLs and the CSOLs, switching to an online mode (on Zoom) and continuing the trainings and other project activities provided them with both purpose and technological competence during a difficult time in life:

“We learned about how to engage through online platforms like zoom and it was the most suitable and efficient way to continue our WILL discussions and training during COVID 19 times. We can even manage the stressful mindset we had during such time by engaging in activities through the online platform zoom” (FGD, EWL, Jaffna)

“We have done a lot and improved a lot of our skills. Learning how to use a touch-phone and getting online work done” (FGD, CSOL, Badulla)

Whilst most women appreciated the online meetings/training as a distraction from the mundane, day-to-day duties of being stuck at home, some women complained that it added to the stress of trying to balance work and household chores and care duties. Nevertheless, the implementers of the project were able to find suitable timings to engage the women, thus a majority of beneficiaries were able to continue project activities even with the personal challenges and restrictions caused by the pandemic. As such, 96 percent of EWLs and 85 percent of CSOs stated that they were able to continue their participation in the project, despite facing numerous challenges, of which the most prominent was the increased incidence of household responsibilities. Additional challenges experienced by EWLs and CSOLs in the wake of the pandemic are presented in Figures 8 and 9 below:
Figure 8: How did COVID-19 affect EWLs

![Bar chart showing how COVID-19 affected EWLs.]

Figure 9: How did COVID-19 affect CSOLs
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Did not get a chance to present recommendations, public statements, interventions as expected

Did not get a chance to materialise proposals that were accepted

Funding reduced

Socio-economic wellbeing of constituencies deteriorated

Had the chance to work on improving healthcare service delivery in my constituency

Had the chance to oversee vaccine rollouts and COVID-19 information dissemination campaigns in my constituency

Did not get a chance to engage in advocacy

Did not get a chance to materialise proposed activities

Funding reduced

Socio-economic wellbeing of beneficiaries deteriorated

Had the chance to oversee vaccine rollouts and COVID-19 information dissemination campaigns
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Including Female Journalists in Gender Sensitive Training for Journalists

Another modification the project made was including female journalists in the gender sensitive training that was initially intended only for male journalists. A district partner mentioned that this modification was made to ensure gender representation, however, for the purpose of this exercise not having a gender balance would not have affected its implementation. The target beneficiaries were male journalists, based on the assumption that more male journalists report on politics and current events at a grassroots level. As such, including female journalists in this activity at the implementation stage would have been interpreted as tokenistic and thus redundant. However, one could challenge this assumption by questioning if women should not also be gender sensitized. Therefore, this modification may have positively impacted the project’s outcomes by improving how female journalists also report on women political leaders, thereby widening the scope of the project’s initial target beneficiaries and the possible impact created through the project. However, there was no data to further measure or comment on the specific impact on the female journalists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 2.4. How did the project ensure the visibility of the project activities among participants and relevant stakeholders?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two main components were identified as having contributed to creating visibility for the project. The first being engagement with journalists through the project, and the second being through the Vote Women SL social media campaign.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visibility/Awareness Created by Engaging with Media/Journalists

The project has been successful in creating positive visibility for its beneficiaries, particularly for EWLs, by building in the component on engaging and training journalists. The training aimed at making their reporting gender sensitive, and creating opportunities for EWLs and journalists to network through dialogues and round table discussions. Through this component the project also intended to contribute to media products that promote women’s leadership, challenge negative stereotypes or promote positive narratives towards women and their leadership abilities (indicator 1.3.2). A combination of the components activities (training and roundtables) ensured that the work of the EWLs received promotion on media platforms at district level and sometimes at national level. The EWLs were also given the opportunity to share their stories, achievements, and challenges with mainstream media journalists through the roundtable discussions and create visibility for the work they do.

Although the journalists changed how they report about women in politics, and chose to report more about women councillors as opposed to male councillors, the impact of this is not fully seen because their stories might not always be picked up by editors/publishers. Therefore, the journalists resorted to publishing their stories in alternative platforms such as social media. However, the reach of these platforms may not be as large as those of mainstream media platforms.
The following table gives a breakdown of the type of media outputs that were created in relation to the EWLs by the participating journalists.

Table 4: Media outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Output</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>No. of Outputs</th>
<th>Combined reach of outputs in given medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper and website articles</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,911,758 readers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sinhala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV and Radio</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,220,000 Listeners/viewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sinhala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>536 views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sinhala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>545,016 engagements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sinhala</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Media Tracking Sheet (WILL)

Vote Women SL – Social Media Campaign

The Vote Women SL Social media campaign was run on Facebook with the aim of creating visibility for the EWLs through social media, and also to create a positive narrative about women in politics in general. Overall, the page has had about 4000 likes since its inception, and the highest monthly organic reach (the number of people who had any content from the Page or about the Page enter their screen through unpaid distribution) was about 600 profiles. In comparison to similar social media campaigns, the reach could have been improved by cross sharing on Search’s own pages, and by being shared on the personal platforms of the CSOs and EWLs. The project had some differences in opinion with the initial social media consultant due to a miscommunication about the expectation of the campaign and the role of the consultant. The social media consultant who was hired subsequently did not have adequate time to create more content and drive organic reach following the initial derailment.

However, it should be commended that the project leveraged the changing context (in relation to pandemic restrictions) to their benefit and generated more visibility by hosting advocacy events and panel discussions on virtual platforms that would have opened up avenues for more people outside of the project locations to attend these events. However, the exact number of attendees at these online events are not known and cannot be commented on.
3.3. Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination

This section of the report includes an evaluation of the extent to which the project was successful in mainstreaming gender equality and non-discrimination as well as the extent to which the project included the most marginalised groups in the locations of the project’s activities.

EQ 2.5. What measurable changes in gender equality and women’s empowerment have occurred as a result of the project?

Although there is no such framework to measure changes in improvements of gender equality (as it is not quantifiable), qualitative data regarding (increased) empowerment through the project is presented here. Where possible, quantitative data pertaining to changed perceptions regarding gender are incorporated in order to provide insights regarding the temporal changes that have taken place before and after project activities.

Perceptions about ‘Gender’

The fact that most respondents – both EWLS and CSOLs – have learned to attribute gender to a social construction within a short span of time, is in itself a notable achievement of gender equality and women’s empowerment (see Figure 10).

Figure 10: Respondents’ perceptions on how gender is defined

The survey results indicate that 96 percent of EWLS and 98 percent of CSOLs surveyed have responded that their perception regarding gender changed after taking part in the project.
Empowerment of EWLs/CSOLs

The project activities were successful in addressing the needs of EWLs and CSOLs and capacitating them in areas in which they were lacking skills and/or resources. According to the EWLs, the trainings allowed them to stand up for themselves and work towards the betterment of their constituents;

“I feared speaking out before the project. But now I have developed the skill much better” (EWL, Jaffna).

This was seconded by the CSOLs during the FGDs;

“Male politicians usually do not like to give EWLS any opportunities, but EWLs are now empowered to speak in front of people without fear, share their ideas with other people and grab the opportunities available to them. Now, even at a committee level, you would see that it is mostly women holding positions of office” (FGD, CSOL, Kurunegala).

Through the FGDs and KPIs, the evaluation team was able to determine that the project and its training had been able to empower and capacitate EWLs and CSOLs. Prior to the project’s implementation, the EWLs were often perceived to be incompetent because they did not speak up during council proceedings and perceived as being of no use to their constituents. However, the responses (through KPIs and FGDs) made it evident that there is a gendered element to their non-participation at the council meetings due in part to their fear of male dominated and exclusive spaces. The EWLs believed that with the training they had received, they had the capacity to actively participate in council proceedings and as a result be of use to their constituents. According to statements by the EWLs and CSOLs, the EWLs became more confident and were even able to find their voice;

“Definitely empowered, we found these trainings to be very important” (FGD, EWL, Kurunegala)

“The project empowered us to talk without fear because we now know what we are talking about” (FGD, EWL, Badulla).

Apart from gender sensitivity training, improvements to their political literacy also increased their confidence. EWLs who had no prior knowledge of the Local Council Act and even the proceedings within the Council were given the skills to navigate within their titles:

“We used to be subservient. But since we are now trained on laws and Acts, our male counterparts cannot oppose us anymore. Some male politicians do not have any understanding about the Local Council Act” (FGD, EWL, Badulla)

“My confidence increased, and I developed the skills to speak out anywhere without hesitation, unlike before” (FGD, CSOL, Ampara)

“We as EWLs couldn’t even go forward because of gender discrimination. We used to think that men should take the lead. But when we were given training on gender sensitivity, we realised that it shouldn’t have to be that way. At council proceedings, we used to sit at the
very back earlier because we didn’t think that women could sit in front, but now, we sit in front because we have the confidence to do so” (FGD, EWL, Kurunegala).

Other measurable changes to women’s empowerment resulting from the project are indicated in Figure 11 below. Among the most significant changes are more women in leadership positions in local government and CSO committees, and a greater number of women engaging with the media to voice their needs and concerns.

**Figure 11: Measurable changes in gender equality and empowerment**

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

- More women voicing their needs through media (print/electronic/social): 75%
- More women in leadership and decision-making positions in CSOs: 85%
- More women in leadership and decision-making positions in local governments: 62%

However, since this is a project designed with the purpose of empowering women (EWLs), the inclusion of other genders could have benefitted the EWLs further since genders do not exist in isolation. The performativity and the reception of the performativity take place within a structure; therefore, the inclusion of other genders, especially cisgender men (those who benefit from patriarchy the most), would have enabled the empowerment of women within the larger society and rendered the process of empowerment to be collaborative instead of capacitating in a silo.

**Gender Sensitised Male Journalists**

The gender sensitivity training given to the male journalists helped further advance this cause. The training had made the journalists rethink their treatment of EWLs prior to the project (for example, emphasising mishaps of the EWLs for the sake of sensationalist journalism):

“Even we have at times not given these EWLs the chance to speak up. It may have been because of our own biases of EWLs and their smaller achievements not being worthy of coverage for us” (FGD, Journalist)

During the FGDs with the journalists, it was revealed that this change in reporting has now helped EWLs in bringing their work to the community, further empowering them. Apart from gender sensitising the journalists,
the Search team and other trainers too were trained on gender sensitivity in order to make sure that the beneficiaries were not discriminated against at any point.

**Non-Involvement of Men (Male Elected Officials)**

Although many respondents believe that both EWLs and CSOLs were empowered as both women and community leaders and subsequently fight for their place within the council and community, the non-involvement of men and male elected officials was still an obstacle to creating the space for gender equality.

As mentioned above, genders are not performed in isolation. While providing the EWLs and CSOLs the capacity to empower themselves is admirable, it does not lead to an attitudinal and/or behavioural change within the men in the community and the council. In conversations with beneficiaries, it was evident that they too shared this sentiment:

"Practically hard to ingrain these ideas such as gender equality without the involvement of both men and women [...] We are seeking equality. As men are the ones who oppose equality, men need this training more on how to deal with women" (FGD, CSOL, Kurunegala).

"It would have been better if they were involved in the project because they too need to be sensitized to these issues. It would have taught them to work cooperatively with us instead of being at war with each other" (FGD, EWL, Kurunegala).

"They are the ones that need this training more. They are not gender sensitive at all and do not know how to behave in a forum" (FGD, EWL, Badulla).

In countering this sentiment, however, there were other beneficiaries who thought that a space which was made safe for women (EWLs and CSOLs) would have been invaded by the men had they been involved in the training:

"They will never allow women to talk or they will never speak about the needs of women politicians as well" (FGD, CSOL, Jaffna).

Although this is a valid concern, the sense of safety created within a space would also depend on the facilitators of that space. By resorting to ways of giving everyone equal opportunity within that space and paving the way for attitudinal and behavioural change, the project could have achieved both empowerment and equality.

Search agreed that including male counterparts would have made the project more efficient, as those men would then be more mindful of the women’s concerns and not prevent their participation in council activities. During the validation workshop, it was revealed that although the inclusion of men was recognised as important, it was not done because Search identified the activity as being too large to fit within the project’s scope. Thus, achievement of gender equality was sought by capacitating EWLs:

"We didn’t have a focus on male political counterparts because overall male political counterpart culture in SL and addressing that is a large and much more complex aspect which
needed more time and resources...even though we recognised that’s an important aspect in gender empowerment by engaging men” (Validation Workshop, Search).

Structural (Patriarchal) Constraints as Obstacles

Although this project largely did empower women, there were instances wherein gender empowerment was difficult to achieve due to structural (patriarchal) constraints in place in the local regions. According to CSOLs from Jaffna, even with the knowledge and skills they gained from the trainings, they still could not speak up against blatant sexism during a project activity; this evident in the statement below, made in relation to a claim made by a figure in authority:

“...the election commissioner came as a guest and expressed that the women should come to politics only after cooking in their homes... at that time we weren’t able to raise our voice against him by using the skills derived from the training” (FGD, CSOL, Jaffna).

Another structural constraint faced by a trainer (recounted by a CSOL) is the fact that women themselves did not allow the trainer to help them to raise their voice against men’s power and this can be seen in the example below:

“During the training session, a woman came up with the question 'how should women raise their voice against men in power?' She was told to not ask such questions from the resource person (by other participants). So, the question was suppressed even at the training by women themselves” (FGD, CSOL, Jaffna).

This shows how deeply rooted the patriarchal structure is in certain communities, and at times these constraints have proved to be difficult to break through the project. Such instances further point to the crucial need of having men included in the project as well.

| EQ 6.1. How far had the project mainstreamed gender equality and non-discrimination? |

Knowledge and Skills in Mainstreaming Gender

Notably, 98 percent of CSOLs surveyed believe that their knowledge of gender equality and skills in mainstreaming gender into advocacy plans have changed after engaging with the project. As indicated in Figure 12 below, the project has also successfully mainstreamed both gender equality and non-discrimination into the project.
Figure 12: Mainstreaming gender equality and non-discrimination into the project

Mainstreaming gender equality and non-discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successfully mainstreamed both gender equality and non-discrimination</th>
<th>Successfully mainstreamed non-discrimination but not gender equality</th>
<th>Successfully mainstreamed gender equality but not non-discrimination</th>
<th>Was not successful mainstreaming either gender equality or non-discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="" /></td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competence of Trainers**

The evaluation findings revealed that the cultural and religious sensitivity of the trainers ensured non-discrimination within the training and help impart that on to the trainees as well. For instance, the trainers were able to change the attitudes of the beneficiaries towards other religions and cultures:

“In Badulla, we had to handle a lady trainee by advising her to not be partial to a particular party or religion because the people who elected them were not from a one particular religion or culture. So, through such kind of advice, we addressed their misunderstandings” (KPI, Trainer).

This was extended to trainers encouraging the beneficiaries to expand their service beyond those who only voted for them. During conversations with CSOLs and EWLs, the evaluation team also learnt of the ways in which the trainers and project implementers helped them take part in the project by explaining the situation to their families and by even making provisions to assist in their participation at project activities. This ensured that there was no discrimination against the beneficiaries participating in the project.

Another instance of inclusion seen in the project, was that apart from giving the journalists training on gender sensitivity, the trainers also opened up the conversation on queer individuals. The receptivity of the beneficiaries to such discussions enabled the trainers to expand the margins of non-discrimination as well.
Instances of Discrimination

Although the project managed to mainstream gender equality and non-discrimination to some extent, the earlier mentioned concerns of the non-involvement of men continued to affect the project’s achievement of its overall objective. Furthermore, it was revealed during the evaluation process that there was discrimination between the EWLs during the project activities and trainings:

“There was a kind of discrimination can be identified in trainings. It was actually between the women who got the seats by votes and the other women who got seats by the selection of parties according to the 25% quota system. The elected women by votes see the others as inferior than them and it causes discrimination and consequently it was also a challenge identified” (KPI, District Partner).

Although this may be beyond the project’s scope or control, addressing this during the implementation of the project would have increased cooperation amongst the EWLs and made the project activities easier to conduct, particularly as it was identified as a challenge by a District Partner.

Challenging Stereotypes

When conducting the FGDs, it was clear that both EWLs and CSOLs were empowered in terms of gender and the expression of it. However, it was also clear that they were still very much obsessed with the idea of a "well-behaved woman" - in their opinion, it is the kind of woman who deserves respect in society. They also seemed to believe that a woman should know how to work or behave in a manner to earn respect and worth from society:

“A lot of the gender issues in politics can be avoided if we live simply. Especially in villages. We should not follow fashion that does not suit us. Because we engage directly with the community, we cannot afford to send them the wrong message. Decency is so important for women” (FGD, EWL, Badulla).

In one instance, when questioned about their understanding of transgender individuals, an EWL said “they wouldn’t be having sex in hiding if their identity was legally recognised” (EWL, Kurunegala); although their intentions are in the correct place, it still shows that their understanding of other genders and sexualities are still very much influenced by what society thinks and it is reduced to the performance of sexual acts. The EWLs, CSOLs, and even the constituents seemed to share essentialist notions regarding being a woman and womanhood; sentiments on women being inherently emotional and/or sensitive to peoples’ needs were repeated during the FGDs:

“Women are inherently jealous and this project got rid of that” (FGD, CSOL, Badulla).

“Women are more sensitive about issues” (FGD, EWL, Kurunegala)

“Women are inherently more sensitive and we can easily work with EWLs because of that” (FGD, Constituent, Badulla).
The evaluation team is well aware of how difficult it is to change attitudes, ideologies, and opinions within a short period of time through one project. However, having this understanding throughout the project when seeking “measurable changes” in terms of gender equality and empowering – essentially overthrowing patriarchy in a sense – would allow the project implementers to have realistic and more suited approaches to addressing gender equality and empowerment.

**EQ 6.2. To what extent did the project actively identify and include the most marginalised groups in Sri Lanka, ensuring no one is left behind?**

**Non-Inclusion of Socially Marginalised Groups**

When questioned by the District Partners, Trainers, CSOLs, and EWLs, it was mentioned that the most marginalised groups in their respective regions had the space to take part in the project, especially as a part of the community. However, as the conversations progressed, it was mentioned that no provisions were made to actively include socially marginalised individuals in the project. This was seen especially in relation to LGBTQIA+ individuals and persons with disabilities;

“We didn’t choose anyone from LGBTQ community since the Jaffna community is in its very early stages in accepting and accommodating and recognising them in the ordinary society” (KPI, District Partner).

“There were no disabled individuals. They anyway would have an issue with going to the field. only people with proper capacity came to the trainings” (KPI, Trainer).

The comment about persons with disabilities also highlights the insensitivity of the trainer towards that specific group of individuals as they seem to believe that the project activities should not be designed to be accessible.

The project did, however, make provisions for women (EWLs and CSOLs) from any socioeconomic background to participate:

“People belonging to low castes and even marginalised groups of people in terms of their skills or economy, were engaged in the project better collectively than ever before” (FGD, CSOL).

### 3.4. Efficiency

**EQ 3.1. Is the transformation of resources into results being carried out efficiently?**

**EQ 3.2. Are there any alternatives for achieving more cost-effective results?**

**EQ 3.3. Measure the results (qualitative and quantitative) about the inputs/resources devoted to the project.**

**Efficiency of Resource Use**

By analysing the project budget and revisions to the budget it was deduced that the project budget had been managed efficiently. Due to the lack of availability of financial reports an analysis of the efficient use of funds
cannot be deduced. From the information available the following findings are derived regarding the cost efficiency of the project:

- There is no revision in the total grant amount.
- There have been substantial savings (35,429 EUR) made in expenses related to meetings. This could be attributed to the use of electronic modes for conducting meetings during the lockdown.
- Savings have been made in relation to the baseline survey assignment (2,342 EUR).
- A combination of these savings and the additional use of the contingency amount (5,427 EUR) have been reallocated for the following expenses:
  - Augmenting personal costs of SEARCH in line with an increase in salary and benefits (by 15,367 EUR).
  - Augmenting personal costs of Federation of Sri Lanka Local Government Authorities (FSLCA) in line with an increase in salary and benefits (by 2,600 EUR).
  - Managing increased training costs (by 18,247 EUR). This could also be evidenced by the inclusion of additional topics for training that have been requested/identified and the cost of resource person being higher.
  - Increasing the allocation for sub-grant schemes for district partners (by 5,740 EUR).
  - The reallocation of funds for beneficiaries to be able to participate online during the COVID lockdown.

Apart from this analysis of budgets, all the stakeholders interviewed agreed that the funds were adequate to carry out the planned activities efficiently. Moreover, there has been no evidence of alternative ways in which the project partners could have been cost effective, as even within the limitations the project has been cost effective. However, some district partners have faced challenges in keeping up with the workload and pressure in dealing with the large amounts of paperwork for procedural matters. Whilst the district partners identified this as an inefficient use of their time, the project asserted that had the CSOs made efficient use of the resources provided to them (training and financial resources), their ability to meet document compliance would not have become a burden. Additionally, the requirements of ground level local CSOs to register for EPF/ETF has caused further challenges as most of them work on a project basis and not for a fixed monthly salary. These have caused unwarranted challenges for district partners who operate at a much smaller scale than national or international NGOs. However, it has been noted that these are requirements local level CSOs will have to fulfil to be partners of a project of this nature.

### EQ 3.4 - Are the capacities of EWLs, CSOs and journalists sufficient to achieve the expected results and objectives?

**Increased Capacities of Beneficiaries**

The capacities of the EWLs, CSOs and journalists increased through the project activities and particularly the training component, this contributed to achieving the project results and objectives to a great extent. Overall,
the capacities of the EWLs have improved creating a direct impact to their political careers and personal lives. For example, during discussions the EWLs mentioned how they have improved skills in designing project proposals and budgets, communication skills, time management and accountability. As one participant reiterated:

"The capacity of the EWLs were increased and improved through their overall learnings since all of them were well prepared to be ready for the next election" (KPI, District Partner)

However, some beneficiaries mentioned that they would have appreciated more capacity building on engaging with the media, especially in terms of public speaking.

Moreover, through the training, the EWLs are able to fulfil their role in local governance processes due to these increased capacities. Figure 13 below shows what aspects of the project increased effective participation by locally elected women leaders in local governance processes (from the perceptions of the EWLs surveyed).

Figure 13: Factors that increased the effective participation of EWLs in local governance processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable learning and exchange via WILL clubs</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased knowledge on effective dialogue</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased political literacy</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of professional development trainings</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient training in advocacy and networking activities</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of mutual accountability dialogues</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EQ 3.5 - Are sufficient human and material resources available to strengthen these capacities, particularly regarding the integration of the gender perspective?**

**Adequate Material Support**

Overall stakeholders agreed that they received adequate support and were satisfied with the facilities and materials received to successfully implement project activities. The following statement by one trainer illustrates this further:
"I would say, every single material or equipment was provided without any deficiency" (KPI, Trainer).

Capacity of Trainers

Overall, there was positive feedback regarding the capacity of the trainers who were mainly selected by FSLGA which coordinated the training components. Search also ensured the quality of the trainers through an orientation. However, there were some improvements suggested by the beneficiaries. For example, some mentioned that the trainers who conducted the needs assessment and Community Scorecard training were not able to cater to the needs of the beneficiaries. This could also be attributed to the fact that the Scorecard activity was not completed due to a combination of challenges discussed in section 3.7, and therefore did not meeting the expectations of the beneficiaries. Some beneficiaries mentioned that sections of the training were too complex to understand – this could be attributed to the relevant trainers not being able to gauge the skill and knowledge level of participants. There were also suggestions that more guidance was needed after the training were conducted. However, no follow up sessions were conducted. A district partner also stated that one particular trainer seemed insensitive to gender, which was particularly concerning given that this project’s overarching objective was to promote women’s empowerment and challenge negative stereotypes. These minor gaps in human resources could have inhibited some aspects of the capacity building element of this project.

Capacity of Implementers

The capacity of the Search team was commended by many of the stakeholders, who appreciated the additional support received to implement the project activities – especially when it came to facilitating the training programmes and navigating the additional challenges during the pandemic. The district partners too had sufficient capacity to carry out the project efficiently; skills such as digital literacy, writing reports, conducting, facilitating and coordinating meetings with no oversight has made this project efficient.

3.5. Impact

EQ 4.1 - What were the direct impacts of the project on target beneficiaries?

Increased Self-Confidence of EWLs

The project has empowered the EWLs and developed their self-confidence, enabling them to speak up and contribute to decision-making in a meaningful manner. For example, about 100 women are now members of committees (indicator 1.2) (secondary data provided by Search). The self-actualisation and realisation of self-worth has given them the confidence to speak up in council meetings and public forums. For example, from the EWLs surveyed a total of 711 public statements have been made. As one EWL stated:

“We have now realised our worth. Because our skills have developed, we are of a standard beyond male politicians” (FGD, EWL, Badulla)
Figure 14 below shows that 85 percent of EWLs and 87 percent of CSOLs believe they are completely confident in their professional roles.

**Figure 14: Degree of confidence among EWLs and CSOLs in their roles**

Although this has empowered the EWLs to put forward proposals and engage in advocacy, they still face challenges from male politicians in the council who may not have had the same exposure to conversations regarding gender equality and non-discrimination as the EWLs.

**Widened Networks of Beneficiaries**

The project interventions have also widened the circle/networks of the women. The project created platforms for EWLs, CSO members, activists, journalists/media actors, and even national level political party organisers to engage in. Moreover, the networks created through the WILL Clubs have continued, thus giving EWLs a formal platform to nurture these connections even beyond the project’s life cycle.

**Positive Impact on Women’s Personal and Professional Lives**

Moreover, according to some of the beneficiaries interviewed, due to the project, they have now received greater support in their political careers from their families. For example, the spouses of the beneficiaries had initially been apprehensive about sending their wives for the project training. However, later on in the project a project partner recognized that “the male spouses of women were sending them for training and programmes without hesitation and now women are working independently” (KPI, District Partner).

**Impact of Visibility Created for EWLs**

The media engagement component of the project has created visibility for EWLs, adding to the positive impact on their political careers. This visibility also contributes to their self-confidence to carry out their roles and also
to make a positive change in their communities. The statement below portrays the ambitiousness of the women, and speaks to the confidence the women have in their ability to be political leaders:

"Maybe it will be a separate party for the women politicians which may cause positive as well as negative impacts in local governments." (FGD, CSOL, Jaffna)

**Impact on Community and Constituents**

The EWLs seem to be more attuned to the needs of women in their constituency and are more consciously and actively advocating for their issues. For example, the EWLs have submitted a proposal to the Jaffna Municipal council to build a room for feeding mothers at the bus station (KPI, District Partner). Similarly, EWLs are advocating for issues such as the prevention of sexual and gender-based violence which they have not done previously.

The training provided through the needs assessment and resource mapping component to design impactful projects for their communities/constituencies, has enabled the EWLs and CSOLs to positively impact their communities. The survey revealed that 98 percent of beneficiaries believe they can make a positive difference in their neighbourhood (Indicator 2.1). It was observed that EWLs actively listen to the needs of the community members and try to address these needs by way of implementing projects. Figure 15 below shows the status of proposals submitted to the relevant local councils.

**Figure 15: Proposals submitted on women’s empowerment by EWLs and their status**

![Chart showing proposals submitted and accepted on various topics]

Note: One (1) percent of the projects submitted are reported to have been rejected and these are in Gender responsive budgeting and planning; Women’s economic empowerment; and Rights and entitlements of women. The decision is pending on the rest of the projects that have been submitted.
Challenges in Implementing Community Project Proposals

It must be noted that pandemic restrictions have hindered the potential for the community to directly benefit from the project due to the delays in developing proposals and implementing the project activities. Due to the delays the women missed the opportunity to submit their proposals in time for the approval of the new council budget, which negated a key impact the project could have had on the community. Not being able to implement the Scorecard activity was also a loss for the community as they would have been positively impacted by improved service provision through the feedback mechanism of the Community Scorecard process. Furthermore, some CSOs have also voiced their concerns about EWLs reverting back to their former habit of only supporting their party members/supporters.

EQ 4.3. Has there been any influence beyond the project circle?

Unintended Impacts of the Project

Interestingly, the project created an unintended impact by way of improving the digital literacy of beneficiaries, due to COVID restrictions and having to implement some of the activities online. As it was essential for all participants to have access to online project activities, Search introduced new training programmes which contributed to improving the digital literacy of some beneficiaries.

The capacity building of CSOLs, especially in relation to coaching, mentoring, and positive leadership, and effective communication and outreach will spill over to other projects that they are or will be involved in the future. Similarly, other women (activists etc.) have also been empowered to reach out to journalists and share their own positive stories. The quote below illustrates this further:

"After we published about the EWLs’ activities, the other women who do social activities were contacting us to publish their activities as well” (FGD, Journalist).

3.6. Sustainability

EQ 5.1. What is the project exit plan (if any)?

Networking and Capacitating

The evaluation team learnt of a few exit plans put in place through the project through the KPIs and FGDs. One major exit plan or strategy is the continuation of WILL Clubs from a previous project by Search; while these clubs managed to bring together EWLs and CSOLs and other stakeholders during the implementation of the project, the EWLs and CSOLs are hopeful that they will continue to be helpful in collaborative efforts between different stakeholders. Interviewed EWLs in Badulla have already made plans for future collaborations:

"They also try to engage with us frequently now. They call us and ask us to inform them if we are doing any programmes” (FGD, EWL, Badulla).
Many EWLs also saw this as an opportunity going beyond collaboration as it becomes a platform for them to harness their skills as elected officials in the local council:

“[I] learned the importance of journalists’ role in exposing the works and transparency of EWL’s to the common public” (FGD, EWL, Ampara).

Creating Resource Material

Although it was not planned for, initially, as mentioned by a trainer on gender sensitivity, the project implementers decided to create a manual cum glossary on gendered terms and expressions for future reference by journalists:

“They didn’t want the training to end after the workshop, so a booklet was made to sustain the training. Tips and strategies were put into the booklet and it was circulated amongst them. Terminologies, for instance, were included and they were asked to refer to it when writing in their work” (FGD, KPI, Trainer).

This move ensures the sustainability of gender sensitised reporting by the journalists and it may even lead to a wider circulation of resource material beyond the group of selected trainees.

EQ 5.2. Did the achieved outcomes lead to long-term improvements?

Scepticism of Beneficiaries of Long-Term Improvements

There was a sense of scepticism when the beneficiaries were asked about the status of the achieved outcomes, and the incomplete status of the proposals they developed was brought up by many in response. The inability to implement the proposals was a disappointment as the EWLs and CSOLs felt they had not been able to give any concrete interventions back to the community members who were involved in the Needs Assessment activity. Additionally, the branding of EWLs and CSOLs as “liars” by the community members in some districts, have led them to believe that the achieved outcomes would not lead to much improvement in the long-run:

“So, we also lost community support. Because people already don’t have any faith in politicians. When we take a project like this to the community together with EWLs, but do not get the required provisions for it, we are also then branded as liars” (FGD, CSOL, Kurunegala).

The CSOLs who were interviewed believe that the attitudinal change created within the EWLs will lend itself to sustaining the achieved outcomes of the project. However, the CSOLs expressed their concerns about the EWLs reverting back to their opportunistic selves, motivated by their own political agenda:

“But they also have to stick to the political agenda of their respective parties. So, there was some reluctance on their part to work together with others who have different political agenda. What they want to take forward is their political agenda” (FGD, CSOL, Kurunegala).
This opportunism, however, seems to be in part due to larger constraints placed on EWLs by the political parties to which they belong. Had the project factored in the constraints placed upon EWLs by party political divisions at the project design stage, the project could have mitigated the challenges which rose from it.

As one EWL suggested, a good benchmark to ascertain the long-term improvements of the project would be to see how many of the EWLs would get re-elected at the upcoming local government elections:

“In the next election, they should see how successful the project is by looking at how many would be re-elected into office” (FGD, EWL, Badulla).

EQ 5.3. Are the achieved outcomes sustainable after the end of the project?

Continued Engagement Needed

Of the EWLs surveyed, 69 percent have expressed willingness to continue their engagement in politics in subsequent elections, albeit with continued support from the project partners. Reasons cited among those that are unwilling to continue their engagement in politics are listed in Figure 16 below. Among ‘other’ categories of reasons are their willingness to offer opportunities to younger political leaders to assume office, old age, and the present turbulent political climate.

Figure 16: Reasons for not competing in the next election

![Figure 16: Reasons for not competing in the next election](image)

Although EWLs and CSOLs are hopeful that the WILL Clubs would lead to greater collaboration between the two parties, many of the interviewed beneficiaries emphasised the need to continue this project or other projects of similar nature; since they feel that they need a project implementer’s push to keep going forward.

“We need this push going forward. There are instances where we fall down. We need this push. Please don’t end this from here” (FGD, EWL, Badulla).
In a way, these beneficiaries believe that they are still not capacitated enough to carry on by themselves and this is evident in the continuous requests made during FGDs for further training and learning. However, it should be mentioned that, both EWLs and CSOLs have recognised the extent to which they have become skilled in creating project proposals, forwarding them, and even working on them. The trainings on project proposal creation and financial literacy seem to have greatly benefitted these individuals:

“The project also helped us build an image as EWLs. In fact, we did not know how to design projects according to our proposals. [The trainer] taught us everything from budgeting to project management” (FGD, EWL, Badulla).

It must be noted that among the reasons that have facilitated the EWLs to continue their engagement in politics amidst the aforementioned challenges, are the sufficiency of training, networks fostered, and increased media visibility (see Figure 17).

**Figure 17: Factors enabling beneficiaries to continue activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate trainings</th>
<th>Networks fostered</th>
<th>Media visibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EWLs</td>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Successful Networking**

Many of the networks created between the EWLs, CSOLs, and the journalists appear to have continued. The CSOLs and EWLs share WhatsApp group chats amongst themselves and between themselves and these groups were noted to be in use during the data collection phase of this evaluation. The WhatsApp groups are used in disseminating information regarding EWLs’ work and projects and collaboration between different stakeholders. Apart from these group chats, the EWLs also revealed that they are still in touch with the journalists who were involved in the project and these sentiments were shared by the journalists themselves as well. Therefore, these networks created during the project are being used by the beneficiaries to both their advantage and to their constituents’ advantage as well.
Structural Constraints in Sustainability

Although these networks seem to be sustainable even beyond the project’s closure, there also seems to be a faction of EWLs who are being left behind. According to the FGDs with EWLs and CSOLs in Jaffna, the same group of EWLs could not take part in the project continuously as the EWLs who entered through the 25 percent quota system have been changed each year by the political parties they represent:

“Since it was the party who nominated some women leaders to fulfil the quota within a specific period of time, there were missing members or altered members in our training and needs assessment programmes which were held for one year. So, it’s affected them to maintain a continuity in training programmes and it was a challenge” (KPI, District Partner).

The failure of the project implementers to take into account the bigger picture, in which party politics played a role, has led to a situation where the project’s activities could not be disseminated amongst the same group resulting in a loss of knowledge and skills.

Non-Involvement of Youth

Although the non-involvement of youth in the project was beyond the implementers’ control – as the EWLs comprised of women mainly over the age of 35 – the absence of that faction of society, in the beneficiaries’ opinion, would be an obstacle to sustaining the achieved outcomes of the project. As there is a high likelihood of the beneficiaries of this project retiring from politics soon.

EQ 5.4. How have the local stakeholders taken ownership of the project initiatives?

Continuation of the Project’s Initiatives by Local Stakeholders and Beneficiaries

The FSLGA was inspired by the WILL Club initiative and is presently planning to merge their district level women’s caucuses with the WILL Clubs in order to share knowledge and establish cooperation amongst women. Interestingly, the FSLGA will be including male elected officials in this as well:

“Our mandate is to work with the women and male councillors and the administrators just to enhance the local authorities’ capacity and so on. So, we have established district level women caucuses which are very similar to the WILL Club and we had a discussion to merge the committees together to work as one by exchanging their knowledge” (KPI, FSLGA).

Apart from this, as mentioned earlier, the networks created between the EWLs, CSOLs, and journalists continue to function even beyond the project’s closure, pointing to the stakeholders of the project taking ownership over project initiatives.
EQ 5.5. Are there any independent initiatives started to complement the project initiatives or are there any formal commitments towards this?

**Independent Initiatives Beyond the Project Life Cycle**

Key Person Interviews held with the Search team and FSLGA revealed that they have further funding for about five to six years to continue the WILL Clubs.

“The Federation said that they have Canadian funding to carry on for about 5 more years with the WILL clubs. I think even Search is about to get Norwegian funding and so we have included WILL clubs in that too” (KPI, Search).

“We do have one which is implemented for 6 years, funded by Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) which has the scope to enhance and support women to participate in local governments. It’s an island-wide project” (KPI, FSLGA).

From a larger organisational level, the elements of the project has the potential to sustain itself for a few more years and even perhaps broaden its margins. However, the absence of opportunities for local actors to initiate independent projects may again lead to a situation where local opinions and needs are neglected when the larger organisational level projects are designed. Taking the needs and opinions of beneficiaries into account when designing future projects would be ideal if the comprehensive sustainability of the project’s outcomes are to be considered.

### 3.7. Good Practices, Challenges and Lessons Learnt

**EQ 7.1. What are the good practices observed during the life of the project?**

**Good Practices**

**Networking**

Interviews with the beneficiaries revealed that they have identified a few initiatives of the project as good practices and further assessment of these practices has confirmed this. One of the most important initiatives which also led to sustainability of some of the project’s achieved outcomes was the establishment of networks. The incorporation of WILL Clubs into this programme has allowed cooperation between various stakeholders at the ground level, ranging from EWLs, CSOLs, to resource persons within the community, ultimately benefiting the community members:

“Considering the WILL Club, it was an utmost achievement of the project” (District Partner).

“After joining the WILL Club, I got clarity about politics and women’s leadership and started to be involved little by little by fighting against the ordinary barriers I had before” (FGD, CSO, Jaffna).
Added to this networking is the network created between the EWLs and journalists and this is identified as a positive relationship by both parties. As revealed during data collection, the EWLs have already started connecting with the journalists to cover the work they have done as elected officials, allowing them to gain greater visibility for their work for the community. The move to refrain from sensationalist reporting by the journalists has also allowed the EWLs to be portrayed in media for the work they do instead of instances of ‘mishaps’ – which are often taken out of context.

Trainings and Learnings

Other initiatives which could also be named as good practices are the trainings provided to the beneficiaries. All the beneficiaries interviewed were happy with the content of the training provided to them. Many of them claimed that the learnings on financial literacy and gender sensitivity cannot be obtained through a formal education in Sri Lanka, and the opportunity of learning this through the project can be seen as a great achievement. The CSOLs too appreciated these trainings, for they believe that EWLs, as individuals who engage with the community, needed such capacity and attitudinal and/or behavioural changes:

“Since EWLs are there, they always interact with society so their attitudes changed as a result of these training sessions and it’s such a good thing” (CSOL, Kurunegala).

The activities on resource mapping and needs assessment too allowed the EWLs to get closer to the community. Although the scorecard activity could not be completed due the financial cycle of the Local Councils ending by the time the activity came to an end, many EWLs claimed that the process of conducting a needs assessment and resource mapping would benefit them in the long-run; particularly through networking with resource persons within their localities and being able to serve their constituents:

“But through this project we were able to gain the confidence to talk and present proposals. Because of this project we learnt about the process of the council and now we can work as EWLs properly” (EWL, Badulla).

Participatory Approach

The overarching approach to the provided trainings too, can be pointed to as a good practice of the project. According to the beneficiaries and the trainers, the project had resorted to a participatory approach in rolling out the training, and this had allowed beneficiaries at all levels of understanding to take part in the project at their own pace:

“Almost each session was conducted by the participatory methods and sharing of experiences such as individual sharing, group sharing and presentations” (KPI, Trainer).
EQ 7.2. What were the potential project implementation risks and challenges faced during the project implementation and how they were managed?

EQ 7.3. What worked and what did not work? Why?

EQ 7.4. What are the major lessons learned? How have they been incorporated into the programming?

Challenges and Lessons Learnt

Challenges in implementing the Community Accountability Tool (CAT) – Community Scorecard

The Community Scorecard also referred to as the Community Accountability Tool in previous project documents was one of the activities that could not be implemented due to various challenges. The Community Scorecard is essentially a user feedback survey that allows government service providers to improve their service provision. The activity needs a minimum of 6 months to be successfully implemented (KPI, Consultant). However, due to changes in the project timeline and the restrictions caused by the pandemic, the project did not have adequate time to implement it. Although Search tried to implement it, the consultants advised against doing so due to the risk of not being able to see it to fruition given the short time allocated for it. Moreover, it would not have been sustainable because the local councils do not have a mechanism to take the Scorecard forward; there is usually no allocation within government budgets to conduct feedback survey/user satisfaction surveys. Further, it may have been beyond the scope of the project to get higher level local government officials buy-in to this. Therefore, the project would have had to do much more than initially planned to make this component a success.

Redundancies Caused by Shifts in Timeline

The Needs Assessment and Resource Mapping training built in a component of capacitating EWLs to develop their own proposals that could be presented to the council and implemented if approved. Whilst this was intended as a learning process, accurate expectations were not set with the target beneficiaries. The EWLs interviewed were disappointed because they expected some sort of seed funding to implement the proposals. Similarly, the timing of the activity meant that it was done just after the council budgets were approved. Therefore, the community-based plans and needs assessment conducted was seen as redundant because the shift in timelines negated its intended impact. Some EWLs interviewed also felt that they lost the respect of their constituents due to the non-implementation of the proposals. The following quote from the EWLs emphasises this further:

“Had it been communicated to us we would have not given hope to our communities. We would have done it on our own without engaging the community. In fact, we lost respect in the community because of that” (FGD, EWL, Kurunegala).

“We made a project proposal through this project but not all of us could do it. If you can provide funding by selecting at least some of them or parts of it. It would actually be useful to us and the villagers” (FGD, EWL, Badulla).
“Yes, the community asks about them (unfinished projects). We informed them that, for now, with the economic decline, development activities have been halted... Because prior to developing project proposals, we conducted surveys, took down their names. So, they are awaiting some result” (FGD, EWLs, Badulla).

“We could not complete the need assessment activity with full satisfaction because of lack of time caused by COVID-19” (KPI, District Partner).

Although this was a challenge for the achievement of project outcomes, it was beyond the control of the project as the pandemic was the reason for the delay in carrying out and completing the needs assessment, the Community Scorecard activity, and proposal submission.

**Invisible party politics and challenges**

The project did not fully factor in the party politics that would get in the way of implementing some project activities. For example, the expectation was that the EWLs would come together despite political differences during the needs assessment activity. However, due to issues between some EWLs there were challenges in agreeing to what issues should be prioritized. What was perceived from the participants of the needs assessment was that the EWLs wanted to do what benefited their own supporters and therefore failed to look at the big picture. The following quote illustrates that the district partners also realized this as a challenge:

“We kind of wished that we had approached that task differently when we were actually implementing it” (KPI, District Partner)

However, the district partners were also able to pick up on this issue and try to intervene by making the EWLs understand the purpose of the project as a whole. This quote from a district partner illustrates this further:

“Party differences among the participants were problematic and we had to make them frequently remember that we are expecting them to work as women leaders without party discriminations and criticisms. We managed this issue by emphasising and explaining our standards” (KPI, District Partner)

**Additional Training Topics Identified and Conducted**

Since project activities had to be shifted to online platforms, which was not anticipated at project design stage, additional training had to be introduced to improve the digital literacy of some beneficiaries so that they would be able to join the training through the online platforms utilized. Therefore, Search was able to successfully mitigate the risk of non-participation of beneficiaries in project activities due to pandemic restrictions. Moreover, some of the trainers were able to conduct the sessions online using innovative methods that would keep participants engaged even on a virtual platform. For example, the trainer who conducted the gender sensitivity training narrated how she used an online software where participants were able to dress up an avatar as a gay man, lesbian woman, and a trans person in order to challenge preconceived notions of gender and sexuality.
By interacting with the beneficiaries through the training programmes the trainers were also able to identify more training modules that should have been included as part of the capacity building component. Some of these include basic legal knowledge regarding the constitution; separate sessions for project management (and not as a subsection of proposal development); problem solving; personal development, and knowledge about international conventions such as Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) (which was also requested by some CSOs and EWLs). For example, one of the beneficiaries from Badulla had requested Search to conduct the CEDAW training, so that they could understand how they were elected and why they had to come into politics.
4. Conclusions

The project ‘WILL - Women in Learning and Leadership’ was conceptualised with the aim of strengthening women’s voice and participation in political decision-making in Sri Lanka. With the hope of achieving this, the project was implemented with two key objectives; to strengthen women’s voice and participation in political and civic life; to involve the media in the transformative process, in particular by challenging stereotypes. In fulfilling these two objectives, activities under the following three clusters were implemented: capacity building and networking and advocacy for women leaders and CSOs; collaboration between women political leaders and local communities to develop response strategies to constituents’ needs; and media engagement.27 Adhering to and taking into consideration these objectives and activity streams, the evaluation report has reached the following conclusions.

i. The project was largely relevant to the local context in which it was implemented and relevant in capacitating relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries. There were, however, assumptions which were identified as incorrect by the beneficiaries and the addition of non-involvement of male counterparts was identified as affecting the relevance of the project. The project adapted to external shocks well, and initiated community and ground level engagement.

ii. In terms of effectiveness, the project was able to evidently increase and enhance the capacities of both EWLs and CSOLs. Some activities managed to promote cooperation between the CSOLs and EWLs. However, the lack of cooperation between them posed a challenge to achieving outcomes within the project. Male journalists were rendered gender sensitised in their reporting; as per the findings, the trained journalists are now aware of their own biases in relation to women and reporting in media, and they are now using this knowledge in their profession as journalists. The change in modalities (from onsite to online) ensured the effectiveness of project activities; instead of allowing the project to come to a halt when the COVID-19 pandemic happened, the implementers managed to switch the majority of the project content to an online mode to ensure the continuity of the project. Although the visibility gained through the journalists was positive, the social media campaign lacked enough reach or attention in order to give the project due visibility. The increased and positive visibility was possible, according to the journalists, because the content which they produced in relation to this project had reached a larger audience than they are used to receiving. The performance of the social media campaign was due to its low organic reach, the absence of cross-posting between the project’s Facebook page and that of Search, and the tight timeline as understood by the second social media consultant.

iii. There is a noticeable increase in levels of confidence and empowerment amongst EWLs as they are now more forward, vocal, and present during council proceedings. This was achieved mainly through the training on gender sensitivity and political literacy. Male journalists too were gender sensitised in their work. However, creating a meaningful approach to gender equality has been hampered due to

27 Refer footnote 1
the non-involvement of male counterparts of the EWLs within the project. Structural (patriarchal) constraints in certain areas too hindered the achievement of gender equality and women's empowerment. While the trainers were mostly sensitive to the needs of the beneficiaries, there had also been instances where some trainers themselves were not sensitised to gender and its iterations. The project’s expectations and approaches to transformation of how gender is perceived and performed by the beneficiaries seem to be too ambitious.

iv. Whilst it was beyond the scope of the project to actively include socially marginalised groups such as persons with disabilities and members of the LGBTQI+ community, the perception of some stakeholders regarding the non-inclusion of the said communities could have been avoided. As it could have negatively influenced how the beneficiaries themselves view and treat those from marginalised communities, especially when the trainers speak about it in a negative and non-inclusive.

v. There had been no revision in the total grant amount and the project managed to make large savings and these savings were effectively repurposed. All the project partners were in agreement that the project’s funds have been properly and adequately managed. The EWLs, CSOLs, and journalists’ capacities were increased in a way which produced the expected results and objectives of the project. The beneficiaries were not satisfied with the way in which the scorecard activity was conducted, for they found the material to be too complicated and tedious. Overall the project has been implemented efficiently.

vi. As a direct impact of the project, processes of self-actualisation, self-confidence, and self-worth can be seen amongst the EWLs. The project’s decision to continue WILL Clubs has also led to its sustained activity even beyond the project’s natural cycle. The gender sensitivity training given to male journalists has also positively impacted the EWLs. The EWLs and CSOLs seem to be more attuned to the needs of their communities now, especially those of women (for instance, issues of sexual and gender-based violence). However, there had been no direct impact on community members in most instances, for the scorecard activity was delayed.

vii. The project is likely to be sustainable beyond its natural cycle by having created networks between CSOLs, EWLs, and journalists, and by also capacitating the beneficiaries through the given training. In terms of long-term improvement of achieved outcomes, the beneficiaries were sceptical – this was due to the failure in completing the scorecard activity and the division of party politics amongst the EWLs. The beneficiaries revealed that they require continued engagement by the project or one of similar nature. The non-involvement of youth and men is seen as an obstacle to achieving sustainability, for the project’s outcomes would have to be carried forward alone by the CSOLs and EWLs, who are close to retirement from their professional roles. The larger organisations involved in
the project have future funding for WILL Clubs. However, the absence of independent initiatives by smaller, local organisations could run the risk of neglecting the beneficiaries needs and opinions.

viii. As for **good practices** within the project, the beneficiaries identified the networks created between them as they felt they would aid in capacitating themselves further and fulfilling their duty towards community members. The training and learnings provided were greatly appreciated. The participatory approach which trainers had adopted was also commended by the beneficiaries as it ensured that individuals could learn and benefit from the training at their own pace.

ix. The project faced many **challenges** in terms of implementing the Community Accountability Tool – the inability to complete the activity and implement the proposals was also seen as a waste of effort by many beneficiaries, although they did appreciate the learnings achieved from it. The play of party politics and the further learnings and training which were not identified earlier on in the project also proved to be challenges for the smooth implementation of the project and its activities.
5. Recommendations

The following recommendations are derived with the aim of contributing to the improvement of future interventions; and are based on the main findings of this evaluation and from learnings and best practices of the WILL project.

**Recommendations regarding widening the scope of the target beneficiaries**

i. Whilst this project was targeted at women leaders who have already navigated the barriers to entry into politics, and especially bypassed barriers in getting elected, it is imperative that such projects should also address the prevalent issue of women not being able to enter into politics. Therefore, such interventions should also target potential candidates and aspiring women political leaders so that they are equipped with knowledge, skills, and self-confidence to enter into the council. This could also enable such projects to target younger women and encourage and enable them to participate in politics by defying the barriers. Moreover, creating opportunities to increase the capacity of EWL’s with fiscal management skills will further empower other women in defying these barriers at future elections.

ii. Apart from targeting aspiring women political leaders, such interventions should also actively involve those from socially marginalised communities (including persons with disabilities and LGBTQI+ communities) so that they too are empowered and encouraged to enter into politics by defying barriers that are particularly unique to them.

iii. Whilst the project was able to capacitate and empower EWLs and thereby give them more confidence to fulfil their roles as councillors, they still face many challenges and barriers that are sometimes caused by their male counterparts, party leaders and other decision makers. Therefore, including these actors in some component of the project (just as male journalists were included) could ensure that at least the mindset of some individuals could be changed in order to facilitate a conducive environment outside the safety of the project. Apart from gender sensitivity, male counterparts should also be provided with financial literacy and familiarity with the Local Council Act and the procedures and processes of and in relation to local councils, so that they too would be capacitated in a similar manner to the EWLs. This would also ensure that male elected officials would not be a hindrance to EWLs’ work within the council (for instance, when forwarding proposals, making statements, etc.) with their lack of knowledge in council proceedings and principles of economics and finances.
**Recommendations regarding project design**

iv. Although the project was successfully implemented despite some issues related to divisions caused by party politics, it should factor in the effects of party politics at the project design stage, so that it could build in activities to create awareness and address the divisions at the onset. By understanding that EWLs are not a uniform group by virtue of gender, and acknowledging ideological differences along party lines, the project could design interventions to increase collaboration and awareness, which could strengthen project design further.

v. In order to address the varying educational levels of participants, projects that include training components should assess if some beneficiaries require foundational training that would help them engage better in a group that has prior knowledge of certain topics. For example, some beneficiaries have asked for training regarding the local council system and constitution. This is especially important for those who have not completed formal education.

vi. The Community Scorecard activity that Search introduced to the EWLs and local CSOs through this project had the potential to create a wider impact, particularly at the local governance level by measuring and setting up a mechanism to ensure better service provision. Therefore, this component should be introduced in similar projects in the future, with better planning for implementation in place.

vii. Future projects that aim to strengthen networks and relationships between EWLs and CSO members should devise activities/methods to ensure better coordination between them, and other team building activities that can lessen tensions between the two groups of actors. For example, Activities could have been designed to encapsulate common struggles faced by both CSOLs and EWLs, as both groups face similar challenges working in the civic and political space. A stakeholder mapping in relation to unique struggles faced by women and how both CSOLs and EWLs have a critical role to play in collectively lobbying for change would have fostered better relations. The understanding that the CSOs and EWLs complement each other in terms of finding solutions to common problems, and the awareness that in working collectively they may arrive at better, more sustainable and inclusive solutions, would have enriched the eco-system for both CSOLs and EWLs.

viii. Although there was no formal framework to measure changes and/or improvements in gender equality and empowerment in the project, it is recommended that projects of this nature incorporate such frameworks at the design stage to better mainstream gender through project activities. A possible framework would be a Gender Responsive Index based on the UN Women’s
Gender Results Effectiveness Scale (GRES)\textsuperscript{28}. This framework relies on the following five-point scale; (i) gender negative – result had a negative outcome; aggravated/reinforced existing gender inequalities and norms, (ii) gender blind – result had no attention to gender, failed to acknowledge the different needs of men, women, girls and boys, or marginalised populations, (iii) gender targeted – project was able to deliver key outputs related to outcomes of the project, (iv) gender responsive – project had the right focus and addressed the needs of beneficiaries, and (v) gender transformative (result contributed to attitudinal change at both individual and institutional level. Expecting a positive outcome in relation to this scale when implementing activities aimed at improving gender equality and empowerment would benefit the beneficiaries, project implementers, and even donors.

Recommendations regarding creating visibility

ix. In the current digital age, outreach and advocacy through social media is one of the most effective mediums to create visibility; however, this can only be successful if more importance is given to the social media component of a project. This should be done by building in the social media campaigns from the onset of the project to the completion of the project (at every stage), including a clear social media strategy and recruiting the right skills and competencies to create innovative and engaging content that can increase the reach.

Recommendations regarding sustainability of project outcomes

x. WILL Clubs have been identified as one of the biggest achievements of this project. Therefore, just as WILL Clubs are continuing even after the completion of the project, they should be formally registered as an association, in order to further ensure sustainability of project outcomes. Similarly, Search should continue to build in WILL Clubs to similar projects in the future.

xi. Such projects specially targeted at local elected women should be implemented for a longer period, at least for the term of the EWLS so that they have time and resources to implement proposals they develop for their communities, and also to be able to establish mechanisms such as the Community Scorecard, and ensure effectiveness and sustainability of project interventions/objectives overall.

xii. A Training of Trainers (TOT) element should be implemented in projects of a similar nature so that the EWLs in turn can support and provide such capacity development and other training to new EWLs. This could also improve the sustainability of similar project interventions.
## Annex 1 – Activity Stream and Status of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Stream</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Description of Activity</th>
<th>Progress/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Capacity building and networking and advocacy for women leaders and CSOs</td>
<td>1.1.1. Women CSO Trainings</td>
<td>3 x 3-day training sessions for 40-50 CSO women</td>
<td>Three 3-day residential trainings for 40-50 CSO women. Each of the three 3-day trainings will address one module: 1) coaching, mentoring, and positive leadership; 2) resource mobilisation, participatory needs assessments, and scorecards; 3) effective communication, community outreach, media, and non-adversarial advocacy. By the end of the trainings, targeted women will be equipped with the necessary skills and confidence to take a lead role in supporting women's political participation in decision-making.</td>
<td>Completed (First 2 sessions were conducted separately for CSOs and a part of the third session was combined with EWLs' third professional development training. The remainder of the third session was continued online; reporting is only available for Kurunegala. The status of the rest of the trainings in Badulla, Jaffna, and Ampara are unclear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2. Sub-granting Scheme for Local Women CSOs</td>
<td>4 sub-grants extended to women-led and women-serving CSOs; at least 4 tailored capacity building sessions organised</td>
<td>Subgrants to women CSOs to engage a larger group of women CSOs working on women's empowerment in Sri Lanka. The sub-grants will provide local women CSOs with the financial resources to raise their sustainability, build their membership, and engage elected women leaders in capacity building, networking and advocacy. Subgrants ranging</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3. Professional Development Trainings</td>
<td>Between €15,000 and €20,000 will be awarded and managed by Search. Will also include capacity building for selected CSOs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Twelve 3-day professional development workshops organised; 160-200 elected women leaders trained</strong></td>
<td>Each training will focus on one module: 1) collaborative leadership and collective impact; 2) resource mapping, mobilisation strategies, and participatory needs assessment; 3) communication, self-profiling, and engaging the media. Three 3-day Professional Development Trainings will be organised per target district for 40-50 leaders from each district. FSLGA will own the newly developed training curriculum and can leverage it later to train elected women leaders in all districts across the country. All training programmes will be conducted by the FSLGA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed (First two workshops were conducted separately for EWLs; the third one was combined with CSOs’ training workshop)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1.4. Women in Learning and Leadership Clubs</th>
<th>15 clubs inaugurated in Kurunegala and in 14 Pradeshiya Sabha in Jaffna. Data from Ampara and Badulla are unavailable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>16 WILL Clubs organised; reaching up to 200 women.</strong></td>
<td>Women in Learning and Leadership Clubs to meaningfully engage women leaders in sustainable learning and exchange. The clubs will convene the elected women leaders and will be open to women from other councils in the district as well as other women leaders interested in political representation, including supporters from media, the private sector, and the government. The women CSOs will establish one club per district that will discuss challenges to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 16 WILL Clubs organised; reaching up to 200 women. | 15 clubs inaugurated in Kurunegala and in 14 Pradeshiya Sabha in Jaffna. Data from Ampara and Badulla are unavailable |
women's participation in political decision-making and will invite speakers to address collectively identified knowledge gaps. These women-only safe spaces will provide a trusting atmosphere where the participants can feel comfortable to speak about sensitive issues and help each other overcome negative stereotypes and navigate the gender dynamics in politics defined by a patriarchal society.

<p>| 1.1.5. Advocacy and Networking Activities | At least 16 district-level advocacy meetings, 1 national-level advocacy meetings; at least 2 inter-district networking meetings. | The trained elected women leaders will have opportunities to connect with political party stakeholders and government ministers and officials around issues that have been raised by their local constituents in activities (A1.2.1) and (A1.2.2) and after collaboratively developing their district-level advocacy plans (A1.2.2). This will include district-level advocacy meetings which will culminate in a national-level meeting. Each event will bring together approximately 50 women leaders and will include participants from different ethnic and religious backgrounds. |
| 1.2. Collaboration between women political leaders and local | 30 reports developed each including a needs assessments | Completed |
| 1.2.1. Women-led Needs Assessments and Resource Mappings | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communities to develop response strategies to constituents' needs.</th>
<th>Resilience and resource mapping.</th>
<th>1.2.2. Mutual Accountability Dialogues</th>
<th>The needs assessments will focus on issues linked to service delivery of the elected women leaders’ Local Councils. This can range from socio-economic challenges to development challenges impacting the constituents’ daily lives and will include specific gender considerations. Based on the issues identified through the needs assessments the elected women leaders with support of the women CSO partners will develop a resource mapping in order to identify the resources to address those issues. The reports will also inform key issues around which the elected women leaders will engage local communities in the mutual accountability dialogues (A.1.2.2).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2. Mutual Accountability Dialogues</td>
<td>30 master scorecards developed and updated; At least 90 mutual accountability dialogues organised.</td>
<td>The needs assessments will focus on issues linked to service delivery of the elected women leaders’ Local Councils. This can range from socio-economic challenges to development challenges impacting the constituents’ daily lives and will include specific gender considerations. Based on the issues identified through the needs assessments the elected women leaders with support of the women CSO partners will develop a resource mapping in order to identify the resources to address those issues. The reports will also inform key issues around which the elected women leaders will engage local communities in the mutual accountability dialogues (A.1.2.2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Media Engagement</td>
<td>1.3.1. Media Fellowship Opportunities</td>
<td>One-day training on gender-sensitive reporting; 8 feature stories developed.</td>
<td>The media fellowship will kick-off with a training on gender-sensitive reporting for all the local journalists that will be engaged in the project. After the training the 8 most motivated journalists showing potential in positive reporting on elected women leaders will be selected to engage local communities in the media fellowship (A.1.3.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Media Engagement</td>
<td>1.3.1. Media Fellowship Opportunities</td>
<td>One-day training on gender-sensitive reporting; 8 feature stories developed.</td>
<td>The media fellowship will kick-off with a training on gender-sensitive reporting for all the local journalists that will be engaged in the project. After the training the 8 most motivated journalists showing potential in positive reporting on elected women leaders will be selected to engage local communities in the media fellowship (A.1.3.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2. Roundtables between Local Journalists and Women Leaders</td>
<td>A minimum of 12 roundtables between Journalists and Women Leaders organised.</td>
<td>Search will facilitate a minimum of 3 roundtables per district between the local journalists and the elected women leaders to ensure regular networking, dialogue, and engagement. The local journalists will be selected ensuring an ethnic and religious mix and will represent diverse forms of media from traditional to social media. Search will select the journalists leveraging its relationship with the district journalist's associations and the Sri Lanka Press Institute (SLPI). The selected journalists will highlight the political actions of the elected women leaders, how they are accountable to their local constituents, how they are doing politics the same or differently from their male counterparts, and highlight new ways of participation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completed = the round tables took place thrice in each district
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3.3. Radio Productions</strong></td>
<td>15-30 radio spots in Sinhala and Tamil, aired over a period of 60 days. The activity will produce radio spots to elevate the voices of elected women leaders and their male counterparts in presenting women political leaders as positive role models. The radio spots will feature diverse political actors and influencers, male or female, young or old, marginalised or in leadership positions, who speak up about locally elected women's positive role in political decision-making. The spots will be aired over a period of two months. 15 to 30 stories will be aired several times a day during primetime slots, during a 60 day campaign.</td>
<td>Nothing found in the narrative reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3.4. Social Media Campaign</strong></td>
<td>A minimum of 300 posts shared on social media over the project duration. The Social Media Campaign (SMC) will showcase positive alternatives for engaging with women political leaders online and promote the exposure of women as positive role models in political decision-making in local languages. The campaign will showcase success stories of successful women that have affected change through amplifying the actions of the target elected women, amplify the Women Radio Productions (A1.3.3), as well as link to national level campaigns on women political participation. The SMC will actively engage male</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>supporters in producing and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>featuring in the content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>Indicator/Key Questions</td>
<td>Methods of Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Relevance</td>
<td>1. To what extent do the assumptions which guided the project design hold up to date? If not – how has the change in the assumptions impacted the realisation of results?</td>
<td>- Desk Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- KPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- FGDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Does the intervention address the short and long-term priorities and needs of the EWL and CSO targeted by the project?</td>
<td>- Desk Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- FGDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- KPIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.3. To what extent did the project activities directly address the leadership needs of the target group? | - Desk Review  
- FGDs  
- KPIs  
- Grant Application  
- FGDs with EWLs and CSOs  
- KPI Search Project Team | - (FDGs) What were their needs/skill gaps etc. before the project; did the project address their leadership needs; was the training useful to address their skill gaps/needs; how were the quality of trainers etc.  
- (KPI Search) What was their vision for leadership development? |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1.4. To what extent were the project’s strategies relevant to national and local contexts? | - Desk Review  
- KPIs  
- FGDs  
- Grant Application/Interim Report/CAT Report  
- Contextual Literature Review  
- KPIs with Search Project Team  
- FGDs with EWL | - (KPI Search) What is the context they designed the project for  
- (FGDs) What were their circumstances and context like before the project; was the project relevant; election campaign timings – would they have been able to benefit from the training if it wasn’t clashing with campaigning |
| 2. Effectiveness | 2.1. Were the overall objective, specific objectives, results, and indicators adhered to as stated in the project’s documents? | - Desk Review  
- Survey  
- KPIs  
- Log Frame, Interim Report, Quarterly Reports from CSO Partners  
- KPIs with Search Team | - (Desk Review) Fill activity stream table and update status of each activity based on quarterly reports from CSO partners; What are the main outputs and outcomes of the project vis-a-vis the log frame and project results framework? |
2.2. What were the factors that led to the achievement or non-achievement of results?

- Desk Review
- KPIs
- FGDs
- Survey

- Interim Report, Quarterly Report; post-training evaluations; training material; social media backend report
- KPIs with all stakeholders and beneficiaries
- FGDs with EWLs and CSO members
- Survey for EWLs and CSOs

- (Survey) Question for each indicator
- (KPI Search) why certain activities/outcomes/indicators were changed; perception of if the objectives were achieved?: what was the success in implementing the project; Are the actions taken and the level of progress in implementing the results contribute to achieving the specific objectives of the project?
- (Survey – EWL/CSO) – testing for the indicators in the log frame.

- (Survey) perceptions about achievement/non-achievement of results; what worked and what did not.
- (FGDs EWL/CSO) about activities and how it went etc.; what was something they did/change they made that they were proud about?; what was something they wish they could have done differently or done at all; ask relevant questions related to indicators; How has this project helped women political and CSO leaders to have the skills and opportunity to develop collaborative relationships, establish channels for information-sharing, and identify common challenges and goals?
| 2.3. To what extent have the modifications made to the project improved the intervention strategy as a whole and the impact of the intervention? | - Desk Review  
- KPI | - Interim Report  
- KPI with project partners/Search Team | - (KPI Search) – what modifications did they have to make and why, did it make the project better (how?) or what could have been done differently?; did they consult with the beneficiaries/partners when making changes? |
| 2.4. How did the project ensure the visibility of the project activities among participants and relevant stakeholders? | - Desk Review  
- KPIs  
- FGDs | - Interim Report/ Feature Articles done by journalists/Social Media Campaign/Social Media Backend Data | - (FGDs constituents) how they found out about the project etc.; how they got involved in the dialogues etc. |
### 2.5. What measurable changes in gender equality and women’s empowerment have occurred as a result of the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Activities and Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPIs with Search Team and Journalists; Social Media Consultant</strong></td>
<td>- (FGDs CSOs) how did they get involved in the project etc.; did they get enough visibility for their campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FGDs constituents</strong></td>
<td>- (FGD EWL) after the project did the people reach out to them about the project/campaigns etc.; have they seen the social media campaign?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI Journalists</strong></td>
<td>- (KPI Search Team) what activities did they do to create visibility? How successful was it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI Journalists</strong></td>
<td>- (KPI Journalists) how did they get involved in the project; did they get any feedback on the feature articles; results of radio programmes; what is the reach of their general audience?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Survey**
  - KPIs
  - FGDs

- **KPIs with Gender Consultant, Social Media Consultant and Journalists**
  - FGD with EWLs
  - Survey with EWLs

- **(FGDs) self-perception of level of empowerment, self-confidence and self-esteem etc.; was there a change in how their male-counterparts and husbands perceived/treated them**

- **(KPI Journalists) were they aware of the nuances of gender sensitive reporting before the project; has their reporting style etc. changed? Did they see a change in their attitudes;**

- **(KPI Search) are there any usual parameters they use to measure gender**
### 3. Efficiency

#### 3.1. Is the transformation of resources into results being carried out efficiently?
- Desk Review
- Financial Reports and Budgets; Post Training Evaluations
- Measure efficiency of resources used to achieve the results; Number of days budgeted and used etc.; cost per activity/budget line etc. (exceeded or not); if results were achieved with the given resources

#### 3.2. Are there any alternatives for achieving more cost-effective results?
- KPIs
- KPIs with Search Team / Project partners (CSO leaders) / Donor
- (KPI Search/CSO Partners) Were the project activities cost effective; were there areas that budgets were not enough or could have been used differently

#### 3.3. Measure the results (qualitative and quantitative) about the inputs/resources devoted to the project.
- Desk Review
- KPIs
- Grant Application; Financial Reports
- KPI with Search Team/CSO Partners
- (KPI Search/CSO partners) COVID and other external shocks and how it affected budgets and how it was managed

#### 3.4. Are the capacities of EWL, CSO, and journalists sufficient to achieve the
- Desk Review
- KPIs
- FGDs
- LogFrame, Post Training Evaluations, Baseline Survey
- KPIs with Journalists
- (FCDs/KPIs with Journalists) understanding of key concepts (check baselines); do they feel their capacities were...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.5. Are sufficient human and material resources available to strengthen these capacities, particularly regarding the integration of the gender perspective?</th>
<th>4. Impact</th>
<th>4.1. What were the direct impact of the project on target beneficiaries?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Desk Review  
  - KPIs  
  - FGDs | - Desk Review  
  - FGDs  
  - FGDs with EWLs and CSO members | - Desk Review  
  - Quarterly Partner Narrative Reports  
  - FGDs with EWLs and CSO members |
| - FGDs with EWLs and CSO members | - Grant Application, Interim Report  
  - KPIs with Search Staff, Consultants and Trainers  
  - FGDs with EWLs/CSOs | - (FGDs) were the expectations met from the trainings; what could have been improved  
  - (KPIs Trainers) what did they think of the facilities/material etc. available to conduct the trainings, and the support received by Search  
  - (KPI CSO Partners) if they had enough funds to carry out the activities; were there any issues faced relating to funds.  
  - (KPI Search) how did they recruit the trainers/consultants, what were the criteria and process; what were their perceptions about the trainers after the training; any areas of improvement etc.  
- (KPIs EWL) if they felt more empowered and confident about their roles etc.; what are they going to do to advance policy changes; how has this inspired measures in policy advocacy; or whether they have already done anything within the course of this project; translation of the learnings into policy; |
4.2. What is the relationship between the project purpose and goal and the extent to which the benefits received by target beneficiaries had affected a large number of people in the project sites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk Review</td>
<td>Grant Application, LogFrame, Interim Report, CAT Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGDs</td>
<td>FGDs with EWLS and CSO members, FGD with Constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPIs</td>
<td>KPIs with Journalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGDs with EWLs and CSO</td>
<td>FGDs – How it impacted the community and constituents;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>- KPI Journalists – did the project benefit others apart from direct beneficiaries and how?; did the change in the way they report have a ripple effect on other reporters?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Has there been any influence beyond the project circle?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPIs</td>
<td>KPIs with Search Team and CSO Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGDs</td>
<td>Were there any unintended impacts from the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Sustainability (NP)

5.1. What is the project exit plan (if any)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk Review</td>
<td>Grant Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPIs</td>
<td>KPIs with Search Team/CSO Partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2. Did the achieved outcomes lead to long-term improvements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk Review</td>
<td>Interim Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPIs</td>
<td>KPIs with Search Team, CSO Partners and Journalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGDs</td>
<td>FGDs with EWLS, CSO members and constituents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3. Are the achieved outcomes sustainable after the end of the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPIs</td>
<td>KPIs with Search Team/Donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGDs</td>
<td>FGDs with EWLS and CSO Members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- (FGDs) If they feel they have enough of a foundation to continue on their own
- (KPI Search) Do they have any measures in place to continue the engagement with the beneficiaries and amongst beneficiaries;
| 5.4. How have the local stakeholders taken ownership of the project initiatives? | - KPIs  
- FGDs | - KPIs with journalists  
- FGDs with EWLs and CSO Members | - (FGDs/KPIs Journalists) Do they see the networks with Journos and CSOs continuing beyond the project?; do the EWLs have a continuing line with the journalists; Has the network been helpful?; what are they planning to do after the project? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5. Are there any independent initiatives started to complement the project initiatives or are there any formal commitments towards this?</td>
<td>- KPIs</td>
<td>- KPIs with Search Team; CSO Partners; Donor</td>
<td>- Are there similar projects to carry on the initiative?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination | 6.1. How far had the project mainstreamed gender equality and non-discrimination? | - Desk Review  
- FGDs  
- KPIs  
- Survey | - Grant Application, CAT Report, Quarterly and Interim Report, Log Frame  
- FGDs with EWLs and CSO members, FGDs with Constituents | - (KPI Search) - Why were men not included? Would they have expected a better outcome if men were included?  
- (FGDs) how did they feel about men not being included; did it affect how they carried out the project/work? |
6.2. To what extent did the project actively identify and include the most marginalised groups in Sri Lanka, ensuring no one is left behind?

- Desk Review
- FGDs
- KPIs
- Survey
- KPI with gender expert, journalists
- Grant Application, CAT Report, Quarterly and Interim Report, Beneficiary profiles
- FGDs CSO members, KPI with gender expert; Search Team
- Survey (EWL/CSO) – if beneficiaries mainstream gender into their activities

(FGDs/KPIs) was there participation from people with disabilities; LGBTQ persons and economically marginalised people etc.; has the project been sensitive to the local culture; were arrangements made to ensure that people who wanted to be involved in the project can be?

- Survey (EWL/CSO) – has the project made an effort to include marginalised groups

7. Good Practices, Challenges and Lessons Learned

7.1. What are the good practices observed during the life of the project?

- Desk Review
- FGDs
- KPIs
- Interim Report, Quarterly Reports
- FGDs with EWLs and CSO Members
- KPIs with Consultants, Journalists and Search Team
- Best part about the project; most memorable part of the project etc.
- Unique practices that had positive outcomes

7.2. What are the potential project implementation risks and challenges faced during the project implementation and how they were managed?

- Desk Review
- KPIs
- Grant Application, Interim Report
- KPIs with Search Team
- Questions about assumptions and risks and how these were mitigated

7.3. What worked and what did not work? Why?

- Desk Review
- Interim Report, Quarterly Reports
- What could have been done better or differently
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>- FGDs - KPIs</th>
<th>- FGDs with EWLs and CSO Members - KPIs with Consultants, Journalists and Search Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.4. What are the major lessons learned? How have they been incorporated into the programming?</td>
<td>- Desk Review - KPIs</td>
<td>- Interim Report - KPIs with Search Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3 – Document Checklist

The following documents in this table were consulted during the desk review and informs the findings presented in this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Comments/Document Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Proposal/ Grant Application Form</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>16/6/2022</td>
<td>200619_C-409951...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Logframe (M&amp;E Indicators)</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>16/6/2022</td>
<td>Updated Logframe WILL Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Project Budget</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>1/7/2022</td>
<td>NCE Working WILL...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Project Extension Documents</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>1/7/2022</td>
<td>Addendum No1...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Quarterly Progress Reports from CSO Partners</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>30/6/2022</td>
<td>Narrative Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Quarterly Financial Reports</td>
<td>Not Received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Interim Narrative Report (March 2021)</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>16/6/2022</td>
<td>Annex IV - Interim Narrative Report...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Mid Term Review</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 Final Report</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
<td>Will be ready by Sep 2022 only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 Final Financial Report</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
<td>Will be ready by Sep 2022 only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7 Annexures from Progress Reports</td>
<td>Not Relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Baseline Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 Inception Report</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>16/6/2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Annex 2A</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>16/6/2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Annex 2B</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>16/6/2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Annex 2C</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>16/6/2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 Annex 2D</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>16/6/2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6 Annex 2E</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>16/6/2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Annex 2F</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>16/6/2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Baseline Survey Report</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>16/6/2022</td>
<td>SFCG Baseline Study Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Baselines Survey (raw) data</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>4/7/2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Additional Documentation/Lists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Contact Information - Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Contact Information - Partner Organisations</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>16/6/2022</td>
<td>All in one excel - Stakeholder Details WILL Latest 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Contact Information - Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>30/6/2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Training modules/documents</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>30/6/2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Post-Workshop/Training Evaluations</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>29/8/2022</td>
<td>4 reports received from Search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Final Report - Development of a Community Accountability Tool</td>
<td>Received - from CEPA</td>
<td>24/5/2022</td>
<td>CEPA had this on file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Minutes from district level</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>5/9/2022</td>
<td>Minutes of journalists roundtables and fellowships received from Search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minutes from national level advocacy meetings</td>
<td>Not Received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Papers/Media Publications from National Advocacy Campaign</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>30/6/2022</td>
<td>In folder - National Level Advocacy Nov 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Needs assessments and resource mapping reports (done by EWLs) (Activity 1.2.1)</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>5/9/2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Master Scorecards (Activity 1.2.2)</td>
<td>Not Received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Feature Stories by Journalists (Activity 1.3.1)</td>
<td>Not Received</td>
<td>5/9/2022</td>
<td>Media Tracking Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>Notes/Minutes from RT between Journalists and EWLs (Activity 1.3.2)</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>5/9/2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>Links to Social Media Campaign pages/accounts (Activity 1.3.4)</td>
<td>Party Received</td>
<td><a href="https://www.facebook.com/VoteWomenSL">https://www.facebook.com/VoteWomenSL</a></td>
<td>Other links will be shared ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Social Media Backend Report</td>
<td>Recieved</td>
<td>3/8/2022</td>
<td>Analytics from Vote Women FB Page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 4 – List of Persons Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Sadaath</td>
<td>M&amp;E Manager</td>
<td>SFCG</td>
<td>25/07/2022</td>
<td>Sinhala and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahunthala</td>
<td>Senior Project Coordinator</td>
<td>SFCG</td>
<td>25/07/2022</td>
<td>Sinhala and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Rathnarajah</td>
<td>Senior Programme Manager</td>
<td>SFCG</td>
<td>25/07/2022</td>
<td>Sinhala and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nishadhini</td>
<td>Senior Project Manager</td>
<td>SFCG</td>
<td>25/07/2022</td>
<td>Sinhala and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasika</td>
<td>Deputy Project Manager</td>
<td>SFCG</td>
<td>25/07/2022</td>
<td>Sinhala and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa</td>
<td>Head of Programmes</td>
<td>SFCG</td>
<td>25/07/2022</td>
<td>Sinhala and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Hewawasam</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>25/08/2022</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Ramanayake</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>FSLGA</td>
<td>18/08/2022</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Tharumarajah</td>
<td>District Partner</td>
<td>CWD</td>
<td>27/07/2022</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janushiya</td>
<td>District Partner</td>
<td>Vani Sutha</td>
<td>15/08/2022</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Vani</td>
<td>District Partner</td>
<td>Vani Sutha</td>
<td>15/08/2022</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Perera</td>
<td>District Partner</td>
<td>WRC</td>
<td>04/08/2022</td>
<td>Sinhala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Inadeen</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>CEPA</td>
<td>26/07/2022</td>
<td>English and Sinhala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Croos</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Anthony</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Benedict</td>
<td>Management Consultant and Trainer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>01/08/2022</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. K. G. Dhanapala</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>05/08/2022</td>
<td>Sinhala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Priscilla</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>02/08/2022</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5 – Indicator Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Goal: To strengthen Sri Lankan women’s voices in political decision making at all levels</th>
<th>Achieved in the Project</th>
<th>Project Target</th>
<th>Comments on % of Target Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1.1:</strong> Women political empowerment index</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>Target not achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 1:** Increased effective participation of local women organisations and locally elected women leaders in local governance processes

**Indicator 1.1:** Number of recommendations/ public statements/ interventions resulting from consultations with citizens organized with the support of the intervention, presented by the elected women

- **Achieved:** 35
- **Target:** To be defined by the OM and the IP

*Data shared by Search indicates that 35 recommendations have been provided by EWLs. However, survey data shows a total of 1,473 recommendations, public statements, and interventions. The numbers indicated by beneficiaries may not align with data available with Search as beneficiary perceptions tend to be overstated.*

**Indicator 1.2:** Number of Elected Women Leaders in leadership/ managerial/ decision making positions in local governance structures

- **Achieved:** 100
- **Target:** 20

**Indicator 1.3:** Number of women CSOs who have completed at least one campaign to promote women’s role in political decision-making

- **Achieved:** 41
- **Target:** 10

**Output 1.1** Increased capacity of local women CSO leaders and locally elected women leaders to participate in decision-making at the district, provincial, and national level in a way that is more accountable to their local constituents

**Indicator 1.1.1:** Number of women members of CSOs trained by the intervention with increased knowledge and skills in coaching, mentoring, and positive leadership

- **Achieved:** 52
- **Target:** 40

**Indicator 1.1.2:** Number of women members of CSOs trained by the intervention with increased knowledge and leadership

- **Achieved:** 50
- **Target:** 40

Target surpassed
| Indicator 1.1.3: Number of women members of CSOs trained by the intervention with increased knowledge and skills in effective communication, community outreach, media, and non-adversarial advocacy | 47 | 40 | Target surpassed |
| Indicator 1.1.4: Number of elected women leaders trained by the intervention with increased knowledge and skills in collaborative leadership and collective impact | 119 | 160 | Target not achieved |
| Indicator 1.1.5: Number of elected women leaders trained by the intervention with increased knowledge and skills in resource mapping, mobilisation strategies, and participatory needs assessment | 160 | 111 | Target surpassed |
| Indicator 1.1.6: Number of elected women leaders trained by the intervention with increased knowledge and skills in communication, self-profiling, and engaging the media | 160 | 102 | Target surpassed |
| Indicator 1.1.7: Number of women members of CSOs with increased knowledge of gender equality and skills in women and gender mainstreaming | 54 | 18 | Target surpassed |
| **Output 1.2: Increased collaboration between women political leaders and local communities** |  |  |  |
| Indicator 1.2.1: Number of advocacy plans developed by participating women CSOs and elected women leaders resulting from consultations with citizens organised with the support of the intervention | 27 | 4 | Target surpassed |
| Indicator 1.2.2: Number of elected women leaders having interacted with citizens through mutual accountability dialogue | 160 | 111 | Target surpassed |
| Indicator 1.2.3: Number of group consultations between citizens and elected women leaders facilitated by the intervention | 90 | 90 | Target achieved |
### Output 1.3: Increased capacity and engagement of local media actors to challenge negative stereotypes and enable positive attitudes towards women’s role in decision-making.

#### Indicator 1.3.1: Number of media actors trained by the intervention with increased knowledge on gender equality and increased skills in inclusive leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Target achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Indicator 1.3.2: Number of media products produced by the participating media actors promoting women leadership, challenging negative stereotypes or promoting positive narratives towards women and their leadership abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Target surpassed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output 1.4: Strengthened public awareness and debate on women as positive role models in political decision-making and democratic processes

#### Indicator 1.4.1 Number of individuals reached through civil society campaigns/ events/ consultations aiming at promoting women as positive role models in political decision-making, thanks to support of the intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total media reach</th>
<th>To be decided by the OM and the IP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,714,609</td>
<td>Data from Search’s media tracking data. This number include social media reach, and TV, radio and newspaper reach. Therefore it is unclear what percentage of this reach can be attributed to those who actually saw/heard the project message that was broadcast/ telecasted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 2: Increased personal agency and institutional legitimacy (Added from Search’s Global Impact Framework)

#### Indicator 2.1: Personal agency – % of the beneficiaries that believe they can make a positive difference in their neighbourhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target surpassed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Indicator 2.2: Institutional Legitimacy – % of the beneficiaries who believe that decision-making is inclusive and responsive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target surpassed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 6 – Ethnic composition of FGD participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sinhalese</th>
<th>Tamil</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EWLs</td>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>EWLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampara</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaffna</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurunegala</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badulla</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 7 – Demographic composition of survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ampara EWLs</th>
<th>CSOs</th>
<th>Jaffna EWLs</th>
<th>CSOs</th>
<th>Kurunegala EWLs</th>
<th>CSOs</th>
<th>Badulla EWLs</th>
<th>CSOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and above</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinhala</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgher</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to grade 9</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to O/Ls but did not sit for O/Ls</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat for O/Ls</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to A/Ls but did not sit for A/Ls</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat for A/Ls</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masters</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 8 – Qualitative Data Collection Tools
(Sample question guides)

KPI Guide – Search Team

1. In designing the project there were certain assumptions made (refer grant application)
   a. How did you arrive at these assumptions?
   b. Did you find these assumptions relevant? (prompt to explain)
   c. Did you find these assumptions change throughout the project period and what were they?
   d. How did the change in those assumptions affect the project implementation?
   e. How were these assumptions received by the beneficiaries or partners – if they were discussed with them?

2. What was the national and local context that you designed the project for? What were some of the prevalent issues you were trying to address?

3. How did this project address the long- and short-term priorities of target communities?

4. How and why was leadership development built into the project? Were there other modifications that were made to the project?
   a. Why were these modifications made and why?
   b. Did you consult with the beneficiaries/partners when making these changes?

5. Overall, what do you think were the main achievements of the project?

6. Were there things you would have done differently?

7. What were the reasons for not conducting certain activities (if any) (go through activity stream)?

8. What activities did you do to create visibility of the project?
   a. How successful was it? Do you think sufficient visibility was created? If not, what could have been done better?

9. Are there any usual parameters you use to measure gender equality and women’s empowerment or how would you expect this to be measured for this project?

10. Something the evaluators found interesting is that only male journalists were selected for this project – was this by design, if so what was the reasoning behind it?

11. Did you find any shortcomings by not including male elected leaders or male CSO members in the project? Why?

12. Do you think the project activities were cost effective?
   a. Were there savings in certain areas?
   b. Were there areas that budgets were not enough or could have been used differently?

13. How did COVID and other external shocks affect the budgets and how was it managed?

14. Can you tell us about the grants given to CSOs partners?
   a. How did that work? What sort of activities did the CSOs do with the grants?
   b. How were the grants monitored and managed?

15. How were the trainers and consultants recruited, what was the criteria and process?
   a. What were your perceptions about the trainers after the trainings?
   b. Any areas of improvement etc?

16. What were the plans put in place to ensure the continuity of project interventions?
   a. Do you have any measures in place to continue the engagement with the beneficiaries and amongst beneficiaries?
   b. Are there any other funding streams to continue the project interventions/or phase 2 etc. or are there similar projects to carry on the initiative?

17. When do you expect improvements to be seen in EWLs/CSOs etc?

18. What tangible improvements do you expect in the long run? What would you define as long term?

19. Was there participation from people with disabilities; LGBTQ persons and economically marginalised people etc.?
   a. How did you ensure marginalised groups were included in the project?

20. What were some of the unique practices that had positive outcomes?

21. Any areas of improvement – things that could have been done differently?

22. What were some of the unintended impacts from the project?

23. Any recommendations for future interventions?
KPI Guide – Donor
1. In your understanding, did the project align with the global priorities on women in political participation and decision making?
2. What were the funding priorities of the EU at that time, and how did the project fit into that?
3. Did the implementing partners require changes to the contract and agreed timelines and how did you as the donor respond to these?
4. Do you think the project was able to bounce back from the COVID-19 pandemic? How?
5. Do you think the project’s objectives were achievable/feasible in the context of Sri Lanka?
6. At the outset do you think the project design mainstreamed gender equality and non-discrimination angle sufficiently?
7. Do you think the project was able to achieve its objectives? If yes, why and if not, why not??
8. What do you think are the key achievements of the project on gender equality and women’s empowerment?
9. How timely was the delivery of the project’s objectives and results?
   a. Could it have been improved?
10. In your opinion, were the resources allocated (including technical expertise and human resources) sufficiently to achieve the objectives of this project?
11. Do you think the project has an effective exit strategy to ensure sustainability of results/objectives even after the project has ended?
12. Are there future projects in the pipeline to support the same effort?
13. What were some of the unique practices that had positive outcomes?
14. Any areas of improvement – things that could have been done differently?
15. What were some of the unintended impacts from the project?
16. Any recommendations for future interventions?

KPI Guide – CSO Partners
1. What was your organisation’s role in this project?
2. What did you expect from the project and were those expectations met?
3. What were some of the skill gaps of your staff before the project?
   a. Was the project able to address those and fill the capacity gaps?
4. Were you consulted before the project was designed or at what stage did you get involved in the project?
5. What were some of the challenges you had to face due to external shocks like COVID, etc.?
   a. How did Search help navigate these issues?
6. Overall, do you think the project was successful? Why?
   a. Would you be able to tell us the number of elected women leaders in leadership/managerial/decision making positions in local governance structures currently? Or how can we access this information?
7. How did your component contribute to achievement of project goals and objectives? (what did you achieve as a partner?)
8. Were there things that could have been done differently?
9. If you pointed out issues, was Search quick to respond and address them?
10. Do you think the funding you received was adequate to carry out the project activities?
   a. Were there areas that budgets were not enough or could have been used differently?
11. How did COVID and other external shocks affect the budgets and how was it managed?
12. Did you have sufficient human resources to carry out the project (capacity gaps)?
   a. Were there any roles that should have been included to make it more effective?
13. What were the plans put in place to ensure the continuity of project interventions?
   a. Do you have any measures in place to continue the engagement with the beneficiaries and amongst beneficiaries?
   b. Are there similar projects you are working/or potential to work on to carry on the initiative?
14. What tangible improvement do you expect in the long run as a result of this project?
15. Was there participation from people with disabilities; LGBTQ persons and economically marginalised people etc.?
   a. How did you ensure marginalised groups were included in the project?
16. What were some of the unique practices that had positive outcomes?
17. Any areas of improvement – things that could have been done differently?
18. What were some of the unintended impacts from the project?
19. Any recommendations for future interventions?
KPI Guide – Trainers and Consultants

General Opening Questions

1. What was your role in the project?
   a. What were the activities you were involved in and in what capacity?
2. What did you think about the project overall?
   a. Was it relevant to the Sri Lankan political and social context?
3. What were some of the measures taken by Search to ensure the implementation of project activities you were involved in through challenging external shocks (such as COVID)?
4. Do you think the project responded to the context
   a. For example - do you think women are represented adequately and accurately in politics and was the project able to address this issue?

Specific Questions

Trainers

1. What content did the training you conducted cover?
2. What were some of the methods used to conduct the training?
3. Did you play a role in designing the training?
4. Did you think the training material/approach was adequate? Would you have done anything differently?
5. Did you observe the knowledge/skills increase of beneficiaries after the training?
6. What did they think of the facilities/material/financial resources available to conduct the training?
7. How is the support received by Search to conduct the training/activities?
8. Was there participation from people with disabilities; LGBTQ persons and economically marginalised people etc?
9. Was the project being sensitive to the local culture?
10. Were arrangements made to ensure that people who wanted to be involved in the project can be despite personal circumstantial challenges?
11. Did you receive any particular feedback from participants?

Consultants on the Community Accountability Tool (CAT)

1. What were some steps taken by the project to mainstream gender equality and non-discrimination?
2. How do tools such as the Scorecard deployed through CAT facilitate this?
3. When designing the tool, were safeguards incorporated to improve accessibility to marginalised groups?
4. What are some direct benefits of using CAT in this kind of project?
5. What are some indirect benefits of using CAT in this type of project?

Trainer – Gender Sensitive Training/Gender Consultant

1. Are there any usual parameters used to measure gender equality and women’s empowerment or how would this be measured?
3. In your expert opinion, did the overall project benefit or lose out by engaging all male journalists?
   a. Was this by design or what was the reason for this?
4. How would having female journalists impact the project differently?
9. How did the training contribute to mainstreaming gender equality and non-discrimination?
10. Were the resources provided for the training adequate to strengthen capacity on the gender perspective?

Social Media Consultant

1. What activities were done to create visibility of the project?
2. To what extent was Search involved in designing the campaign?
3. Can you tell us about the social media campaign?
   a. What was the purpose of it?
   b. What did it entail?
   c. Were there any unique approaches taken to create maximum visibility?
   d. Do you have any data on the reach/visibility created through the campaign?

General Closing Questions

1. What was the best part about the project/most memorable part of the project?
2. What were some of the unique practices that you observed that had positive outcomes?
3. What are some things that could have been done differently or improved?
4. Any recommendations for future interventions?

FGD Guide – Journalists

1. How did you get involved in the project? Where did you hear about the project?
2. What were some of the activities you took part in?
3. Did you receive any feedback or comment on the feature articles or radio programmes you did as a part of this project?
4. What is the general reach of your/your medium's (newspaper/social media page/radio show) audience/readership?
5. Prior to this training, did you normally consider gender sensitivity when reporting?
6. Have you received any training on gender sensitive reporting before this?
7. Do you have a better basic understanding of gender related issues after the training?
8. Did the training impact your reporting style as it pertains to gender?
9. Did the training help increase/improve your capacity as a journalist?
10. Did the project benefit others apart from direct beneficiaries, if so, how?
11. Are the networks established/contacts made through the project still in touch?
12. Do you see a benefit in the contacts made through the project, how do you hope to leverage it going forward?
13. What was the important part/aspect of the project?
   a. What was the most relevant aspect/part of the project?
14. What were your key takeaways/learnings?
15. What areas that could have been improved? What are the areas that could have been included when it came to the training and networking events etc.?

FGD Guide - EWLs

Relevance:

1. The SFCG team came to you with certain assumptions (through KPIs) as EWLs in your respective regions
   a. What did you think about those initial assumptions made about you?
   b. Did they hold true?
   c. Were you able to dispel some/all of them?
2. What were your short-term and long-term priorities as EWLs prior to this project?
   a. Was the project able to address those priorities? If not, why?
3. What were your expectations of this project?
   a. Were those expectations met?
4. Prior to the implementation of the project, what would you say your leadership needs/skill gaps as EWLs were?
   a. Were the project activities relevant in addressing those needs and skill gaps?
   b. What did you think about the project activities/training given to you?
c. What did you think about the trainers who conducted programmes/trainings?

5. How were your circumstances as EWLs when the project reached out to you?
   a. Was the project relevant in dealing with/addressing those circumstances?
   b. Did the project overlap with your election campaigning? Did this affect the project in any way?
   c. Was the project mindful of the local culture when approaching you/conducting project activities?

Effectiveness:
1. Were the training/project activities used effective in bringing about expected outcomes (refer to the indicators)?
   a. Why do you think they were effective?
   b. Why do you think they were not effective?
2. Did this project help you develop the skills and opportunity to develop collaborative relationships, establish channels for information-sharing, and identify common challenges and goals? How?
3. Did people reach out to you about the project once it was over/were people aware of this project associated with EWLs?
   a. Did you see the social media campaign created as a part of the project?
   b. Did you listen to radio programmes done in relation to this project?
   c. Do you think that the social media campaign and the radio programmes were successful in bringing visibility to this project?
4. Can you tell us what you understand by the term gender?
   a. Did the project help you rethink gender and gender equality? Is it any different from how you understood these concepts/notions prior to the project?
   b. Do you think the project either positively or negatively affected your own notions and identifications of gender and gender-empowerment?
   c. Do you think that there is a change in how you are treated as a woman and an EWL at your workplace/home?
5. Was the project mindful of the external shocks such as the COVID pandemic when conducting project activities with you?
   a. Did the pandemic affect your circumstances both as an EWL and a woman?
   b. Did the project team make necessary changes to adapt to the pandemic and your changed circumstances? How?

6. Efficiency:
1. Were the concepts touched in the project completely new to you?
2. Do you think that you already had some knowledge on what you were being trained on?
   a. Refer to the indicators

Impact:
1. Did this project make you feel more empowered/confident within your role?
2. Did this project enable you to advance more policies and policy advocacy in relation to your fields of expertise and gender?
   a. Have you already done something similar before or during the course of this project?
3. How have you used the learnings of this project in your work as an EWL? How? In what areas?
4. How has this project helped your community and constituents?
5. Do you believe that as a result of this project you can help your locality and constituency better? How?
6. Have you heard anyone beyond your constituency mention this project and related activities?

Sustainability:
1. What tangible changes/improvements/outcomes did you gain/hope to gain from this project?
   a. Do you expect them to last in the long-run?
2. Do you think the training provided and the engagement with the project is enough for you to carry on by yourself?
3. Has the network created between you and the other stakeholders (journalists and CSOs) been helpful?
   a. Do you think that this network would continue even after the project?
   b. Do you have any collaborations in mind for the future?

Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination:
1. How did you feel about this project not including EMLs?
   a. Did that lessen/heighten the impact of the project?
2. Was the project and related activities successful in mainstreaming gender equality and non-discrimination?
   a. How did the EWL use the training on the ground?
   b. Were men and women differently affected by COVID-19 closure? In what ways?
c. Did you or the council initiate any specific activity in this regard?
d. In what ways did the training contribute to advancing gender equality and non-discrimination?

3. Did the project extend itself to include the marginalised in your communities (disabled, othered sexual and
gender identities, economically marginalised, caste, etc.)?
   a. Was it successful?
   b. Were arrangements made for anyone who wanted to be a part of the project to join despite personal
circumstantial challenges?

Good Practices and Lessons Learned:
1. What do you think was the best or the most memorable part about the project?
   a. Any unique practice of the project that had an impact on you?
2. Is there anything that you think this project could have done better or handled in a better way?

FGD Guide – CSO Members
Relevance:
1. Search designed this project with certain assumptions (list out some assumptions)
   a. What did you think about those initial assumptions made?
   b. Did they hold true?
   c. Were you able to dispel some/all of them through the project?
2. What were your short-term and long-term priorities prior to this project as CSO members in this specific
   sector?
   a. Was the project able to address those priorities?
      i. If yes, how?
      ii. If not, why?
3. What were your expectations of this project?
   a. Were those expectations met?
4. Prior to the implementation of the project, what would you say your leadership needs/skill gaps as CSO
   members were?
   a. Were the project activities relevant in addressing those needs and skill gaps?
   b. What did you think about the project activities/training given to you?
   c. What did you think about the trainers who conducted programmes/trainings?
5. Was the project mindful of the COVID pandemic when conducting project activities?
   a. Did the project team make necessary changes to adapt to the pandemic and your changed
      circumstances?
   b. Were those changes relevant?

Effectiveness:
7. Were the training/project activities used effectively in bringing about expected outcomes (refer to the
   indicators)?
   a. Why do you think they were effective?
   b. Why do you think they were not effective?
8. Did people reach out to you about the project once it was over/were people aware of this project associated
   with CSOs?
   a. Did you see the social media campaign created as a part of the project?
   b. Did you listen to radio programmes done in relation to this project?
   c. Do you think that the social media campaign and the radio programmes were successful in bringing
      visibility to this project? Or were they not enough?
9. Can you tell us what you understand by the term gender?
   a. Did the project help you rethink gender and gender equality? Is it any different from how you
      understood these concepts/notions prior to the project?
   b. Do you think the project either positively or negatively affects your own notions and identifications of
      gender and gender-empowerment?
   c. Do you think that there is a change in how you are treated as a woman at your workplace/home?
10. Was the project mindful of external shocks such as the COVID pandemic when conducting project activities with
    you?
    a. Did the project team make necessary changes to adapt to the pandemic and your changed
       circumstances? How?
3. Were the concepts touched in the project completely new to you?
4. Do you think that you already had some knowledge on what you were being trained on?
   a. Refer to the training modules

**Impact:**
7. Did this project make you feel more empowered/confident within your role?
8. Did this project enable you to advance more policies and proposals in relation to your fields of expertise and gender?
   a. Have you already done something similar before or during the course of this project?
9. How have you used the learnings of this project in your work as a CSO member?
10. Do you believe that as a result of this project you can help your locality better? How?
11. Have you heard anyone beyond your community mention this project and related activities?

**Sustainability:**
4. What tangible changes/improvements/outcomes did you gain/hope to gain from this project?
   a. Do you expect them to last in the long-run?
5. Do you think the training provided and the engagement with the project is enough for you to carry on by yourself?
6. Has the network created between you and the other stakeholders (journalists and EWLs) been helpful?
   a. Do you think that this network would continue even after the project?
   b. Do you have any collaborations in mind for the future?

**Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination:**
4. How did you feel about this project not including EMLs?
   a. Did that lessen/heighten the impact of the project?
5. Was the project and related activities successful in mainstreaming gender equality and non-discrimination?
6. Did the project extend itself to include the marginalised in your communities (disabled, othered sexual and gender identities, economically marginalised, caste, etc.)?
   a. Was it successful?
   b. Was the project sensitive to the local culture?
   c. Were arrangements made for anyone who wanted to be a part of the project to join despite personal circumstantial challenges?

**Good Practices and Lessons Learned:**
3. What do you think was the best or the most memorable part about the project?
   a. Any unique practice of the project that had an impact on you?
4. Is there anything that you think this project could have done better or handled in a better way?

**FGD Guide – Constituents**

**Effectiveness:**
1. Have you heard of this project prior to being contacted for the FGD? What do you know about it?
   a. How, where, and when did you hear about it?
   b. Have you seen their social media campaign?
   c. Have you heard any of the radio programmes on this?
   d. Do you know of other stakeholders involved in the project?
   e. Were you ever involved in any of the dialogues with the EWLs?
2. What has your engagement with the EWLs been like?
   a. Has it changed during the course of the project and after that (Jan 2020 – now)?
   b. What kind of help have you received from EWLs? Has it changed? What kind of help do you receive now?

**Impact:**
1. How do you think this project has impacted your community?
   a. Do you think that the training given to the EWLs has impacted you in any way?
2. Have you seen any improvements in the EWLs who received training from this project?
3. Do you think that there is gender equality amongst local elected leaders in your area?
   a. What do you think about only EWLs being involved in this project?
   b. Do you think that involving EMLs would have had an impact on achieving the project’s outcomes?
### Annex 9 – Survey Tool

#### Survey Tool for EWLs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Response type</th>
<th>Coded options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Name of the Elected Women Leader</td>
<td>Text (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. District.</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Badulla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Jaffna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Kurunegala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Divisional secretariat division.</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Local authority that you served in?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. Municipal council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Urban council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Pradeshiya Sabha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Position held within the local government?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. Mayor/chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Deputy mayor/deputy chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Specify 'other'</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Name of the municipal council, urban council, or Pradeshiya Sabha.</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How did you become a member at the municipal council, urban council, or Pradeshiya Sabha?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. Contested through election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Nominated through PR list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Age.</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. 19 or below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. 20 – 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. 25 – 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. 35 – 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. 45 – 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. 65 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Sinhala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Tamil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Burgher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Highest educational attainment</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. No schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Up to primary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Up to grade 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Up to O/Ls but did not sit for O/Ls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Sat for O/Ls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Up to A/Ls but did not sit for A/Ls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Sat for A/Ls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Degree or equivalent qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Masters or equivalent qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Vocational training and diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Are you attached to a political party?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. If yes, name of the party.</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Position at the party.</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do you regularly attend local government meetings?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>If not, list out reason(s).</td>
<td>Select multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Are you given opportunities to freely raise your voice during council meetings?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>If not, list out reason(s).</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Who opposes you?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>How many times did you speak in the last council meeting you attended?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Before the project, what were your needs to fulfil your role as an Elected Woman Leader?</td>
<td>Select multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>What is the extent to which the project addressed your needs as an Elected Woman Leader?</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Select the activities you participated in through this project?</td>
<td>Select multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>How effective do you think are the activities implemented by the project?</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Were you able to take part in project activities during COVID-19?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>If no, why not?</td>
<td>Select multiple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Could not join online trainings because I did not have a device
3. Could not join online trainings because of household responsibilities
4. Could not join online trainings because of connectivity issues
5. Other (specify)

27. How did the COVID-19 pandemic affect you as an Elected Woman Leader?

Select multiple
1. Did not get a chance to present recommendations, public statements, interventions as I expected
2. Did not get a chance to materialise proposals that were accepted
3. Funding reduced
4. Socio-economic wellbeing of constituencies deteriorated
5. Had the chance to work on improving healthcare service delivery in my constituency
6. Had the chance to oversee vaccine rollouts and COVID-19 information dissemination campaigns in my constituency
7. Other (specify)

### Effectiveness

28. Have you ever presented a proposal (at a general meeting, standing-committee or other level)?

Select one
1. Yes
2. No

29. If yes, have you submitted proposals on any of the following areas?

Select multiple
1. Education
2. Public health
3. Housing and town planning
4. Transport
5. Environment
6. Women empowerment
7. Other (specify)

30. Were they rejected or accepted?

Select one
1. Rejected
2. Accepted
3. Decision pending

31. What proposals have you submitted on women empowerment?

Select multiple
1. Women economic empowerment
2. Women's social and political empowerment
3. Prevention of SGBV
4. Equal opportunities for women
5. Rights and entitlements of women
6. Women's education
7. Gender responsive budgeting and planning
8. Other (specify)

32. Were they rejected or accepted?

Select one
1. Rejected
2. Accepted
3. Decision pending

33. How frequently have you participated and engaged in the decision-making process in above areas (consider the last 12 months)?

Select one
1. Never
2. Once a week
3. Once a month
4. Once in 3 months
5. Once in 6 months
6. Once in last 12 months
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>How actively have you participated and engaged in the decision-making process in above areas (consider the last 12 months)?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. I participate but do not speak</td>
<td>2. I participate and speak sometimes</td>
<td>3. I participate and speak frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. I participate and my voice is heard by others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. I participate and influence decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Do you think engagement in decision making processes has increased over time?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Do you believe that the decision-making process in your council is inclusive and responsive?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. Inclusive and responsive</td>
<td>2. Inclusive but not responsive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Not inclusive but responsive</td>
<td>4. Not inclusive and not responsive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Have you taken any action or started any initiative to influence a positive change in your community/electorate?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Do you think you can make a positive change/difference in your electorate?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>How many recommendations on any of the above-mentioned areas have you presented after taking part in the project?</td>
<td>Integer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>How many public statements on any of the above-mentioned areas have you presented after taking part in the project?</td>
<td>Integer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>How many interventions on any of the above-mentioned areas have you presented after taking part in the project?</td>
<td>Integer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>How many advocacy plans have you developed on any of the above-mentioned areas have you presented after taking part in the project?</td>
<td>Integer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Are your ideas, proposals, opinions respected by male counterparts at district/provincial level?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>How do you rate the support of your male counterparts when presenting recommendations, public statements, interventions, and advocacy plans?</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1. Extremely low</td>
<td>2. Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Moderate</td>
<td>4. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Extremely high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>How many citizens have you interacted with through mutual accountability dialogue?</td>
<td>Integer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>How many group consultations with citizens have you participated in after taking part in the project?</td>
<td>Integer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>How do you rate the support of your male constituents when interacting with citizens?</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1. Extremely low</td>
<td>2. Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Moderate</td>
<td>4. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Extremely high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Rate the extent to which you think the project was able to increase effective participation of locally elected women leaders in local governance processes.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1. Very much</td>
<td>2. Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Not much</td>
<td>4. Not at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>What enabling factors helped increase the effective participation of locally elected women leaders in local governance processes?</td>
<td>Select multiple</td>
<td>1. Increased political literacy</td>
<td>2. Increased knowledge on effective dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Lack of political literacy
2. Lack of knowledge on effective dialogue trainings
3. Insufficient professional development trainings
4. Non facilitation of WILL cubs
5. Insufficient training in advocacy and networking activities
6. Insufficient training in mutual accountability dialogues
7. Attitudes of male counterparts
8. Attitudes of constituents
9. COVID-19
10. Other (specify)

51. How do you perceive gender? Select one 1. It is defined biologically
2. It is defined socially

52. Did your perception on gender change after joining the project? Select one 1. Yes
2. No
3. Did not change

53. How do you perceive leadership? Select up to 3 1. Humility
2. Empowering
3. Collaborative
4. Fearlessness
5. Innovative
6. Self-confident
7. Positive mental attitude
8. Other (specify)

54. Did your perception on leadership change after joining the project? Select one 1. Yes
2. No
3. Did not change

55. How do you perceive advocacy? Select up to 3 1. Educate communities
2. Empowering
3. Training others
4. Other (specify)

56. Did your perception on advocacy change after joining the project? Select one 1. Yes
2. No
3. Did not change

57. How do you perceive accountability? Select up to 3 1. Consulting communities
2. Sharing information with the public
3. Handling grievances of public
4. Other (other)

58. Did your perception on accountability change after joining the project? Select one 1. Yes
2. No
3. Did not change

59. Has the project contributed to changing how you are treated as an Elected Woman Leader? Select one 1. Yes
2. No
3. Did not change

Impact
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Likert scale</th>
<th>Select multiple</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60. Do you think the project was successful in mainstreaming gender equality and non-discrimination?</td>
<td>1. Successfully mainstreamed both gender equality and non-discrimination</td>
<td>1. More women in leadership and decision-making positions in local governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Successfully mainstreamed gender equality but not non-discrimination</td>
<td>2. More women in leadership and decision-making positions in CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Was not successful mainstreaming either gender equality or non-discrimination</td>
<td>4. Less incidence of GBV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Rate the extent to which the project included marginalised groups of women in project activities?</td>
<td>1. Very much</td>
<td>5. More reporting of GBV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Somewhat</td>
<td>6. More women voicing their needs through media (print/electronic/social)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Not much</td>
<td>7. Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Not at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. What measurable changes in gender equality and women’s empowerment have occurred as a result of the project?</td>
<td>1. More women in leadership and decision-making positions in local governments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. More women in leadership and decision-making positions in CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. More women collaborating on advancing the Women, Peace, and Security (WPS) agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Less incidence of GBV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. More reporting of GBV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. More women voicing their needs through media (print/electronic/social)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. After taking part in the project, do you feel confident in your role as an Elected Woman leader?</td>
<td>1. Completely yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Somewhat no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Not at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Did this project enable you to advance more policies and proposals in relation to your fields of expertise and gender following discussions with citizens?</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. If yes, how many proposals and policies have you advanced following discussions with citizens?</td>
<td>Integer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Do you think you will compete for the next local authorities’ elections?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Why will you not compete for the next local governance?</td>
<td>Select multiple</td>
<td>2. Because I have lost confidence in my party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Because I have lost confidence in my party</td>
<td>3. Because I do not like the way I am treated by my male counterparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Because I have lost confidence in my party</td>
<td>4. Because I do not like the way I am treated by my constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Because I have lost confidence in my party</td>
<td>5. Because my family doesn’t like my continued engagement in politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Because I have lost confidence in my party</td>
<td>6. Because I believe I have fulfilled my role as an Elected Woman Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Because I have lost confidence in my party</td>
<td>7. Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. If yes, do you think your engagement with the project enables you to carry on by yourself?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. Completely yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Somewhat</td>
<td>2. Adequate trainings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Somewhat no</td>
<td>3. Networks fostered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Not at all</td>
<td>4. Media visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Other (specify)</td>
<td>6. Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. If yes, what are the factors that enable you to carry on?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. Adequate trainings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Networks fostered</td>
<td>2. Media visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Media visibility</td>
<td>3. Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Other (specify)</td>
<td>4. Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
70. If not, what are the factors that challenge you to carry on?

| Select one | 1. Inadequacy of training |
| 2. Insufficiency of networks fostered |
| 3. Lack of media visibility |
| 4. Other (specify) |

### Survey Tool for CSOLs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response type</th>
<th>Coded options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Name of CSO member.</td>
<td>Text (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. District.</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Badulla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jaffna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kurunegala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Divisional secretariat division.</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What is your position within the CSO?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Duration of membership.</td>
<td>Integer</td>
<td>1. 19 and Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 20 – 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 25 – 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 35 – 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 45 – 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 65 and above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Sinhala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tamil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Burgher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Highest educational attainment</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. No schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Up to primary education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Up to grade 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Up to O/Ls but did not sit for O/Ls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sat for O/Ls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Up to A/Ls but did not sit for A/Ls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sat for A/Ls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Degree or equivalent qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Masters or equivalent qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Vocational training and diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response type</th>
<th>Coded options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you regularly attend your organisation’s management/leadership meetings?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If not, list out reason(s).</td>
<td>Select multiple</td>
<td>1. Because I am not treated with dignity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Because my contribution is belittled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Because of household responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Because the male head of the household does not like my engagement in advocacy
5. Because other members of my family do not like my engagement in advocacy
6. I am not part of management/leadership
7. Other (specify)

11. Are you given opportunities to freely raise your voice during your civil society organisation meetings?
   Select one
   1. Yes
   2. No

12. If not, list out reason(s).
    Text

13. Who opposes you?
   Select one
   1. Other male CSO members
   2. Other female CSO members
   3. Other male and female CSO members

14. How many times did you speak in the last committee/organisation you attended?
   Select one
   1. 1 – 2 times
   2. 3 – 4 times
   3. 5 or more times

15. Before the project, what were your needs to fulfil your role as a member of a CSO?
   Select multiple
   1. I wanted to increase my knowledge impact monitoring
   2. I wanted to increase my knowledge in advocacy
   3. I wanted to increase my visibility at community level
   4. I wanted to learn how to prepare and present proposals
   5. I wanted to learn how to engage in effective dialogue with other CSOs
   6. Other (specify)

16. What is the extent to which the project addressed your needs as a CSO member?
    Likert scale
    1. Completely addressed my needs
    2. Somewhat addressed my needs
    3. Did not address my needs much
    4. Did not address my needs at all

17. Select the activities you participated in through this project?
    Select multiple
    1. Coaching, mentoring, and positive leadership training
    2. Training on resource mobilisation, participatory needs assessments, and scorecards
    3. Training on effective communication, community outreach, media, and non-adversarial advocacy
    4. Sub grant scheme
    5. Mutual accountability dialogue
    6. Other (specify)

18. How effective do you think are the activities implemented by the project?
    Likert scale
    1. Completely effective
    2. Somewhat effective
    3. Somewhat effective
    4. Completely effective

19. Were you able to take part in project activities during COVID-19?
    Select one
    1. Yes
    2. No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Select multiple</th>
<th>1. Project activities were halted during COVID-19</th>
<th>2. Could not join online trainings because I did not have a device</th>
<th>3. Could not join online trainings because of household responsibilities</th>
<th>4. Could not join online trainings because of connectivity issues</th>
<th>5. Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If no, why not?</td>
<td></td>
<td>20. If no, why not?</td>
<td>Select multiple</td>
<td>1. Project activities were halted during COVID-19</td>
<td>2. Could not join online trainings because I did not have a device</td>
<td>3. Could not join online trainings because of household responsibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Select one</th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
<th>2. No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever presented a proposal (at an executive/management meeting</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>22. Have you ever presented a proposal (at an executive/management meeting or other meeting)?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, have you submitted proposals on any of the following areas?</td>
<td>Select multiple</td>
<td>23. If yes, have you submitted proposals on any of the following areas?</td>
<td>Select multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were they rejected or accepted?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>24. Were they rejected or accepted?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Were they rejected or accepted?                                         | Select one                                                                 | 26. Were they rejected or accepted?                                                                                | Select one                                                                        | 1. Rejected                                                                      | 2. Accepted                                                                     | 3. Decision pending                                                            | 4. Accepted                                                                      | 5. Decision pending                                                            | 6. Other (specify)                                                                 |
| How frequently have you actively participated and engaged in the        | Select one                                                                 | 27. How frequently have you actively participated and engaged in the decision-making process in the above areas (consider the last 12 months)? | Select one                                                                        | 1. Never                                                                        | 2. Once a week                                                                   | 3. Once a month                                                                | 4. Once in 3 months                                                             | 5. Once in 6 months                                                            | 6. Other (specify)                                                                 |
| areas (consider the last 12 months)?                                   | Select one                                                                 | 28. How frequently have you actively participated and engaged in the decision-making process in the above areas (consider the last 12 months)? | Select one                                                                        | 1. Never                                                                        | 2. Once a week                                                                   | 3. Once a month                                                                | 4. Once in 3 months                                                             | 5. Once in 6 months                                                            | 6. Other (specify)                                                                 |
6. Once in last 12 months

28. How actively have you participated and engaged in the decision-making process in the above areas (consider the last 12 months)?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I participate but do not speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I participate and speak sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I participate and speak frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I participate and my voice is heard by others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I participate and influence decision-making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Do you think your engagement in decision-making processes have increased over time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Do you believe that the decision-making process in your council is inclusive and responsive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inclusive and responsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inclusive but not responsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not inclusive but responsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not inclusive and not responsive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Have you taken any action or started any initiative to influence a positive change in your community/electorate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Do you think you can make a positive change/difference in your electorate?

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Have you completed at least one campaign to promote women’s role in political decision-making?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Are your ideas, proposals, opinions respected by male counterparts in your CSO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. How do you rate the support of your male counterparts when presenting recommendations, public statements, interventions, and advocacy plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Extremely low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Extremely high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. How do you perceive gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is defined biologically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is defined socially</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. Did your perception on gender change after joining the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Did not change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Do you think your knowledge in gender equality has changed after engaging with the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Do you think your skills in mainstreaming gender into advocacy plans has changed after engaging with the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Do you believe that the decision-making process in your CSO is inclusive and responsive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inclusive and responsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inclusive but not responsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not inclusive but responsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not inclusive and not responsive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. How do you perceive leadership?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select up to 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Empowering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fearlessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Positive mental attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Select</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Did your perception on leadership change after joining the project?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Did not change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>How do you perceive advocacy?</td>
<td>Select up to 3</td>
<td>Educate communities</td>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>Training others</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Did your perception on advocacy change after joining the project?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Did not change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>How do you perceive accountability?</td>
<td>Select up to 3</td>
<td>Consulting communities</td>
<td>Sharing information with the public</td>
<td>Handling grievances of public</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Did your perception on accountability change after joining the project?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Did not change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Has the project contributed to changing how you are treated as a CSO member?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Did not change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Likert scale</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Do you think the project was successful in mainstreaming gender equality and non-discrimination?</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>Successfully mainstreamed both gender equality and non-discrimination</td>
<td>Successfully mainstreamed gender equality but not non-discrimination</td>
<td>Successfully mainstreamed non-discrimination but not gender equality</td>
<td>Was not successful mainstreaming either gender equality or non-discrimination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Rate the extent to which the project included marginalised groups of women in project activities?</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>What measurable changes in gender equality and women’s empowerment have occurred as a result of the project?</td>
<td>Select multiple</td>
<td>More women in leadership and decision-making positions in local governments</td>
<td>More women in leadership and decision-making positions in CSOs</td>
<td>More women collaborating on advancing the Women, Peace, and Security (WPS) agenda</td>
<td>Less incidence of GBV</td>
<td>More reporting of GBV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>After taking part in the project, do you feel confident in your role as a member of a CSO?</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>Completely yes</td>
<td>Somewhat yes</td>
<td>Somewhat no</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Did this project enable you to advance more policies and proposals in relation to your</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. If yes, how many proposals and policies have you advanced following discussions with citizens?</td>
<td>Integer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 54. Do you think your engagement with the project enables you to carry on by yourself? | Select one | 1. Completely yes  
2. Somewhat yes  
3. Somewhat no  
4. Not at all |
| 55. If yes, what are the factors that enable you to carry on?            | Select one | 1. Adequate trainings  
2. Networks fostered  
3. Media visibility  
4. Other (specify) |
| 56. If not, what are the factors that challenge you to carry on?          | Select one | 1. Inadequacy of training  
2. Insufficiency of networks fostered  
3. Lack of media visibility  
4. Other (specify) |
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TERMS OF REFERENCE
Final Evaluation
Program: Women in Learning and Leadership (WILL)
Search for Common Ground (Search) is recruiting a local consultant(s) or research group/institution to undertake the final evaluation of "WILL - Women in Learning and Leadership: Strengthening Women's Voice and Participation in Political Decision-Making in Sri Lanka). This project is funded by the European Union under its “Enhancing CSOs' Contribution to Governance and Development Process in Sri Lanka” program.

1. **About Search:**
Search is an international conflict transformation NGO that intends to transform the way the world deals with conflict, away from adversarial approaches and toward cooperative solutions. Search is a multifaceted, culturally appropriate, and conflict-sensitive organization with headquarters in Washington, DC, and Brussels, Belgium, and field offices in over 30 countries in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East, as well as the United States. Search designs and implements programs using a diverse range of tools, including media and training, to promote dialogue, increase knowledge, and determine a positive shift in behaviour.

Search Sri Lanka ([https://www.sfcg.org/sri-lanka](https://www.sfcg.org/sri-lanka)) is implementing the WILL initiative in collaboration with the Federation of Sri Lankan Local Government Authorities (FSLGA), Affected Women Forum (AWF) from Akkaraipattu in Ampara, Women's Resource Centre (WRC) from Kurunegala, Women Development Centre from Jaffna and Women’s Development Centre from Badulla.

The overall goal of this 30-month project (with a 6-month extension) is to increase the voices and participation of Sri Lankan women to positively influence political decision-making processes. The specific objectives are to strengthen the capacity of local women's organizations and locally elected women leaders to be active, respected, and accountable actors in political decision-making processes.

The direct target groups of the project include around 160 elected women leaders from the selected local authorities from the 4 target districts. Direct beneficiaries also include around 45 Community Service Organizations (CSO) members from 4 selected organizations mentioned above. In addition to the above target groups, 20 local journalists also benefit from this project. The journalists are predominantly male journalists and work as allies (of women participants of the project) to change perspectives on the role of women in political decision-making.

The project has two specific objectives:

1. **To strengthen women's voice and participation in political and civic life; and**
2. **To involve the media in the transformative process, in particular by challenging stereotypes.**

To achieve the above specific objectives, the following three activity clusters are implemented
• *Activity stream 1*: capacity building and networking and advocacy for women leaders and CSOs;
• *Activity stream 2*: collaboration between women political leaders and local communities to develop response strategies to constituents’ needs; and
• *Activity stream 3*: media engagement.

2. Theory of change or intended impact of the program
The project is guided by the following Theory of Change:
**IF** local women CSO leaders and locally elected women leaders increase their capacity to participate in decision-making in a way that is more accountable to their local constituencies (O1.1), **IF** elected women leaders enhance their collaboration with their local communities (O1.2), **IF** the local media actors increase their capacity to challenge negative stereotypes and enable positive attitudes towards women’s role in decision-making (O1.3), and **IF** the public is aware of the positive role women can play in policy decision-making and democratic processes (O1.4), **THEN** local women organizations and locally elected women leaders can improve their effective participation in local policy decision-making and in the overall democratic processes (SO) which. In the long-term, this will contribute to strengthening Sri Lankan women’s voices in political decision-making at all levels (OO). This is **BECAUSE** women leaders will be more empowered and seen as legitimate representatives capable of making a positive contribution to governance and development.

4. Scope of the Evaluation
The geographic locations of the evaluation will be in Jaffna, Ampara, Kurunegala, and Badulla districts.

5. Audience
The primary audience of the evaluation are the donor, Search, FSLGA, local partners as well as other relevant stakeholders. The above audience and stakeholders involved in the execution of the project would use, as appropriate, the evaluation findings and lessons learned.

6. Objectives of Project Evaluation
The final evaluation will be carried out to assess

1. The relevance of the theory of change and project design
2. To assess the project contribution to achieve the objectives as defined in the project logframe and the progress markers of the outcome mapping process (Effectiveness).
3. To assess the immediate impact of the project: What longer-term results are likely to emerge from the project’s achievements?
4. The sustainability of the project’s outcomes/impact
5. To draw lessons learned from the project to use this to inform future program designs and potentially follow up phases

7. Key Evaluation Questions
The final evaluation will be guided by the following Key evaluation questions under seven major evaluation criteria. However, the evaluator is free to suggest important key questions that could be considered to make these evaluation results more informative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Information needed</th>
<th>Key Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relevance| An evaluation of the relevance of the project intervention in the context in which it is conducted and the actual needs vis-a-vis women leadership in the target districts.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | - To what extent do the assumptions which guided our project design hold up to date? If not – how has the change in the assumptions impacted the realisation of results?  
- Does the intervention address the short and long-term priorities and needs of the EWL and CSO targeted by the project?  
- To what extent the project activities directly address the leadership needs of the target group?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Effectiveness | Measurement and evaluation of the extent to which the objectives originally established are being met - to assess the intervention in terms of its orientation towards results.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | - Were the overall objective, specific objectives, results, and indicators adhered to as stated in the project’s documents?  
- What are the main outputs and outcomes of the project vis-a-vis the logframe and project results framework?  
- What are the main results from the project, intended and unintended, positive and negative?  
- How has this project helped women political and CSO leaders to have the skills and opportunity to develop collaborative relationships, establish channels for information-sharing, and identify common challenges and goals?  
- How has this project helped women leaders to initiate pilot initiatives to implement WPS agenda and what results those initiatives sproduced?  
- Are the actions taken and the level of progress in implementing the results helping to achieve the specific objectives of the project?  
- What were the factors that led to the achievement or non-achievement of results?  
- To what extent have the modifications made to the project improved the intervention strategy as a whole and the impact of the intervention?  
- How did the project ensure the visibility of the project activities among participants and relevant stakeholders?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
<p>| Efficiency | Analysis and assessment of the                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | - Is the transformation of resources into results being carried out efficiently?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>An evaluation of the longer-term (intended and unintended) results of the project on beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- How has the project empowered local women leaders to collaboratively advance the WPS agenda, and address their conflict related, including GBV, challenges?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How has this project helped women leaders to position to advance formal or informal mechanisms for reconciliation and leverage those mechanisms to address the unique challenges faced by Sri Lankan women, including GBV?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What is the relationship between the project purpose and goal and the extent to which the benefits received by target beneficiaries had affected a large number of people in the project sites?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has there been any influence beyond the project circle?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>An evaluation of the extent to which outcomes are likely to be sustained beyond the timeframe of the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- What is the project exit plan (if any) ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did the achieved outcomes lead to long-term improvements?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are the achieved outcomes sustainable after the end of the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How have the local stakeholders taken ownership of the project initiatives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are there any independent initiatives started to complement the project initiatives or are there any formal commitments towards this?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good practices, Challenges and Lessons learned</th>
<th>Document the challenges and lessons throughout the project’s implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- What are the good practices observed during the life of the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are the potential project implementation risks and challenges faced during the project implementation and how they were managed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Methodology and Data Collection Tools
The evaluation will be summative and will employ a mixed-method approach whereby discussions and surveys of key stakeholders provide/verify the substance of the findings. Proposals submitted by the prospective consultant(s) should outline a clearly explained mixed-method 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. Therefore, the methodology design should reflect the following:

- Ensure that quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated by geographic coverage, ethnicity, religion, sector (EWL, CSO, journalist, community), age and gender, etc.
- Establish a methodological focus capable of validating the four levels of analysis: I) results, II) analysis based on data, facts, and information, III) conclusions, and IV) recommendations.
- Offer a standard interpretation that considers the dimensions of the project (design, structure, resources, processes, and outcomes) and interprets the causes and contributing factors.

11. Deliverables
Desk Review: The consultant(s) is required to carry out a 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 with Evaluation matrix: The 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 a 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 also includes an evaluation Matrix. The inception report and the data collection tools/questions should be approved by the Search DM&E Team.

Draft evaluation report: The consultant(s) should submit the first draft of the evaluation report, analysing and integrating both qualitative and quantitative data. The report is subject to Search’s 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 copy-edited evaluation report:** The report should be written (and fully copy-edited) in English (maximum 80 pages), and consist of

1. Title page and other initial pages
2. Table of contents
3. Executive summary: Around 3 pages, including the main results and outcomes of the evaluation.
4. Current context analysis vis-à-vis the analysis during the Rapid need assessment period (approximately 3-4 pages)
5. Introduction, outlining the purpose of the evaluation, the questions: 3-4 pages
   a. Backgrounds and objective of the evaluation
   b. The methodology used in the evaluation
   c. Conditioning factors and limitations of the evaluation
6. Description of the intervention, its objectives, and structure; background, organization, and management; stakeholders and the updated context in which the project is conducted: 2-3 pages
7. Findings of the evaluation Analysis of information gathered, evaluation questions and established criteria, analysis of the different levels (design, process, outcomes); Around 20-25 Pages
   - Relevance
   - Effectiveness and TOC
   - Efficiency
   - Intermediate impact and TOC
   - Sustainability
   - Lessons learned and good practices
8. Conclusions and recommendations through specific indications in regard to impact and future actions to be built on the lessons learned: 5-7 pages
9. Appendices: ToR, proposed methodology, the data collection tools applied, the database used with all information organized and updated, the work plan and mission statement (detailed breakdown of all work undertaken), list of people/organizations interviewed, Presentation of the evaluation team, if any…etc

**Video Documentary**

Evaluator are also required to deliver an 8-10 minutes video-based documentary on final evaluation findings in a creative way using video software and animation, including quotes from stakeholders and key findings

The final evaluation report should be approved by the Search’s technical team.

**12. Logistical Support**

The consultancy firm will be responsible for organizing the 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 consultant: background materials including the project proposal and results in framework, progress reports, modules/ session plans developed for the project, etc.
13. Ethical Considerations
The consultant(s) must clearly outline key risks of conducting the study and the steps to assure Do No Harm, conflict sensitivity, and inclusion principles (i.e. 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\(^1\).

14. 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.

15. Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/output</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting of Contract</td>
<td>01\textsuperscript{st} June 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review and submission of the inception report</td>
<td>10\textsuperscript{th} June 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize the inception report</td>
<td>20\textsuperscript{th} June 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>21\textsuperscript{st} June to 31\textsuperscript{st} July 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the first draft</td>
<td>19\textsuperscript{th} August 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and resending of the above draft to the consultant(s)</td>
<td>29\textsuperscript{th} August 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the final draft report</td>
<td>16\textsuperscript{th} September 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the final copy-edited version of the report along with raw materials and documents</td>
<td>26\textsuperscript{th} September 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Budget
The total budget available for this study is a maximum of Rs.7.0 Million. 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. The application with a relatively smaller budget proposed and higher quality technical proposal will be considered for selection.

17. Requirements of Consultant(s)
- Experience of undertaking similar works in Sri Lanka in the last four years and having a good understanding of local as well as national context and gender norms of Sri Lanka
- A master’s degree in social science or other related areas
- Demonstrated experience in mixed-method and interdisciplinary approaches, data collection tools (such as surveys, KII/IDIs, and FGDs), and analysis techniques (both qualitative and quantitative)
- Experience in carrying out project evaluations in women’s political empowerment and gender and politics

• Knowledge of conflict-sensitive data collection and reporting
• Good analytical and writing skills, and the ability to present findings, draw practical conclusions, and develop lessons learned
• Fluency in English is required and the team should have team members with working knowledge of Sinhala and Tamil
• Ability to travel to the field for data collection and cross-checking the data, unless there are travel restrictions

In addition, the consultant is required to respect the following Ethical Principles:
• Comprehensive and systematic inquiry: The consultant should make the most of the existing information and the full range of stakeholders available at the time of the review. The consultant 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: Consultants should possess the abilities and skills and experience appropriate to undertake the tasks proposed, and should practice within the limits of their professional training and competence.
• Honesty and integrity: The consultant 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: Consultants respect the security, dignity, and self-worth of respondents, and program participants. The consultant has the responsibility to be sensitive to and respect differences amongst participants in culture, religion, gender, disability, age, and ethnicity.

18. Applications
Interested candidates should send:
 a) a short cover letter explaining how the applicant meets the qualifications, experience, and skills requirements (no more than 1 page)
b) A technical proposal including a detailed methodology section, with a detailed budget-including data collection and analyses, plan of video documentary and budget for video documentary production and other logistical costs, etc.
c) Provide up-to-date CVs of all team members and their specific roles in the assignment
d) A sample work from previous similar assignment/research within the last four years
e) Email them to sfcgprocurementsri@sfcg.org by 26th May 2022

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.

Compensation: In consideration of the Consultant performing the services described above, Search shall pay the consultancy payment in the following manner.
After approval of the inception report and structure of video documentary: 30%
After submission of the first draft of the report and video documentary: 30%
After submission of the final copy-edited Evaluation report and final video documentary: 40%

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