

ANNEX 16

Additional issues to be considered for the Terms of Reference for the appraisal mission for the new IFSP planned for the North and East of Sri Lanka

The Government of Sri Lanka has officially submitted a request for assistance from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany for the "...extension of the Integrated Food Security Programme (IFSP) to formerly uncleared areas Mullaitivu, Manare and Batticaloa districts". The request dated 30 October 2002 will eventually be subject to an appraisal mission.

During the lessons learnt mission conducted in March 2003 a number of issues were raised that were seen to be of particular importance for any extension or rather new IFSP project to be undertaken in the former uncleared areas of the above mentioned districts.

The following points should be seen as being "additional points" to those of a standard set of terms of reference for a normal IFSP.

In addition to the standard ToR, the appraisal team should also:

- Determine how the different approaches pursued by the Jaffna Rehabilitation Programme in the new proposed areas of extension are compatible with the conceptual approach of an IFSP working in the same districts or areas. Some of the conceptual elements may be mutually exclusive. For example, food-for-assets/work may not be compatible with the conceptually approach undertaken by the JRP and the concepts may actually undermine each other.
- In the event that the concepts are not compatible, the appraisal team would need to determine whether a spatial or thematic separation between the JRP and the newly proposed IFSP should be undertaken. One example could be that the JRP concentrates on rebuilding infrastructure, especially housing, in the more urban areas and the new IFSP concentrates on the rural areas. Another alternative could be that the new IFSP does not work in the same districts as the JRP.
- Analyse the "lessons learnt" and experiences made by the IFSP Trincomalee in the period from 1988-2003 and documented in the lessons-learnt report and determine which of the lessons learnt can and should be taken over in the new project (e.g. PNA, community mobilisation, etc.).
- Briefly assess the levels of vulnerability in the proposed project areas and determine some of the main causes as to why this vulnerability exists. Reference should be made to the levels of vulnerability encountered in Trincomalee district.
- Examine how a project spread over a larger area can be realistically managed and administered (especially with regard to logistical viability of managing a project spread over a wide geographic area (i.e. from Vanni to Ampara).

- Examine the institutional “landscape” with the aim of identifying suitable service providers /GO / NGO / INGO / CBOs) for micro-project implementation and institutional strengthening in general.
- Determine the extent to which capacity building can be undertaken with the existing institutions, especially in view of the limited existing capacities.
- Determine the extent to which other organisations are already undertaking capacity building efforts and the determine how duplications and overlaps can be avoided.
- In the event that the capacity of the GO and NGOs is limited in the area, define the extent to which an IFSP can realistically undertake capacity building while at the same time also being expected to achieve “tangible benefits and impacts” amongst the vulnerable communities.
- On the basis of the initial impressions / survey, determine realistic impact indicators (both intermediate ones and higher levels ones) that can be used for steering the IFSP during implementation and that serve as a basis for the GTZ/BMZ offer according to the Aura system.
- In the event that baseline data is insufficient to determine impact indicators, propose the main elements that would need to be included in baseline study / survey to be conducted within the first few months of operations of the IFSP programme.
- Examine how PNA can be undertaken in the area and a how a systematic approach for community mobilisation can be undertaken that does not rely solely on having an own IFSP mobilisation team.
- In the wake of IFSP experiences in Trincomalee as well as in Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam determine the extent to which IFSP should get involved in employment and income generating activities or whether these should not be taken over from the start by other initiatives such as CEFE, Rural Banking etc.
- Thoroughly assess procedures and products designed by the IFSP in Trincomalee with the aim of replicating and thus negating the need to develop new approaches, procedures and products.

10 March 2003

Dr. Nikolaus Schall and Dr. Eberhard Bauer