



Canada/Sri Lanka Municipal Cooperation Program
Programme de coopération municipale Canada/Sri Lanka

PROJECT EVALUATION GUIDE

June 2007

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROJECT EVALUATION GUIDE

Background

The Canada/Sri Lanka Municipal Cooperation Program (MCP) is a 4-year program to restore and improve local government operations, services and infrastructure in five tsunami-affected districts in Sri Lanka. MCP is a partnership of Canadian municipalities and Sri Lankan local authorities, communities and sector leaders.

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) is the implementing agency for the \$11.4 million program. The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) has contributed \$9 million, while Canadian municipalities have contributed \$2.4 million.

The program comprises a number of projects and special initiatives involving local authorities, provincial councils, and national government and civil society organizations. The projects follow detailed project plans which tend to last about two years. All projects will wind down in Year 3 or Year 4 of the program (i.e. 2007 or 2008).

As part of its commitment to democratic governance, FCM regularly evaluates its overseas activities. In preparation for the MCP evaluation exercise, we have written this Project Evaluation Guide (PEG) to help ensure standards are met and benefits realized.

Purpose and Objectives of the Project Evaluation Guide (PEG)

The PEG was written for Canadian volunteers and local partners. It provides methods and tools to help you prepare your evaluation activities, and to gather the data required to assess project performance and results. The PEG was written to help you

1. Define the roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team
2. Know what information and products are needed
3. Plan the evaluation process and activities

How to Use this Guide

The PEG is a guide and a work book. It contains explanations, step-by-step instructions, checklists, tools and forms for you and your partners to use in the process.

We recommend that you review the PEG before planning your evaluation activities and that you take it with you to use in your evaluation workshop. The evaluation activities will take place during the final mission of your project.

The PEG is a generic guide that is tailored to fit individual MCP projects. At the back of the guide, we have included an Evaluation Form with statements of expected results and success indicators that were taken from your project plan. This form should be completed by you and your partners, and submitted to FCM with your Evaluation Report.

2. EVALUATION RATIONALE

Why evaluate your project? Evaluation is simply too important to put aside for others to do. Evaluation is an integral part of good management and democratic governance, which are pillars in Canadian – Sri Lankan municipal cooperation. Why evaluate?

- Evaluation is a necessary activity in the project management cycle.



- Evaluation helps determine what worked, what did not work, and why. It is a platform for making adjustments and improvements that are needed for success.
- Evaluation is an opportunity to share your learning with others so that they can benefit from your experience. Evaluation helps us identify effective practices and knowledge products to use in local government operations and services delivery.
- Evaluation reinforces transparency in resource use and performance. It connects one to the other. This is key in the normative framework for cooperation.
- Evaluation provides greater accountability to our sponsors and partners.

Evaluation can bring a range of benefits to program stakeholders. For Canadian municipalities, it provides information that justifies your contributions. For Sri Lankan partners, it reinforces the value of implementing governance principles and building management know-how. For FCM, it provides information and oversight that we need for success in our programming. For CIDA, it provides the accountability they require when entrusted with public monies for the international aid program.

The objectives of project evaluations are fourfold:

1. To identify results achieved in the project that have improved local government operations and services and helped in tsunami reconstruction in Sri Lanka.
2. To explain the key factors that have either contributed to or constrained project performance and the achievement of results.
3. To identify lessons learned that can inform programming to address governance issues in local government system in Sri Lanka
4. To identify best practices to document and share with other local governments

3. EVALUATION TEAM

Who should be involved in the evaluation of your project? Who should be on the evaluation team?

Evaluation is a partnership and capacity building activity, so Canadian and Sri Lankan partners should both be involved. Among Sri Lankan partners, you need to involve the project champions as well as technical staff who have received training and support. Others will be involved as sources of information on results. This will depend on the design of your project.

The evaluation team’s responsibilities outlined below illustrate the roles they should play. You will need to identify the team members and write them in the space provided. This will help you plan for the evaluation activities in the final project mission.

Team Members	Team Members’ Responsibilities	Team Members’ Names
<i>Canadian Municipal Volunteers</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plan and organize the evaluation activities ▪ Lead evaluation workshop, meetings and interviews ▪ Provide data on project performance and results ▪ Identify factors influencing project performance ▪ Identify lessons learned and best practices ▪ Write evaluation report (with Sri Lankan partners) 	
<i>Sri Lankan Local Government Partners</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Schedule and participate in evaluation workshop, meetings and interviews ▪ Provide data on project performance and results ▪ Identify factors influencing project performance ▪ Identify lessons learned and best practices ▪ Write evaluation report (with Canadian volunteers) 	
<i>MCP Country Program Manager</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brief MCP District Coordinators and other staff on the purpose and process for project evaluations ▪ Support evaluation activities during project mission ▪ Incorporate evaluation findings, lessons learned and recommendations into MCP progress reports to CIDA 	
<i>MCP District Coordinator</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Liaise with local authorities on the evaluation ▪ Provide logistical support to the evaluation activities ▪ Participate in evaluation workshop and other evaluation activities as required 	
<i>FCM Program Staff in Ottawa</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide logistical support to the evaluation activities ▪ Review evaluation report ▪ Incorporate evaluation findings, lessons learned and recommendations into MCP progress reports to CIDA 	

One suggestion: you should make sure that women play active roles in the evaluation. Women should be included both as team members and as sources of information on project results and performance.

4. EVALUATION ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

What issues should you focus on in the evaluation? What questions should you answer?

Evaluation Issues

The evaluation exercise is meant to help you and your partners determine what worked in the project, what did not work, and why. It is meant to help others benefit from your experience. It should tell us:

- What results were achieved in the project? What results were not achieved?
- What factors contributed to or constrained the achievement results?
- What lessons were learned from the experience?

Some people like to know what information the Evaluation Report will contain. Then they will carry out the evaluation process to generate this information. For them, the report outline provides a good indication of the content and focus of the evaluation exercise.

As seen in the textbox, the Evaluation Report should include five sections. These sections are described in more detail in chapter 7 of the PEG.

Suggested Outline of the Evaluation Report

- 1) Introduction
- 2) Project Context
- 3) Project Results
- 4) Factors Affecting Project Performance
- 5) Conclusions, Lessons and Recommendations

Achievement of Project Results

The main focus of the project evaluation is the achievement of results. This is section 3 of the evaluation report.

In your project plan, you identified the 'short-term results' and 'end-of-project results' that you expected to achieve. The evaluation should determine the extent to which your project achieved what it set out to achieve as described in the project plan.

Your project focused on improving specific operations or services delivered by local authorities. It may have helped your partners replace or restore equipment and infrastructure that was lost or damaged in the tsunami disaster.

- What improvements did the project make to municipal operations, services delivery, and equipment and infrastructure in the locality?
- What results were achieved by improving operations and services, and replacing equipment and infrastructure?
- How did this assistance benefit the tsunami-affected populations in the district and municipality?

Your project plan includes performance indicators for results achievement. At the start of the project, you and your partners collected baseline data linked to these indicators.

- What is the current data linked to these performance indicators?

- What results are evident in the changes between baseline and current data?

Your project is part of the broader FCM program for the reconstruction of municipal operations, services and infrastructure in selected districts in the country. FCM has identified one or more program-level results that we expect to achieve through your project. In some projects, the partners identified the same results at the project level that FCM identified at the program level – while in other cases they varied.

The program-level results that are relevant to your project are identified in the Evaluation Form found at the back of the PEG. We have included numbers in square brackets beside the project results and project indicators that are the same at the program level.

Achievement of Results Related to Thematic Priorities

FCM sought to incorporate three crosscutting priorities into MCP programming activities. They are related to gender equality, peace building, and environmental sustainability.

You and your partners may have integrated some or all of these priorities into your project. The evaluation should determine the results achieved related to them.

- What results were achieved by integrating gender equality, peace building and environmental sustainability into local government operations and services?
- How did addressing these priorities benefit tsunami-affected communities?

If you did not identify any objectives for crosscutting priorities in your project plan, you can assess performance in terms of what the program wanted to achieve in these areas.

Gender Equality	Peace Building	Environmental Sustainability
1. In what ways were GE tools used in the project?	1. In what ways were Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA) tools used in the project?	1. In what ways were environment impact assessments or environmental mapping used in the project?
2. In what ways did local partners become more sensitive to the needs and priorities of women?	2. In what ways did the project increase local authorities' understanding of how to strengthen social cohesion?	2. In what ways did the project increase local authorities' knowledge of issues affecting environmental sustainability?
3. In what ways did the project increase women's access to local services?	3. In what ways did the project improve service delivery to strengthen social cohesion?	3. In what ways did the project improve environmental management systems used by local authorities?
4. In what ways did the project increase women's participation and influence in local government decision making?	4. To what extent was social cohesion strengthened in participating communities?	4. To what extent did the project improve environmental conditions in participating communities?
5. To what extent did men and women benefit equally from the project?		

Achievement of Unexpected Results

The evaluation should also identify any results achieved in the project that you had not anticipated in the project plan. Although they were unplanned, these results would still stem from your partners' involvement in the project.

- What unplanned results were achieved by your project partners?
- How did the unplanned results benefit tsunami-affected families in the district?

Some examples of unexpected results include new management practices implemented by your partners in areas beyond the project focus; new areas of cooperation between local governments and community groups; or achievements through expanded partnerships between Canadian and Sri Lankan community groups.

Explanation of Results

The value of the evaluation is derived from the analysis of why results were achieved or not achieved in the project. It is important to understand the reasons why you were successful if we want to repeat or replicate your success.

Any number of factors could explain why a project was successful or conversely, why it fell short of expectations. For example, our successes and shortcomings in development projects could be explained by the extent to which:

- The project addressed local partners' priorities
- Project activities were suited to the local context
- Local partners 'owned' the project and participated as equal partners
- Beneficiaries helped decide on what to do, when and how
- Canadian experts knew their subject matter and how to be effective
- Activities were well planned
- Participants in activities were the 'right' people
- Changes and improvements benefited men and women equally
- The project managers dealt with problems effectively as they arose
- The budget was properly allocated and used effectively
- Equipment was delivered on time
- FCM managers and staff in Ottawa and Colombo provided the necessary support
- The risks identified in the project plan were effectively mitigated

In the evaluation exercise, you and your partners should try to explain why the project achieved what it achieved.

- What key factors contributed to the achievement of project results?
- What key factors constrained the achievement of results?

You don't need to identify scores of reasons why your project was a success. It's more valuable to explain only the most important factors. On the following page, we provide a worksheet to help you identify these factors from a range of possibilities. The worksheet is optional but it can be used to help focus your discussions with partners.

Identifying Key Success Factors in Your Project

Here is a worksheet to help you identify possible success factors in your project. It is a series of questions relating to factors introduced on the previous page. Using the 5-point scale, circle the number that best represents your answer to the question. Begin by making an assessment of the overall success of your project.

1 = Not at all
2 = A little
3 = Somewhat
4 = A lot
5 = Completely
n/a = Don't know

Interpreting Your Responses: You should see a correspondence between results achieved and success factors. For example, if your project met with great success, the questions you answered by circling 4s and 5s could be the key factors explaining your success.

Overall, was the project successful in achieving results?

1. Did the project make sense given local conditions, needs, problems?

1	2	3	4	5	n/a
---	---	---	---	---	-----

1	2	3	4	5	n/a
---	---	---	---	---	-----

2. Was the project consistent with local partners' priorities?

1	2	3	4	5	n/a
---	---	---	---	---	-----

3. Were local partners actively involved in project design?

1	2	3	4	5	n/a
---	---	---	---	---	-----

4. Were local partners able to use what they learned from Canadians?

1	2	3	4	5	n/a
---	---	---	---	---	-----

5. Did local partners understand their roles in the project?

1	2	3	4	5	n/a
---	---	---	---	---	-----

6. Were women actively involved in project design and implementation?

1	2	3	4	5	n/a
---	---	---	---	---	-----

7. Was the project design sound in its context?

1	2	3	4	5	n/a
---	---	---	---	---	-----

8. Were the project objectives and expectations realistic?

1	2	3	4	5	n/a
---	---	---	---	---	-----

9. Were risks to project success managed effectively?

1	2	3	4	5	n/a
---	---	---	---	---	-----

10. Were innovative approaches and solutions explored?

1	2	3	4	5	n/a
---	---	---	---	---	-----

11. Did experts possess the skills and knowledge they needed?

1	2	3	4	5	n/a
---	---	---	---	---	-----

12. Were the 'right' participants involved in project activities?

1	2	3	4	5	n/a
---	---	---	---	---	-----

13. Was money well allocated within the project budget?

1	2	3	4	5	n/a
---	---	---	---	---	-----

14. Was project monitoring effective at producing timely information?

1	2	3	4	5	n/a
---	---	---	---	---	-----

15. Was appropriate action taken when change was needed?

1	2	3	4	5	n/a
---	---	---	---	---	-----

5. EVALUATION PROCESS

What is the evaluation process? What steps should the team take to ensure everything gets done? What reminders could be useful to evaluators in the Sri Lankan context?

Evaluation Approach

In the MCP, project evaluation is a self-assessment exercise that is carried out by project partners. Members of the team of municipal experts who planned and implemented the project will carry out the evaluation. As we have said, the goal is to provide an informed and objective assessment of results and benefits for purposes of learning, reporting and improvement in the program.

The evaluation will take place during the final mission of the project. It will consist of a evaluation workshop and a small set of interviews and discussions with beneficiaries. During these activities, you and your partners will try to answer the evaluation questions found in the PEG and Evaluation Form.

The main evaluation activity is a 2-day evaluation workshop for you and your partners. During the workshop, you should try to complete the Evaluation Form which identifies the results achieved in the project. The workshop is also an opportunity to identify the key success factors in results achievement and the lessons learned in the project.

You will likely need to interview stakeholders and beneficiaries who have information on results, but will not attend the workshop. We recommend that you carry out these interviews prior to the evaluation workshop. This will give you the opportunity to discuss the information with your partners before completing the Evaluation Form.

FCM and MCP staff members will provide the full range of services that we normally provide to partners during their missions. This includes guidance, logistics and feedback on your Evaluation Report and Evaluation Form.

Some Points to Remember about Conducting Project Evaluations

An evaluation can be a stressful experience for Canadian and Sri Lankan partners alike. We need to make sure that we are sensitive to everyone's concerns. At the same time, FCM is looking for accurate assessments and useful explanations of all performance, whether strong or weak. A self-assessment should not be a 'good news only' exercise.

- Take time to make sure your partners know why we are evaluating the project, what we are evaluating, and how. Answer their questions and concerns before you begin.
- Refer back to the Project Plan as a starting point in the evaluation. The plan contains statements of expected results and success indicators. You now want to see the extent to which you achieved what you set out to achieve.
- Review the Evaluation Form with partners to make sure its purpose and language is clear. Completing the form is a central activity of the evaluation.

- Update your baseline data with current data linked to your indicators. This will help you develop your statements about performance and results achieved.
- Take time to discuss the evaluation findings as they emerge. Try not to surprise anyone and be willing to soften language as needed without compromising accuracy.
- Give people the chance to speak for themselves in the assessment. Let women provide their own opinions and perspectives. If possible, disaggregate the data you collect by gender. Don't let service providers speak for the service users.
- Take care that ethnic and religious groups are well represented, and that their beliefs and preferences are respected. Muslim women will want to speak with women evaluators and be met separately from the men in their community.
- Let municipal staff members provide feedback separately from elected officials and senior managers. They may not want to disagree with leaders in public.
- Guarantee that all individuals will remain anonymous in the Evaluation Report.
- Avoid finger-pointing and don't let things get personal. Avoid naming people in your report. Instead, speak of positions or groups of people.
- Try to work toward consensus in the assessment of performance. Where this is not possible, you can say in the Evaluation Report that one group thought one way while another group thought differently.

The Evaluation Process

FCM recommends that the evaluation process follow the four steps described below. At each step, there are a set of tasks to complete. If you wish, you can tick the boxes in the list as you complete each of the tasks.

STEP 1 – Prepare for the Evaluation

Planning is the key to your success in the evaluation. With FCM support, you should begin making preparations for the evaluation at least a month prior to the final project mission. Preparations should include completing the following tasks:

- Confirm dates of 2-day evaluation workshop in final project mission
- Develop and discuss evaluation questions for sake of clarity
- Identify sources of information to answer evaluation questions
- Identify evaluation workshop participants
- Develop workshop agenda and plan
- Identify evaluation interviewees
- Develop interview questions and plan, including who will interview whom
- Arrange for interviews
- Organize baseline data
- Gather other documentation and data for review

STEP 2 – Conduct Evaluation Interviews

The evaluation will consist of a workshop for partners and interviews or meetings with other stakeholders and beneficiaries. You should try to interview those people with results information who will not attend the workshop. Building on the preparations completed in Step 1, you should:

- Explain to interviewees the purpose of the project evaluation and how the interview data will be used
- Guarantee that they will remain anonymous as sources in the evaluation report
- Discuss the project results and achievements against what was planned
- Identify key success factors explaining results achievement
- Allow interviewees the opportunity to ask questions or share their views about any other matters of importance or concern to them

STEP 3 – Carry Out the Evaluation Workshop

The evaluation workshop is the main activity in the project evaluation. The 2-day workshop takes place in Sri Lanka in the local district. Through plenary and small-group discussions and exercises, the workshop participants should:

- Discuss purpose of the evaluation exercise
- Review workshop objectives and agenda
- Discuss the content of the Evaluation Report
- Discuss the Evaluation Form
- Generate current data linked to project performance indicators
- Compare current data with baseline data from start of project
- Examine project results and achievements against what was planned
- Examine project results linked to crosscutting themes such as gender equality
- Identify key success factors explaining results achievement
- Discuss lessons learned in the project, including about governance issues
- Make recommendations to FCM for ongoing and future programming

STEP 4 – Prepare Evaluation Report

Once you have collected your data, and made joint analyses and recommendations, you will need to prepare the evaluation report. The core of the report is the completed Evaluation Form that is found in the back of this guide. Taking the lead in writing the report, the Canadian partners should:

- Complete Evaluation Form summarizing evaluation findings, data and lessons
- Review completed Evaluation Form with partner and revise content as needed
- Prepare a plan to write Evaluation Report indicating responsibilities and timelines
- Prepare other sections of Evaluation Report as per your plan
- Send draft report to FCM for comments
- Incorporate comments into final Evaluation Report and send to FCM

6. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Where do you get the information you need for the evaluation? Who has the information on results achieved?

People as Sources of Information

There are two sources of information for the evaluation– people and documents. Project participants and beneficiaries will be your main sources of information. Your partners will have a good amount of the information you need.

We have listed the possible range of participants and beneficiaries in the exhibit below. You can use the exhibit to identify names of the people you want to talk to.

Group	Definitions and Examples	Names of Sources
<i>Local Government Partners</i>	Local government partners have guided the project and participated in its activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mayors and Chairmen ▪ Council members ▪ Administrative leaders ▪ Department heads ▪ Municipal staff 	
<i>Other Local Partners</i>	These are leaders and members of community-based organizations (CBOs) who have participated in project activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CBO leaders ▪ CBO staff ▪ Local experts ▪ Community representatives 	
<i>Canadian Partners</i>	These are Canadian volunteers and consultants who have guided the project or provided training and expertise: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Canadian council members ▪ Canadian municipal staff ▪ Canadian community groups engaged in the project 	
<i>Project Stakeholders</i>	These people have a stake in the project, but have not participated in its activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Other government leaders and key staff ▪ Local government associations' staff ▪ Leaders of universities, training centres ▪ Donors and other programs' staff ▪ CSF proponents 	
<i>Project Beneficiaries</i>	These people are community members who benefit from better local services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Citizens-at-large (men, women, children) ▪ Users of services ▪ Target beneficiaries ▪ Others 	

Documents as Sources of Information

Documents are another source of information about project performance – although you will probably rely more on people than documents. Still, we have provided some examples of documents you may want to review in the evaluation. You are not expected to collect all of them, but only those most relevant to the task.

Project Documents

- Project-related assessments, studies and surveys
- Project plans
- Baseline data
- Project mission reports
- Photographs, presentations and tools

Local Government Documents

- Local government policies
- Studies, surveys, reports
- Procedure manuals
- Training manuals
- Web sites
- Budgets

Community Documents

- Studies and reports
- Minutes of public or community meetings
- Photographs
- Newspapers

Donor Documents

- Studies and reports
- Surveys

7. OUTLINE OF THE PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

What are the main evaluation products? What does FCM want from the project evaluation team?

Evaluation Report

The main product of the evaluation is the Project Evaluation Report. The report should be about 10-12 pages in length not including its appendices. The report should be submitted to FCM in draft form for comments before it is finalized.

Here is the suggested outline for the Project Evaluation Report:

List of Acronyms
Contents

1) Introduction

The Introduction should describe (1) the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, (2) the content of the evaluation report, and (3) the evaluation methodology and sources of information. It should be no more than one (1) page in length.

2) Project Context

This section should have information about (1) the conditions, needs or problems in the local context that provide a rationale for the project, (2) the project objectives, and (3) the project partners and beneficiaries.

The information on the local conditions, needs or problems should focus on four or five aspects that are most pertinent to the project. This could include information about tsunami-affected conditions, operations capacity, service delivery capacity, or quality of life issues related to the project. This information was likely compiled when preparing the Project Plan. The information on project objectives and project partners and stakeholders is also available in the Project Plan.

The section should be two (2) pages long – one on context and one on the project.

3) Project Results

This section should have information about (1) the Short-term Results Achieved, (2) the End-of-Project Results Achieved, (3) the Crosscutting Priority Results Achieved, and (4) the Unexpected Results Achieved. It should be divided into four sub-sections. It should include analytical statements (findings) about results achieved with evidence, numbers, opinions or examples (data) to support the analysis.

The sub-sections on short-term and end-of-project results achieved should be a summary of the completed Evaluation Form. The sub-section on crosscutting priorities should focus on one or more themes, such as gender equality, that were integrated into the project. The sub-section on unexpected results achieved should list one or two results only. The entire section should be about four (4) pages in length with most space given to short-term and end-of-project results achieved.

4) Factor Affecting Project Performance

This section should have information about (1) the factors that contributed to effective project performance and the achievement of expected results, and (2) the factors that constrained project performance and results achievement. It should be divided into these two sub-sections. It should include analyses of the way the positive or negative factors affected project performance.

You should rely on information from the worksheet for identifying the factors affecting performance, which is found in chapter 4 of the PEG. This section should be about three (3) pages in length.

5) Conclusions. Lessons and Recommendations

As indicated in the title, this section should have information about (1) the overall conclusions about project performance drawn from the evaluation, (2) the lessons learned from the project experience, and (3) the recommendations that the project team would make to FCM for continuing to work with the local authority or in the project area.

The lessons learned in the project could refer to what was learned about project design, planning, implementation and monitoring, what was learned about working effectively in the project context, about building capacity, engaging local communities, using Canadian volunteers, addressing governance issues, or any number of areas relevant to achieving results in the project.

The recommendations to FCM could also cover any of these areas. They could include recommendations for follow up to the project. This section should be about two (2) pages in length.

Appendices

The Evaluation Report should contain these appendices:

- The completed Evaluation Form
- List of Evaluation Team members
- List of participants in the Evaluation Workshop
- List of people involved in the evaluation

Evaluation Form

The PEG contains an Evaluation Form in the pages to follow. The Evaluation Form is for you to complete and submit to FCM as an appendix to the Evaluation Report.

The Evaluation Form lists the expected results that you identified in your project plan, and it provides space for you to write your findings or analyses of the actual results achieved. The Form also lists your performance indicators for results achievement, and provides space for baseline data and current data linked to these indicators.

EVALUATION FORM

IMPROVEMENT OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICES IN THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF GALLE, SRI LANKA							
<i>Evaluation Date</i>		<i>LFA Output</i>	1100	<i>WBS Number</i>	1130	<i>Indicators</i>	1.2, 1000.1, 1100.3
Expected Short-term Results		Short-term Results Achieved					
<i>Result Statement 1</i> Replicate the pilot garbage collection project in two more wards (distribute uniform garbage collection containers with public education). [1000.1]		<i>Findings/Analysis</i>					
<i>Success Indicators</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noticeable absence of loose garbage dumped on the street in front of homes in two more wards in GMC area [1100.3] 		<i>Baseline Data</i>		<i>Current Data</i>			
<i>Result Statement 2</i> Replicate the pilot composting project in two more wards (distribute uniform composting containers with public education) [1000.1]		<i>Findings/Analysis</i>					
<i>Success Indicators</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measurable reduction in quantity of food and yard waste set out for collection compared to the background waste sampling results 		<i>Baseline Data</i>		<i>Current Data</i>			

IMPROVEMENT OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICES IN THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF GALLE, SRI LANKA		
<p><i>Result Statement 3</i> Compaction garbage collection truck(s) introduced.</p>	<p><i>Findings/Analysis</i></p>	
<p><i>Success Indicators</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in volume of garbage collected per truck compared to the current collection system ▪ Reduction in trips to disposal site. ▪ Increase in households served by a driver and same sized crew compared to current system ▪ Increase/decrease of maintenance and repair costs compared to current collection vehicles 	<p><i>Baseline Data</i></p>	<p><i>Current Data</i></p>
<p><i>Result Statement 4</i> Improved interim waste disposal alternatives for dumping waste consistent with environmentally sound methods and procedures which support local authorities need for an interim disposal site. [1.2]</p>	<p><i>Findings/Analysis</i></p>	
<p><i>Success Indicators</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mitigation strategies, including methods and procedures, planned and introduced for interim dumpsite which contribute to an improved disposal of waste in an environmentally sound manner 	<p><i>Baseline Data</i></p>	<p><i>Current Data</i></p>

IMPROVEMENT OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICES IN THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF GALLE, SRI LANKA		
Expected End-of-Project Results	End-of-Project Results Achieved	
<p><i>Result Statement 5</i> Better waste management services.</p>	<p><i>Findings/Analysis</i></p>	
<p><i>Success Indicators</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elimination of loose garbage dumped on the street [1100.3] ▪ Elimination of health, environmental and aesthetic impacts associated with dumping loose garbage on street ▪ Reduced health and safety concerns for employees that are currently collecting waste. 	<p><i>Baseline Data</i></p>	<p><i>Current Data</i></p>
<p><i>Result Statement 6</i> Reduction of waste disposed at the dump sites. [1100.3]</p>	<p><i>Findings/Analysis</i></p>	
<p><i>Success Indicators</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More efficient collection of garbage with fewer vehicles. ▪ Reduced cost of hauling waste to the disposal site. ▪ Reduction in quantity of garbage that requires collection, hauling and disposal at public expense [1100.3] ▪ Reduction of carbon dioxide and methane generation rates at the disposal site. 	<p><i>Baseline Data</i></p>	<p><i>Current Data</i></p>

IMPROVEMENT OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICES IN THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF GALLE, SRI LANKA		
<i>Result Statement 7</i> Better public education on waste management.	<i>Findings/Analysis</i>	
<i>Success Indicators</i>	<i>Baseline Data</i>	<i>Current Data</i>
Crosscutting Priority Results Achieved		
<i>Gender Equality</i>	<i>Peace Building</i>	<i>Environmental Sustainability</i>