

Final Review Report

Social Cohesion & Democratic Participation Project

Final Review

**Submitted to
UNDP Nepal**

Project Information		
Project title	Social Cohesion and Democratic Participation	
Atlas ID	00060493	
Corporate outcome and output	CPD OUTCOME 2-By 2022, inclusive, democratic, accountable and transparent institutions are further strengthened towards ensuring rule of law, social justice and human rights for all particularly for vulnerable people CPD OUTPUT 2.3: Civic space for engagement, voice and participation of youth, women and vulnerable groups broadened at all levels.	
Country	Nepal	
Region	Asia	
Date project document signed	N/A	
Project dates	Start	Planned end
	2016	2019
Project budget	US\$ 1,475,233.37	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	US\$ 1,401,026.00	
Funding source	UNDP Track Fund	
Implementing party	UNDP Nepal	
Evaluation/Review information		
Evaluation/Review type (project/outcome/thematic/country programme, etc)	Project	
Final/midterm evaluation/review/other	Final	
Period under evaluation	Start	End
	2016	2019
Evaluators	Mr. Omer Ahmed Awan	
Evaluator email address	omerahmedawan@yahoo.com	
Evaluation dates	Start	Completion
	15.11.2019	20.12.2019

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS.....	
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1 INTRODUCTION	14
2. REVIEW OBJECTIVES AND APPROACH	15
3. REVIEW METHODOLOGY	17
3.1. Programmatic Scope of the Assessment.....	18
3.2. Development of Assessment Tools	22
3.4. Data Collection From The Field	20
3.5. Data Analysis.....	23
3.6. Review Limitations.....	25
4. REVIEW FINDINGS	26
4.1. Relevance.....	26
4.2. Effectiveness& Impact	27
4.3. Efficiency.....	40
4.4. Sustainability	44
4.5. Gender Equality and Vulnerable Groups.....	45
5. Lessons Learned	45
6. RECOMMENDATIONS	46
7. CONCLUSIONS	50
Annex	

ACRONYMS

AWP	Annual Work Plans
CISFC	Community Information and Service Facilitation Centre
CPAP	Country Program Action Plan
CPD	Country Programme Document, UNDP
CPP	Conflict Prevention Program
CSO	Civil Society Organization
ISFC	Information and Service Facilitation Center
LPC	Local Peace Committee
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MOPR	Ministry of Peace and Reconciliation
MSDF	Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue Forum
PEB	Project Executive Board
RTI	Right to Information
SCDP	Social Cohesion and Democratic Participation Project
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNPFN	United Nations Peace Fund Nepal

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The final review report of the UNDP's Social Cohesion and Democratic Participation project is based on the overall Review criteria of assessing the *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability* of the project. The project's varied results framework and AWP, related indicators and targets provided the benchmark for the performance review of the project. On the basis of documents review, Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS) and field mission in Nepal to conduct Key Informant Interviews, FGDs and related observations, following set of review findings are consolidated.

A. Summary of Findings

Relevance

Overall Rating: Relevant- However a refocus and realignment with the new CPD is required.

A1- Relevance of the Social Cohesion & Democratic Participation (SCDP) project with the country level and UN priorities and policies for Nepal, at the time of its inception is one of the strongest attributes of the programme. However, in its current state of activities, not all attributes/activities can be directly linked with UNDAF, CPD as well as Fourteen & Fifteen Plan of Nepal.

A2- Some (but not all) of the project objectives and results area are directly linked to the 'Priority Area 4' of the Fourteenth Plan (2073/74-2075/2076 [2017-2020], that is 'Promotion of good governance and human rights through effective and accountable public finance and clean, transparent and people-friendly public service (SDG 16)'.

A3- Some of the SCDP project interventions are directly aligned and relevant to outcomes and related outputs of era of UNDAF & CPAP documents. For instance some of the SCDP results are linked with the Outcome 8: National institutions have addressed conflict-related violations of human rights and international humanitarian law and the post-conflict needs of victims (UNDAF & CPAP 2013-2017) and Outcome 4: Governance, Rule of Law, and Human Rights (UNDAF & CPD 2018-2022), CPD OUTCOME 2-By 2022, inclusive, democratic, accountable and transparent institutions are further strengthened towards ensuring rule of law, social justice and human rights for all particularly for vulnerable people.

Project Effectiveness

Overall Rating: Moderately Satisfactory at micro and activity levels with limited to no high level or strategic impact

A4- Overall, SCDP has contributed in enhancing the social cohesion and democratic participation in the context of post 2015 constitution and 2017 era, however primarily at the activities level whereby,

sometimes a very micro level set of interventions were carried out that might not have a medium to no significant macro level impact and/or contribution towards the CPD goals.

A5- It was observed that; i) from 2016 to 2019, overall results framework, outputs and indicators have changed considerably whereby, no two consecutive years have contributed to the same results framework, ii) there are discrepancies between the results area/outputs and related targets defined in the Annual Work Plan and the APRs highlighting the achievements/progress against these targets, iii) moreover it was also observed that due to intrinsic lack of coherence within different outputs and related targets since inception and over the years, the project's interventions (if they are assessed together) are focused on many diverse micro level activities that are not necessarily entirely linked or contributed to the overall CPD/UNDAF outcomes. In nutshell, the project design and related interventions were not entirely based on the best practices of the Results Based Management.

A6- Nevertheless, if these interventions are assessed as standalone activities and on the basis of their achievements in various years of interventions, there are considerable milestones achieved and established success stories in promoting the social cohesion and democratic participation in targeted areas, though sometimes at very micro levels.

A7- In year 2016, overall rating of effectiveness is '**Moderately Satisfactory at micro level**' whereby most of the results and related targets and indicators of AWP for the Year 2016 were achieved to a certain extent. **In Year 2017**, overall rating effectiveness is '**Moderately Satisfactory**' (at micro level only; whereas many activities and reported results are not aligned with the outputs). **In Year 2018**, overall rating of effectiveness is '**Moderately Satisfactory**' (At micro/activity levels with no clear evidence of any high-level impact). **In year 2019**, overall rating of effectiveness is '**Moderately Unsatisfactory**' (with clear underachieved targets of AWP's under 2 outputs).

A8- Some of the overall findings on project's effectiveness include:

- Lack of consistent, well defined and focused results framework of the project is observed as the basis of inadequate linkages and sometimes underachieved targets.
- Combined with the lack of a results framework, the basis of developing varied and inconsistent AWP's remained unclear. As a result, project's overall focus remained at activity and micro level interventions with no clear evidence of any medium to high level strategic and result oriented contribution towards the outputs and outcomes of the CPD and UNDAF.
- Nevertheless keeping in view these limitations and/or evaluating the effectiveness at the activities level, the project team has achieved considerable progress and success in the certain areas at the community level. One of the most standout and effective component of the project intervention was the **risk identification and risk mitigation related activities** under the output of 'Improved social cohesion and community security'. With the overall establishment of more than 70

mechanisms and more than 150 violence/risk mitigation & prevention activities in the most conflict prone sensitive areas of the country is a high impact result of the project at local level.

- The overall progress in the various outputs related to the accountable and transparent public services as well as increase access to public services in different years of project implementation is inadequate. Some of the intended targets and related interventions are unaligned too.
- Some of the key high impact project interventions are less focused as well as less showcased. For instance, success stories of highly effective **Multi Stakeholder Dialogue Forum (MSDF)** have got extremely low projections in the APRs, QPRs and other communication tools. Similarly, the achievements in assisting vulnerable community members in filing more than 80 **RTI applications** as well as facilitating more than 15 **public hearings** between local government officials and vulnerable groups in one local municipality are both very less reported and secured limited focus in the overall project implementation. Alternatively, least aligned micro level activities were highly projected as well secured more focus in the project. Such interventions include **youth volunteerism and entrepreneurship training, community facilitation centres for filing public service applications** etc.
- Similarly, project's overall impact in the area of broadening civic space for engagement, voice and inclusive democratic participation of youth, women and vulnerable groups has yielded varied results from one component to the other. Some potentially effective and high impact initiatives were implemented in the project that can provide a good guiding mechanism for the future. Apart from the Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue Forum (MSDF), The other 2 tangible and potentially sustainable mechanisms include **i) Utilizing Community Based Organizations, ii) Formation of Deputy Mayor's Club,**
- Some initial adhoc and stand-alone activities in the area of building partnership for SDGs' localization has started such as using Mithila Art, major targets for both output 4 (SDGs) and output 5 (Gender Empowerment) are under achieved. A more focused result-oriented interventions under both outputs are required to meet the targets.

Project Efficiency

Overall efficiency rating is 'Moderately Satisfactory' with clear gaps in implementation arrangement and M&E functions

A9- The **budget utilization** over the entire project duration has turned out to be one of the most efficient components of the project whereby average of 97% utilization was achieved. Although the overall budget utilization was very much efficient, following are the few key findings in this regard:

- The reported expenditure breakdown in the APRs and other tracker sheet include a summarized snapshot on the basis of results areas and activity. For more transparency and better understanding on the utilization of expenditure, detailed output wise and activity wise expenditure report could have been provided and reported.
- It was observed that ‘**programme support cost**’ has contributed up to more than 50% of the actual expenditure over the duration of the project duration. It seemed to be on a higher side and might have resulted on fewer resources on the actual implementation of activities.

A10- The **project executive board (PEB)** of the project provided the supervisory role during the entire duration of the project. It was assessed that;

- In the initial years of the project, more detailed planning and reporting aspects of the project were discussed and presented that included quarter-wise progress, budget analysis and detailed planning in the coming months and quarter.
- More importantly, it was observed that although MOPR represented in the PEB during the initial years of the project, PEB only included staff from the UNDP without any representation from the other stakeholders such as federal/provincial government, donors, academia etc in the later years of the project implementation. It affected both the transparency/accountability as well as efficiency mechanisms of the project implementation.

A11- The findings on the efficiency of the **project team** include:

- Keeping in view the geographical focus, range of activities and very limited human resources, the project team has provided efficient support for the project implementation to a certain extent.
- The documentation of the project implementation, data gathering from communities and overall information synthesis and availability are immensely efficient components of the project team’s overall performance in the project. However overall communication strategy that included the selection of showcasing successful stories and level of dissemination of project outcomes at all internal and external levels could have been much more efficient.
- It is also worth mentioning that overall progress of the project team on the planned vs. actual activities & targets of AWP were **moderately efficient**, whereby, efficiency of delivering planned activities were high in some years and thematic areas (such as identification and mitigation of risk mechanism in 2017), whereas it was moderate to low in certain areas and years (such as activities related to CISFCs, SDGs and Gender etc).

A12-The role of **provincial field offices** in the project implementation remained limited in this project. It was observed that more coordination as well as well-established partnership between the project team and provincial field offices could have enhanced the overall project efficiency as well as the visibility of UNDP work at all levels. It was also observed that continued communication and coordination gaps between the project team and provincial field offices can further hinder the overall projection of UNDP's work in the thematic area of intervention.

A13- With the exception of the project team reporting through APRs and QPRs, the overall **M&E** function of the programme was assessed as one of the **weakest/inefficient link** of the project implementation mechanism. The observations include:

- The data gathering and reporting of overall project implementation (at activity level) through APRs, QPRs as well as in PEBs were efficient from the project team.
- However, it was observed there are certain M&E activities that ideally should not have been mandated to the project team to perform, such as provincial coordinator were implementing, monitoring and evaluating their own activities in the field. A more dedicated project M&E officer and more independent and active role of M&E team from the UNDP's country office could have enhanced the overall transparency, accountability and M&E aspects of the project efficiency.
- Moreover, independent Midterm Review and/or periodic third-party review were entirely missed in the project. It could have enabled more timely assessments of lessons learned, enhanced accountability and corrective measures.
- Similarly, although CSOs provide periodic feedback and reports to the project team, any independent audit/review of the funds utilized by the CSOs/grantees could not be found. No documents/information on annual audit of project funds (if it did not happen) could be found. The APRs provide a generic activity level breakdown of the expenditure.

SCDP Partnership and Synergy Strategy

Overall Rating: Moderately Satisfactory, though with observations

A14-Project's partnership strategy, implementation and management with the CSOs and grantees were considerably efficient. Project team maintained strong planning and implementation mechanism with the CSOs and grantees whereby comprehensive activity planning and execution plans were in place at the micro level. However, the project partnership strategy is not efficient enough beyond the scope of engaging CSOs. There is no demonstrated, sustained and long-term partnership with provincial government, local government, potential donors and/or any other major stakeholders. This intrinsic lack of coherence due to no overall documented and agreed partnership strategy resulted in adhoc and vast range of activities at the micro level that could not be translated into a sustained network of partners.

Similarly, limited to no linkages are found between SCDP project interventions and other projects under the portfolio of unit. It could result in potential duplication of efforts and inefficient utilization of available resources.

Sustainability

Overall Rating: Moderately Unlikely with the exceptions of few components

A15- There was no overall sustainability/exit plan for the project due to lack of a project document and document. Since there is inadequate coherence within the project outputs and activities, it is not likely that all activities can be sustained. The data analysis indicated that certain interventions have been sustained at the micro level such as CISFCs have been adopted in few local governments. However, such sustainability mechanism may not be as efficient in the long run as CISFCs should have not been logically designed to assist local governments. Rather such initiatives should have been more focused on providing voice to the vulnerable groups of the community. There are few interventions that have been sustained on longer run such as Multi Stakeholder Dialogue Forum that was in place in a district since the time of CPP interventions. Similarly, Deputy Mayors Club has already shown signs of potential sustainability due to its effective and efficient design and objectives. The financial sustainability of the entire project at the current level of activities is also assessed as highly unlikely, mainly due to lack of any engagement with the potential donors as well as incoherent and adhoc design of activities. However, some of the key activities such as MSDF, Deputy Mayors Club, RTI & public hearing mechanisms, if effectively designed have comparatively high-level potential of sustainability.

Gender Equality, Empowerment & Vulnerable Groups

Overall Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

A16- Although the overall outputs related to gender empowerment are highly underachieved, ensuring gender equality and focus on vulnerable groups were assessed to be the considerable focus of the project in terms of its representation in the overall beneficiary's group. Based on the data gathered and analyzed, it is evident that up to 50% of the overall beneficiaries that were directly outreached or engaged under various activities of the project were females. Similarly, composition of vulnerable communities in overall beneficiaries are also worth mentioning whereby almost 11% of beneficiaries are from Dalit community, 20% from Janajati community, 36% from Madhesi community and 5% from Muslim community.

A17- Lessons Learned

- Lack of project design document and related results framework hindered overall linked and coherent progress of the project in terms of creating medium to high level strategic impact as well as contributing to CPD and UNDAF.
- Inadequate representation of external stakeholders in the Project Executive Board (PEB) limited neutral and independent evaluation and monitoring of the project.
- Scattered geographical focus along with a range of outputs and activities hindered in achieving optimum level of efficiency in terms of project implementation
- Limited to no coordination between project team and provincial field offices reduced overall visibility and impact of UNDP's valuable work in the area of social cohesion and democratic governance.
- Lack of projects sustainability and exit strategy resulted in reduced sustainability of the project to fewer components only.

Recommendations

A18- Project Plan and Design

- As a starting point and keeping in view the feedback from the field and research, the **title of the project may be changed**. Since there is a general perception that country has come out of the conflict and peace building phases, it should be aligned with the output 2.3 of the CPD such as **‘Civic space and Participation Support for the Vulnerable Communities.’**
- There is a need for an **updated context analysis** of the vulnerable communities in the targeted provinces of the CPD and their issues related to the civic space, voice and participation in democratic governance.
- **Revisit the overall scope and a robust Results Framework** of the project for the entire duration of the Phase II should be developed. Clear, concise and focused Results Framework with less ambitious indicators and targets should be developed.
- **The geographical focus should be considerably reduced**. The intervention should be more focused in the high priority provinces and relevant districts. It is highly recommended that project should be focused on 1-2 high priority provinces and limited number of districts/municipalities to ensure high impact. Moreover, the impact and visibility of the UNDP project intervention should be aimed at all levels of government and should not be focused at micro level activities only
- The project to broaden civic space for vulnerable communities should not duplicate the vast range of outputs and related targets of newly signed **“Provincial and Local Governance Support Programme”**.

Rather it should be focused on creating an enabling environment and mechanisms at local government level for other projects of the portfolio in general and local government technical assistance programme in particular. The project document should clearly form linkages of project outputs and related activities with the Local Government Technical Assistance Programme and other projects under the Governance portfolio.

- Based on the observations mentioned above and linked with the output 2.3 of the CPD, it is highly recommended that maximum 2 outputs should be included in the next phase of the project. With the results-based project document, the overall outlook of the suggested output include:

Output 1- Capacity of government duty bearers enhanced in creating civic space for more voice, engagement and participation of vulnerable groups and enhanced transparency

- The activities under output 1 should be concise, strategic, tangible, results oriented and focused on sustainable interaction between the duty bearers and vulnerable groups. It may include formation of **Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue Forums** to bring vulnerable groups closer to the government, building capacity of government in **RTI mechanisms and formation of local government/mayors/deputy mayors clubs** whereby network of duty bearers can share their best practices and lessons learned in the focused thematic area of broadening the civic space for the vulnerable groups.
- Keeping in view the comparative advantage of UNDP as a strong convener and facilitator, a **National Dialogue Forum (NDF)** may be included as an activity whereby if and any potential conflict arise in the country, particularly with reference to the vulnerable groups, the stakeholders can be brought together under this forum. This intervention will provide flexibility to the project as well to include any evolving situation in this regard
- Moreover, the use of innovation (both technological and non-technology based) can be included as focal area whereby **UNDP's Accelerator lab** can play a vital role in development of local level solutions that will enable duty bearers to broaden the interaction and enhancing participation of vulnerable groups such as women in their decision making etc.
- Moreover, to contribute **output 2.3.1 of the CPD**, a special focus can be made to support **female duty bearers as well duty bearers from all other vulnerable communities, such as Dalit and other ethnic groups** on preparedness for their perspective leadership and decision-making roles.

Output 2- Broadened civic space of vulnerable groups for enhanced participation and voice in sub-national governance and decision making

- The activities under output 2 should be focused on identified vulnerable groups only and not to a range of generic beneficiaries. Through the utilization of CSOs, the interventions should include advocacy campaigns, **formation of networks and facilitation of RTI process** for vulnerable groups to ensure more voice and participation as well as enhanced transparency, facilitation of **‘public hearing’** whereby, vulnerable groups will be provided direct access to the government officials so that their voice can be heard.
- Similarly, the use of **UNDP Accelerator Lab** to find innovative home-grown solutions to the identified problems of the vulnerable groups in the targeted areas is highly recommended. There are best practices of Accelerators network in the world available whereby, the grassroots approach adopted by the Labs emphasizes the importance of exploring socially acceptable and locally-sourced solutions that directly addresses the issues of social inequality, lack of civic space for vulnerable groups such as women and limited access to information for better transparency. The intervention can include provision of seed funding to innovative ideas whereby, the community members can come up with their own solutions to the problems of limited civic engagement and voice.

A19- Implementation and Management

- It is recommended that a **new Project Executive Board (PEB)** should be formed that may include external members such as government organization, potential donors and academia/think tank. Since it is recommended that RTI should be given a thorough focus in the next phase of the project, **National Information Commission** can be a potential member of the PEB. Moreover, donors should be invited to be members of the PEB as well. It will also ensure donor’s perspective as well as it will assist in resource mobilization if the project interventions in the thematic area of broadening civic space for vulnerable groups are matched with the donor’s priorities
- The project team should be focused on implementation mechanism whereby a close coordination mechanism should be established between the project team and UNDP’s provincial field office. The provincial field offices can act as both a strategic partner in the project and they can provide a role of dedicated M&E function for the independent project monitoring.
- Apart from the project team’s own monitoring mechanisms through the approved M&E framework, The overall monitoring and evaluation of the project intervention should be done by Country Office M&E team as well as independent midterm and periodic review should be conducted. It will assist in validating the outputs and activities, reported by the partners to the project team and project team to the Country Office.

- Similarly, the results based budgeting as well as reporting mechanism should be developed with an optimum proportion of allocation between the programme support cost and project interventions. The detailed breakdown of expenditure should be provided with each QPR & APR.
- A more robust 'Results Based' monitoring and reporting mechanism should be developed whereby the AWPS, progress reports/templates are clearly aligned with the projects Results Framework. A thorough RBM training should be conducted for project staff.
- The selection criteria of the CSOs, grant approval, implementation and management process should be duly endorsed by the PEB to ensure transparency and accountability.

A20- Partnership and Communication

- A comprehensive and **results oriented partnership strategy** should be developed and included as integral part of the project design in the next phase of the project.
- Partnership with the CSOs should be focused and strictly aligned with the results framework of the project whereby each activity of the CSO should be aligned with and contributing the overall indicators and targets of the project. It will assist in avoiding some of the challenges of phase where a range of activities were carried out by the CSOs that are not necessarily linked with the overall scope of the project.
- The partnership strategy should clearly outline and demonstrate a sustained and long-term partnership mechanism with the provincial government, local government, potential donors and/or any other major stakeholders.

Final Review Report

Social Cohesion and Democratic Participation

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Nepal has made significant progress over the last few years in institutionalizing democracy by making a swift transition from the unitary to the federal system of governance. After the first Constituent Assembly (CA) was not able to promulgate the new constitution, the house was dissolved and the elections for the second CA held in November 2013. The second CA promulgated the Constitution in September 2015. After promulgation of the new constitution in late 2015, Nepal experienced an uproar of discontents coupled with mistrust among communities based on their ethnic identities, political beliefs and regional identities regarding the federal restructuring and equitable participation. Confrontational politics and spiraling tensions created deep and widespread social rifts that have the risk of being overplayed during the transition to federalism and implementation of the new constitution. There are very much concerned about few of the issues related to the identity, citizenship, proportional representation of the marginalized communities in state machineries and demarcation of the provinces. Building on the program achievements already put in place by the previous project called Conflict Prevention Programme (CPP), and effectively responding to the new political context of Nepal, UNDP Nepal initiated Social Cohesion and Democratic Participation Programme (SCDP) in September 2015. SCDP aims to help address socio-political tensions emerging from Nepal's transition to federalism and ensure harmonious implementation of the constitution with the following objectives:

- Support the Government of Nepal, local authorities, and key stakeholders to strengthen social cohesion during the initial roll-out of a new federal arrangements and broader implementation of a new constitution.
- Promote multi-sectoral mechanisms to enhance democratic participation and good governance in provincial and local governance and development processes.

Following are the 5 key outputs of the SCDP Project

- i. Improved social cohesion and community security in targeted conflictive areas for sustaining peace and sustainable development in Nepal;
- ii. Increased access to public services in an inclusive, transparent and accountable manner for women, marginalized groups and vulnerable population;
- iii. Civic space for engagement, voice and inclusive participation of youth, women and vulnerable groups broadened at the local level;

- iv. Effective mechanisms and partnership for multi-stakeholder approaches to the Goals are created at the provincial and local levels to sustaining peace;
- v. Women's participation in peace and security issues is enhanced through their political and economic empowerment;

2. Review Objectives & Approach

2.1 Review Objectives and Criteria

The final Review of the SCDP project was aimed at addressing the following objectives and related review criteria:

i) To assess & review the relevance of the SCDP Project under following sub criteria:

- To what extent is the SCDP Project aligned with the Nepal's priorities, policies and strategies on conflict prevention, social cohesion and democratic participation?
- To what extent is SCDP Project aligned with the UNDP's mandate, Strategic Plan, CPD and UNDAF for Nepal?
- Do the project outcomes address identifiable problems?
- How relevant was the geographical coverage?
- How the SCDP Project was able to cater the needs of the beneficiaries in the changed context? Is there any evidence that the project advanced any key national human rights, gender or inclusion policies and the priorities of UN, UNDP, including the UNDAF?

ii) To assess/review the effectiveness & impact the SCDP project under the following broader sub criteria:

- To what extent are outputs and targets of SCDP project's results framework achieved?
- To what extent have the project objectives and outcomes, as set out in the Project Concept Note, project's Results Framework and other related documents, have been achieved?
- Are some components better achieved than others? If yes then Why?
- What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the SCDP project results?
- How effective has been the contribution of SCDP project to improving government ownership, planning and management capacity process towards social cohesion, conflict prevention and democratic governance?
- Are the SCDP objectives clearly stated and contribution to results measurable?
- Did women, men, youth and marginalized groups directly benefit from the Project's activities? If so, how and what was the impact?
- Were any changes made in the project regarding approach, partnerships, beneficiaries etc. suggested by any internal or external project mid-point assessment, context/risk analysis? Did it affect project results?

- How successful have partnership arrangements been in contributing to sharing institutional capacity
- What impact did the work of SCDP have on the democratic participation and civic engagement in the governance process in Nepal? Is there evidence of improvements for under-represented and/or disadvantaged segments of Nepali society?

iii) To assess and review efficiency of the SCDP delivery and implementation under the following sub-criteria:

- Are outputs achieved within expected cost and time?
- Could the activities and outputs have been delivered in fewer resources without reducing their quality and quantity?
- Is there major cost- or time-overruns or budget revisions?
- Is there a management or coordination mechanism for the partnership?
- How frequently and by what means information is shared within the project stakeholders?
- Are SCDP project objectives and strategies understood by staff?
- Are SCDP project objectives and strategies understood by partners?
- How many levels of decision making are involved in operational approval?
- To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time?
- Were the SCDP project inputs and benefits fairly distributed amongst different genders and communities while increasing access for the most vulnerable? What factors influenced decisions to fund certain proposed activities, and not others?
- To what extent did monitoring systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?
- Were the risks identified in the project document or process the most important and the risk ratings applied appropriately
- How useful was the results framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it?
- To what extent did the coordination with other UN agencies and UNDP projects reduce transaction costs, optimize results and avoid duplication?

iv) To assess and review the programme sustainability under the following sub criteria:

- How sustainable has been the contribution of SCDP project to improving country level ownership, planning and management capacity?
- Was project sustainability strategy developed during the project design?
- How sustainable has been the SCDP project to improving efforts of social cohesion and democratic participation at federal and provincial levels?
- How sustainable has been the contribution of SCDP project to improving country's performance in social cohesion and democratic participation?

- Is the SCDP project itself sustainable? (Financial, Institutional, Socio Economic and Resources etc)?
- What indications are there that the outcomes will be sustained (systems, structures, staff, etc)?
- To what extent has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key stakeholders of country, been developed or implemented?
- To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support?

v) Assess and analyze any Lessons Learned, challenges faced and furnish recommendations

2.2 Inception/Introductory Meeting/Call

Upon the award of a contract, a Skype based inception/introductory meeting was held with the UNDP's team on 18th November, 2019.

The meeting was initiated with a brief introduction of the SCDP by the UNDP team member. The overview was followed by discussion on methodology, scope and expectations about key deliverables, particularly, field mission. In addition, the inception meeting call served as an opportunity to discuss management approach and coordination mechanisms of the assignment and to request relevant important documents. During the meeting, UNDP also shared that all the readily available information as well as documents pertaining to SCDP for desk review and document analysis. Inception meeting call was followed by email-based correspondence on exchange of key information on programme (documents) and management of the field mission.

3. REVIEW METHODOLOGY

The following sections provide relevant details with regard to the **Review methodology** finalized on the basis of the TORs for undertaking the assignment **and findings from the Desk Review**.

PREPARATION OF THE REVIEW

3.1 Desk Review and Document Analysis

The foundation of the desk review was the background documents shared by the UNDP team. It was worth mentioning that a multiple sourced set of documents were furnished that included detailed APRs, QPRs for the year 2019, AWP's etc. The published success stories, videos with a range of news articles also provided multiple channels of information about different activities under the 5 results areas. However, the lack of a Project Design Document was a clear missing link as it would have provided the detailed design, project implementation and management arrangements, agreed results framework and activities etc. The draft project concept note prepared in the 2016 though, provided a basic understanding of the project background in context of its linkages with the Conflict Prevention Programme (CPP) and post 2015 scenario of the country but it lacks details about the key elements of project implementation. The

documents nevertheless, facilitated a good understanding of the project and enabled an effective assessment design. Some of the other documents will be further requested as required.

A list of documents reviewed during the review exercise is provided in the **Annex A**.

3.2 Programmatic Scope of the Assessment

Since the project has intrinsic limitation of no results framework as well as the AWP of SCDP project showed varied and different results, indicators and targets for the years 2016-2019, The programmatic scope of the review exercise was primarily focused on evaluating the relevance, effectiveness & impact, efficiency and sustainability of the following key outputs, indicators and targets of the results framework in the different years of SCDP implementation.

Year 2018& 2019			
Outputs	SDGs Indicators to be Reviewed	Project Indicators to Reviewed	Targets
Output 1: Improved social cohesion and community security in targeted conflictive areas for sustaining peace and sustainable development in Nepal (SDG 16.1)	Indicator 1: (SDG 16.1.3) Proportion of population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months Indicator 2: (SDG 16.1.4) Proportion of population that feel safe walking alone around the area they live	Indicator 1: # of active local/provincial risk identification and mitigation mechanisms Indicator 2: # of initiatives taken for mitigating conflict related risks at local/provincial level	Target 1: 15 mechanism at the municipal levels (2018/2019) Target 2: 30 initiatives taken by the mechanism (2018/2019)

Output 2 Increased access to public services in an inclusive, transparent and accountable manner for women, marginalized groups and vulnerable population.	SDG Indicator 1: (SDG 16.6.1) Primary government expenditures as a proportion of original approved budget, by sector (or by budget codes or similar) SDG Indicator 2: (SDG 16.6.2) Proportion of population (segregated by women, marginalized and vulnerable) satisfied with their last experience of public service	Indicator 1: Increase in % of women, marginalized groups and vulnerable population in accessing public services Indicator 2: # of initiatives taken by CBOs, women, youth and marginalized groups to enhance access to services and mutual accountability Indicator 3: # of active community information and service facilitation Centers Indicator 4: # of active RTI Networks at municipal level	20% (2018) Target 2: 30 initiatives (2018/2019) Target 3: 12 (2018/2019) Target 4: 15 (2018/2019)
Output 3: Civic space for engagement, voice and participation of youth, women and vulnerable groups broadened at all levels.	SDG Indicator 1: # of women and vulnerable groups benefitting from private and/or public measures to support women's preparedness for leadership and decision-making roles (SDG 16.7). Target 5% increase (2018)	Indicator 1: # of CSOs/CBOs using open platforms and networks to have an effective voice in sub national governance and decision-making processes. (CPD) Indicator 2: # of young girls and boys engaged in volunteerism, and entrepreneurial initiatives.	Target 1: 15 CSOs/CBOs Target 2: 15
Output 4: Effective mechanisms and partnership for multi-stakeholder approaches to the Goals are created at the federal, provincial and local levels through SDG localization platforms. (SDG 17.17)	Indicator 1: # of government officials, local representatives, civil society members, and private sector with better understanding of SDGs Indicator 2: # of interventions implemented by local governments with engagement with the private sectors in accordance with national development priorities	Indicator 1: # of government officials, local representatives, civil society members, and private sector with better understanding of SDGs Indicator 2: # of interventions implemented by local governments with engagement with the private sectors and other stakeholders in accordance with national development priorities	Target 1: 2000 relevant stakeholders get the orientation and understanding about SDGs Target 2: 10 intervention/events.

Output 5: Strengthened gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in targeted areas. (SDG 5)	Indicator 1: # of women and adolescent girls benefited from career and skills development trainings and other entrepreneurial initiatives	indicator 1: # of women and adolescent girls benefited from career and skills development trainings and other entrepreneurial initiatives	Target 1: 500
	Indicator 2: # of women benefited from the women leadership development initiatives	Indicator 2: Decrease in % of cases of violence against girls and women in targeted areas	Target 2: 5% decrease
	Indicator 3: Decrease in % of cases of violence against girls and women in targeted areas		

Year 2017			
Outputs	SDGs Indicators to be Reviewed	Project Indicators to Reviewed	Targets
Output 1: Risk identification systems contribute to shape local responses to potential or actual issues that may affect social cohesion	None	Indicator 1: # local risk identification mechanisms that report to have discussed potential or actual issues that may affect social cohesion	At least 12 risk identification mechanisms
Output 2 Risk mitigation improved through Early Response Initiative, Quick Impact Support to Inter-Community Cohesion	None	Indicator 1: # of initiatives taken for mitigating social cohesion related risks at local level	Target 1: 60 initiatives
Output 3: Community leaders (male and female), CBOs, youth organizations, marginalized groups lead actions and/or processes to make public institutions accountable	None	Indicator 1: Increase in % of women, youth and marginalized groups participate in local level decision-making processes Indicator 2: # of initiatives taken by CBOs, women, youth and marginalized groups to enhance accountability Indicator 3: # initiatives taken by local stakeholders for strengthening community security	Target 1: 20% Target 2: 30 initiatives Target 3: 12
2016			

Outputs	SDGs Indicators to be Reviewed	Project Indicators to Reviewed	Targets
Output 1 Increased Knowledge, skills and confidence of key women leaders to mobilize people and resources for sustained collective advocacy for women's inclusion in all aspects of peace and security processes	None	None	
Output 2: Developed shared agenda by Nepal leaders on land property issues and agreed on a national implementation plan	None	None	National Implementation Plan on land finalized and signed List of technical terms and concepts accepted by principle political leaders and key stakeholders Agreed on shared agenda on land and property issues
Output 3: Effective risk identification systems in place through capacity building, improved participation and networking	None	None	At least 12 risk identification are functional
Output 4 Risk mitigation improved through Early Response Initiative, Quick Impact Support to Inter-Community Cohesion	None	None	Risk mitigation and community security is integrated in regular institutional plan of Government and NGOs At least 8 EQ affected district development actors trained on CS approaches Identified risks are mitigated through early response initiative and quick response

Output 4 Policy Makers (male and female) feel confident and committed to implement gender responsive land reforms Output 5 Inclusive regional and national levels land discussion forums are gender responsive	None	None	Gender specific land concerns are identified Lands concerns are converted into policy proposals with common understanding of leaders at district, provincial and national levels Goodwill on gender responsive declared and adopted
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------	------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

3.3 Development of Assessment Tools

The TORs and the desk Review of the documents provided an informed foundation for the development of assessment tools. These tools were based on the principles of three participatory techniques and comprise of:

- Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)
- Questionnaire based Survey (QBS)
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) (wherever possible/required)

The above-mentioned tools were user friendly and provide a combination of qualitative and quantitative information. Annex B provides a detailed ‘Review Questions Matrix’, relevant/related data collection methods and sources for the Review mission. These questions provided the guiding basis for the interviews, QBS and the Focused Group Discussions (FGDs).

DATA COLLECTION FROM THE FIELD

3.4 Data Collection

To undertake the assessment, it was ensured that the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative information through a combination of primary and secondary sources. Data collected from one source was triangulated with the other to ensure accuracy and validity. An intelligent mix of both approaches lent more quality and depth to ensure greater understanding of the phenomenon. This was, therefore, presented information about the nature, extent, effect and impact of the issues in the targeted area.

The assessment was carried out in a participatory manner, where feedback was gathered both from stakeholders at the beneficiaries as well as the institutional levels. During the data collection, following data collection tools were conducted:

3.4.1 Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

To consult the relevant project stakeholders, key informant interviews were conducted. The **Annex D** indicates the relevant stakeholders who were consulted for each of the key results area of the SCDP project. The stakeholders interviewed include UNDP staff, Implementation Partners (CBOs) and beneficiaries etc

Annex B provides a guiding list of interview question for the key informant interviews under the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, cross cutting themes and UN's partnership strategy

3.4.2 Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS)

Since the project geographical scope is vast and scattered and stretched to various provinces of the country, combined with the postponement of field mission twice (overall, for a time period of almost 3 weeks due to the logistical/visa issues) a comprehensive Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS) was planned to capture data from a range of stakeholders of SCDP project. It assisted in further validation and triangulation of data gathered from the range of project documents, news articles, published stories, as well as data gathered during KIIs and FGDs. Annex C provided the overall set of questions for the QBS. **Annex C** provides the basic set of questions for QBS, divided into 3 parts; i) For UNDP staff, (ii) Implementation Partners, (iii) – Beneficiaries.

Overall, more than 20 stakeholders participated in the QBS that includes a major proportion of beneficiaries from various provinces, implementation partners and UNDP project staff. The QBS provided comprehensive data that assisted in the validation of data provided from the other sources.

3.4.3 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)

Keeping in view the time constraints and nature of the project, **FGDs** was proposed/planned (wherever possible) to get a combined feedback of the project staff and implementation partners and. While conducting FGDs, a selected set of direct stakeholders was gathered to discuss issues and concerns based on a list of key themes drawn up by the time of the FGDs. The participants of the FDG were selected in consultation with the UNDP team. Proportionate gender representation was ensured.

3.5 Development of Field Activity Plan

Considering the limited duration of the assignment, postponement of the field missions and extensive reach of the stakeholders, UNDP team assisted in developing the field activity. This activity plan outlined a list of stakeholders as well as dates and locations where the activity was undertaken. The activity plan

format is given in the **Annex D** and it was finalized in consultation with the UNDP team. The field mission took place from 17-20th December, 2019.

3.6 Data Analysis

The process of data analysis was intensive as it is aimed to analyze both quantitative and qualitative data from broad stakeholder base and 5 outputs area; analytical tools was applied which permit comparisons. Triangulation of data gathered from various data collection tools was conducted as a basic data analysis mechanism. **Qualitative data** gathered during the course of the assessment was transcribed and categorized according to the various themes and topics explored with clear conclusions drawn. The **quantitative analysis** included comparisons, planned vs. actual quantitative targets (as per the SCDP's results framework for each year and in various AWP), etc.

Following obligatory ratings were used for the assessment of each of the sections of the project:

Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution	Sustainability ratings	Relevance ratings
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability	2. Relevant (R)
	3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks	1. Not relevant (NR)
	2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks	
	1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

3.6 Debriefing of Findings

Based on the collected data through documents review and field mission, a debriefing session was held at UNDP on 20th December, 2019, whereby the overall findings, lessons learned and key recommendations for the potential Phase II of SCDP were presented to the key stakeholders.

3.7 Review Limitations

Although the review mission was conducted in a structured manner, there are certain limitations in gathering the data during the review exercise;

- Field mission was postponed more than once due to, sudden and unforeseen changes in visa related rules and regulation as well as limited time frame to issue visa that resulted in delaying the field mission for at least 3 weeks. It considerably affected the overall planned methodology. However the issue was proactively addressed by changing the methodology and through development of a detailed Questionnaire Based Survey that enabled data gathering from beneficiaries, implementation partners and UNDP project staff. In fact, this remedy assisted in gathering data from more geographically dispersed stakeholders as compared to the initial field mission plan.
- Lack of a clearly defined project document, consistent and coherent project's results framework and related indicators for the entire time span of the project hindered the analysis of overall effectiveness of the project against standard milestones. To tackle this limitation, year wise indicator and target analysis was conducted to analyze the overall effectiveness of the project.

4. Review Findings

4.1 Relevance

Overall Rating: Relevant- However a refocus and realignment with the new CPD is required.

Relevance of the Social Cohesion & Democratic Participation (SCDP) project with the country level and UN priorities and policies for Nepal, at the time of its inception is one of the strongest attributes of the programme. However, in its current state of activities, not all attributes/activities can be directly linked with UNDAF, CPD as well as Fourteen & Fifteen Plan of Nepal.

4.1.1 Relevance with the National Level Priorities

The relevance of SCDP with the national level priorities and policies can be divided into two different phases;

First, the project was aligned and responded to breakthrough promulgation of the new federal Constitution of Nepal in late 2015 that represented a historic step towards finalizing the commitments of the peace process and created an important new framework for shifting political power from Kathmandu to provincial and local structures. This resulted in Elections that were held in 2017, forming the three levels of governments. SCDP design for the year 1 (2016) was directly relevant to these developments in the country as it was focused on enhancing social cohesion in the tense and sensitive geographical areas and assisting newly formed local governments in enhancing democratic participation of citizens in general and vulnerable communities in particular.

In the later stages of the SCDP, some (but not all) of the project objectives and results area are directly linked to the ‘Priority Area 4’ of the Fourteenth Plan (2073/74-2075/2076 [2017-2020], that is

‘4. Promotion of good governance and human rights through effective and accountable public finance and clean, transparent and people-friendly public service (SDG 16)’

4.1.2 Relevance with the UN Priorities

In the entire duration of the SCDP (2016-2019), the UN agencies’ interventions in the country have been based on two different UNDAF and CPD frameworks that are, 2013-17 and 2018-2022.

Some of the SCDP project interventions are directly aligned and relevant to outcomes and related outputs of era of UNDAF & CPAP documents. For instance, some of the SCDP results are linked with:

i) UNDAF & CPAP 2013-2017

Outcome 8: National institutions have addressed conflict-related violations of human rights and international humanitarian law and the post-conflict needs of victims.

Output 8.3: An independent and impartial property dispute resolution has been established and implemented in regard to conflict-related property issues.

Outcome 9: National actors and institutions have managed conflict risk and are progressively consolidating the peace.

Output 9.1: National actors have collaborated to manage and resolve conflict issues, strengthening peace consolidation.

Output 9.2: National actors implemented National Plans of Action on UNSCRs 1325 and 1820, ILO Convention 169 and United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), resulting in increased participation of indigenous people, women and girls and protection of their rights

ii) UNDAF & CPD 2018-2022

UNDAF- Outcome Area 4: Governance, Rule of Law, and Human Rights

CPDOUTCOME 2- By 2022, inclusive, democratic, accountable and transparent institutions are further strengthened towards ensuring rule of law, social justice and human rights for all particularly for vulnerable people.

Output 2.2 Systems, procedures and capacities of government institutions at subnational level in place for service delivery in an inclusive, transparent and accountable manner

Output 2.3 Civic space for engagement, voice and participation of youth, women and vulnerable groups broadened at all levels.

4.2 Effectiveness and Impact

Overall, SCDP has contributed in enhancing the social cohesion and democratic participation in the context of post 2015 constitution and 2017 era, however primarily at the activities level whereby

sometimes a very micro level interventions were carried out that might not have a medium to macro level impact and/or contribution towards the CPD goals.

The Review exercise was aimed to be based on the Results Based Management (RBM) principles whereby it was intended that, the overall project results framework would provide the basis for the assessment of the SCDP's effectiveness and impact.

However, despite a defined theoretical Theory of Change, the lack of a focused project document and a coherent and consistent results framework for the entire project duration posed an immense challenge to consolidate a consistent and linked results-oriented assessment of the project effectiveness in terms of its contribution to the overall outcomes of UNDAF and CPD.

It was observed that:

- i) From 2016 to 2019, overall results framework, outputs and indicators have changed considerably whereby, no two consecutive years have contributed to the same results framework.
- ii) There are discrepancies between the results area/outputs and related targets defined in the Annual Work Plan and the APRs highlighting the achievements/progress against these targets. For instance, in the 2016 AWP, the number of targeted areas was 6 whereas only 5 are reported in the APR 2016. The two separate intended results were included in the AWP that are related to the risk identification & risk mitigation, whereas the APR included progress on only risk identification. Moreover, the agreed vs. reported targets are different in both documents as well.
- iii) Moreover, it was also observed that due to intrinsic lack of coherence within different outputs and related targets since inception and over the years, the project's interventions (if they are assessed together) are focused on many diverse micro level activities that are not necessarily entirely linked or contributed to the overall CPD/UNDAF outcomes.

For instance, the output 3 of the project that is focused on 'Community leaders (male and female), CBOs, youth organizations, marginalized groups lead actions and/or processes to make public institution accountable' with the related indicator 1 'Increase in % of women, youth and marginalized groups participate in local level decision-making processes'. However the project intervention on the other hand, was focused and reported on the number of citizens accessing the public services. Hence, there was a missing link/alignment between the output, indicator and reported activity/result

In nutshell, the project design and related interventions were not entirely based on the best practices of the Results Based Management.

Nevertheless, if these interventions are assessed as standalone activities and on the basis of their achievements in various years of interventions, there are considerable milestones achieved and established success stories in promoting the social cohesion and democratic participation in targeted areas, though sometimes at very micro levels.

Keeping in view this foundation shortfall of lack of coherent results framework, a year wise assessment is conducted to analyze the project's effectiveness in terms of its contributions towards the agenda of enhancing social cohesion and democratic participation.

Following section will provide specific output-wise assessment of programme effectiveness and impact:

4.2.1-Year 2016

Outputs	Project Indicators to Reviewed	Targets
Result Area/Output 1 Increased Knowledge, skills and confidence of key women leaders to mobilize people and resources for sustained collective advocacy for women's inclusion in all aspects of peace and security processes	None	
Result Area/Output 2: Developed shared agenda by Nepal leaders on land property issues and agreed on a national implementation plan	None	National Implementation Plan on land finalized and signed List of technical terms and concepts accepted by principle political leaders and key stakeholders Agreed on shared agenda on land and property issues
Output 3: Effective risk identification systems in place through capacity building, improved participation and networking	None	At least 12 risk identification are functional
Output 4-Risk mitigation improved through Early Response Initiative, Quick Impact Support to Inter-Community Cohesion	None	Risk mitigation and community security is integrated in regular institutional plan of Government and NGOs At least 8 EQ affected district development actors trained on CS approaches Identified risks are mitigated through early response initiative and quick response

Output 5-Policy Makers (male and female) feel confident and committed to implement gender responsive land reforms Output 6-Inclusive regional and national levels land discussion forums are gender responsive	None	Gender specific land concerns are identified Lands concerns are converted into policy proposals with common understanding of leaders at district, provincial and national levels Goodwill on gender responsive declared and adopted
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Overall, most of the results and related targets and indicators of AWP for the Year 2016 were achieved to a certain extent.

Under output 1, more than 400 community members were incapacitated on the peace building and social cohesion aspects. A considerable 37% female representation was ensured. 12 community security plans in 7 targeted districts were developed in key vulnerable and sensitive communities through implementation partners. The sustainability mechanism of these activities and their impact for a longer period of time could not be validated/found.

Under output 2, although a 12 points common understanding among political parties on land and property issues was agreed upon, there is no clear evidence found that SCDP enabled National Implementation Plan on land was finalized and signed.

Under Output 3, the AWP indicated that at least 12 risk identification systems are functional, the APR reported that 4 peace structures were established and functional along with 50 initiatives to promote social cohesion in the targeted communities. Although the AWP included output 4 on risk mitigation initiatives and support, there was no clear evidence found regarding progress on the related targets as mentioned in the table above. The Multi Stakeholder Dialogue Forum (MDSF) was apparently formed under the CPP project that enabled some risk mitigation initiatives. However, the planned, structured and coherent intervention was found missing in this regard. Regarding output 5 and 6 on Gender mainstreaming, evidence validated that capacity of local governments in 2 districts were trained in the gender responsive planning and budgeting. The overall impact of this activity at higher levels could not be found/validated.

Overall Rating 2016: Moderately Satisfactory (At micro level)

4.2.2-Year 2017

Outputs	SDGs Indicators to be Reviewed	Project Indicators to Reviewed	Targets
Output 1: Risk identification systems contribute to shape local responses to potential or actual issues that may affect social cohesion	None	Indicator 1: # local risk identification mechanisms that report to have discussed potential or actual issues that may affect social cohesion	At least 12 risk identification mechanisms
Output 2 Risk mitigation improved through Early Response Initiative, Quick Impact Support to Inter-Community Cohesion	None	Indicator 1: # of initiatives taken for mitigating social cohesion related risks at local level	Target 1: 60 initiatives
Output 3: Community leaders (male and female), CBOs, youth organizations, marginalized groups lead actions and/or processes to make public institutions accountable	None	Indicator 1: Increase in % of women, youth and marginalized groups participate in local level decision-making processes Indicator 2: # of initiatives taken by CBOs, women, youth and marginalized groups to enhance accountability Indicator 3: # initiatives taken by local stakeholders for strengthening community security	Target 1: 20% Target 2: 30 initiatives Target 3: 12

Overall, most of the results and related targets and indicators for the Year 2017 AWP were considerably achieved at micro level, however a considerable shift in the overall project outputs and related indicators was found as compared to the project's results framework in 2016. The overall gender related outputs were excluded in year 2017.

Under the output 1, the target of developing new risk identification mechanism were over achieved whereby 40 new mechanisms formed at the local level instead of targeted 12. Although the evidence of

establishment of these mechanisms is found and validated to a considerable extent through multiple secondary sources as well as stakeholders' response in the QBS, the current status and sustainability of these mechanisms could not be fully established. **Under the output 2**, the target was surpassed as 73 initiatives were taken for mitigating conflict instead of targeted 60. These interventions were supplemented by more than 500 sub initiatives taken by SCDP formed mechanism and groups.

Under the new output 3 that was focused on enhanced participation of CBOs, marginalized communities etc in public sector accountability, the overall interventions were somehow not directly linked with the intended indicators and results.

Some of the reported and validated achievements include:

- 30 information centers and RTI networks formed that assisted citizens in accessing public services such as birth certificates, citizenship, marriage certificates, voters ID etc
- 14 youth volunteer groups carried out more than 58 community initiatives engaging more than 6,000 people including their role Terai floods in Banke, Bardiya and Sunsari directly benefitted 50 flood affected families.
- Various mechanism and groups carried out more than 500 initiatives including 168 cultural and sports programs promoting social ties and interaction. The programs were conducted with a dual focus of engaging youth, with more than 1,000 young volunteers taking part in cultural and sports activities.

The assessment concluded that these interventions may be directly linked with the first 2 outputs however they did not contributed directly to the indicators set under the output 3. For instance it was targeted that 20% increase of women, youth and marginalized groups participate in local level decision-making processes will be ensured as well as at least 20 initiatives taken by CBOs, women, youth and marginalized groups to enhance accountability of the public institutions. Apart from a reference to RTI that is linked to the accountability component of the output, the interventions and related achievements are directly linked to increasing access to public services as well as promoting social cohesion **and no clear evidence is found that the interventions were targeted and/or resulted in increased government's accountability.**

Year 2017- Overall Rating: Moderately Satisfactory (at micro level only; whereas many activities and reported results are not aligned with the outputs)

4.2.2-Year 2018-19

Outputs	SDGs Indicators to be Reviewed	Project Indicators to Reviewed	Targets
Output 1: Improved social cohesion and community security in targeted conflictive areas for sustaining peace and sustainable development in Nepal (SDG 16.1)	Indicator 1: (SDG 16.1.3) Proportion of population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months Indicator 2: (SDG 16.1.4) Proportion of population that feel safe walking alone around the area they live	Indicator 1: # of active local/provincial risk identification and mitigation mechanisms Indicator 2: # of initiatives taken for mitigating conflict related risks at local/provincial level	Target 1: 15 mechanism at the municipal levels (2018/2019) Target 2: 30 initiatives taken by the mechanism (2018/2019)
Output 2 Increased access to public services in an inclusive, transparent and accountable manner for women, marginalized groups and vulnerable population.	SDG Indicator 1: (SDG 16.6.1) Primary government expenditures as a proportion of original approved budget, by sector (or by budget codes or similar) SDG Indicator 2: (SDG 16.6.2) Proportion of population (segregated by women, marginalized and vulnerable) satisfied with their last experience of public service	Indicator 1: Increase in % of women, marginalized groups and vulnerable population in accessing public services Indicator 2: # of initiatives taken by CBOs, women, youth and marginalized groups to enhance access to services and mutual accountability Indicator 3: # of active community information and service facilitation Centers Indicator 4: # of active RTI Networks at municipal level	20% (2018) Target 2: 30 initiatives (2018/2019) Target 3: 12 (2018/2019) Target 4: 15 (2018/2019)

Output 3: Civic space for engagement, voice and participation of youth, women and vulnerable groups broadened at all levels.	SDG Indicator 1: # of women and vulnerable groups benefitting from private and/or public measures to support women's preparedness for leadership and decision-making roles (SDG 16.7). Target 5% increase (2018)	Indicator 1: # of CSOs/CBOs using open platforms and networks to have an effective voice in sub national governance and decision-making processes. (CPD) Indicator 2: # of young girls and boys engaged in volunteerism, and entrepreneurial initiatives.	Target 1: 15 CSOs/CBOs Target 2: 15
Output 4: (2019) Effective mechanisms and partnership for multi-stakeholder approaches to the Goals are created at the federal, provincial and local levels through SDG localization platforms. (SDG 17.17)	Indicator 1: # of government officials, local representatives, civil society members, and private sector with better understanding of SDGs Indicator 2: # of interventions implemented by local governments with engagement with the private sectors in accordance with national development priorities	Indicator 1: # of government officials, local representatives, civil society members, and private sector with better understanding of SDGs Indicator 2: # of interventions implemented by local governments with engagement with the private sectors and other stakeholders in accordance with national development priorities	Target 1: 2000 relevant stakeholders get the orientation and understanding about SDGs Target 2: 10 intervention/events.
Output 5: (2019) Strengthened gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in targeted areas. (SDG 5)	Indicator 1: # of women and adolescent girls benefited from career and skills development trainings and other entrepreneurial initiatives Indicator 2: # of women benefited from the women leadership development initiatives Indicator 3: Decrease in % of cases of violence against girls and women in targeted areas	indicator 1: # of women and adolescent girls benefited from career and skills development trainings and other entrepreneurial initiatives Indicator 2: Decrease in % of cases of violence against girls and women in targeted areas	Target 1: 500 Target 2: 5% decrease

The assessments of year 2018-2019 are combined as the results frameworks for both project years were comparatively similar as compared to the previous 2 years. However, it is worth mentioning that a new output 3 on **‘Civic Space for engagement’** was added in 2018, followed by 2 additional outputs in year the 2019 on ‘effective mechanism for partnership’ and ‘gender equality & empowerment’ respectively. Some of the earlier outputs were excluded whereas the outputs on ‘risk identification’ and ‘risk mitigation’ were combined under output 1.

In year 2018, overall effectiveness of the project intervention provided mixed results as some of the results and related targets and indicators for the Year 2018 were either overachieved or under achieved.

Output 1 on risk identification and mitigation mechanisms, 26 new mechanisms were formed (instead of targeted 15) at the local level in Bara, Parsa, Rautahat, Chitwan, Banke, Bardiya, Kailali and Kanchanpur more than 107 events/initiatives. The data triangulation validated that these mechanisms were effective as quoted by various stakeholders in the QBS, combined with the published success stories and news articles.

Output 2 on ‘increased access to public service delivery in transparent and accountable manner’; most of the targets were under achieved. For instance, 5 information centers (target of 12) and 10 Right to information networks (target of 15) are formed. Nevertheless, the centers were quite effective in increasing access to service delivery whereby more than 4,450 targeted population in accessing public services such as birth certificates, citizenship certificates, marriage certificates, and voters ID etc in 9 local government units.

No clear data and related evidence is found on the indicator of ‘Increase in % of women, marginalized groups and vulnerable population in accessing public services’

New output 3 on ‘Civic space for engagement, voice and participation’, there were two well defined indicators and targets as milestones.

Under indicator 1 of ‘at least 15 CSOs/CBOs using open platforms and networks to have an effective voice in sub national governance and decision-making processes’, it was found that nine CSOs were selected and engaged through the micro-capital grants in the nine districts. However, further details on use of open platforms and details on how it enabled increased voice of communities in the decision-making process could not be fully validated. It was reported that 119 initiatives directly involving more than 5,000 targeted populations for an effective voice in local governance and decision-making processes.

However, no clear evidence is found regarding the impact and outcome of these interventions in any local policy. A clearer follow-up and success story could have been showcased.

Similarly, for the indicator 2 of number of young girls and boys engaged in volunteerism, and entrepreneurial initiatives, 29 youth volunteer's networks and centers were supported and engaged that surpassed the overall target of 15. However, no evidence is found on the entrepreneurial activities of these youth.

Year 2018- Overall Rating: Moderately Satisfactory (At micro/activity levels with no clear evidence of any high-level impact)

In year 2019, progress was made on the first three outputs whereas, 2 additional outputs were added in year 2019 on 'effective mechanism for partnership' and 'gender equality & empowerment' respectively.¹ However, the sudden inclusion of two additional outputs under social cohesion project in the last year of its implementation remained unclear.

For Output 1 on risk identification and mitigation mechanisms, few new mechanisms were formed, specifically in province 2 and 5. For instance In Province 5 and Sudurpashchim only, twenty-one inclusive committees comprising police, local government and civilians were formed to jointly identify community security issues and develop a response plan. Similarly, in Rupandehi and Kailali, 26 community police partnership initiatives to strengthen community security were implemented.

Similarly, under the output 2, although no clear evidence is found on establishment of new service centers, however a total of 357 people got assistance from the existing three Community Information and Service Facilitation centres (CISFCs) in obtaining senior citizen IDs, opening of accounts for social security allowance, birth and marriage registrations, and other important services. Moreover, two information and youth volunteer centres have been established along with seven RTI networks were formed in province 5 to strengthen the accountability of services provided by government authorities and agencies.

Under the output 3, it is worth mentioning that a very focused, and effective initiatives was implemented that was provision technical support in the formation of a **Deputy-Mayor Club in Parsa**, comprising deputies of all PALIKAs in the district of Province 2. The club has been a platform for sharing learning experiences. It can take as a benchmark for future interventions where by such the clubs can provide good medium to share, learn, and discuss local challenges they've faced as well as good practices for overcoming them.

Nevertheless, some of the activities again had no direct link with the high level CPD indicators. For instance, Youth Entrepreneurial training on Cow farming that included an interaction among youth and dairy entrepreneurs in Bara and identified 15 local youth who were further provided with training on cow farming.

¹ Assessment is conducted on reported data as of August 2019. Hence no overall rating is provided for the year 2019.

Under the new output 4: ‘Effective mechanisms and partnership for multi-stakeholder approaches to the Goals are created at the provincial and local levels to sustaining peace two major interventions were implemented. It included:

- An exhibition of SDGs in Mithila Art was organized where local women presented the Sustainable development Goals (SDGs) through Mithila paintings. The women artists prepared a set of paintings on each of the 17 goals envisioning possible local interventions to achieve the goals and presented those paintings among the key stakeholders representing different walks of life. This has also been initiated in Nepalgunj, province 5, where the team of artists and grant partner is working on the exhibition of SDGs in Awadh art and paintings.
- Six orientation events on the SDGs were organized for elected representatives of Mithila Municipality, Parsauni Rural Municipality, Chandrapur Municipality and Birgunj Metropolitan City-23 as well as civil society groups in Bara and Dhanusha. The orientations aimed to draw the attention of the local representatives towards the 17 goals and encourage them to use the SDG lens during local level planning processes.

However, no clear data and evidence is found regarding the progress of two well defined indicators that are number of government officials, local representatives, civil society members, and private sector with better understanding of SDGs and number of interventions implemented by local governments’ engagement with the private sectors and other stakeholders in accordance with national development priorities. The targets were clearly underachieved.

For the reintroduction of output 5 ‘Women's participation in peace and security issues is enhanced through their political and economic empowerment, no considerable progress could be found or validated under the following two clearly defined indicators (As of August 2019) on number of women and adolescent girls benefited from career and skills development trainings and other entrepreneurial initiatives and decrease in percentage% of cases of violence against girls and women in targeted areas.

Overall, progress on output 5 that is related to women empowerment is significantly underachieved and requires special attention.

Overall Rating for year 2019: Moderately Unsatisfactory (with clear underachieved targets of AWP's under 2 outputs)

4.2.3 Project Effectiveness and Impact- Summary of Overall Findings

Project Effectiveness-Overall Rating: Moderately Satisfactory at micro and activity levels with limited to no high level or strategic impact

Social Cohesion and Democratic Participation (SCDP) project has demonstrated varied progress in the thematic area of promoting social cohesion and enhancing voice and participation of communities in democratic transition of the country towards a federal system, predominantly at micro level. Nevertheless, the overall effectiveness and impact of its components varies from one output/result area to the other, whereby, some of the components even surpassed the intended targets at the activities level whereas, some of the areas have either under achieved or they could have been more focused, coherent and with better showcased impact and success. Some of the key findings include:

- **Lack of consistent, well defined and focused results framework** of the project is observed as the basis of inadequate linkages and sometimes underachieved targets. Apart from year 2018-2019 where 3 outputs were consistent, there were variety of outputs, indicators and targets over the years. It hindered in more sustained and focused impact as well as showcasing clear contribution towards UNDAF and CPD etc
- Combined with the lack of a results framework, **the basis of developing varied and inconsistent AWP's remained unclear**. As a result, project's overall focus remained at activity and micro level interventions with no clear evidence of any medium to high level strategic and result oriented contribution towards the outputs and outcomes of the CPD and UNDAF.
- Nevertheless, keeping in view these limitations and/or evaluating the effectiveness at the activity levels, **the project team has achieved considerable progress and success in the certain areas at the community level**. One of the most standout and effective component of the project intervention was the risk identification and risk mitigation related activities under the output of 'Improved social cohesion and community security'. With the overall establishment of more than 70 mechanisms and more than 150 violence/risk mitigation & prevention activities in the most conflict prone sensitive areas of the country are a high impact result of the project at local level. The data gathered from various means including QBS validated its effectiveness and need in the given context. However, the two aspects of this intervention need to be re-examined. First, going forward, the need of this output might have reduced to some extent as compared to its high demand at the time of project inception, particularly in 2015-2017 eras. Second, the sustainability of these mechanisms along with their sustained success and effectiveness over the longer period of time remained unanswered.

- The overall progress in the various outputs related to the accountable and transparent public services as well as increase access to public services in different years of project implementation is inadequate. Some of the intended targets and related interventions are unaligned too. For instance, in year 2017, whereby more focus was given to increasing access to services through service centres. Though more than 40 information centres and RTI networks were formed, the impact of these initiatives in enhanced vulnerable communities in local decision-making process in terms of in major policy/procedural outcomes as well increased accountability of local governments could not be showcased, referenced or evidenced.
- It is worth mentioning that upon validation of data from various sources, some of the highly reported Community Information Service Facilitation Centres (CISFCs) despite aiming at increasing access to the public services for the vulnerable groups, have resulted in assisting local governments in sharing their workload. Perceiving these centres as their supporting arm, it was reported that local government entities send citizens back to these centres to get assistance about submission of applications. However, these centres should have been focused on;
 - i) Providing access of public services to those vulnerable communities who cannot easily access these government offices due to many reasons such as geographical distance etc.
 - ii) Providing a support for holding local government officials accountable through RTI applications and other advocacy services for vulnerable communities.
- Some of the key high impact project interventions are less focused as well as less showcased. For instance, success stories of highly effective **Multi Stakeholder Dialogue Forum (MSDF)** have got extremely low projections in the APRs, QPRs and other communication tools. Similarly, the achievements in assisting vulnerable community members in filing more than 80 **RTI applications** as well as facilitating more than 15 public hearings between local government officials and vulnerable groups in one local municipality are both very less reported and secured limited focus in the overall project implementation. Alternatively, least aligned micro level activities were highly projected as well secured more focus in the project. Such interventions include youth volunteerism and entrepreneurship training, community facilitation centres for filing public service applications etc.
- Similarly, projects overall impact in the area of broadening civic space for engagement, voice and inclusive democratic participation of youth, women and vulnerable groups has yielded varied results from one component to the other. Despite a more focused and results oriented interventions could have been implemented while aiming at the meeting the targets set by the AWP and UNDAF, some potentially effective and high impact initiatives were implemented in the project that can provide a good guiding mechanism for the future. The 3 tangible and potentially sustainable mechanisms include:

i) Utilizing Community Based Organizations- as implementation partners through small grants to reach communities. It enabled direct access to community and local governments working at the grass root levels. Nevertheless, the grants could have been more directly linked with the indicators and targets under the thematic area as well transferring this activity level progress to strategic level could have been ensured.

ii) Formation of Deputy Mayor's Club- Within the context of new government system in the country, this initiative enables a direct opportunity and medium to share, learn, and discuss local challenges of the targeted communities as well as good practices to overcome them. Going forward, it should also include multiple stakeholders including members of vulnerable communities to have a direct access and opportunity in the local decision-making process

iii) Multi-stakeholders Dialogue Forum (MSDF)- Although it is originated from the CPP project, this is a unique but highly effective mechanism to enhance civic space for voice the local community as well as members of more vulnerable segments. The successes of Multi-stakeholders Dialogue Forum (MSDF) in Rautahat could have been replicated in other parts of the targeted districts as a major focus area of SCDP.

- Finally, although some initial adhoc and standalone activities in the area of building partnership for SDGs' localization has started such as using Mithila Art, major targets for both output 4 (SDGs) and output 5 (Gender Empowerment) are under achieved. A more focused result-oriented interventions under both outputs are required to meet the targets.

4.3 Efficiency

Overall Efficiency Rating: Moderately Satisfactory with clear gaps in implementation arrangement and M&E functions

Overall, the efficiency of SCDP varied from one area to the other as it can clearly be divided into three categories:

i) High Efficiency- Overall budget management was quite efficient whereby least variances between planned vs. actual expenditure were observed

ii) Moderate Efficiency - Overall progress on planned vs. actual activities of AWP were moderately efficient whereby, efficiency of delivering planned activities planned were high in some years and areas (such as identification and mitigation of risk mechanism in 2017), whereas, it was moderate to low in

certain areas and years (such as activities related to CISFCs, SDGs and Gender etc). Similarly, one of the aspects of partnership strategy that is; with CSOs, is considerably efficient.

iii) Inadequate Efficiency- Some of the aspects of project implementation have limited efficiency with some identified gaps such as implementation arrangements and project board, M&E function and linkages and partnership within UNDP projects as well partnership strategy towards stakeholders other than CSOs.

4.3.1 Allocated Budget vs. Actual Expenditure

The budget utilization over the entire project duration has turned out to be one of the most efficient components of the project whereby average of 97% utilization was achieved. Following is the breakdown of the planned vs. actual expenditure;

Year	Planned Budget USD	Actual Expenditure USD	% Utilization
2016	1086001	1023786	95%
2017	674686	641,744	95 %
2018	300,000	321124	107%
2019	312,047	271,440 ²	87%

Although the overall budget utilization, if very much efficient, following are few key findings in this regard:

- The reported expenditure breakdown in the APRs and other tracker sheet include a summarized snapshot on the basis of the results areas and activity. For more transparency and better understanding on the utilization of expenditure, detailed output wise and activity wise expenditure report could have been provided and reported.
- No periodic/ year wise audit report on the expenditure could be found that could have provided more detailed assessment of the expenditure pattern and deeper assessment³
- It was observed that ‘programme support cost’ has contributed up to more than 50% of the actual expenditure over the duration of the project duration. It seemed to be on a higher side and might have resulted on fewer resources on the actual implementation of activities.

² As of 13th December 2019

Overall Rating: Satisfactory on budget utilization with some observations.

4.3.2 Implementation Arrangement & Project Board

Overall Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory

Overall project implementation mechanism included two main teams that are Project Executive Board and the project team. Provincial field offices are though established in the targeted provinces, their role as a partner in the implementation mechanism is limited (if not any).

i) Project Executive Board (PEB)

The project executive board of the project provided the supervisory role during the entire duration of the project. The data collected from the field mission as well analysis of furnished minutes of the PEB meetings yielded following observations:

- In the initial years of the project, more detailed planning and reporting aspects of the project were discussed and presented that included quarter-wise progress, budget analysis and detailed planning in the coming months and quarter. The overall frequency and depth of discussion and reporting had gone comparatively less in the later years of the project.
- More importantly, it was observed that although MOPR represented in the PEB during the initial years of the project, PEB only included staff from UNDP without any representation from the other stakeholders such as federal/provincial government, donors, academia etc in the later years of the project implementation. It affected both the transparency/accountability as well as efficiency mechanisms of the project implementation.

ii) Project Team

Project team comprises of a project manager, 2 provincial coordinators and support staff. Following are the key findings about the efficiency of the project team:

- Keeping in view the geographical focus, range of activities and very limited human resources, the project team has provided efficient support for the project implementation to a certain extent and the coordination as well as team management mechanism within the project team (that is between the project manager and provincial coordinators) was found to be efficient. However, the team was observed to be overburdened, though it can be linked with the ad-hoc and range of activities resulted from inadequate and incoherent planning of the project.
- The documentation of the project implementation, data gathering from communities and overall information synthesis and availability are immensely efficient components of project team's

overall performance in the project. However overall communication strategy that included the selection of showcasing successful stories and level of dissemination of project outcomes at all internal and external levels could have been much more efficient.

- It is also worth mentioning that overall progress of the project team on the planned vs. actual activities & targets of AWP were moderately efficient whereby, efficiency of delivering planned activities were high in some years and thematic areas (such as identification and mitigation of risk mechanism in 2017) whereas it was moderate to low in certain thematic areas and years (such as activities related to CISFCs, SDGs and Gender etc).

iii) Provincial Field Offices.

The role of provincial offices in the project implementation remained unclear. It was observed that more coordination as well as well-established partnership between the project team and provincial field offices could have enhanced the overall project efficiency as well as visibility of UNDP work at all levels. It was also observed that continued communication and coordination gaps between the project team and provincial field offices can further hinder the overall projection of UNDP's work in the thematic area of intervention.

4.3.3 Monitoring and Evaluation

Overall Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory

With the exception of the project team reporting through APRs and QPRs, the overall M&E function of the programme was assessed as one of the weakest/inefficient link of the project implementation mechanism. Following are some of the key observations in this regard:

- The data gathering and reporting of overall project implementation (at activity level) through APRs, QPRs as well as in PEBs were efficient from the project team. Detailed count of activities, beneficiaries and other details were provided.
- However, it was observed there are certain M&E activities that should not ideally be mandated to the project team to perform, such as provincial coordinator was implementing, monitoring and evaluating their own activities in the field. It included building partnership with the CSOs, grant management, monitoring and evaluation of activities that were all done by project team. A more dedicated project M&E officer and more independent and active role of M&E team from the UNDP's country office could have enhanced the overall transparency, accountability and M&E aspects of the project efficiency.
- Moreover, independent midterm Review and/or periodic third-party review were entirely missed in the project. It could have enabled more timely assessments of lessons learned, enhanced accountability and corrective measures.

- Similarly, although CSOs provide periodic feedback and reports to the project team, any independent audit/review of the funds utilized by the CSOs/grantees could not be found. No documents/information on annual audit of project funds (if it did not happen) could be found. The APRs provide a generic activity level breakdown of the expenditure.
- Lastly and as indicated above, the PEB acted as a key monitoring and evaluation body of the project. However, it clearly lacked continued and consistent representation of independent actors/stakeholders who can provide more neutral monitoring and evaluation functions

4.3.4 SCDP Partnership and Synergy Strategy

Overall Rating: Moderately Satisfactory though with observations

The project was fundamentally funded through UNDP trac fund. Overall, the project partnership strategy provided varied results in terms of its efficiency. Following are the key findings in this regard:

- Project's partnership strategy, implementation and management with the CSOs and grantees were considerably efficient. Project team maintained strong planning and implementation mechanism with the CSOs and grantees whereby comprehensive activity planning and execution plans were in place at the micro level.
- However, the project partnership strategy is not efficient enough beyond the scope of engaging CSOs. There is no demonstrated, sustained and long-term partnership with provincial government, local government, potential donors and/or any other major stakeholders. This intrinsic lack of coherence due to no overall documented and agreed partnership strategy resulted in adhoc and vast range of activities at the micro level that could not be translated into a sustained network of partners.
- Similarly, limited to no linkages are found between SCDP project interventions and other projects under the portfolio of unit. It could result in potential duplication of efforts and inefficient utilization of available resources.

4.4 Sustainability

Overall Rating: Moderately unlikely with the exceptions of few components

Like many other key components of a project, there was no overall sustainability/exit plan for the project due to lack of a well document project plan and document. Following are the key findings in this regard:

- Since there is inadequate coherence within the project outputs and activities, it is not likely that all activities can be sustained.
- The data analysis indicated that certain interventions have been sustained at the micro level such as CISFCs have been adopted in few local governments. However, such sustainability mechanism may not be as efficient in the long run as CISFCs should not have logically been designed to assist local governments. Rather such initiatives should have been more focused on providing voice to the vulnerable groups of the community.
- There are few interventions that have been sustained on longer run such as Multi Stakeholder Dialogue Forum that was in place in a district since the time of CPP interventions. Similarly, Deputy Mayors Club has already shown signs of potential sustainability due to its effective and efficient design and objectives.
- Lastly, the financial sustainability of the entire project at the current level of activities is also assessed as highly unlikely, mainly due to lack of any engagement with the potential donors as well as incoherent and adhoc design of activities. However, some of the key activities such as MSDF, Deputy Mayors Club, RTI & public hearing mechanisms, if effectively designed have comparatively high level potential of sustainability.

4.5 Gender Equality, Empowerment & Vulnerable Groups

Overall Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

Although the overall outputs related to gender empowerment are highly underachieved, ensuring gender equality and focus on vulnerable groups were assessed to be the considerable focus of the project in terms of its representation in the overall beneficiary's group. Based on the data gathered and analyzed, it is evident that up to 50% of the overall beneficiaries that were directly outreached or engaged under various activities of the project were females. Similarly, composition of vulnerable communities in overall beneficiaries are also worth mentioning whereby almost 11% of beneficiaries are from Dalit community, 20% from Janjati community, 36% from Madhesi community and 5% from Muslim community.

5. Lessons Learned

- Lack of project design document and related results framework hindered overall linked and coherent progress of the project in terms of creating medium to high level strategic impact as well as contributing to CPD and UNDAF.
- Inadequate representation of external stakeholders in the Project Executive Board (PEB) limited neutral and independent evaluation and monitoring of the project.

- Scattered geographical focus along with a range of outputs and activities hindered in achieving optimum level of efficiency in terms of project implementation
- Limited to no coordination between project team and provincial field offices reduced overall visibility and impact of UNDP's valuable work in the area of social cohesion and democratic governance
- Lack of projects sustainability and exit strategy resulted in reduced sustainability of the project to fewer components only

6. Recommendations

On the basis of the lessons learned and findings mentioned in the sections above, following is a set of recommendations for the SCDP project:

6.1- Project Plan and Design

- As a starting point and keeping in view the feedback from the field and research, the **title of the project may be changed**. Since there is a general perception that country has come out of the conflict and peace building phases, it should be aligned with the output 2.3 of the CPD such as '**Civic Space and Participation Support for the Vulnerable Communities.**'
- There is a need for an **updated context analysis** of the vulnerable communities in the targeted provinces of the CPD and their issues related to the civic space, voice and participation in democratic governance.
- **Revisit the overall scope and a robust Results Framework** of the project for the entire duration of the Phase II should be developed. Clear, concise and focused Results Framework with less ambitious indicators and targets should be developed.
- **The geographical focus should be considerably reduced**. The intervention should be more focused in the high priority provinces and relevant districts. It is highly recommended that project should be focused on 1-2 high priority provinces and limited number of districts/municipalities to ensure high impact. Moreover, the impact and visibility of the UNDP project intervention should be aimed at all levels of government and should not be focused at micro level activities only
- The project to broaden civic space for vulnerable communities should not duplicate the vast range of outputs and related targets of newly signed "**Provincial and Local Governance Support Programme**". Rather it should be focused on creating an enabling environment and mechanisms at local government level for other projects of the portfolio in general and local government technical assistance programme

in particular. The project document should clearly form linkages of project outputs and related activities with the Local Government Technical Assistance Programme and other projects under the Governance portfolio.

- Based on the observations mentioned above and linked with the output 2.3 of the CPD, it is highly recommended that maximum 2 outputs should be included in the next phase of the project. The overall outlook of the suggested outputs may include:

Output 1- Capacity of government duty bearers enhanced in creating civic space for more voice, engagement and participation of vulnerable groups and enhanced transparency

- The activities under output 1 should be concise, strategic, tangible, results oriented and focused on sustainable interaction between the duty bearers and vulnerable groups. It may include formation of **Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue Forums** to bring vulnerable groups closer to the government, building capacity of government in **RTI mechanisms and formation of local government/mayors/deputy mayors clubs** whereby network of duty bearers can share their best practices and lessons learned in the focused thematic area of broadening the civic space for the vulnerable groups.
- Keeping in view the comparative advantage of UNDP as a strong convener and facilitator, a **National Dialogue Forum (NDF)** may be included as an activity whereby if and any potential conflict arise in the country, particularly with reference to the vulnerable groups, the stakeholders can be brought together under this forum. This intervention will provide flexibility to the project as well to include any evolving situation in this regard.
- Moreover, the use of innovation (both technological and non-technology based) can be included as focal area whereby **UNDP's Accelerator lab** can play a vital role in development of local level solutions that will enable duty bearers to broaden the interaction and enhancing participation of vulnerable groups such as women in their decision making etc.
- Moreover, to contribute **output 2.3.1 of the CPD**, a special focus can be made to support **female duty bearers** on preparedness for their perspective leadership and decision-making roles.

Output 2- Broadened civic space of vulnerable groups for enhanced participation and voice in sub-national governance and decision making

- The activities under output 2 should be focused on identified vulnerable groups only and not to a range of generic beneficiaries. Through the utilization of CSOs, the interventions should include advocacy campaigns, **formation of networks and facilitation of RTI process** for vulnerable groups to ensure more voice and participation as well as enhanced transparency, facilitation of

‘public hearing’ whereby, vulnerable groups will be provided direct access to the government officials so that their voice can be heard.

- Similarly, the use of **UNDP Accelerator Lab** to find innovative home-grown solutions to the identified problems of the vulnerable groups in the targeted areas is highly recommended. There are best practices of Accelerators network in the world available whereby, the grassroots approach adopted by the Labs emphasizes the importance of exploring socially acceptable and locally-sourced solutions that directly addresses the issues of social inequality, lack of civic space for vulnerable groups such as women and limited access to information for better transparency. The intervention can include provision of seed funding to innovative ideas whereby, the community members can come up with their own solutions to the problems of limited civic engagement and voice.

6.2 Implementation and Management

- It is recommended that a **new Project Executive Board (PEB)** should be formed that may include external members such as government organization, potential donors and academia/think tank. Since it is recommended that RTI should be given a thorough focus in the next phase of the project, **National Information Commission** can be a potential member of the PEB. Moreover, donors should be invited to be members of the PEB as well. It will also ensure donor’s perspective as well as it will assist in resource mobilization if the project interventions in the thematic area of broadening civic space for vulnerable groups are matched with the donor’s priorities
- The project team should be focused on implementation mechanism whereby a close coordination mechanism should be established between the project team and UNDP’s provincial field office. The provincial field offices can act as both a strategic partner in the project and they can provide a role of dedicated M&E function for the independent project monitoring.
- The overall monitoring and evaluation of the project intervention should be done by Country Office M&E team as well independent midterm and periodic review should be conducted.
- Similarly, the results based budgeting as well as reporting mechanism should be developed with an optimum proportion of allocation between the programme support cost and project interventions. The detailed breakdown of expenditure should be provided with each QPR & APR.
- A more robust ‘Results Based’ monitoring and reporting mechanism should be developed whereby the AWPS, progress reports/templates are clearly aligned with the projects Results Framework. A thorough RBM training should be conducted for project staff.

- The selection criteria of the CSOs, grant approval, implementation and management process should be duly endorsed by the PEB to ensure transparency and accountability.

6.3- Partnership and Communication

- A comprehensive and **results oriented partnership strategy** should be developed and included as integral part of the project design in the next phase of the project.
- Partnership with the CSOs should be focused and strictly aligned with the results framework of the project whereby each activity of the CSO should be aligned with and contributing the overall indicators and targets of the project. It will assist in avoiding some of the challenges of phase where a range of activities were carried out by the CSOs that are not necessarily linked with the overall scope of the project.
- The partnership strategy should clearly outline and demonstrate a sustained and long-term partnership mechanism with the provincial government, local government, potential donors and/or any other major stakeholders.

7. Conclusions

7.1 Project Relevance: Relevance of the Social Cohesion & Democratic Participation (SCDP) project with the country level and UN priorities and policies for Nepal, at the time of its inception is one of the strongest attributes of the project. However, in its current state of activities, not all attributes/activities can be directly linked with UNDAF, CPD as well as Fourteen & Fifteen Plan of Nepal.

7.2 Project Effectiveness: Overall, SCDP has contributed in enhancing the social cohesion and democratic participation in the context of post 2015 constitution and 2017 era, however primarily at the activities level whereby sometimes a very micro level interventions were carried out that might not have a medium to macro level impact and/or contribution towards the CPD goals. Some of the key conclusions include:

- Lack of consistent, well defined and focused results framework of the project is observed as the basis of inadequate linkages and sometimes underachieved targets;
- Combined with the lack of a results framework, the basis of developing varied and inconsistent AWP's remained unclear;
- Nevertheless, keeping in view these limitations and/or evaluating the effectiveness at the activity levels, the project team has achieved considerable progress and success in the certain areas at the community level such as MSDF, Formation of Deputy Mayors Club etc. However, the overall progress in the various outputs related to the accountable and transparent public services as well as increase access to public services in different years of project implementation is inadequate;
- Although some initial adhoc and standalone activities in the area of building partnership for SDGs' localization has started such as using Mithila Art, major targets for both output 4 (SDGs) and output 5 (Gender Empowerment) are under achieved;
- Overall, the project effectiveness is moderately satisfactory at micro and activity levels with limited to no high level or strategic impact.

7.3 Project Efficiency: Overall, the efficiency of SCDP varied from one area to the other at it can clearly be divided into three categories;

i) High Efficiency- Overall budget management was quite efficient whereby least variances between planned vs. actual expenditure were observed.

ii) Moderate Efficiency - Overall progress on planned vs. actual activities of AWP's were moderately efficient whereby efficiency of delivering planned activities planned were high in some years and areas (such as identification and mitigation of risk mechanism in 2017) whereas it was moderate to low in certain

areas and years (such as activities related to CISFCs, SDGs and Gender etc). Similarly, one of the aspects of partnership strategy that is, with CSOs is considerably efficient.

iii) Inadequate Efficiency- Some of the aspects of project implementation have limited efficiency with some identified gaps such as implementation arrangements and project board, M&E function and linkages and partnership within UNDP projects as well partnership strategy towards stakeholders other than CSOs.

7.4- Project Sustainability- Like many other key components of a project, there was no overall sustainability/exit plan for the project due to lack of a well document project plan and document. Apart from some components of the project such as MSDF, Deputy Mayors Club and mechanism of public hearings/RTI, overall sustainability of the major aspects of the project are assessed to be moderately unlikely.

7.5 Gender Equality & Vulnerable Group- Ensuring gender equality and focus on vulnerable groups were assessed to be the foundation of the project. Both at the design and implementation stages, gender empowerment and vulnerable groups were given considerable focus. Based on the data gathered and analyzed, it is evident that up to 50% of the overall beneficiaries that were directly outreached or engaged under various activities of the project were females.

7.6 Lessons Learned

- Lack of project design document and related results framework hindered overall linked and coherent progress of the project in terms of creating medium to high level strategic impact as well as contributing to CPD and UNDAF.
- Inadequate representation of external stakeholders in the Project Executive Board (PEB) limited neutral and independent evaluation and monitoring of the project
- Scattered geographical focus along with a range of outputs and activities hindered in achieving optimum level of efficiency in terms of project implementation
- Limited to no coordination between project team and provincial field offices reduced overall visibility and impact of UNDP's valuable work in the area of social cohesion and democratic governance
- Lack of projects sustainability and exit strategy resulted in reduced sustainability of the project to fewer components only

7.7 Recommendations

On the basis of the overall assessment, it is recommended that since project has a direct link with the CPD output 2.3 on broadening Civic space for engagement, voice and participation of youth, women and vulnerable groups at all levels, the project may continue with vigorous redesigning and planning with following key features:

- A well coherent and focused project document should be developed with well-designed results framework;
- The project design should both, integrate with the other project/interventions of the portfolio as well as it should enable/facilitate entry points for the larger Local Government Technical Assistance Programme;
- Project should only be focused on maximum 2 outputs with focused set of activities. Recommended areas include assisting local government in ensuring transparency and giving voice/access to vulnerable communities through means like public hearing, Multi Stakeholder Dialogue Forums; sharing best practices of transparency and bringing vulnerable communities closer to the government through means like Local Government/Mayors/Deputy Mayors Clubs; More focus on demand side by enabling and broadening voice of vulnerable communities through mechanism of RTI, public hearings and advocacy for more transparency and voice in decision making processes;
- Project implementation mechanism should be re-designed with multi stakeholders-based Project Executive Board, a project team that includes coordinated role of provincial field officers and a robust, neutral and multi-layer M&E mechanism.

ANNEXES

- UNDP (2019), ‘UNDP in Nepal- Annual Report 2018’, Nepal: UNDP,
- UNDP (2019), ‘SCDP- Summary Progress Report- January- August 2019,
- UNDP (2019), ‘SCDP- Q1 Progress Report’
- UNDP (2019), ‘Summary of Micro-Capital Grants 2019’
- UNDP (2019), ‘SCDP- Annual Work Plan 2019’
- UNDP (2019), ‘SCDP- Annual Progress Report 2018’, Nepal: UNDP
- UNDP (2019), ‘SCDP- Key Results 2018, Nepal: UNDP
- UNDP (2018), ‘SCDP- Annual Progress Report 2017’, Nepal: UNDP
- UNDP (2018), ‘SCDP- Annual Work Plan 2018’
- UNDP (2017), ‘SCDP- Annual Work Plan 2017’
- UNDP (2017), ‘Building Blocks of Social Ties, Nepal: UNDP
- UNDP (2017), ‘SCDP- Annual Progress Report 2016’, Nepal: UNDP
- UNDP (2017), ‘UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-21’, New York: UNDP
- UNDP (2017), ‘Nepal Country Programme 2018-2022’, New York: UN
- UN (2017), ‘2018-2022 United Nations Development Assistance Framework for Nepal’, New York: UN
- UNDP (2017), ‘Promoting Peaceful Environment, Federal, Provincial and Local Elections 2017’
- UNDP (2016), ‘SCDP- Annual Work Plan 2016’, Nepal: UNDP
- UNDP (2015) SCDP- Project Concept Note
- UN (2012), ‘United Nations Development Assistance Framework for Nepal 2013-17’, New York: UN
- UNDP (2012), ‘Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2013-17, New York: UN
- UNDP (2010), ‘Conflict Prevention Plan (CPP)- Project Document’, UNDP

Additional Documents/Material

News Stories, Videos, News Linkages available on SCDP website and Annex of Annual Report

ANNEX B Review Criteria & Questions Matrix Checklist– Social Cohesion and Democratic Participation (SCDP) project: Final Review 2019				
Review Criteria	Key questions specific sub-questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods/Tools	Indicators/Success Standard
Relevance/design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To what extent is the SCDP Project aligned with the country level priorities, policies and strategies on conflict prevention, social cohesion and democratic participation? ➤ To what extent is SCDP Project aligned with the CPD and UNDAF for Nepal? ➤ Do the Project outcomes address identifiable problems? ➤ Does the SCDP Project objectives consistent with the UN mandate and strategic plan? ➤ How relevant was the geographical coverage? ➤ How was the SCDP Project able to cater the needs of the beneficiaries in the changed context? Is there any evidence that the project advanced any key national human rights, gender or inclusion policies and the priorities of UN, UNDP, including the UNDAF? 	UNDP, Government Officials, Donors, CBOs/Implementation Partners, Beneficiaries (e.g. youth) Project documents	Key informant Interviews Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS) Document Review	Projects' results indicators Linkages with National Plans, UNDAF, CPD

Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To what extent are outputs and targets of SCDP project's results framework achieved? ➤ To what extent have the project objectives and outcomes, as set out in the Project Concept Note, project's Results Framework and other related documents, have been achieved? ➤ Are some components better achieved than others? ➤ What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the SCDP project outcomes? ➤ How effective has been the contribution of SCDP project to improving government ownership, planning and management capacity process towards social cohesion, conflict prevention and democratic governance? ➤ Are the SCDP objectives clearly stated and contribution to results measurable? ➤ Did women, men, youth and marginalized groups directly benefit from the Project's activities? If so, how and what was the impact? ➤ Were any changes made in the project regarding approach, partnerships, beneficiaries etc. suggested by project mid-point assessment, context/risk analysis? Did it affect project results? 	<p>UNDP, Government Officials, Donors, CBOs/Implementation Partners, Beneficiaries (e.g. youth)</p> <p>Project documents</p>	<p>Key informant Interviews</p> <p>Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS)</p> <p>FGDs</p> <p>Document Review</p>	<p>Overall Results Framework Indicators</p> <p>Varied Indicators in the AWPS 2016-2019</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ How successful have partnership arrangements been in contributing to sharing institutional capacity? ➤ What impact did the work of SCDP have on the democratic participation and civic engagement in the governance process in Nepal? Is there evidence of improvements for under-represented and/or disadvantaged segments of Nepali society? 			
Output 1 Improved social cohesion and community security in targeted conflictive areas for sustaining peace and sustainable development in Nepal (SDG 16.1)	<p>How many local/provincial risk identification and mitigation mechanisms established so far?</p> <p>What is the current status of these mechanisms? Are they sustained?</p> <p>Were there any shortcomings in achieving the targets?</p> <p>How many initiatives taken for mitigating conflict related risks at local/provincial level? What is the current status of these initiatives? Are they sustained and have they created any evident impact?</p> <p>Were there any shortcomings in achieving the targets?</p> <p>How can we rate the overall achievements under this output?</p> <p>What are the key success and challenging factor</p>	UNDP, Government Officials, Donors, CBOs/Implementation Partners, Beneficiaries (e.g. youth) Project documents	Key informant Interviews Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS) FGDs Document Review	<p>Indicator 1: # of active local/provincial risk identification and mitigation mechanisms</p> <p>Indicator 2: # of initiatives taken for mitigating conflict related risks at local/provincial level Target 1: 15 mechanism at the municipal levels (2018/2019)</p> <p>Target 2: 30 initiatives taken by</p>

				the mechanism (2018/2019)
Output 2 Increased access to public services in an inclusive, transparent and accountable manner for women, marginalized groups and vulnerable population.	<p>Is there any evidence that women, marginalized groups and vulnerable population have increased access to public services? If yes what are the key achievements</p> <p>How many initiatives taken by CBOs, women, youth and marginalized groups to enhance access to services and mutual accountability</p> <p>How many active community information and service facilitation Centers are established and operational?</p> <p>How many active RTI Networks at municipal level are established and operational?</p> <p>What is the current status of these initiatives? Are they sustained and have they created any evident impact?</p> <p>Were there any shortcomings in achieving the targets?</p> <p>How can we rate the overall achievements under this output?</p> <p>What are the key success and challenging factors?</p>	UNDP, Government Officials, Donors, CBOs/Implementation Partners, Beneficiaries (e.g. youth) Project documents	Key informant Interviews Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS) FGDs Document Review	<p>Indicator 1: Increase in % of women, marginalized groups and vulnerable population in accessing public services (Target 20% (2018))</p> <p>Indicator 2: # of initiatives taken by CBOs, women, youth and marginalized groups to enhance access to services and mutual accountability</p> <p>Target 2: 30 initiatives (2018/2019)</p> <p>Indicator 3: # of active community</p>

				<p>information and service facilitation Centres (Target 3: 12 (2018/2019))</p> <p>Indicator 4: # of active RTI Networks at municipal level Target 4: 15 (2018/2019)</p>
<p>Output 3 Civic space for engagement, voice and participation of youth, women and vulnerable groups broadened at all levels.</p>	<p>How many CSOs/CBOs using open platforms and networks to have an effective voice in subnational governance and decision-making processes</p> <p>How many young girls and boys engaged in volunteerism, and entrepreneurial initiatives? Any examples?</p> <p>What is the current status of these initiatives? Are they sustained and have they created any evident impact?</p> <p>Were there any shortcomings in achieving the targets?</p> <p>How can we rate the overall achievements under this output?</p> <p>What are the key success and challenging factors</p>	<p>UNDP, Government Officials, Donors, CBOs/Implementation Partners, Beneficiaries (e.g. youth) Project documents</p>	<p>Key informant Interviews Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS) FGDs Document Review</p>	<p>Indicator 1: # of CSOs/CBOs using open platforms and networks to have an effective voice in sub national governance and decision-making processes. (CPD) (15)</p> <p>Indicator 2: # of young girls and boys engaged in volunteerism, and entrepreneurial initiatives. (15)</p>

<p>Output 4</p> <p>Effective mechanisms and partnership for multi-stakeholder approaches to the Goals are created at the federal, provincial and local levels through SDG localization platforms. (SDG 17.17)</p>	<p>How many trainings and initiatives taken for government officials, local representatives, civil society members, and private sector to mainstream and develop better understanding of SDGs in their planning processes?</p> <p>What is the number of government officials, local representatives, civil society members, and private sector with better understanding of SDGs?</p> <p>What is the number of interventions implemented by local governments with engagement with the private sectors and other stakeholders in accordance with national development priorities</p> <p>What is the current status of these initiatives? Are they sustained and have they created any evident impact?</p> <p>Were there any shortcomings in achieving the targets?</p> <p>How can we rate the overall achievements under this output?</p> <p>What are the key success and challenging factors?</p>	<p>UNDP, Government Officials, Donors, CBOs/Implementation Partners, Beneficiaries (e.g. youth) Project documents</p>	<p>Key informant Interviews Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS) FGDs Document Review</p>	<p>Indicator 1: # of government officials, local representatives, civil society members, and private sector with better understanding of SDGs Target 1: 2000 relevant stakeholders get the orientation and understanding about SDGs Indicator 2: # of interventions implemented by local governments with engagement with the private sectors and other stakeholders in accordance with national development priorities Target 2: 10 intervention/events.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Output 5 Strengthened gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in targeted areas. (SDG 5)	<p>What is the number of women and adolescent girls benefited from career and skills development trainings and other entrepreneurial initiatives?</p> <p>What is the current status of these initiatives? Are they sustained and have they created any evident impact?</p> <p>Were there any shortcomings in achieving the targets?</p> <p>How can we rate the overall achievements under this output?</p> <p>What are the key success and challenging factors?</p> <p>Is there any evidence that shows decrease in % of cases of violence against girls and women in targeted areas? If yes, then what is the source?</p>	UNDP, Government Officials, Donors, CBOs/Implementation Partners, Beneficiaries (e.g. youth) Project documents	Key informant Interviews Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS) FGDs Document Review	<p>indicator 1: # of women and adolescent girls benefited from career and skills development trainings and other entrepreneurial initiatives</p> <p>Target 1: 500</p> <p>Indicator 2: Decrease in % of cases of violence against girls and women in targeted areas</p> <p>Target 2: 5% decrease</p>
Efficiency	➤ Are outputs achieved within expected cost and time?	UNDP, Donors, CBOs/Implementation Partners, Project documents	Key informant Interviews	Results Framework Indicators AWPs

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Could the activities and outputs have been delivered in fewer resources without reducing their quality and quantity? ➤ Is there major cost- or time-overruns or budget revisions? ➤ Is there a management or coordination mechanism for the partnership? ➤ How frequently and by what means is information shared within the Programme stakeholders? ➤ Are SCDP project objectives and strategies understood by staff? ➤ Are SCDP project objectives and strategies understood by partners? ➤ How many levels of decision making are involved in operational approval? ➤ To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time? ➤ Were the SCDP project inputs and benefits fairly distributed amongst different genders and communities while increasing access for the most vulnerable? What factors influenced decisions to fund certain proposed activities, and not others? ➤ To what extent did monitoring systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly? ➤ Were the risks identified in the project document or process the most important and the risk ratings applied appropriately 		Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS) Document Review	Planned vs. Actual Budget Allocation & utilization
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ How useful was the results framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it? ➤ To what extent did the coordination with other UNDP projects reduce transaction costs, optimize results and avoid duplication? 			
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ How sustainable has been the contribution of SCDP project to improving country level ownership, planning and management capacity? ➤ Was project sustainability strategy developed during the project design? ➤ How sustainable has been the SCDP project to improving efforts of social cohesion and democratic participation at country and local levels? ➤ How sustainable has been the contribution of SCDP project to improving country's performance in social cohesion and democratic participation? ➤ Is the SCDP project itself sustainable? (Financial, Institutional, Socio Economic and Resources etc) ➤ What indications are there that the outcomes will be sustained (systems, structures, staff, etc.)? ➤ To what extent has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key stakeholders of countries, been developed or implemented? 	UNDP, Donors, CBOs/Implementation Partners, Project documents	Key informant Interviews Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS) Document Review	Sustainability strategy Resource mobilization mechanism

	➤ To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support?			
Cross Cutting Issues	<p>To what extent and how effective the SCDP has mainstreamed and addressed cross cutting themes like human rights-based approach; gender equality; youth;</p> <p>To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the SCDP?</p> <p>Is the gender marker data assigned to this programme representative of reality?</p> <p>To what extent have the SCDP promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?</p>	UNDP, Government Officials, Donors, CBOs/Implementation Partners, Beneficiaries (e.g. youth) Project documents	Key informant Interviews Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS) FGDs Document Review	Programme Indicators on gender, youth and other vulnerable groups
UN Strategic Position & Partnership Strategy	<p>UN being one of many development partners operating in Nepal, are there any UN's overall comparative strengths or value addition,' vis-à-vis other development partners</p> <p>Do partner organizations share the same goals as the UN?</p> <p>How effective the UN partnership strategy and the partners are in providing added benefits for the SCDP to achieve overall outcomes and outputs</p>	UNDP, Donors, CBOs/Implementation Partners, Project documents	Key informant Interviews Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS) Document Review	

Questionnaire Based Survey- QBS

Name	Title, Department (if applicable)	Institution
Category of Stakeholder a) UNDP staff & Donors b) Implementation Partners c) Beneficiaries	Email Address	District

Introduction: The UNDP Nepal office is conducting a final project Review of ‘**Social Cohesion and Democratic Participation (SCDP) project**. It examines UNDP’s contribution to development results to ensure organizational learning and accountability. The Review is carried out by an independent international Review specialist.

You have been identified as one of the key stakeholders of the UNDP’s SCDP project in the country, and we would like to receive your feedback on your experience with UNDP-supported SCDP project. Your feedback is valuable and will be used as part of the overall analysis together with other information and data collected by the consultant. You will send the response directly to the consultant.

The survey questions are divided into three sections: A. *for UNDP Core staff/ project staff* B. *for Implementation Partners* and C. *For Beneficiaries*

BACKGROUND:

- Please identify the name of activity/workshop/initiative of SCDP on which you are providing your feedback (Risk Identification Mechanism, Risk Mitigation Mechanism, RTI, Service Centers etc):

- 1) _____
- 2) _____

A. QUESTIONS FOR UNDP CORE STAFF/ PROJECT STAFF

1. RELEVANCE:

1.1 To what extent is the SCDP Project aligned with the country level priorities, policies and strategies on conflict prevention, social cohesion and democratic participation?

1.2 To what extent is SCDP Project aligned with the CPD and UNDAF for Nepal?

1.3 Do the Project outcomes address identifiable problems of Nepal?

1.4 How relevant was the geographical coverage considering the nature of conflict prevention context of the project?

1.5 How was the SCDP Project able to cater the needs of the beneficiaries in the changed context? Is there any evidence that the project advanced any key national human rights, gender or inclusion policies and the priorities of UN, UNDP, including the UNDAF?

2. EFFECTIVENESS:

2.1 To what extent are outputs and targets of SCDP project's results framework achieved?

2.2 To what extent have the project objectives and outcomes, as set out in the Project Concept Note other related documents, have been achieved?

2.3 Are some components better achieved than others?

2.4 What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the SCDP project outcomes?

2.5 How effective has been the contribution of SCDP project to improving government ownership, planning and management capacity process towards social cohesion, conflict prevention and democratic governance?

2.6 Are the SCDP objectives clearly stated and contribution to results measurable?

2.7 Did women, men, youth and marginalized groups directly benefit from the Project's activities? If so, how and what was the impact?

2.8 Were any changes made in the project regarding approach, partnerships, beneficiaries etc. suggested by project mid-point assessment, context/risk analysis? Did it affect project results?

2.9 How successful have partnership arrangements been in contributing to sharing institutional capacity?

2.10 What impact did the work of SCDP have on the democratic participation and civic engagement in the governance process in Nepal? Is there evidence of improvements for under-represented and/or disadvantaged segments of Nepali society?

3. EFFICIENCY:

3.1 **Managerial and operational efficiency:**

- a) Has the project been implemented **within expected dates, costs estimates**? Were there any deviations? If yes, Why?
- b) Has UNDP taken prompt actions to solve implementation and other operational issues? What is the current **project management structure** (incl. reporting structure; **oversight** responsibility)? What has worked/ not worked in this structure?
- c) How often and how have the **monitoring and evaluation** activities been conducted? How are the results reported to UNDP programme units, donors and other partners? What worked, or did not work, and why?

3.2 Programmatic efficiency:

- a) Were the **financial resources and approaches** (conceptual framework) envisaged appropriate to achieving planned objectives?
- b) Were the resources focused on a set of activities that were expected to produce significant results (**prioritization**)? Has the project achieved ‘value for money’?
- c) Were there any efforts to **ensure ‘synergies’** among various projects within UNDP (and those with other partners)? Explain results, and contributing factors.
- d) Have **alternative approaches and ‘innovative’ solutions** been actively explored? What could be done to ensure the overall efficiency of the UNDP project?
- e) Were the SCDP project inputs and benefits fairly distributed amongst different genders and communities while increasing access for the most vulnerable? What factors influenced decisions to fund certain proposed activities, and not others?

4. SUSTAINABILITY:

4.1 How sustainable has been the contribution of SCDP project to improving country level ownership, planning and management capacity?

4.2 Was project sustainability strategy developed during the project design?

4.3 How sustainable has been the SCDP project to improving efforts of social cohesion and democratic participation at country and local levels?

- Is the SCDP project itself sustainable? (Financial, Institutional, Socio Economic and Resources etc)
- What indications are there that the outcomes will be sustained (systems, structures, staff, etc.)?

- To what extent has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key stakeholders of countries, been developed or implemented?

B. FOR IMPLEMENTATION PARTNERS

5. Which area of the SCDP project your organization partnered with the UNDP?

- Improved social cohesion and community security in targeted conflictive areas
- Increased access to public services in an inclusive, transparent and accountable manner for women, marginalized groups and vulnerable population
- Civic space for engagement, voice and participation of youth, women and vulnerable groups broadened at all levels.
- Effective mechanisms and partnership for multi-stakeholder approaches to the Goals are created at the federal, provincial and local levels through SDG localization
- Strengthened gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in targeted areas.

6. What was your organization's role in the SCDP project?

7. What are the key achievements of your activities under the SCDP project?

8. Were the SCDP objectives, outcomes, outputs and targets fully explained to your organization before the start of the partnership/initiative?

9. Were there any shortcomings in achieving the set targets? If yes, then what are the main factors behind it?

10. UNDP is one of many development partners operating in the country. What is your view on UNDP's performance (or contribution) in the following areas, and why:

10.1 Overall **responsiveness** to emerging priorities and needs of Nepal in the area of enhancing social cohesion and democratic participation

10.2 Ability to **influence national-level development policies** (e.g. SDGs) with its technical knowledge and expertise in thematic areas.

10.3 Contribution to the following **5 results area of the project**

- Improved social cohesion and community security in targeted conflictive areas

- Increased access to public services in an inclusive, transparent and accountable manner for women, marginalized groups and vulnerable population
- Civic space for engagement, voice and participation of youth, women and vulnerable groups broadened at all levels.
- Effective mechanisms and partnership for multi-stakeholder approaches to the Goals are created at the federal, provincial and local levels through SDG localization
- Strengthened gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in targeted areas.

i) Highly Effective ii) Effective iii) moderately Effective iv) Not effective

10.4 Ability to **lead other development partners** on important issues?

10.5 Ability to **coordinate and establish effective partnerships and networks** with relevant partners (e.g., CSOs, private sector, UN agencies, donors, academic/research institutions).

10.6 Ability to integrate **gender and human rights** issues **into its programmes**. Examples?

10.7 What are UNDP's overall '**comparative strengths**, 'value added,' vis-à-vis other development partners, if any?

10.8 What are the key challenges (if any) face by your organization as implementation partner with UNDP and/or project itself

11. Do you have any recommendations for the way forward?

C. FOR BENEFICIARIES

12. Under which of the following area of the SCDP project you participated

- Risk identification and mitigation mechanisms
- Increased access to public services through
 - i) Community information and service facilitation Centers
 - ii) RTI networks
 - iii) Any other initiative:
- Broadened Civic space for engagement, voice and participation of youth, women and vulnerable groups broadened at all levels through
 - i) CSOs/CBOs using open platforms and networks

ii) Volunteerism and entrepreneurial initiatives

- Training, orientation sessions etc for the understanding about SDGs
- Strengthened gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in targeted areas through career and skills development trainings and other entrepreneurial initiatives

13. What are the dates and venue of the activity you participated under the SCDP project?

14. Were the objectives, learning outcomes and benefits of the initiative/activities fully explained to you before the start of the activity/initiative?

15. Could you provide details on what was the main learning & benefit of the initiative and how did it bring any change in your post participation scenario?

16. What is the level of your satisfaction from the benefits of the activity/initiative of the project?

i) Highly Satisfied ii) satisfied iii) moderately Satisfied iv) Not satisfied

18. Were there any components/parts of the initiative that required improvement or were there any shortcomings in the initiative?

19. How did you contribute in your related community/family/career through the learning of the initiatives, you participated in?

20. Was there any continued follow up by the UNDP/Implementation partners after the completion of the initiative/activity

Do you have any recommendations for the way forward?

DATE	DAY	ACTIVITY	Stakeholder
18 th November, 2019	Monday	Skype meeting	UNDP Team + OA
19 th – 21 st November, 2019	Tuesday– Thursday	Desk Review and Document Analysis	OA
22- 25 th November, 2019	Friday-Monday	Development of Inception Report and Methodology	OA
25 th November, 2019	Monday	Submission of the Inception Report	OA
27 th November 2019	Wednesday	Feedback from team on the Inception Report and field activity plan	OA
25 th – 29 th November	Monday- Friday	Circulation of Questionnaire Based Survey to UNDP project staff in districts, IPs & beneficiaries	UNDP
4 th -11 th December 2019	Wednesday-Wednesday	Data Analysis Phase I	OA
17 th - 20 th December	Tuesday-Friday	Field Mission, data analysis and compilation of draft report ⁴	UNDP/OA
24 th December 2019	Wednesday	Submission of Draft Report	OA
27 th December 2019	Friday	Feedback on Draft Report	UNDP
30 th December 2019	Monday	Submission of Final Report	OA

⁴ Details of field mission in the next section

Time	Visiting Persons and Organizations	Venue	Remarks
Tuesday, 17 December			
15:35	Arrived and transfer to Hotel		
Wednesday, 18 December			
09:00-10:00	Tek Tamata, Portfolio Manager, UNDP	UNDP Country Office	Completed
10:00-11:00	Yam Nath Sharma, Policy Advisor, Governance, Assistant RR, UNDP	UNDP Country Office	Completed
11:30-12:30	Bernardo Cocco, Deputy RR	UNDP Country Office	Completed
12:45-13:45	Lunch Meeting with Youbaraj Acharya, NTTP	NTTP	Completed
14:00-15:00	Bhasker Kafle, NPM, SCDP Meeting	UNDP Country Office	Completed
15:30-16:30	Vijaya Singh, Policy Advisor, Resilience and Disaster Preparedness, Assistant RR, UNDP	UNDP Country Office	Completed
Thursday, 19 December			
09:30-10:30	Dinesh Bista, Bal Ram Poudel	UNDP Country Office	Completed
13:00-14:00	Meeting SCDP Field Partners--FGD	SCDP office	Completed
14:30-15:30	Stine Heiselberg, Head of RC Office	RC Office	Completed
16:00-17:00	Joint Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs	MOHA office	Completed
17:30	SCDP staff members including provincial coordinators	SCDP office	Completed
Friday, 20 December			
09:00-10:00	Debrief with the senior management		Completed



UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

TERMS OF REFERENCE

I. Consultancy Information

Title: International/National Consultant as Team Leader for the Review of the Social Cohesion and Democratic Participation Project (SCDP)

No. of position: One

Project : Social Cohesion and Democratic Participation Project

Reports to : Tek Tamata Portfolio Manager, UNDP

Duty Station : Kathman

Expected Places of Travel (if applicable): visits to one or two provinces if and as required. The travel cost for field visit will be paid by UNDP on actual basis and DSA will be paid as per UN rate.

Duration of Assignment: 20 working days, starting from 15 October 2019 to 15 November 2019

PROVISION OF SUPPORT SERVICES:

Office space	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Equipment (laptop etc.)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Secretarial Services	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

II. Background

National Context:

Nepal has made significant progress over the last few years in institutionalizing democracy by making a swift transition from the unitary to the federal system of governance. After the first Constituent Assembly (CA) was not able to promulgate the new constitution, the house was dissolved and the elections for the second CA held in November 2013. The second CA promulgated the Constitution in September 2015.

After promulgation of the new constitution in late 2015, Nepal experienced an upsurge of discontents coupled with mistrust among communities based on their ethnic identities, political beliefs and regional identities regarding the federal restructuring and equitable participation. Confrontational politics and spiraling tensions created deep and widespread social rifts that have the risk of being overplayed during the transition to federalism and implementation of the new constitution. There are very much concerned about few of the issues related to the identity, citizenship, proportional representation of the marginalized communities in state machineries and demarcation of the provinces.

Building on the program achievements already put in place by the previous project called Conflict Prevention Programme (CPP), and effectively responding to the new political context of Nepal, UNDP Nepal initiated Social Cohesion and Democratic Participation Programme (SCDP) in September 2015.

SCDP's work is divided into two distinct pillars; one focused on Risk Identification and the other on Risk Mitigation. The Risk Identification pillar consists of an Early Warning initiative with Near-term and Medium/Long-term components. The Risk Mitigation pillar encompasses three distinct initiatives that, taken together, form a comprehensive approach to addressing localized tensions and keep the social fabric intact. Both pillars are shaped by a cross-cutting Gender and Social Inclusion (GESI) and Conflict Sensitivity approaches that ensure that processes are socially inclusive and equipped to navigate the socio-political complexities of local environments. Besides its activities at the national level, the SCDP works in select provinces and districts that are vulnerable to confrontational politics or ethnic, social or religious tensions.

So far the achievements are concerned, the Project successfully rolled-out micro grant's for community-based organizations as 52 quick impact projects that brought together marginalized groups with history of hostilities and mistrusts for mutually beneficial collective actions such as livelihood activities and facilitating access to government services. More than 108,000 youths,

women, marginalized groups, CSOs members, government officials, elected representatives, political leaders and journalists engaged in promotion of social cohesion with more than 550 community level initiatives through various mechanisms formed by the project such as Social Cohesion and Community security mechanism, Right to Information Networks, Youth Volunteers Group and Community Service Facilitation Centers. Furthermore, the SCDP contributed in creating a peaceful environment for the timely administration of elections through a range of activities. 1,704 political leaders, CSOs leaders, and government officials were directly engaged in electoral violence prevention dialogue and consultations where 36% of participants were women. 56 forum theater shows were conducted in 10 districts, and audio and video Public Service Announcements (PSAs) were broadcasted throughout Nepal to promote peaceful elections. After few years of the violent incident in Tikapur, both the rival communities (*Tharu and Pahadi*) leaders sat together for the first time to form a collaborative committee on social cohesion. The committee decentralized and have formed similar committees at the community level to build mutual trust. Mechanisms supported by this project contributed for timely and effective community acts to mitigate emerging risks and consolidating social cohesion by moderating and neutralizing inter-religious and inter-ethnic tensions between ethnic and ideological groups.

Project Description

SCDP aims to help address socio-political tensions emerging from Nepal's transition to federalism and ensure harmonious implementation of the constitution. Social cohesion should be an integral part of resilience-based development efforts and is a precondition for good governance. Strengthening social cohesion requires a long-term approach. This includes capacity building of communities; cooperative actions among communities; and support the government and civil society organizations to develop and adjust policies for promoting social cohesion. SCDP brings communities together, promoting inter-community goodwill and increasing ownership of people in the political process which are going to be key for Nepal to achieve Sustainable Development Goals. The core goal of the project is to reinforce the establishment of a more socially cohesive society and avoid the escalation of social and political tensions. And the specific objectives are given as follows:

- Support the Government of Nepal, local authorities, and key stakeholders to strengthen social cohesion during the initial roll-out of a new federal arrangements and broader implementation of a new constitution
- Promote multi-sectorial mechanisms to enhance democratic participation and good governance in provincial and local governance and development processes

And the outputs of the Project are the following:

- **Improved social cohesion and community security in targeted conflictive areas for sustaining peace and sustainable development in Nepal:** Under this output, the project

conducts conflict analysis and support social cohesion and community security mechanisms at the community level. Furthermore, the project also conducts provincial and national level dialogue and consultations on contentious/disputed issues.

- **Increased access to public services in an inclusive, transparent and accountable manner for women, marginalized groups and vulnerable population:** SCDP Supports Community Information and Service Facilitation Centers (CISFC)/RTI networks/youth networks for promoting social accountability and service delivery through various interventions at local level Conduct training on Social Accountability Tools (SAT) for youth and the representatives of CSOs, local cooperative for enhancing service delivery and mutual accountability.
- **Civic space for engagement, voice and inclusive participation of youth, women and vulnerable groups broadened at the local level:** The Project implements initiatives aimed at broadening civic space for engagement, voice and inclusive democratic participation of youth, women and vulnerable groups and also supports local initiatives to strengthen citizen participation and collaboration in decision-making processes and community development activities. In addition, it conducts the dialogue among youth, women, vulnerable communities and businessmen or enterprises to create enabling environment for inclusive participation in entrepreneurial sectors.
- **Effective mechanisms and partnership for multi-stakeholder approaches to the Goals are created at the provincial and local levels to sustaining peace:** The Project supports in the implementation of the initiatives with civil society organizations focusing on targeted pocket area of poverty and deprivation with the principal of "Leaving no one behind". It also conducts national and provincial multi stakeholder (including academic discourses) for promoting partnership for achieving SDGs and sustaining peace.
- **Women's participation in peace and security issues is enhanced through their political and economic empowerment:** The Project support to implement the UNDP regional hub's initiative on women peace and security agenda (N-Peace Initiative) in Nepal. To effectively respond to the victim and outreach to the community to prevent GBV/VAW/DV and sexually abused cases hip and decision-making, SCDP conducts training with different marginalized and vulnerable groups/networks.

The duration of SCDP is from 2016 to till 2019 and the total budget is USD US\$ 2,209,745. The Project is implemented by UNDP under the Direct Implementation Modality and in partnership with the local government and CSOs.

III. Objectives

Since SCDP is coming to an end in December 2019, the project review is being carried out to assess the progress made by the project against the project outputs and indicators. In-depth

analysis will be needed to review the results achieved under eight project activities as outlined in the project document.

The review should look into the relevance, sustainability, effectiveness and efficiency of the assistance provided by SCDP during the project cycle.

The analysis and recommendations presented by the review mission will be useful to UNDP in measuring the contributions made by the project and in designing future interventions for strengthening social cohesion in Nepal.

The specific objectives of the review are the following:

- To assess and evaluate the progress made by the project towards an attainment of the results as specified in the project monitoring and evaluation framework, UNDAF and CPD;
- To measure the contributions made by the project in enhancing the accountability, effectiveness, efficiency and inclusiveness of democratic system and processes with focus on elections;
- To assess the sustainability of the project interventions;
- To examine the cost efficiency and effectiveness of SCDP assistance to document main lessons learned, best practices and propose recommendations, and
- To suggest the way forward for future of the project.

IV. Methodology/Responsibilities

The review team will consist of one international team leader and one national expert. The team is expected to apply the following approaches for data collection and analysis:

- Desk review of relevant documents (work plan, progress reports, event reports etc.);
- Briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP as well as with other partners;
- Interviews with partners and stakeholders (including gathering the information on what the partners have achieved with regard to the outcome and what strategies they have used); etc.
- Field visits to selected project sites and discussions with project teams, project beneficiaries and major stakeholders (as deemed necessary);
- Consultation meetings.

Evaluation Questions

Relevance:

- To what extent SCDP technical and operational assistance were relevant in addressing the meeting the objectives of the project?
- To what extent the project was able to cater the needs of the beneficiaries in the changed context? Is there any evidence that the project advanced any key national human rights, gender or inclusion policies and the priorities of UN, UNDP, including the UNDAF?
- How relevant was the geographical coverage?

Effectiveness:

- How effective has the project been in enhancing social cohesion?
- Has the project achieved its outputs? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the outputs?
- Did women, men, PWD, youth and marginalized groups directly benefit from the Project 's activities? If so, how and what was the impact?
- Were any changes made in the project regarding approach, partnerships, beneficiaries etc. suggested by project mid-point assessment, context/risk analysis? Did it affect project results?

Efficiency:

- To what extent have resources (financial, human, institutional and technical) been allocated strategically?
- Could the activities and outputs have been delivered in fewer resources without reducing their quality and quantity?
- Were the project inputs and benefits fairly distributed amongst different genders and communities while increasing access for the most vulnerable? What factors influenced decisions to fund certain proposed activities, and not others?
- To what extent did the coordination with other UN agencies and UNDP projects reduce transaction costs, optimize results and avoid duplication?

Impact:

- What impact did the work of SCDP have on the democratic participation and civic engagement in the governance process in Nepal? Is there evidence of improvements for under-represented and/or disadvantaged segments of Nepali society?

Sustainability:

- Have SCDP interventions enhanced managing local issues = for sustainable peace?

Gender and Social Inclusion:

- The review should assess to what degree was the project sensitive to gender and social inclusion

V. Expected Results/Deliverables

Target Groups and Stakeholder Coverage

- Beneficiaries of the project at local community level;
- National level stakeholders: Ministry of Home Affairs, UNRC Office, UN Women and UNDP projects
- Other stakeholders: Sub-metropolitan city, rural and urban municipalities, and civil society organizations.

The tentative schedule will be the following:

Planned Activities	Tentative Days	Timeline			
		15 Oct- 15 Nov.			
Desk review and preparation of design (home based)	1 day				
Briefing by Development Partner/UNDP	1 day				
Finalizing design, methods & inception report and sharing with reference group for feedback	2 days				
Stakeholders meetings and interviews	4 days				
Field visit(s) outside Kathmandu	4 days				
Analysis, preparation of draft report, presentation of draft findings	5 days				
Stakeholder meeting to present draft findings	1 day				

Finalize and submit report (Home Based) and review brief	2 days				
Total	20 days				

Specifically, the team leader will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the review mission;
- Design the detailed scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis) for the report;
- Decide the division of labor within the team;
- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the review described above) for the report;
- Contribute to and ensure overall quality of the outputs and final report.

The Review Team should deliver the following outputs:

- Inception report detailing the reviewer's understanding of what is being reviewed, why it is being reviewed, and how (methodology) it will be reviewed. The inception report should also include a proposed schedule of tasks, evaluation tools, activities and deliverables.
- Start of mission debriefing/meeting on proposed methodology, design and work plan;
- Presentation of the inception report to the Reference Group, including UNDP, potential development partners and SCDP;
- An exit presentation on findings and initial recommendations;
- Final report within 30 days of the start date with sufficient detail and quality and incorporating relevant comments from the stakeholder meeting together with annexes and working papers as required

The reports to include, but not be limited to, the following components:

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the review methodology
- Political and development context
- Key findings
- Lessons learned
- Recommendations
- Annexes: mission report including field visits, list of interviewees, and list of documents reviewed.

The review team is required to discuss the full draft of its report prior to departure from Nepal.

Implementation Arrangements

To facilitate the review process, UNDP will assist in connecting the review team with concerned officials of the local implementing partners and key stakeholders. In addition, UNDP will provide operational support in organizing meetings and field visits, if necessary.

Key project materials will be sent before the field work and will be reviewed by the team prior to the commencement of the field work. The review team will prepare and share the draft inception report before the field mission. The review team will be briefed by UNDP upon arrival on the objectives, purpose and output of the project evaluation. An oral debriefing in-country by the review team on the proposed work plan and methodology will be done and approved prior to the commencement of the review process.

The review team will assess the project based on interviews undertaken, discussions and consultations with all relevant stakeholders or interested parties and review of project documents. As a minimum indication, the review team should consult with implementing partners, other key government stakeholders, development partners and civil society representatives. UNDP will provide guidance in identifying, contacting and arranging for discussions, meetings with the stakeholders as required.

A mission wrap-up meeting during which comments from participants will be noted for incorporation in the final review report.

Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

Consultant must send a financial proposal based on Daily Fee. Consultant shall quote an all-inclusive Daily Fee for the contract period. The term “all-inclusive” implies that all costs (professional fees, communications, consumables, etc.) that could be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment are already factored into the daily fee submitted in the proposal. If applicable, travel or daily allowance cost (if any work is to be done outside the IC’s duty station) should be identified separately.

In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources

In the event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

Schedule of payments

- 20% payment after finalization of inception report following presentation to reference group and incorporation of relevant comments
- 40% payment upon submission of the draft report, and
- 40% payment after submission of final report.

Documentation required

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications. Please group them into **one (1) single PDF document**:

- **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided in Annex II.
- **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
- **Financial proposal**, as per template provided in Annex II.

Incomplete proposals **may** not be considered.

Annexes

- Annex I - [Individual IC General Terms and Conditions](#)
- Annex II – [Offeror's Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual IC, including Financial Proposal Template](#)

For any clarification regarding this assignment please write to rbap.icroster@undp.org

VI. Consultant Qualifications

Education:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master's degree in Conflict, Management or Administration with substantive knowledge
------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Experience and required skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5-7 years of extensive experience with leading development project evaluations and review using the norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group or their equivalent. • At least 10 years of experience in the area of peace building, conflict management and good technical understanding of a variety of fields within peace building, public outreach, training, information technology, gender and inclusion. • Sound knowledge of results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation) • Previous work experience working on peace building and social conflict management • Ability to manage a team and ensure quality of a team output • Fluency in English with demonstrated ability to write flawless English and requested to submit examples of English-language evaluations s/he have led.
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

VII. OTHER SELECTION CRITERIA

The consultant should have the following competencies:

- Excellent organizational and time management skills;
- Excellent leadership skills including dealing with people of multi-disciplinary backgrounds to deliver quality products in high stress or short deadline situations;
- Strong interpersonal skills, ability to work on own initiative and work as part of the team.

Evaluation Method and Criteria

The candidates will be evaluated based on the cumulative analysis methodology.

The award of the contract shall be made to the candidate whose offer has been evaluated and determined as;

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable;

- b) having received the highest score out of set of weighted technical criteria (70%) and financial criteria (30%).

Financial score shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal received by UNDP for the assignment.

Technical Criteria for Evaluation (Maximum 70 points):

- Criteria 1: Education – Max 10 points (10 pts – PhD degree; 5 pts – Master’s degree)
- Criteria 2: Relevant professional experience - Max 20 Points (20 pts – above 12 years; 15 pts – 10 to 12 years; 10 pts – 8 to 10 years);
- Criteria 3: Language skills – Max 5 points (5pts - native English speaker)
- Criteria 4: Knowledge and experience about Nepal – Max 10 points (10 pts - work or consultancy experience in Nepal; 5pts – experience in other Asia Pacific countries)
- Criteria 5: Proposed methodology to undertake the assignment – Max 25 Points (25 pts – fully understand the task, logical and reachable; 15 pts - get sense of the task, basically meet the requirement; 5 pts – rough and unclear)

General Conditions of Contract & Code of Conduct

GENERAL CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT

FOR THE SERVICES OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTORS



1. LEGAL STATUS: The Individual contractor shall have the legal status of an independent contractor vis-à-vis the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and shall not be regarded, for any purposes, as being either a "staff member" of UNDP, under the UN Staff Regulations and Rules, or an "official" of UNDP, for purposes of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 13 February 1946. Accordingly, nothing within or relating to the Contract shall establish the relationship of employer and employee, or of principal and agent, between UNDP and the Individual contractor. The officials, representatives, employees or subcontractors of UNDP and of the Individual contractor, if any, shall not be considered in any respect as being the employees or agents of the other, and UNDP and the Individual contractor shall be solely responsible for all claims arising out of or relating to their engagement of such persons or entities.

2. STANDARDS OF CONDUCT: In General: The Individual contractor shall neither seek nor accept instructions from any authority external to UNDP in connection with the performance of his or her obligations under the Contract. Should any authority external to UNDP seek to impose any instructions regarding the Individual contractor's performance under the Contract, the Individual contractor shall promptly notify UNDP and shall provide all reasonable assistance required by UNDP. The Individual contractor shall not take any action in respect of his or her performance of the Contract or otherwise related to his or her obligations under the Contract that may adversely affect the interests of UNDP. The Individual contractor shall perform his or her obligations under the Contract with the fullest regard to the interests of UNDP. The Individual contractor warrants that s/he or he has not and shall not offer any direct or indirect benefit arising from or related to the performance of the Contract or the award thereof to any representative, official, employee or other agent of UNDP. The Individual contractor shall comply with all laws, ordinances, rules and regulations bearing upon the performance of his or her obligations under the Contract. In the performance of the Contract the Individual contractor shall comply with the standards of conduct set in the Secretary General's Bulletin ST/SGB/2002/9 of 18 June 2002, entitled "Regulations Governing the Status, Basic Rights and Duties of Officials other than Secretariat Officials, and Expert on Mission". The Individual contractor must comply with all security directives issued by UNDP.

Prohibition of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse: In the performance of the Contract, the Individual contractor shall comply with the standards of conduct set forth in the Secretary-General's bulletin ST/SGB/2003/13 of 9 October 2003, concerning "Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and sexual abuse". In particular, the Individual contractor shall not engage in any conduct that would constitute sexual exploitation or sexual abuse, as defined in that bulletin.

The Individual contractor acknowledges and agrees that any breach of any of the provisions hereof shall constitute a breach of an essential term of the Contract, and, in addition to any other legal rights or remedies available to any person, shall give rise to grounds for suspension or termination of the Contract. In addition, nothing herein shall limit the right of UNDP to refer any alleged breach of the foregoing standards of conduct or any other terms of the Contract to the relevant national authorities for appropriate legal action.

3. TITLE RIGHTS, COPYRIGHTS, PATENTS AND OTHER PROPRIETARY RIGHTS: Title to any equipment and supplies that may be furnished by UNDP to the Individual contractor for the performance of any obligations under the Contract shall rest with UNDP, and any such equipment and supplies shall be returned to UNDP at the conclusion of the Contract or when no longer needed by the Individual contractor. Such equipment and supplies, when returned to UNDP, shall be in the same condition as when delivered to the Individual contractor, subject to normal wear and tear, and the Individual contractor shall be liable to compensate UNDP for any damage or degradation of the equipment and supplies that is beyond normal wear and tear.

UNDP shall be entitled to all intellectual property and other proprietary rights, including, but not limited to, patents, copyrights and trademarks, with regard to products, processes, inventions, ideas, know-how or documents and other materials which the Individual contractor has developed for UNDP under the Contract and which bear a direct relation to, or are produced or prepared or collected in consequence of, or during the course of, the performance of the Contract, and the Individual contractor acknowledges and agrees that such products, documents and other materials constitute works made for hire for UNDP. However, to the extent that any such intellectual property or other proprietary rights consist of any intellectual property or other proprietary rights of the Individual contractor: (a) that pre-existed the performance by the Individual

contractor of his or her obligations under the Contract, or (b) that the Individual contractor may develop or acquire, or may have developed or acquired, independently of the performance of his or her obligations under the Contract, UNDP does not and shall not claim any ownership interest thereto, and the Individual contractor grants to UNDP a perpetual license to use such intellectual property or other proprietary right solely for the purposes of and in accordance with the requirements of the Contract. At the request of UNDP, the Individual contractor shall take all necessary steps, execute all necessary documents and generally assist in securing such proprietary rights and transferring or licensing them to UNDP in compliance with the requirements of the applicable law and of the Contract. Subject to the foregoing provisions, all maps, drawings, photographs, mosaics, plans, reports, estimates, recommendations, documents and all other data compiled by or received by the Individual contractor under the Contract shall be the property of UNDP, shall be made available for use or inspection by UNDP at reasonable times and in reasonable places, shall be treated as confidential and shall be delivered only to UNDP authorized officials on completion of services under the Contract.

4. CONFIDENTIAL NATURE OF DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION: Information and data that are considered proprietary by either UNDP or the Individual contractor or that are delivered or disclosed by one of them ("Discloser") to the other ("Recipient") during the course of performance of the Contract, and that are designated as confidential ("Information"), shall be held in confidence and shall be handled as follows. The Recipient of such Information shall use the same care and discretion to avoid disclosure, publication or dissemination of the Discloser's Information as it uses with its own similar information that it does not wish to disclose, publish or disseminate, and the Recipient may otherwise use the Discloser's Information solely for the purpose for which it was disclosed. The Recipient may disclose confidential Information to any other party with the Discloser's prior written consent, as well as to the Recipient's officials, representatives, employees, subcontractors and agents who have a need to know such confidential Information solely for purposes of performing obligations under the Contract. Subject to and without any waiver of the privileges and immunities of UNDP, the Individual contractor may disclose Information to the extent required by law, provided that the Individual contractor will give UNDP sufficient prior notice of a request for the disclosure of Information in order to allow UNDP to have a reasonable opportunity to take protective measures or such other action as may be appropriate before any such disclosure is made. UNDP may disclose Information to the extent required pursuant to the Charter of the United Nations, resolutions or regulations of the General Assembly or its other governing bodies, or rules promulgated by the Secretary-General. The Recipient shall not be precluded from disclosing Information that is obtained by the Recipient from a third party without restriction, is disclosed by the Discloser to a third party without any obligation of confidentiality, is previously known by the Recipient, or at any time is developed by the Recipient completely independently of any disclosures hereunder. These obligations and restrictions of confidentiality shall be effective during the term of the Contract, including any extension thereof, and, unless otherwise provided in the Contract, shall remain effective following any termination of the Contract. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Individual contractor acknowledges that UNDP may, in its sole discretion, disclose the purpose, type, scope, duration and value of the Contract, the name of the Individual contractor, and any relevant information related to the award of the Contract.

5. TRAVEL, MEDICAL CLEARANCE AND SERVICE INCURRED DEATH, INJURY OR ILLNESS: If the Individual contractor is required by UNDP to travel beyond commuting distance from the Individual contractor's usual place of residence, and upon prior written agreement, such travel shall be at the expense of UNDP. Such travel shall be at economy fare when by air.

UNDP may require the Individual contractor to submit a "statement of good health" from a recognized physician prior to commencement of services in any offices or premises of UNDP, or before engaging in any travel required by UNDP, or connected with the performance of the Contract. The Individual contractor shall provide such a statement as soon as practicable following such request, and prior to engaging in any such travel, and the Individual contractor warrants the accuracy of any such statement, including, but not limited to, confirmation that the Individual contractor has been fully informed regarding the requirements for inoculations for the country or countries to which travel may be authorized.

In the event of death, injury or illness of the Individual contractor which is attributable to the performance of services on behalf of UNDP under the terms of the Contract while the Individual contractor is traveling at UNDP expense or is

General Conditions of Contract & Code of Conduct

performing any services under the Contract in any offices or premises of UNDP, the Individual contractor or the Individual contractor's dependents, as appropriate, shall be entitled to compensation equivalent to that provided under the UNDP insurance policy, available upon request.

6. PROHIBITION ON ASSIGNMENT; MODIFICATIONS: The Individual contractor may not assign, delegate, transfer, pledge or make any other disposition of the Contract, of any part thereof, or of any of the rights, claims or obligations under the Contract except with the prior written authorization of UNDP, and any attempt to do so shall be null and void. The terms or conditions of any supplemental undertakings, licenses or other forms of Contract concerning any goods or services to be provided under the Contract shall not be valid and enforceable against UNDP nor in any way shall constitute a contract by UNDP thereto, unless any such undertakings, licenses or other forms of contract are the subject of a valid written undertaking by UNDP. No modification or change in the Contract shall be valid and enforceable against UNDP unless provided by means of a valid written amendment to the Contract signed by the Individual contractor and an authorized official or appropriate contracting authority of UNDP.

7. SUBCONTRACTORS: In the event that the Individual contractor requires the services of subcontractors to perform any obligations under the Contract, the Individual contractor shall obtain the prior written approval of UNDP for any such subcontractors. UNDP may, in its sole discretion, reject any proposed subcontractor or require such subcontractor's removal without having to give any justification therefore, and such rejection shall not entitle the Individual contractor to claim any delays in the performance, or to assert any excuses for the non-performance, of any of his or her obligations under the Contract. The Individual contractor shall be solely responsible for all services and obligations performed by his or her subcontractors. The terms of any subcontract shall be subject to, and shall be construed in a manner that is fully in accordance with, all of the terms and conditions of the Contract.

8. USE OF NAME, EMBLEM OR OFFICIAL SEAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS: The Individual contractor shall not advertise or otherwise make public for purposes of commercial advantage or goodwill that it has a contractual relationship with UNDP, nor shall the Individual contractor, in any manner whatsoever, use the name, emblem or official seal of UNDP, or any abbreviation of the name of UNDP, in connection with his or her business or otherwise without the written permission of UNDP.

9. INDEMNIFICATION: The Individual contractor shall indemnify, defend, and hold and save harmless UNDP, and its officials, agents and employees, from and against all suits, proceedings, claims, demands, losses and liability of any kind or nature, including, but not limited to, all litigation costs and expenses, attorney's fees, settlement payments and damages, based on, arising from, or relating to: (a) allegations or claims that the use by UNDP of any patented device, any copyrighted material or any other goods or services provided to UNDP for its use under the terms of the Contract, in whole or in part, separately or in combination, constitutes an infringement of any patent, copyright, trademark or other intellectual property right of any third party; or (b) any acts or omissions of the Individual contractor, or of any subcontractor or anyone directly or indirectly employed by them in the performance of the Contract, which give rise to legal liability to anyone not a party to the Contract, including, without limitation, claims and liability in the nature of a claim for workers' compensation.

10. INSURANCE: The Individual contractor shall pay UNDP promptly for all loss, destruction or damage to the property of UNDP caused by the Individual contractor, or of any subcontractor, or anyone directly or indirectly employed by them in the performance of the Contract. The Individual contractor shall be solely responsible for taking out and for maintaining adequate insurance required to meet any of his or her obligations under the Contract, as well as for arranging, at the Individual contractor's sole expense, such life, health and other forms of insurance as the Individual contractor may consider to be appropriate to cover the period during which the Individual contractor provides services under the Contract. The Individual contractor acknowledges and agrees that none of the insurance arrangements the Individual contractor shall, in any way, be construed to limit the Individual contractor's liability arising under or relating to the Contract.

11. ENCUMBRANCES AND LIENS: The Individual contractor shall not cause or permit any lien, attachment or other encumbrance by any person to be placed on file or to remain on file in any public office or on file with UNDP against any monies due to the Individual contractor or to become due for any work done or against any goods supplied or materials furnished under the Contract, or by reason of any other claim or demand against the Individual contractor.

12. FORCE MAJEURE; OTHER CHANGES IN CONDITIONS: In the event of and as soon as possible after the occurrence of any cause constituting *force majeure*, the Individual contractor shall give notice and full particulars in writing to UNDP of such occurrence or cause if the Individual contractor is thereby rendered unable, wholly or in part, to perform his or her obligations and meet his or her responsibilities under the Contract. The Individual contractor shall also notify UNDP of any other changes in conditions or the occurrence of any

event, which interferes or threatens to interfere with the performance of the Contract. Not more than fifteen (15) days following the provision of such notice of *force majeure* or other changes in conditions or occurrence, the Individual contractor shall also submit a statement to UNDP of estimated expenditures that will likely be incurred for the duration of the change in conditions or the event. On receipt of the notice or notices required hereunder, UNDP shall take such action as it considers, in its sole discretion, to be appropriate or necessary in the circumstances, including the granting to the Individual contractor of a reasonable extension of time in which to perform any obligations under the Contract or suspension thereof.

Force majeure as used herein means any unforeseeable and irresistible act of nature, any act of war (whether declared or not), invasion, revolution, insurrection, or any other acts of a similar nature or force, *provided that* such acts arise from causes beyond the control and without the fault or negligence of the Individual contractor. The Individual contractor acknowledges and agrees that, with respect to any obligations under the Contract that the Individual contractor must perform in or for any areas in which UNDP is engaged in, preparing to engage in, or disengaging from any peacekeeping, humanitarian or similar operations, any delay or failure to perform such obligations arising from or relating to harsh conditions within such areas or to any incidents of civil unrest occurring in such areas shall not, in and of itself, constitute *force majeure* under the Contract.

13. TERMINATION: Either party may terminate the Contract, in whole or in part, upon giving written notice to the other party. The period of notice shall be five (5) days in the case of contracts for a total period of less than two (2) months and fourteen (14) days in the case of contracts for a longer period. The initiation of conciliation or arbitral proceedings, as provided below, shall not be deemed to be a "cause" for or otherwise to be in itself a termination of the Contract. UNDP may, without prejudice to any other right or remedy available to it, terminate the Contract forthwith in the event that: (a) the Individual contractor is adjudged bankrupt, or is liquidated, or becomes insolvent, applies for moratorium or stay on any payment or repayment obligations, or applies to be declared insolvent; (b) the Individual contractor is granted a moratorium or a stay or is declared insolvent; (c) the Individual contractor makes an assignment for the benefit of one or more of his or her creditors; (d) a Receiver is appointed on account of the insolvency of the Individual contractor; (e) the Individual contractor offers a settlement in lieu of bankruptcy or receivership; or (f) UNDP reasonably determines that the Individual contractor has become subject to a materially adverse change in financial condition that threatens to endanger or otherwise substantially affect the ability of the Individual contractor to perform any of the obligations under the Contract.

In the event of any termination of the Contract, upon receipt of notice of termination by UNDP, the Individual contractor shall, except as may be directed by UNDP in the notice of termination or otherwise in writing: (a) take immediate steps to bring the performance of any obligations under the Contract to a close in a prompt and orderly manner, and in doing so, reduce expenses to a minimum; (b) refrain from undertaking any further or additional commitments under the Contract as of and following the date of receipt of such notice; (c) deliver all completed or partially completed plans, drawings, information and other property that, if the Contract had been completed, would be required to be furnished to UNDP thereunder; (d) complete performance of the services not terminated; and (e) take any other action that may be necessary, or that UNDP may direct in writing, for the protection and preservation of any property, whether tangible or intangible, related to the Contract that is in the possession of the Individual contractor and in which UNDP has or may be reasonably expected to acquire an interest.

In the event of any termination of the Contract, UNDP shall only be liable to pay the Individual contractor compensation on a pro rata basis for no more than the actual amount of work performed to the satisfaction of UNDP in accordance with the requirements of the Contract. Additional costs incurred by UNDP as a result of termination of the Contract by the Individual contractor may be withheld from any amount otherwise due to the Individual contractor by UNDP.

14. NON-EXCLUSIVITY: UNDP shall have no obligation respecting, and no limitations on, its right to obtain goods of the same kind, quality and quantity, or to obtain any services of the kind described in the Contract, from any other source at any time.

15. TAXATION: Article II, section 7, of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations provides, *inter alia*, that the United Nations, including its subsidiary organs, is exempt from all direct taxes, except charges for public utility services, and is exempt from customs restrictions, duties and charges of a similar nature in respect of articles imported or exported for its official use. In the event any governmental authority refuses to recognize the exemptions of the United Nations from such taxes, restrictions, duties or charges, the Individual contractor shall immediately consult with UNDP to determine a mutually acceptable procedure. UNDP shall have no liability for taxes, duties or other similar charges payable by the Individual contractor in respect of any amounts paid to the Individual contractor under this Contract, and the Individual contractor acknowledges that UNDP will not issue any statements of earnings to the Individual contractor in respect of any such payments.

16. AUDITS AND INVESTIGATIONS: Each invoice paid by UNDP shall be subject to a post-payment audit by auditors, whether internal or external, of UNDP or by other authorized and qualified agents of UNDP. The Individual contractor acknowledges and agrees that UNDP may conduct investigations relating to any aspect of the Contract or the award thereof, and the obligations performed thereunder.

The Individual contractor shall provide full and timely cooperation with any post-payment audits or investigations hereunder. Such cooperation shall include, but shall not be limited to, the Individual contractor's obligation to make available any relevant documentation and information for the purposes of a post-payment audit or an investigation at reasonable times and on reasonable conditions. The Individual contractor shall require his or her employees, subcontractors and agents, if any, including, but not limited to, the Individual contractor's attorneys, accountants or other advisers, to reasonably cooperate with any post-payment audits or investigations carried out by UNDP hereunder.

If the findings or circumstances of a post-payment audit or investigation so warrant, UNDP may, in its sole discretion, take any measures that may be appropriate or necessary, including, but not limited to, suspension of the Contract, with no liability whatsoever to UNDP.

The Individual contractor shall refund to UNDP any amounts shown by a post-payment audit or investigation to have been paid by UNDP other than in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Contract. Such amount may be deducted by UNDP from any payment due to the Individual contractor under the Contract.

The right of UNDP to conduct a post-payment audit or an investigation and the Individual contractor's obligation to comply with such shall not lapse upon expiration or prior termination of the Contract.

17. SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES:

AMICABLE SETTLEMENT: UNDP and the Individual contractor shall use their best efforts to amicably settle any dispute, controversy or claim arising out of the Contract or the breach, termination or invalidity thereof. Where the parties wish to seek such an amicable settlement through conciliation, the conciliation shall take place in accordance with the Conciliation Rules then obtaining of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law ("UNCITRAL"), or according to such other procedure as may be agreed between the parties in writing.

ARBITRATION: Any dispute, controversy or claim between the parties arising out of the Contract, or the breach, termination, or invalidity thereof, unless settled amicably, as provided above, shall be referred by either of the parties to arbitration in accordance with the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules then obtaining. The decisions of the arbitral tribunal shall be based on general principles of international commercial law. For all evidentiary questions, the arbitral tribunal shall be guided by the Supplementary Rules Governing the Presentation and Reception of Evidence in International Commercial Arbitration of the International Bar Association, 28 May 1983 edition. The arbitral tribunal shall be empowered to order the return or destruction of goods or any property, whether tangible or intangible, or of any confidential information provided under the Contract, order the termination of the Contract, or order that any other protective measures be taken with respect to the goods, services or any other property, whether tangible or intangible, or of any confidential information provided under the Contract, as appropriate, all in accordance with the authority of the arbitral tribunal pursuant to Article 26 ("Interim Measures of Protection") and Article 32 ("Form and Effect of the Award") of the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules. The arbitral tribunal shall have no authority to award punitive damages. In addition, unless otherwise expressly provided in the Contract, the arbitral tribunal shall have no authority to award interest in excess of the London Inter-Bank Offered Rate ("LIBOR") then prevailing, and any such interest shall be simple interest only. The parties shall be bound by any arbitration award rendered as a result of such arbitration as the final adjudication of any such dispute, controversy or claim.

18. LIMITATION ON ACTIONS: Except with respect to any indemnification obligations in Article 9, above, or as are otherwise set forth in the Contract, any arbitral proceedings in accordance with Article 17, above, arising out of the Contract must be commenced within three (3) years after the cause of action has accrued.

The Parties further acknowledge and agree that, for these purposes, a cause of action shall accrue when the breach actually occurs, or, in the case of latent defects, when the injured Party knew or should have known all of the essential elements of the cause of action, or in the case of a breach of warranty, when tender of delivery is made, except that, if a warranty extends to future performance of the goods or any process or system and the discovery of the breach consequently must await the time when such goods or other process or system is ready to perform in accordance with the requirements of the Contract, the cause of action accrues when such time of future performance actually begins.

19. PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES: Nothing in or relating to the Contract shall be deemed a waiver, express or implied, of any of the privileges and immunities of the United Nations, including its subsidiary organs.

- oOo -

(Each UNEG member to create its own forms for signature)

Annex 2: United Nations Evaluation Group Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Evaluation Consultants Agreement Form

To be signed by all consultants as individuals (not by or on behalf of a consultancy company) before a contract can be issued.

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: OMGA AHMED AWAN

Name of Consultancy Organisation (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of
Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at (place) on (date) 14-11-2019

Signature: Omga Awan