

# EVALUATION DEPARTMENT

REPORT 11/2017 COUNTRY EVALUATION BRIEF



# Nepal

## Evaluation Portrait





**Commissioned by**  
The Evaluation Department

**Carried out by**  
Particip GmbH in consortium  
with Menon Economics

**Written by**  
Jörn Dosch

**Supported by**  
Meike Pollakowski (Project Manager)

DECEMBER 2017

---

This report is the product of its authors,  
and responsibility for the accuracy of data included  
in this report rests with the authors alone. The findings,  
interpretations, and conclusions presented  
in this report do not necessarily reflect the  
views of the Evaluation Department.

**Norad**  
Norwegian Agency for  
Development Cooperation  
[www.norad.no](http://www.norad.no)  
[post-eval@norad.no](mailto:post-eval@norad.no)

December 2017

Cover photo: EU/ECHO/Pierre Prakash  
*A woman carrying a basket*

ISBN: 978-82-8369-044-6

# 1 Nepal – Evaluation Portrait

## 1.1 2017

### 1.1.1 Evaluation of UNICEF Nepal Country Programme Action Plan (2013-17)

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Evaluation of UNICEF Nepal Country Programme Action Plan (2013-17)</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2017
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Ernst & Young LLP - India
<b>Commissioned by</b>	UNICEF
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	2013-2017
<b>Keywords</b>	Health, nutrition, water sanitation and hygiene (WASH), education, adolescent development and participation, social policy, disaster risk reduction and emergency preparedness
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The evaluation assessed the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2013-2017. CPAP was the primary agreed document to guide programme co-operation between UNICEF and the Government of Nepal for the period of 2013- 2017. The CPAP was a five year framework that provided the narrative of goals, results and strategies and was developed following UNICEF global refocus on equity in 2010.</p> <p>The overall goal of the 2013-2017 Country Programme was to directly address inequity in three sectors (policy, system and societal) so that all children, adolescents and women have access to education, health care, nutrition, sanitation, hygiene, safe water, protection, information, and other services necessary to fulfil their rights to survival, development, protection and participation.</p> <p>Overall, the CPAP was found to be well-aligned with international and national development priorities.</p> <p>The programme complemented existing national policies and challenges faced by the country. Among a wide range of results, CPAP contributed to the inclusion of progressive provisions related to child protection in Nepal's new constitution. The programme also helped to increase the budget allocation for nutrition within the health sector as well as outside of health sector.</p> <p>UNICEF efficiently utilised the human, financial and technical resources while pursuing the objectives of the CPAP. At the same time the evaluation notes that there had been variations in the amount of funds disbursed, in relation to those that had been allocated to the specific component.</p> <p>The combination of strategies utilised by UNICEF in the process of implementation and positive working relationship with the Government and its operational ministries contributed to overall programme sustainability. On the other hand factors such as unavailability of appropriate data on all indicators to generate evidence limited UNICEF's ability to galvanise support for real-time change and to maintain the same in the long run.</p> <p>There are several lessons that can be drawn out of the CPAP implementation period 2013-2017 such as the importance of adequately focusing building capacities for emergency preparedness given Nepal's disaster vulnerability.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender equity, urbanisation, disaster risk reduction, climate change
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/index_95060.html">https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/index_95060.html</a>

### 1.1.2 Evaluation of Humanitarian Quality Assurance – Nepal: Evaluation of Oxfam’s response to the 2015 earthquake

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Humanitarian Quality Assurance – Nepal: Evaluation of Oxfam’s response to the 2015 earthquake</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2017
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Richard Luff
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Oxfam
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country (emergency response in affected areas)
<b>Project period</b>	2015
<b>Keywords</b>	Earthquake response, humanitarian, emergency, food security, shelter, water, sanitation, hygiene, livelihood
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>A 7.6 magnitude earthquake struck Nepal on 25 April 2015 creating large-scale damage and many casualties. The evaluation focused on Oxfam’s response to this earthquake. The period covered is late April 2015 to late December 2015. The evaluation used a methodology designed to enable Oxfam to estimate how many disaster-affected men and women globally had received humanitarian aid from Oxfam that meets established standards for excellence. The methodology was based on the Humanitarian Indicator Tool (HIT) consisting of up to 15 quality standards and a scoring system using established benchmarks for each standard. Based on the full set of indicators the evaluation awarded an overall score of 34.5 out of 54, equivalent to 64%.</p> <p>Overall, the evaluation found, inter alia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oxfam met the standard for timeliness;</li> <li>• Oxfam put the Core Humanitarian Standard in place and adjusted actions and indicators to the context;</li> <li>• Minimum Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) standards were used regularly;</li> <li>• Feedback from partners and beneficiaries was positive;</li> <li>• Oxfam only partially addressed the needs of vulnerable groups;</li> <li>• Oxfam almost met the standard for preparedness (Contingency plan, risk analysis, etc.);</li> <li>• Oxfam met all the requirements under staff capacity, exceeding quantitative measures where stipulated;</li> <li>• There was not much evidence of Oxfam playing a strong leadership role in any of the forums and standing out as being particularly influential;</li> <li>• There were active measures in place to prevent and/or act upon corruption, fraud, conflicts of interest and misuse of resources;</li> <li>• The imposition of customs duties around four to five weeks into the response (for goods brought in by agencies other than the UN and Red Cross) severely compromised Oxfam’s ability to deliver fast. The arising challenges were not managed effectively.</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/humanitarian-quality-assurance-nepal-evaluation-of-oxfams-response-to-the-nepal-620255">http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/humanitarian-quality-assurance-nepal-evaluation-of-oxfams-response-to-the-nepal-620255</a>

## 1.2 2016

### 1.2.1 Independent Evaluation of the UN Peace Fund for Nepal

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Independent Evaluation of the UN Peace Fund for Nepal</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2016
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Lattanzio

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Independent Evaluation of the UN Peace Fund for Nepal</i>
<b>Commissioned by</b>	UNPFN
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country (thematic)
<b>Project period</b>	2007-2015
<b>Keywords</b>	Peace-building, rule of law, human rights, jobs, good governance, conflict prevention, institution building, participation, children, security, reconciliation, justice, governance
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), signed in 2006, committed conflict parties as the signatories to pursuing inclusive recovery and rehabilitation, and ensuring justice and reparations for victims of conflict. It also committed to the formation of transitional justice mechanisms. The CPA provided a good framework for international peacebuilding interventions to support the peace process. In March 2007 Security Council Resolution 1740 mandated the creation of the United Nations Peace Fund for Nepal (UNPFN). Its goal was to finance projects solicited from UN organisations. UNPFN's objectives evolved over time as the context changed. UNPFN received contributions from the governments of the United Kingdom, Norway, Denmark, Canada and Switzerland, as well as from the global UN Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), which itself has over 50 donors. USD 46.4 million was allocated through 34 projects selected by a competitive process. All the UN agencies operating in Nepal participated in these projects across the country.</p> <p>The evaluation found that UNPFN provided assistance that was relevant to the implementation of the CPA at key moments in time (particularly in 2007 when demobilisation took place and in 2010 when reintegration of ex-combatants was launched on a large scale). This effort was very responsive to the evolving needs of the situation. The quality of relations between the implementing organisations and the parties to the conflict as well as the Government were good thanks to the recognised status of the UN in the country, but relations loosened over the years as a reflection of the changes in the policy environment of aid in Nepal, particularly after the 2015 earthquake.</p> <p>Another important finding is the consistent manner in which all the projects supported the interests of marginalised groups, in particular women, children, and Dalit and Janagati/indigenous people. The UN represented approximately 10% of the total funding allocated to peacebuilding by donors and international agencies, in what can be considered a successful resolution of the conflict, allowing the UNPFN to make a significant contribution. For example, the 2013 elections, to which UNPFN provided support, were repeatedly cited by interviewees in Nepal as one of the most successful elements of the peace process</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, context sensitivity
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://social-terrain.com/static/media/161003-Peacebuilding-Nepal-Evaluation.pdf">http://social-terrain.com/static/media/161003-Peacebuilding-Nepal-Evaluation.pdf</a>

### 1.2.2 Evaluation of UNICEF's Response and Recovery Efforts to the Gorkha Earthquake in Nepal

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Evaluation of UNICEF's Response and Recovery Efforts to the Gorkha Earthquake in Nepal</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2016
<b>Author/Agency</b>	DARA
<b>Commissioned by</b>	UNICEF
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country (emergency response in affected areas)

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Evaluation of UNICEF's Response and Recovery Efforts to the Gorkha Earthquake in Nepal</i></b>
<b>Project period</b>	2015-2016
<b>Keywords</b>	Earthquake response, recovery, reconstruction, humanitarian, emergency, water and sanitation, health, nutrition, education, child protection, social policy, communication for development
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The evaluation assessed UNICEF's response and recovery efforts between 25 April 2015 and 31 January 2016 in a sample of the 14 most severely affected districts. The institutional scope of the evaluation was UNICEF's response at the UNICEF Nepal Country Office (NCO) level as well as support received from the regional and headquarters levels under Level 2 (L2) emergency procedures. A detailed assessment of individual sections' responses was beyond the scope of this evaluation and was not attempted.</p> <p>The evaluation found that the UNICEF response was outstanding overall and characterized by a significant initial field presence and early mobilisation of prepositioned contingency supplies, funds and partners.</p> <p>As of December 2015, UNICEF had largely achieved its targets under the Humanitarian Action for Children (HAC), with the exception of the number of cases of severe acute malnutrition treated, and the indicator related to access to sanitation. In collaboration with other stakeholders, UNICEF contributed to preventing the deterioration of access to health services for children and women and increase in malnutrition rates. A combined Health and WASH approach, including an early contingency plan, was able to limit and control the outbreak of cholera detected in early August.</p> <p>The Education programme ensured the safe return to school for 179,300 children from the communities affected while the Child Protection programme supported data collection activities which were a first for vulnerable children and key to strengthening child protection systems. Analysis of Humanitarian Performance Monitoring (HPM) results, however, provide a partial understanding of the effectiveness of the response; not all programme activities are reflected, disaggregated data is not reflected, and indicators are primarily output focused and unable to capture programme outcomes.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, vulnerability, children
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/index_92870.html">https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/index_92870.html</a>

### 1.2.3 Evaluation of Finland's Development Cooperation Country Strategies and Country Strategy Modality. Nepal Country Report

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Evaluation of Finland's Development Cooperation Country Strategies and Country Strategy Modality. Nepal Country Report</i></b>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2016
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Mokoro Ltd in collaboration with Indufor Oy
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	2008-2015
<b>Keywords</b>	Institution building, rule of law, good governance, human rights, women, peace, education, water, sanitation, hygiene, forestry, environment, waste
<b>Abstract</b>	The evaluation of Finland's Country Strategy (CS) for Nepal 2013–2015 was part of an overall evaluation of Finland's Country Strategy Modality (CSM). According to the report The CS was relevant to the national context and policies, and to Finnish development policy priorities, and improved the focus of the Finnish development cooperation portfolio. However, the CSM

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Evaluation of Finland's Development Cooperation Country Strategies and Country Strategy Modality. Nepal Country Report</i></b>
	directed the portfolio only partially, because at the time it was introduced, the programme was built around a group of ongoing interventions. Assessment of the strategy's effectiveness was hindered by the contribution gap in its logic model. The CS did contribute to more aid effective country programming because the number of sectors and interventions was reduced. However, decisions on new projects or the extension of existing projects were not clearly guided by the CS. Because of the rather abstract impact statements and vague analysis of the contribution path, the impact of the CS was hard to assess. Risk management was not included in the initial CS. Complementarity of the CS with other Finnish channels and mechanisms was inadequate. Coherence of the CS and its programme remained partial. The evaluation recommended to revise the logic model and corresponding results monitoring framework in order to deal with the contribution gap.
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, human rights, climate change
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://formin.finland.fi/public/download.aspx?ID=161133&amp;GUID={D01F9CEC-509F-43B5-A65A-EAA78D2B05A4}">http://formin.finland.fi/public/download.aspx?ID=161133&amp;GUID={D01F9CEC-509F-43B5-A65A-EAA78D2B05A4}</a>

#### 1.2.4 Joint Evaluation of Nepal's School Sector Reform Plan Programme 2009-2016

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Joint Evaluation of Nepal's School Sector Reform Plan Programme 2009-2016</i></b>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2016
<b>Author/Agency</b>	GFA Consulting Group GmbH
<b>Commissioned by</b>	European Union
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Sector programme
<b>Project period</b>	2009-2016
<b>Keywords</b>	Education, SWAp (Sector wide approach) programme, joint funding (ADB, AusAid, Denmark, EU, DFID, FTI-Catalytic, Finland, Norway, UNICEF, World Bank, GPE, JICA, UNESCO, WFP)
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The School Sector Reform Plan (SSRP), 2009-2016, aimed to expand access and equity, improve quality and relevance, and strengthen the institutional capacity of the entire school system. Funded through a pool of Development Partners (DPs) together with the Government of Nepal (GoN) and the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), the SSRP programme tackled long-lasting challenges in the field of education in Nepal. The programme was developed within the framework of wider poverty concerns and has been aligned to poverty reduction strategies, both nationally and internationally. As such, the SSRP objectives were found to be relevant to the development plans, and reflect the Education For All (EFA) goals and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). The SSRP programme was expected to end in July 2016 and the key implementing actor was the Ministry of Education (MoE), using a Sector Wide Approach (SWAp). The evaluation presented an independent assessment of the achievements, strengths and weaknesses of the different components of the programme, against the SSRP result framework. The main findings were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SSRP helped address existing disparities linked to caste, ethnicity, religion and geography, but also helped avert potential conflicts and political divisions;</li> <li>• Access and equity increased in most levels of education, notably in ECED, primary, basic, secondary and non-formal education;</li> <li>• Education has become a priority sector for the GoN, for which investments have steadily increased;</li> </ul>



<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Joint Evaluation of Nepal's School Sector Reform Plan Programme 2009-2016</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In spite of good results in access and equity, the poor quality of education still produced school-leavers who have not acquired the necessary competencies to improve their economic situation;</li> <li>The GoN progressively took over more of the funding responsibilities, but will not be able to take over the whole funding of the SSRP once donors have withdrawn.</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, caste, ethnicity
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://www.moe.gov.np/assets/uploads/files/Joint_evaluation_of_the_School_Sector_Reform_Programme_2009-16_final_report.pdf">http://www.moe.gov.np/assets/uploads/files/Joint_evaluation_of_the_School_Sector_Reform_Programme_2009-16_final_report.pdf</a>

### 1.3 2015

#### 1.3.1 Real-time Evaluation of World Vision's Response to the Nepal Earthquake Emergency

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Real-time Evaluation of World Vision's Response to the Nepal Earthquake Emergency</b>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2015
<b>Author/Agency</b>	World Vision staff
<b>Commissioned by</b>	World Vision
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country (emergency response in affected areas)
<b>Project period</b>	2015
<b>Keywords</b>	Earthquake response, recovery, resilience, shelter, water, sanitation, hygiene, education, health, child protection, food
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The purpose of the real-time evaluation (RTE) of World Vision's response to the emergency situation was to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review the response against established criteria (effectiveness and timeliness, appropriateness, coverage, accountability, connectedness and sustainability, and organisational efficiency) and recommend immediate changes that can improve the emergency programme;</li> <li>Identify good practices to use more widely and scale up and also opportunities for improvement;</li> <li>Promote a learning culture and approach within World and among its partners. Vision and among its partners.</li> </ul> <p>The evaluation concluded that the response was well funded, with a mix of grants and private non-sponsorship (PNS) funds totalling over US\$26 million. World Vision was timely in distributing goods quickly in most districts. The Response was mostly achieving its plans in terms of the number of people reached; as of mid-July 2015 over 63 per cent of the people targeted in the response plan had received emergency relief assistance. People reached by World Vision were those most affected and vulnerable, though a few groups such as the elderly may not have been reached.</p> <p>Overall, good practices on the World Vision Non-food Tracking System (NTS), information management, emergency communications, response management and partnering and collaboration were evident in this response. Areas in which learning occurred were accessing remote areas and locations, using a multisectoral approach in the immediate relief phase of a response, identifying culturally appropriate humanitarian accountability mechanisms, Last Mile Mobile Solutions (LMMS) and staffing and staff care.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Education, health



<b>Evaluation</b>	<i>Real-time Evaluation of World Vision's Response to the Nepal Earthquake Emergency</i>
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://www.alnap.org/resource/21277">http://www.alnap.org/resource/21277</a>

### 1.3.2 Mid-Term Review of the 2013-2017 WHO Country Cooperation Strategy: Nepal

<b>Evaluation</b>	<i>Mid-Term Review of the 2013-2017 WHO Country Cooperation Strategy: Nepal</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2015
<b>Author/Agency</b>	WHO
<b>Commissioned by</b>	WHO
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	2013-2015
<b>Keywords</b>	Health, earthquake response
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The evaluation found the the strategic priorities of the Country Cooperation Strategy 2013-2017 to be valid and relevant, but noted that they needed to be more focused. The report stressed that WHO was overstretched in too many areas, and recommended to adapt to the changes in the country, in particular the new Constitution, National Health Policy 2014 and the National Health Strategy 2015-2020. The MTR also recommended a shift with an increased priority to health system strengthening and non-communicable diseases. WHO should strengthen its capacity to support and monitor universal health coverage and to address inequity in access to health services. The new Constitution implies restructuring of the state through federal form of governance with special emphasis on decentralization and strengthening local health governance. It calls to restructure central and local authorities to make them more responsive to health needs and provides an opportunity for addressing weaknesses in the current health care system and improve service delivery. WHO should be prepared to assist the Government at this important juncture and play a leading role in advising and coordination of the technical support from the external development partners. Health system strengthening should consequently become a core area for WHO support to Nepal. The health system support up to now has been too fragmented and requires a more holistic approach and enhanced technical capacity within the country office.</p> <p>The WHO's response to the earthquake on April 2015 working with the Government and other partners was considered very satisfactory. Efficient deployment of experienced WHO staff from the country office, SEARO and other offices shortly after the earthquake and effective coordination with MoHP and other partners were the main reasons for this achievement.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, governance
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://www.searo.who.int/nepal/documents/mtr_2013-2017_who_ccs_nepal.pdf">http://www.searo.who.int/nepal/documents/mtr_2013-2017_who_ccs_nepal.pdf</a>

### 1.3.3 Report of the Mid-term Review of the Swiss Cooperation Strategy

<b>Evaluation</b>	<i>Report of the Mid-term Review of the Swiss Cooperation Strategy</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2015
<b>Author/Agency</b>	SDC
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	2013-2015

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Report of the Mid-term Review of the Swiss Cooperation Strategy</i>
<b>Keywords</b>	State building, rule of law, security, peace-building, livelihoods, resilience, rural areas, human rights-based approach, emergency response and recovery, humanitarian
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The evaluation found that the contribution of Switzerland towards an inclusive federal state, human security and the rule of law – despite a lot of activities implemented and good outputs produced – was not as effective as the SCS had envisaged, but there were good signs of progress on conflict resolution and gender-based violence reporting.</p> <p>The bulk of the investment under the SCS contributed to improved livelihoods and increased resilience of people, especially disadvantaged groups living in rural areas and small urban centres. In this area, Switzerland's contribution was on track to achieve the outcome set by the SCS, and there was evidence that people's livelihoods were improving, thanks to Switzerland's investments and the efforts of other donors.</p> <p>The policy and political context in Nepal and the unclear road towards federalism constituted risks for the delivery of the strategy, and will need to be monitored closely for the risk to be mitigated effectively.</p> <p>The evaluation concluded that it was important to increase the synergies between the SCS domains of interventions and to streamline key social empowerment aspects within projects in productive sectors. Such integration will better align the SCS with the new development cooperation policy and increase the coherence of the SCS.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender equity, social inclusion
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.eda.admin.ch/content/dam/countries/countries-content/nepal/en/Report_of_the_Mid_term_Review_of_the_Swiss_Cooperation_Strategy_2013_17_for_Nepal-EN.pdf">https://www.eda.admin.ch/content/dam/countries/countries-content/nepal/en/Report_of_the_Mid_term_Review_of_the_Swiss_Cooperation_Strategy_2013_17_for_Nepal-EN.pdf</a>

#### 1.3.4 Real Time Evaluation of the Nepal Earthquake Response Operation

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Real Time Evaluation of the Nepal Earthquake Response Operation</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2015
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Jock Baker, Klaus Palkovits, Tissa Abeywickrama, Chris Lee, and Paul Keen
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Red Cross
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country (emergency response in affected areas)
<b>Project period</b>	2015
<b>Keywords</b>	Earthquake response, recovery, shelter, water, sanitation, hygiene, health, child protection, food
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>With its complex geophysical structure and vulnerability to a variety of disaster types, Nepal ranks as one of the most disaster-prone countries in the world. On 25 April 2015, a 7.8 magnitude earthquake struck Nepal, followed by a series of aftershocks including one with a magnitude of 7.3 on 12 May that occurred in the midst of ongoing relief operations. These combined events left behind more than 8,500 people dead, 17,600 injured, over 855,000 houses damaged or destroyed and have had far-reaching impacts on infrastructure, livelihoods and social services.</p> <p>The evaluation found that there were several positive factors in Nepal that facilitated a coordinated response that was largely consistent with the Principles and Rules for Red Cross and Red Crescent humanitarian assistance. This was a response to large scale natural disaster that had been foreseen and prepared for, including the organization of regular simulation exercises. There was an established and well-functioning cooperation between the Partner National Societies (PNS), the</p>

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Real Time Evaluation of the Nepal Earthquake Response Operation</i></b>
	<p>International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the Nepal Red Cross (NRCS), which is a widely-respected National Society that has a good existing working relationship with the IFRC at a country, regional and global level.</p> <p>Many key informants from the RC Movement felt that the Nepal response was in many ways a model of a well-coordinated response.</p> <p>However, the momentum could not be sustained and NRCS found themselves in a difficult position where they had to coordinate a coherent recovery program to fulfil their accountability commitments to communities affected by the earthquake and at the same time support the government, which had asked agencies and communities to wait until a national recovery and reconstruction plan had been developed and communicated before proceeding with large scale reconstruction efforts.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Health, child protection
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://www.alnap.org/node/23313.aspx">http://www.alnap.org/node/23313.aspx</a>

### 1.3.5 Evaluation of Norway's support to women's rights and gender equality in development cooperation. Nepal case study report

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Evaluation of Norway's support to women's rights and gender equality in development cooperation. Nepal case study report</i></b>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2015
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Swedish Institute for Public Administration (SIPU) in cooperation with Overseas Development Institute (ODI) and the Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI)
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Norad
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Thematic (Nepal country report)
<b>Project period</b>	2007-2013
<b>Keywords</b>	Women, gender, women's political empowerment, gender mainstreaming in the energy sector
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The study covered all Norwegian support to WRGE in development cooperation in the period 2007-2013, whether directly targeted or gender-mainstreamed.</p> <p>Overall, Norway was an important actor in the promotion of gender and women's rights in Nepal and was perceived as such by other development actors. The Norwegian Action Plan emphasized the importance of women's rights and the need to support measures that increase women's control over their own lives. Norway's development policy aimed to 'promote democracy, emphasize the universal human rights, and to support measures that can permanently lift people out of poverty', especially with regard to four key pillars: women's economic empowerment, women's political empowerment, VAW and sexual and reproductive health rights, with a strong focus on the rights of the LGBT community.</p> <p>Norway contributed to systemic change by providing key stakeholders within the political sphere and civil society with the knowledge, tools and platforms needed to continue to promote WRGE with a stronger and more cohesive voice in all ongoing discussion on the different laws, regulations and funding, particularly important as the country is in the process of drafting a new Constitution, as such, helping to guarantee that key priorities for gender stay on the national agenda.</p> <p>One of the key recommendation was that IPWA future work on political empowerment would benefit from an increased focus on the inclusion of marginalised groups and rural populations, as well as ensuring not only elites have the ability to participate in the processes.</p>



<b>Evaluation</b>	<i>Evaluation of Norway's support to women's rights and gender equality in development cooperation. Nepal case study report</i>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.norad.no/en/toolspublications/publications/2015/evaluation-of-Norways-support-to-womens-rights-and-gender-equality-in-velopment-cooperation/">https://www.norad.no/en/toolspublications/publications/2015/evaluation-of-Norways-support-to-womens-rights-and-gender-equality-in-velopment-cooperation/</a>

### 1.3.6 Evaluation of Norwegian Multilateral Support to Basic Education: Nepal Case Study

<b>Evaluation</b>	<i>Evaluation of Norwegian Multilateral Support to Basic Education: Nepal Case Study</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2015
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Development Portfolio Management Group
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Norad
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Thematic (Nepal country report)
<b>Project period</b>	2009-2013
<b>Keywords</b>	Basic education, UNICEF, GPE, gender
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The evaluation found that, overall, the School Sector Reform Program (SSRP) did well on gender equality, achieving gender parity at both primary and secondary level – though learning outcomes for girls are still lower than for boys. There was also convincing evidence that, overall, the SSR-Plan was pro poor and that removing fees and providing in-kind and cash incentives to poor families has increased the economic equity of school education in Nepal. However, SSRP did not as well on other dimensions of equity. There was little evidence that the school system was doing a better job of improving educational outcomes for children who are disabled, who do not speak Nepali or who belong to caste/ethnic groups facing social discrimination.</p> <p>The evaluation recommended, inter alia, to improve the ability of the education management information system to better identify social groups where children's access, participation and learning outcomes are lagging; focus more attention on building local level capacity for school management and on improving the school governance systems to ensure adequate checks and balances; and provide more stable funding to UNICEF in return for greater accountability for its (jointly agreed) outcomes within the overall SSRP.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, social inclusion
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.norad.no/en/toolspublications/publications/2015/evaluation-of-norwegian-multilateral-support-to-basic-education/">https://www.norad.no/en/toolspublications/publications/2015/evaluation-of-norwegian-multilateral-support-to-basic-education/</a>

### 1.3.7 Nepal Constitution Building Process: 2006-2015. Progress, Challenges, and Contributions of International Community

<b>Evaluation</b>	<i>Nepal Constitution Building Process: 2006-2015. Progress, Challenges, and Contributions of International Community</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2015
<b>Author/Agency</b>	IDEA
<b>Commissioned by</b>	International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA)
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Study
<b>Project period</b>	2006-2015
<b>Keywords</b>	Constitution, peace building, donors

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Nepal Constitution Building Process: 2006-2015. Progress, Challenges, and Contributions of International Community</i></b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The study found that with the promulgation of the constitution on 20 September 2015, Nepal was at an important juncture. The constitution is not a perfect document. It is not as inclusive or as equitable as many of Nepal's ethnic groups had hoped and the Madhesi and Tharu political parties are extremely dissatisfied with the proposed federal structure which has sparked violence including numerous deaths, particularly in the southern plains. Successful implementation of the constitution will require, as a first step, the government to bring all disaffected groups to the table. The International community has a critical role to play in supporting such efforts.</p> <p>The material and technical support from international partners has been crucial in enabling national actors to achieve their goals. Now is the time to step up efforts to secure and consolidate the gains that have been made, and continue to support the Nepali people in their aspiration of creating a just and inclusive democratic society. Some are of the opinion that as a result of the earthquakes, the single most pressing need of the country is to rebuild homes, resettle the internally displaced, repair infrastructure, and rehabilitate the livelihoods of thousands of people affected.</p> <p>While there is a need for disaster relief and reconstruction, it is equally important that such reconstruction is well-planned and is carried out in a transparent and accountable manner. Good governance is the cornerstone of efficient post-disaster recovery, and in case of Nepal it can only be ensured through the strategic implementation of the new constitution. Implementation of the constitution, therefore, is more critical for Nepal than ever before.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Governance, socio-economic equality
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/publications/nepals-constitution-building-process-2006-2015.pdf">https://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/publications/nepals-constitution-building-process-2006-2015.pdf</a>

## 1.4 2014

### 1.4.1 Resilience in Nepal. Evaluation of mainstreaming disaster risk reduction and enhancing response capability

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Resilience in Nepal. Evaluation of mainstreaming disaster risk reduction and enhancing response capability</i></b>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2014
<b>Author/Agency</b>	David Bishop
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Oxfam
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Project
<b>Project period</b>	2010-2013
<b>Keywords</b>	Resilience, disaster risk reduction, disaster response capability, local communities and institutions
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>This Effectiveness Review found evidence that the project positively affected several important characteristics that are thought to be associated with positive resilience in Dadeldhura district. On average, households in the project communities met thresholds for positive scores in 73 per cent of the characteristics of resilience, compared to only 47 per cent of the characteristics among households in the comparison communities.</p> <p>For example, there was good evidence of attitudinal shifts in terms of awareness of climate change, and in households' confidence in local leadership and government support in times of crisis, as well as levels of social connectedness. There were also examples of how the project</p>

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Resilience in Nepal. Evaluation of mainstreaming disaster risk reduction and enhancing response capability</i></b>
	<p>successfully effected behaviour change, in terms of households taking practical steps to protect their crops or assets – although the proportion of supported households taking action to protect livestock or assets was very low.</p> <p>There was some evidence of change in some of the more outcome-related measures – for example households exhibiting greater livelihood diversification and having greater reserves of savings. One of the clear successes of the project was in starting the process of involving project participants in the district-level disaster planning activities. There was also evidence of strong confidence in local government support mechanisms in the event of disaster.</p> <p>However, no evidence emerged that the establishment of the early-warning system resulted in reduced loss of crops or assets due to the flash flood in September 2012.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Governance
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/resilience-in-nepal-evaluation-of-mainstreaming-disaster-risk-reduction-and-enh-336274">http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/resilience-in-nepal-evaluation-of-mainstreaming-disaster-risk-reduction-and-enh-336274</a>

## 1.5 2013

### 1.5.1 Mid-term Evaluation of Strømme Foundation Project Nepal (2011-2015)

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Mid-term Evaluation of Stromme Foundation Project Nepal (2011-2015)</i></b>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2013
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Chiranjibi Rijal et al.
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Strømme Foundation
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Project
<b>Project period</b>	2011-2013
<b>Keywords</b>	Civil society, social and economic empowerment of excluded families, poverty reduction, livelihoods, girls and women, children
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The Strømme Foundation (SF) Nepal together with its partner organisations implemented projects in four districts (Rupandehi, Rautahat, Makawanpur and Surkhet). The projects aims were to improve the social and economic status of 8,400 economically and socially excluded families through active participation in civil society collective efforts. SF used the approach of "Help for Self help" to combat poverty in the region. The main strategy was to empower individuals, households and communities and thereby reduce vulnerability and increase the capacity, to organize and work as a force.</p> <p>The evaluation found that by and large the projects met the above-mentioned objectives and achieved most of their targets. The holistic and integrated "family as a unit" approach was regarded highly effective. However, it was also noted that the However, the programme did not have a specific exit plan for fostering sustainability of the activities</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.norad.no/en/toolspublications/publications/ngo-evaluations/2014/a-report-on-mid-term-evaluation-of-stromme-foundation-project-nepal/">https://www.norad.no/en/toolspublications/publications/ngo-evaluations/2014/a-report-on-mid-term-evaluation-of-stromme-foundation-project-nepal/</a>



### 1.5.2 Nepal Case. Creating Change in Children's Lives: An Evaluation of Save the Children's Child Rights Governance Programme. A Limited Study

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Nepal Case. Creating Change in Children's Lives: An Evaluation of Save the Children's Child Rights Governance Programme. A Limited Study</i></b>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2013
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Nordic Consulting Group
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Save the Children
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Programme (Nepal country report)
<b>Project period</b>	2011-ongoing
<b>Keywords</b>	Child rights governance, protection, education, health and nutrition, livelihood, HIV and Aids, emergencies
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>Save the Children (SC) has been working in Nepal since 1976 and Child Rights Governance (CRG) is one of the thematic programmes. The evaluation found that various system level changes could be noted, as a result of contribution made by SC Nepal in collaboration with other actors. Major achievements included institutionalisation of state mechanisms for child rights, with appropriate policy and constitutional framework, functional structures and improved governance processes in terms of increased participation and investment in children and increased recognition of children as the rightful stakeholders for decision making. Considerable progress towards institutionalising the process of CRC reporting within civil society for supplementary reporting was also noted as major milestones.</p> <p>The evaluation also elaborated on some constraints which indicated that progress beyond the outcomes noted at the systemic level, may be difficult to achieve. Achieving results (beyond system level), which impacts the lives of children sustainably, is a challenge in a country context like Nepal given socio-cultural and economic constraints. Any long-term impact would require major social and political reforms (in terms of addressing power dynamics and structural inequalities), which stretch beyond any specific policy and system reform.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, environment
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.norad.no/en/toolspublications/publications/ngo-evaluations/2014/creating-change-in-childrens-lives-an-evaluation-of-save-the-childrens-child-rights-governance-programme-nepal-case-study/">https://www.norad.no/en/toolspublications/publications/ngo-evaluations/2014/creating-change-in-childrens-lives-an-evaluation-of-save-the-childrens-child-rights-governance-programme-nepal-case-study/</a>

### 1.5.3 Nepal Country Programme Evaluation

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Nepal Country Programme Evaluation</i></b>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2013
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD
<b>Commissioned by</b>	International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	1999-2012
<b>Keywords</b>	Leasehold forestry, livestock development, integrated rural development, poverty alleviation
<b>Abstract</b>	Overall, for the period 1999-2012, the evaluation assessed the IFAD/Nepal partnership to be moderately satisfactory, considering improvements in the later part of the period and combining the moderately satisfactory performance of the country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOP)

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Nepal Country Programme Evaluation</i></b>
	<p>and portfolio with the moderately unsatisfactory performance of non-lending activities. IFAD's country programme contributed to alleviation of rural poverty (making many rural households less poor), but it made only a relatively modest contribution to poverty reduction (helping people escape poverty for good). The programme contributed to the formation of thousands of beneficiary groups, but the majority are still weak, institutionally and financially, with limited management capacity, capital and turnover, and they depend largely on project support.</p> <p>The evaluation recommended a paradigm shift: Nepal's rural areas have an abundance of project-created and project-dependent beneficiary groups, but a shortage of profitable enterprises that create income for owners/members and employment for the poor. The support of such enterprises will generate employment for landless and near-landless people, who will not be able to escape poverty without off-farm income. If priority is given to value chains of high-value crops suited for intensive cultivation (or intensive animal husbandry), jobs will also be created in small and medium-sized farms.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, environment, corruption
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.ifad.org/evaluation/reports/cpe/tags/nepal/y2013/1858182">https://www.ifad.org/evaluation/reports/cpe/tags/nepal/y2013/1858182</a>

#### 1.5.4 Joint Evaluation (Denmark, Switzerland, Finland) of the international support to the peace process in Nepal 2006-12

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Joint Evaluation (Denmark, Switzerland, Finland) of the international support to the peace process in Nepal 2006-12</i></b>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2013
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Particip GmbH, Niras
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Danida
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Sector
<b>Project period</b>	2006-2012
<b>Keywords</b>	Development of a democratic political environment, respect for human rights and rule of law, peaceful resolution of the armed conflict, contribution to sustainable peace
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>This evaluation of the international support to the peace process in Nepal focused on the contributions made by Denmark, Switzerland and Finland in the period from 2006 to May 2012. The contributions by these focal development partners were viewed in the context of support from other development partner countries especially where provided through joint funds.</p> <p>The evaluation found that the focal development partner strategies all aim to support the CPA objectives – and, as such, signify good coherence with national peace aspirations. The report noted that the fragile states principles was a useful prism through which to study the support to the peace process, and many of the evaluation questions were also reflected through this framework. The focal development partners generally have lived up to the spirit, if not the letter, of the principles, although the ambition to “Do No Harm” is particularly tricky when supporting change processes.</p> <p>All three focal development partners provided substantial support to the constitutional process. Support to the constitutional process and to the elections accounted for more than one quarter of all Danish PSP expenditure. The Swiss provided constitutional technical expertise and facilitation and mediation support. Finland has supported the constitutional process through its funding of NPTF (though that was not earmarked) and</p>

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Joint Evaluation (Denmark, Switzerland, Finland) of the international support to the peace process in Nepal 2006-12</i></b>
	through the support to the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA). The evaluation produced a broad range of recommendations including but not limited to: Development partners should continue to invest in conflict analysis with a political economy approach, and should mainstream this for all of their development interventions, i.e. paying attention to the potential impact of interventions on differing groups.
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, corruption
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/11211/pdf/the_peace_process_in_Nepal_2006_12.pdf">http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/11211/pdf/the_peace_process_in_Nepal_2006_12.pdf</a>

### 1.5.5 ADB Country Partnership Strategy Final Review

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>ADB Country Partnership Strategy Final Review</i></b>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2013
<b>Author/Agency</b>	African Development Bank
<b>Commissioned by</b>	African Development Bank
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	2010-2012
<b>Keywords</b>	Infrastructure, agriculture transformation, employment generation, governance, private sector investment, broad-based and inclusive economic growth, inclusive social development, climate change adaptation and environmental sustainability, education, energy, finance, transport, water supply, municipal infrastructure
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The review found that the CPS was strategic and adaptive with its conflict-sensitive, flexible, result orientation, collaborative, and knowledge approaches to enhance development impact. The CPS introduced three risk mitigation tools that augmented its strategic positioning in the fragile political, environmental, and governance context. The peace-building tool-first ever to be piloted in a CPS and which ensured ADB projects do not exacerbate the prevailing political and social tensions-has been highly appreciated by the government and development partners (DPs). Given Nepal's high natural disaster and climate change vulnerability, the CPS introduced a climate change and disaster risk management tool (the first initiative in ADB) to 'climate and disaster proof' ADS-supported projects. The governance risk assessment tool helped identify risks and mitigation measures in governance, particularly public financial management (PFM), and enhance the quality of ADB interventions. These tools helped ADB assistance withstand political instability and anchor policy dialogue and operations to actual development gains. Demonstrating flexibility, frequent programming exercises were also undertaken to adjust the country program to ensure its relevance and responsiveness.</p> <p>One of the main conclusions was: Ensuring operational effectiveness and impacts require capacity building including the requisite change in mindset (e.g., for better accountability of programs) and development of sound policy, institutional, and regulatory framework. This in turn requires a long-term commitment and partnership, and strong leadership and ownership by the recipients. The report therefore recommended that the ADB needs to consider long-term engagement and partnership in its operations in priority sector and thematic operations with clear sector or thematic development roadmaps while exploring due ownership and leadership to advance the process. Programs need to be systematically sequenced, with clear monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to be able to systematically monitor outcomes and impacts.</p>



<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>ADB Country Partnership Strategy Final Review</b>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, environment, corruption
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/linked-documents/Nepal-CPS-2010-2012-Final-Review.pdf">https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/linked-documents/Nepal-CPS-2010-2012-Final-Review.pdf</a>

### 1.5.6 Country Assistance Evaluation of Nepal

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Country Assistance Evaluation of Nepal</b>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2013
<b>Author/Agency</b>	International Development Center of Japan Inc.
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	2006-2013
<b>Keywords</b>	Poverty alleviation in rural areas, peacebuilding, transition to democracy, social infrastructure, balanced and sustainable economic growth
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The basic policy for Japan's assistance to Nepal (major objective) is assistance to support sustainable and balanced economic growth, with the goal of allowing the country to graduate from the status of LDC. It consists of the following three priority areas: poverty alleviation in rural areas, peacebuilding and steady transition to democracy, and building social infrastructure and institutions for balanced and sustainable economic growth.</p> <p>The evaluation rated the relevance of Japan's assistance policy rated as "high." The effectiveness of results was rated as "moderate." The appropriateness of the process was rated as "moderate." The overall evaluation of the assistance policy was rated as "moderately satisfactory." In addition, the report noted that from the perspective of diplomacy, Japan's assistance highly contributed to the diplomatic relations between the two countries. Consequently the evaluation recommended: it is important to proactively use ODA as a diplomatic measure. Therefore, steady assistance should continue to be directed to Nepal by maintaining certain amount of aid, combining the various schemes effectively, and thereby highlight the presence of Japan.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/oda/evaluation/FY2012/text-pdf/nepal_summary.pdf">http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/oda/evaluation/FY2012/text-pdf/nepal_summary.pdf</a>

## 1.6 2012

### 1.6.1 Country Programme between Finland and Nepal

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Country Programme between Finland and Nepal</b>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2012
<b>Author/Agency</b>	S.A. AGRER N.V.
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	2002-2011
<b>Keywords</b>	Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), environment, participation, inclusion, gender equity, civil society

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Country Programme between Finland and Nepal</i>
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>Nepal is one of the eight principal development cooperation partner countries of Finland. The evaluation report gives an account of Finland's development policies over the last decade and how it has evolved and how it has been transformed into a cooperation programme with Nepal.</p> <p>Major external and internal factors influenced the cooperation and shaped the implementation over the evaluation period, which covered also politically difficult times in Nepal.</p> <p>The evaluation concluded that despite the changing circumstance a number of development cooperation programmes were able to contribute towards the development goals of Nepal, for example in the education and the environment sectors. Similarly, the development goals and aspirations set by the Finnish development policies were largely fulfilled. The report identified a number of strengths and good practices in the cooperation programme as well as some weaknesses, but not one bad practice. The overall quality of the country programme between Nepal and Finland was assessed to be good. The evaluation made a number of recommendations towards developing further the cooperation between the two countries to face the current and future challenges.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender equality, environment, civil society
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://www.formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=240706&amp;nodeid=49728&amp;contentlan=2&amp;culture=en-US">http://www.formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=240706&amp;nodeid=49728&amp;contentlan=2&amp;culture=en-US</a>

### 1.6.2 Evaluation of the Commission of the European Union's Co-operation with Nepal

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Evaluation of the Commission of the European Union's Co-operation with Nepal</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2012
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Particip GmbH
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Commission of the European Union
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	2002-2010
<b>Keywords</b>	Democracy; human rights; women, poor and excluded people; trade-related assistance; education; agricultural development; energy
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The evaluation covered the entire portfolio of the EU's development co-operation with Nepal over the period 2002-2010. Specific attention was given to: Support to Nepal's poverty reduction strategy, particularly in (i) Education, (ii) Rural Development, (iii) Renewable Energy and the Environment, (iv) Peace Building and Consolidation of Democracy, and (v) Trade facilitation and integration in the international economy</p> <p>The main findings of the report included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By staying engaged with the Government of Nepal in fighting poverty, the EU helped to keep the Government of Nepal poverty reduction strategy on track in achieving the Millennium Development Goals;</li> <li>• The EU interventions improved conditions for further poverty reduction. However, the direct contribution to increased production, employment and incomes remained rather limited as few and only small interventions were implemented in productive sectors;</li> <li>• The EU actively participated in the policy dialogue with the Government of Nepal in line with the size of its support (the EC is a relatively small Development Partner in Nepal), but more could have been done in several sectors of cooperation (e.g. trade, the rule of law and democracy);</li> </ul>

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Evaluation of the Commission of the European Union's Co-operation with Nepal</i></b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EU portfolio was characterised by a suitable mix of instruments and aid modalities. Despite the relatively weak institutional environment and the unstable political context, the move towards budget support was justified and has led to some tangible results in terms of improved service delivery as well as greater government ownership.</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Promoting community participation in and management of activities at the local levels; environment
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/strategic-evaluation-eu-cooperation-nepal-2002-2010_en">https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/strategic-evaluation-eu-cooperation-nepal-2002-2010_en</a>

## 1.7 2011

### 1.7.1 Final Evaluation of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Final Evaluation of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework</i></b>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2011
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Richard M Chiwara et al.
<b>Commissioned by</b>	UNDAF
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	2008-2010
<b>Keywords</b>	MDGs, Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness; national institutions, peace, socially excluded and economically marginalised groups, sustainable livelihood opportunities, socially excluded groups in conflict affected areas; human rights
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The United Nations Development Assistance Framework provided a collective, coherent and integrated United Nations System response to national priorities and needs within the framework of the Millennium Development Goals and the commitments, goals and targets of the Millennium Declaration, international conferences, summits, conventions and human rights instruments of the UN. The UNDAF for Nepal covered a three-year period from January 2008 to December 2010, which was aligned with Nepal's national planning cycle that also covers a three year period from July 2007 to June 2010.</p> <p>The evaluation found that the UNDAF priorities were relevant and aligned to national goals and priorities. The UNDAF priorities were based on the analysis contained in the Common Country Assessment and the Government's Three-Year Interim Plan, which itself was developed through a consultative process involving government, development partners and civil society. A National Steering Committee including the Government and Civil Society Organisations led the development of the UNDAF, which gave it wide acceptance as a nationally owned document.</p> <p>With regards to the effectiveness of UN interventions, the evaluation found that UN interventions effectively contributed to the expected UNDAF outcomes and national goals. Several examples demonstrated that women, youth, socially excluded and economically marginalised groups were participating in development programme initiatives in their communities based on the gender equity and social inclusion (GESI) guidelines. However, the evaluation also noted some instances where programme effectiveness was affected by such factors as weaknesses in interagency collaboration or total absence of integrated approach by the UN in addressing challenges faced by a specific target group.</p>



<b>Evaluation</b>	<i>Final Evaluation of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework</i>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, environment, social equality, human rights
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://reliefweb.int/report/nepal/united-nations-development-assistance-framework-nepal-2008-2010-final-evaluation">http://reliefweb.int/report/nepal/united-nations-development-assistance-framework-nepal-2008-2010-final-evaluation</a>

## 1.8 2010

### 1.8.1 The World Bank in Nepal 2003–2008 Country Program Evaluation

<b>Evaluation</b>	<i>The World Bank in Nepal 2003–2008 Country Program Evaluation</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2010
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Independent Evaluation Group
<b>Commissioned by</b>	World Bank
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	2003-2008
<b>Keywords</b>	Public expenditure management, private sector development, pro-poor agricultural development, education, health, rural water and sanitation, decentralisation and others
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The evaluation covered International Development Association (IDA) support to Nepal during 2003-2008. IDA's overarching goal during this period was to support the Government's efforts to reduce poverty and improve human well-being. IDA focused on helping to foster broad-based growth, social development, social inclusion, and good governance. IDA was Nepal's largest development partner, providing 13 percent of (gross) overseas development assistance (ODA) flows during 2003-2008.</p> <p>The evaluation concluded that IDA's strategy was relevant to Nepal's development needs, but that its relevance to the more immediate situation was compromised by several factors. These included limited ownership of the World Bank-supported government reform program and its lack of realism with respect to political instability and insecurity. Despite a difficult backdrop, IDA assistance during the review period had positive outcomes in social development and to some extent social inclusion. In contrast, the outcome of IDA support fell short of the WB's programme objectives, as well as outcome targets in broad-based growth and governance.</p> <p>The evaluation highlighted the need to introduce greater realism into the country assistance strategy, and to retain flexibility to adjust to changing circumstances.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, social inclusion, environment
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/22740">https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/22740</a>

### 1.8.2 Joint Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration, Phase II, Nepal Country Evaluation

<b>Evaluation</b>	<i>Joint Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration, Phase II, Nepal Country Evaluation</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2010
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Ministry of Finance Nepal
<b>Commissioned by</b>	OECD (the Nepal Country Evaluation was carried out as part of the Phase II Paris Declaration Evaluation (PDE II)).
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Thematic/country
<b>Project period</b>	2000-2010

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Joint Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration, Phase II, Nepal Country Evaluation</i></b>
<b>Keywords</b>	Paris Declaration, ownership, alignment, harmonisation, managing for results, mutual accountability
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The purpose of the evaluation was to document, analyse and assess the relevance and effectiveness of the Paris Declaration, its contribution to aid effectiveness and ultimately to development results, including poverty reduction.</p> <p>The evaluation concluded that the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action were clearly evident in the development partnership in Nepal. There had been moderate progress towards improved aid effectiveness over the last decade despite the constrained context. There were some examples of good practice including the work of the Nepal Portfolio Performance Review, sector wide working in education and health, and emerging programme based approaches in other areas.</p> <p>However the evaluation found that specific implementation of the Paris Declaration principles had been weak, including weakness in the coordination of technical assistance, low levels of aid through government for a significant group of DPs, and slow progress towards greater predictability.</p> <p>The evaluation also found continued fragmentation with many standalone projects, vertical funding, and direct implementation, together with moves away from country PFM and procurement systems due to the perceived increases in corruption.</p> <p>The need to demonstrate attribution, a reluctance to align internal bureaucratic processes with those of GoN, and inadequate ownership and interest in the development process from Nepal were further problematic issues identified by the evaluation.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, corruption
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/47083653.pdf">http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/47083653.pdf</a>