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ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

As part of its annual work plan, the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) will conduct an independent country programme evaluation (ICPE) in Nepal in 2021. Typically conducted in the penultimate year of a country programme cycle, the ICPEs are expected to inform the elaboration of the new country programmes with evaluative evidence of UNDP’s contribution to national development priorities. The purpose of an ICPE is to:

- Support the development of the next UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to the Executive Board.

The ICPEs are independent evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy. The responsibility of IEO, which reports directly to the Executive Board, is two-fold: (i) provide the Executive Board with valid and credible information from evaluations for corporate accountability, decision-making and improvement; and (ii) enhance the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function and its coherence, harmonization and alignment in support of United Nations reform and national ownership.

This is the second country-level evaluation conducted by the IEO in Nepal. IEO conducted in 2012 an Assessment of Development Results of UNDP’s activities in Nepal for the period from 2002 to 2011. The current ICPE Nepal will focus on UNDP Nepal country office’s current programme for 2018-2022, with a view to contributing to the preparation of its new programme starting in 2023. The IEO will conduct the evaluation in close collaboration with the Government of Nepal, the UNDP Nepal Country Office, and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific (RBAP).

The Global COVID-19 pandemic has presented UNDP with considerable challenges in implementing its ongoing programme of work in line with the CPD. Even more so than usual, UNDP has been required to be adaptable, refocusing and restructuring its development work to meet the challenges of the pandemic and country’s need to effectively prepare, respond and recover from the wider COVID-19 crisis, including its socio-economic consequences. This ICPE will also consider the level to which UNDP has been able to adapt to the crisis and support Nepal’s preparedness, response to the pandemic and its ability to recovery meeting the new development challenges that the pandemic has highlighted, or which may have emerged.

NATIONAL CONTEXT

Nepal is a lower-middle income country at medium level of human development. It is a landlocked, mountainous country except for a thin strip of plains, the Terai. Its population is an estimated at about 30 million. Nepal had stronger economic growth in recent years, averaging 6.95 percent growth from the April 2015 earthquake to 2018-2019, while in the past two decades economic growth averaged 4.2 percent, the lowest in South Asia. Agriculture, forestry, and fishing represent the largest sector, with 27% contribution to economic output and estimated 21.5% of employment. The COVID-19 pandemic has severely impacted Nepal, with substantial decreases in economic growth and intensified economic vulnerability. Tourism income is projected to decline by 60 percent in 2020, a loss of US $400 million.

---

Remittances are expected to remain below pre-COVID-19 levels until the end of FY21 due to lower outmigration and weak economic activity in migrant receiving countries. UNDP’s rapid assessment survey indicated an overall job loss of 31.5 percent – 28 percent for men and 41 percent of women – while 74 percent had not been paid since the beginning of lockdown.

Nepal has made steady improvements in human development, transitioning to middle human development category in 2016. Nepal’s human development index (HDI) value for 2019 is 0.602, positioning it at 142 out of 189 countries and territories, and representing a 59 percent increase in the HDI score from 1990 (0.378). However, Nepal’s HDI remains below the average for South Asia (0.634), and the third lowest in the region and its GNI per capita ($3610) is far below that of South Asia ($6448).

Currently a Least Developed Country (LDC), Nepal aspires to graduate from an LDC to a developing country by 2022 and to an upper-middle-income country by 2030 by achieving the SDGs. Nepal’s national development strategy is guided by the Fourteenth and the Fifteenth Five-Year Plan during the current UNDP country programme development and implementation period. Both plans incorporated the Sustainable Development Goals and accompanying sectoral plans. Nepal currently meets criteria LDC graduation (i.e. human assets and economic vulnerability), but its low per-capita income remains below the threshold and threatens sustainability. LDC graduation also may confer some adverse consequences from short to long-term, due to the loss of trade-related concessions for LDCs and special facilities, which may affect export competitiveness, production and jobs without mitigation measures.

Inequalities along geographic, gender and community divides threaten Nepal’s sustainable development. When adjusted for inequality, Nepal’s HDI is 0.446 percent, a loss of 25.9 percent (equivalent to the average discount value for South Asia). There is a large gap between the urban (0.647) and rural (0.561) HDI values, and between the hills regions (0.623) and the mountains (0.564) and Tarai regions (0.563). At province level, Province 2 (0.51), Karnali (0.538) and Sudur Paschim (0.547) lag behind the highest-scoring provinces such as Bagmati (0.66), home to the capital Katmandu. Nepal has 125 ethnic groups, who historically had no access to services and opportunities. Nepal’s Gender Inequality Index value is 0.452, ranking 110 of 162 countries. Nepal has introduced reforms to address social exclusion and gender inequality, e.g., quota of women’s seats and participation of marginalized groups in parliament. However, large gaps remain in labour force participation (26.3 percent for women, 53.8 percent for men) and social barriers.

in 2017. Nepal has also adopted new legislation to strengthen government functioning and ‘leave no one behind’ protections. More than 2.8 million people participate in government social benefits; coverage is estimated at 24 percent in 2019/2020. The most recent general election was held in 2017; K. P. Sharma Oli was sworn in as Prime Minister in 2018. The Prime Minister dissolved the parliament in December 2020 and called for an early election in April/May 2021. In February 2021, the Supreme Court ruled that the dissolved parliament shall be reinstated.

Nepal is one of the most vulnerable countries to climate change and experiences significant disaster risk. It has rich biodiversity, many unique Himalayan ecosystems, and natural resources. Nepal has nominal contributions to global greenhouse gas emissions (0.027 percent), but the number of Himalayan glacier lakes has increased by 11 percent and glaciers recede on average 38 square kilometers each year. In recent years, Nepal has contended with an increasing number of natural disasters including landslides, floods and droughts, with high cost to human life and an estimated loss of almost 1.5 to 2 percent of GDP. Earthquakes in 2015 killed almost 9,000 people and affected eight million. Additional environmental challenges include air pollution, waste management, deforestation, water resources, access to energy, among others.

**UNDP PROGRAMME IN NEPAL**


The 2006 Comprehensive Peace Agreement marked the end of a decade of conflict in Nepal. Against this backdrop, the UNDP country programme for 2008-2010 (extended to 2012), built on the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) of the same period, supported the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and the organization of free and fair elections. This included collaboration with the UN Mission in Nepal (UNMIN) present in the country from 2007 till 2011. Overall, the IEO’s Assessment of Development Results for 2002 to 2011 found that UNDP Nepal made a strong contribution to development results across a diverse portfolio. UNDP contributed to further democratic governance, poverty reduction, crisis prevention and recovery, environment and energy, and HIV/AIDS response.

The 2013-2017 country programme focused on poverty reduction and inclusive growth; reducing discrimination; rule of law, justice and human rights; and inclusive governance. The country office reported reaching over 18 million people across Nepal’s 75 districts through work on economic empowerment,
climate change adaptation, social cohesion and participation. UNDP piloted programmes for micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs) and legal aid services, which have been integrated into government policy. UNDP also played a leading role in post-disaster recovery after the 2015 earthquake, including post-disaster needs assessment, early recovery cluster coordination, and resource mobilization. Under the provisions of the 2015 Constitution, for which UNDP has provided support since 2008, UNDP has been providing support in the previous and current country programme cycles to the federalization and decentralization process.

For the current UNDP 2018-2022 country programme cycle, the preparation of the CPD was guided by the UNDAF for the same period and lessons from previous cooperation. The UNDAF has an indicative budget of around 643.3 million USD, of which UNDP has an indicative budget of $205.7 million (32 percent). The UN Country Team consists of 21 agencies (18 resident agencies and 3 non-resident agencies). Adhering to the “Deliver as One” principles, the UNCT has established Outcome Working Groups, in addition to the UN Communication Group, Operations Management Group, Monitoring and Evaluation Group, UN Gender Theme Group and the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer Committee. The UNDAF supports interventions under four outcome areas:

- **Outcome area 1**: Sustainable and Inclusive Economic Growth (UNDP as participating agency)
- **Outcome area 2**: Social Development (supported by other UN agencies)
- **Outcome area 3**: Resilience, Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change (UNDP as co-chair)
- **Outcome area 4**: Governance, Rule of Law, and Human Rights (UNDP as co-chair)

UNDP’s programming supports three out of four UNDAF outcomes (Table 1). Gender equality, social inclusion and human rights are integrated across the thematic areas. UNDP’s programmatic investments are prioritized for regions with the lowest levels of human development. In 2019, UNDP established four field offices, in addition to the Kathmandu country office. UNDP launched Nepal’s Accelerator Lab in August 2019, which serves as an innovation incubator for locally contextualized solutions for urgent development challenges.

- **Sustainable and Inclusive Economic Growth**: UNDP supports poverty reduction in areas such as employment creation, access to energy, and pro-poor development planning, monitoring, and policy support. It supports rural livelihoods through micro-enterprise development programmes, value chain development, and renewable energy initiatives, as well as urban development actions in collaboration with provincial capitals and municipalities. UNDP also assists Nepal in SDG monitoring and reporting, improving investment climate, and promoting south-south cooperation.

- **Governance, Rule of Law and Human Rights**: UNDP supports government effectiveness, participation, and accountability, in the context of the federalist structure introduced in 2015. Key areas of UNDP support include access to justice, local governance, and capacity building for the parliament and elections.

- **Resilience, Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change**: UNDP contributes to climate change mitigation and adaptation, risk reduction and disaster preparedness, early recovery, promoting pro-poor environmental management, and renewable energy access. It targets most at-risk districts and vulnerable persons through synergies with the livelihood and governance portfolios.

---

30 UNDP collaborates with other agencies in the area of gender-based violence.
31 UNDP OAI, Audit Report No. 2209, 7 May 2020: UNDP Nepal
The tables below indicate UNDP resources for each UNDAF/UNDP outcome and UNDP CPD outputs.

### Table 1. UNDAF/UNDP Outcomes and Indicative Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant UNDAF/CPD outcomes</th>
<th>CPD Outputs</th>
<th>Indicative resources (US$)</th>
<th>Expenditure 2018-2020 (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Outcome 1:** By 2022, impoverished, especially economically vulnerable people have increased access to sustainable livelihoods, safe and decent employment and income opportunities. | Output 1.1: Policy institutional and capacity development solutions lead to improved disaster and climate resilient livelihoods productive employment and increased productivity in rural areas.  
Output 1.2: Municipalities adopt disaster and climate-resilient urban policies that promote access to safe and decent employment and income opportunities for vulnerable groups  
Output 1.3: Improved national capacities in planning monitoring financing and reporting on 2030 agenda | Total: $54,745,713  
Regular: $10,128,300  
Other: $44,617,413 | Total: $19,235,292  
Regular: $7,595,623  
Other: $11,639,670 |
| **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. | Output 2.1: National level executive and legislative branches of the Government and commissions have the capacities and tools to implement the constitution including peaceful transition to federal structure  
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  
Output 2.4: Justice sector institutions strengthened in accordance with the constitution and human rights standards to ensure greater access to justice | Total: $58,628,300  
Regular: $10,128,300  
Other: $48,500,000 | Total: $17,635,318  
Regular: $6,005,516  
Other: $11,629,802 |
Outcome 3: By 2022, environmental management, sustainable recovery and reconstruction, and resilience to climate change and natural disaster are strengthened at all levels.

Output 3.1: Understanding and knowledge on environment climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction enhanced at national subnational and community levels to make development risk-informed

Output 3.2: Policy and institutional mechanisms strengthened for integrating gender responsive CCA/DRR and environment management in national and key sector's development planning

Output 3.3: Mechanisms in place to enable the Government and private sector to increase investment in CCA/DRR recovery and environment management

Output 3.4: Capacities of subnational governments and communities strengthened for effective preparedness and response environment management CCA/DRR

Output 3.5: Improved capacities of communities and government for resilient recovery and reconstruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Understanding and knowledge on environment climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction enhanced at national subnational and community levels to make development risk-informed</td>
<td>$95,833,400</td>
<td>$13,504,400</td>
<td>$82,329,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Policy and institutional mechanisms strengthened for integrating gender responsive CCA/DRR and environment management in national and key sector's development planning</td>
<td>$82,329,000</td>
<td>$6,005,516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Mechanisms in place to enable the Government and private sector to increase investment in CCA/DRR recovery and environment management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Capacities of subnational governments and communities strengthened for effective preparedness and response environment management CCA/DRR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Improved capacities of communities and government for resilient recovery and reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total | Total: $209,207,413 | Total: $61,694,147* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular: $33,761,000</td>
<td>Regular: $18,942,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other: $175,446,413</td>
<td>Other: $42,751,795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: UNDAF, CPD and UNDP Atlas programme expenditure data as of 29 Jan 2021.

*Includes $3,175,358 in expenses unlinked to a specific outcome (i.e., Support to UN Coordination; Management Support to Country Programme Implementation).

Preliminary financial data as of end-January 2021 indicates that country office expenditure from 2018 to date is 69.3% other resources ($42.8 million) and 30.7% core resources ($18.9 million). Government cost-sharing represents 6.3% ($3.9 million) and environmental vertical trust funds 1.7% ($1.0 million), with the remainder from bilateral donors (primarily through direct funding, also through thematic trust funds, multi-partner trust funds, and funding windows). Major donors include the UK Department for International Development ($6.9 million, 11.2%), South-South Triangular Cooperation funding from India ($7.0 million, 11.3%) and China ($2.2 million, 3.5%), European Commission ($4.5 million, 7.3%), Norway ($6.4 million, 10.4%), Australia ($3.1 million, 5.0%), and the Korea International Cooperation Agency ($2.9 million, 4.7%), among others.

The UN Framework for Responding to the Socio-Economic Impacts of COVID-19 in Nepal (August 2020) provides the framework for UN pandemic response for emergency response and support to “build back better” (12-18 months). The framework includes five pillars: 1) Health First: Protecting health services and systems; 2) Protection people: social protection and basic services; 3) Economic Response and Recovery: Projecting Jobs, SMEs and Informal Sector Workers (UNDP lead agency, with co-leads ILO, WFP and FAO);

---

and 4) Social Cohesion and Community Resilience and Macroeconomic Response and Multilateral Collaboration (Resident Coordinator lead agency, with co-leads UNDP and UNCDF).

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The ICPE Nepal will examine UNDP’s 2018-2022 country programme, as formally approved by the Executive Board. Guided by the CPD Results and Resources Framework, the evaluation will assess UNDP’s performance in contributing to the three programme outcomes. The ICPE will consider changes made to the country programme during the period under review, including UNDP’s COVID-19 response.

The evaluation will cover UNDP’s development programme in its entirety, regardless of its funding sources, e.g., UNDP’s regular, core resources, donors, and government. Both projects that are active and/or have completed during the period under review will be covered. Special attention will be paid to the role and responsibilities of other UN agencies contributing to the areas where UNDP has been supporting under the 2018-2022 UNDAF.

METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards.33 It will address the following four main evaluation questions:34

1. What did the UNDP country programme intend to achieve during the period under review?
2. To what extent has the programme achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives?
3. To what extent has UNDP been able to adapt to the COVID-19 pandemic and support Nepal’s preparedness, response, and recovery process?
4. What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP’s performance and eventually, to the sustainability of results?

Evaluation question 1 will be addressed by using a theory of change (ToC) approach. The ToC, either available at the country office or reconstructed in consultation with programme units for the purpose of the evaluation, will be used to understand the underlying programme intent and logic, by outcome, including the assumptions being made for desired changes and expected causal linkages. UNDP’s specific areas of contribution under each of the UNDAF will be defined, and any changes to the programme design and implementation strategy from the initial CPD will be identified.

Evaluation question 2 will address the overall effectiveness of UNDP’s country programme. It includes an assessment on the degree to which UNDP-specific interventions - CPD outputs - have progressed or have been achieved, as well as the level of UNDP’s contribution to the CPD outcomes as envisaged by the initial ToC. In this process, results that are both positive and negative, direct and indirect, as well as unintended results will be identified.

Evaluation question 3 will examine UNDPs support to COVID-19 preparedness, response, and recovery in Nepal, including several sub-questions: i) degree to which UNDP’s COVID support has been relevant to the needs of Nepal; ii) how well UNDP’s support and response has aligned with government plans and support from other UN agencies, donors, and NGOs/CSOs; iii) how well UNDP has supported the country to develop

33 http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1914
34 The ICPEs have adopted a streamlined methodology, which differs from the previous ADRs that were structured according to the four standard OECD DAC criteria. More detailed sub-questions will be developed during the desk review phase of the evaluation.
responses that reduced loss of life and protected longer-term social and economic development; iv) degree
to which UNDP funding decisions were informed by evidence, needs analysis, risk analysis and dialogue
with partners and supported efficient use of resources; and v) whether the support has contributed to the
development of social, economic and health systems in Nepal that are equitable, resilient and sustainable.

Evaluation question 4 will examine various factors have influenced – positively or negatively – UNDP’s
programmatic performance, and eventually, sustainability of results. Country-specific issues (e.g., change
management), managerial practices (e.g. utilization of resources for results), programmatic design and
decisions (e.g. integration of gender equality and women’s empowerment, use of partnerships, South-
South and triangular cooperation, delivery modality) will be examined.

**Stakeholder involvement:** During the evaluation, relevant stakeholders will be engaged to ensure the
transparency of the exercise, collect necessary documentation and evidence, and enhance the national
ownership of evaluation results. A stakeholder analysis will be conducted during the preparatory phase to
identify relevant UNDP partners, including those that may have not worked directly with UNDP but play a
key role in the outcomes to which UNDP contributes. The analysis will help identify key informants for
interviews during the data collection phase.

**Gender-responsive approach:** The evaluation will employ a gender-responsive evaluation approach during
its preparatory and implementation phases. During document desk reviews and the analysis of programme
theory and delivery, the evaluation will examine the level of gender mainstreaming across all UNDP
programmes and operations, in line with UNDP’s gender strategy. Gender disaggregated data will be
collected, where available, and assessed against UNDP’s programme outcomes. The evaluation will assess
the extent to which UNDP’s programmatic efforts were designed to contribute to gender equality and
women’s empowerment (e.g., using Gender Marker and programme expenditures), and in fact have
contributed to promoting gender equality and women’s empowerment by using the gender results
effectiveness scale (GRES). The GRES classifies gender results into five categories: gender negative, gender
blind, gender targeted, gender responsive, and gender transformative.

**Figure 1: IEO’s Gender Results Effectiveness Scale**
ICPE rating system: Based on the Independent Country Programme Review piloted by the IEO in 2020 and lessons learned, IEO is currently developing a rating system to be applied for the ICPEs in 2021 on a pilot basis. Ratings are expected to be applied to assess UNDP’s progress towards CPD Outputs and Outcomes goals. Details will be provided in due course prior to the implementation of the ICPE.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

**Evaluable assessment:** An assessment was conducted to examine the availability of documentation and information, identify potential data constraints, and determine the data collection methods.

- **COVID-19 restrictions:** As internal mobility is limited and many continue to telework, access to national stakeholders for data collection – particularly those in remote areas and community-level populations including the marginalized – may encounter challenges. Expanded outreach measures will be needed, e.g., use of surveys, identification of locally based data collectors and consultants, access to local project managers/coordinators, and/or use of GIS technology for virtual site visits.

- **Political situation:** It is currently unclear to what extent the evaluation will be affected by the political situation in Nepal, potentially in terms of availability of government counterparts, should the situation continue to evolve.

- **Availability of past assessments:** The UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC) includes 13 completed evaluations (12 project and one country programme mid-term review) between 2018 and present of fairly good quality. An additional 7 project evaluations are planned to conduct in 2021 and 2022. The country programme recently conducted a mid-term review completed in December 2020, which will be used to guide validation of progress.

- **Programme and project information:** Programme documentation (including internal annual reports) is available and of adequate quality. The availability and quality of project level documentation will be examined during documentation collection and desk review.

- **CPD results and resources framework indicator results:** The CPD lists 6 indicators for the 3 outcomes, and 29 indicators to measure the 12 outputs, with baseline and targets. To the extent possible, the ICPE will seek to use these indicators to better understand the intention of the UNDP programme and to measure or assess progress towards the outcomes. The data sources of the indicators are mostly national statistics and reports of various ministries, and the evaluation’s ability to measure progress against these indicators will therefore depend on national statistics, where up-to-date data may not be available for all indicators.

- **Intervention maturity:** UNDP projects are at different stages of implementation. In cases where the projects/initiatives are still in their initial stages, it may not be possible to determine the projects’ contribution to the CPD/UNDAF outcomes. The evaluation will document observable progress and seek to assess the possibility of potential contribution given the programme design and measures already put in place.

**Data collection methods:** A design matrix will be prepared to elaborate on data collection and analysis plans. At the time of this writing, the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic are still felt globally. Given the travel restrictions, the evaluation is expected to take predominantly a remote, virtual approach. Data and information required for the evaluation are collected through primary and secondary sources:

- Desk reviews: The IEO will conduct extended reviews of documentation, including those available from the government, the UN, private institutions, donors, and academia, on national context and

---

35 6 evaluation reports by the IEO were rated as ‘satisfactory’ (rating of ‘5’), four as ‘moderately satisfactory (rating of ‘4’), and one as ‘moderately unsatisfactory’. UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre.
areas of UNDP programme interventions. Also included are country programme framework and office strategies (e.g., resource mobilization, gender, communication), programme-/project-related documents and progress reports, theories of change, annual work plans, Results Oriented Annual Reports (ROAR), COVID Mini-ROARs, past evaluation/audit reports, and UNCT/UNDAF related documents. The IEO and the country office will identify a list of background documents, uploaded in the ICPE SharePoint portal.

- Stakeholder interviews: Interviews via face-to-face/Zoom/telephone will be conducted with relevant stakeholders, including government partners; donors; UN agencies; other development partners such as IFIs; UNDP staff at country, regional and HQ levels; private sector; civil society organizations; and beneficiary groups. Focus groups may be organized, where possible.

- Questionnaire/Surveys: An advance questionnaire will be administered to the country office during the preparatory phase as an additional self-reporting input. Surveys may be planned, as required.

- Site visits: As mobility will be limited, physical visits to field project sites are expected to be minimal, if any. A brief verification mission may be organized should travels become advisable in the third quarter of 2021.

Projects for in-depth review: A sample of projects will be selected for in-depth reviews based on a purposive sampling. The criteria for selection include programme coverage, ensuring a balanced representation of issues addressed under each outcome; project maturity; budget, implementation modality and geographical areas. Both ‘flagship’ projects of significant visibility and scope as well as those that have experienced challenges will be included.

Validation: Data and information collected from different sources and through various means will be triangulated to strengthen the validity of findings and conclusions.

Midterm briefing: At the end of the data collection phase, the IEO will have a quick brief to the country office on emerging issues and findings. The meeting will also serve as an opportunity to identify areas requiring further analysis and any missing information and evidence before the full synthesis and drafting phase.

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Independent Evaluation Office: The IEO will conduct the ICPE in consultation with the UNDP country office and the RBAP. The IEO will meet all costs directly related to the conduct of the ICPE. It will establish an evaluation team, ensuring gender balance. The IEO Lead Evaluator will lead the ICPE and coordinate the work of the evaluation team, comprising the following members:

- Lead Evaluator (LE): IEO staff member with the overall responsibility for leading the exercise and managing the work of all team members, including the development of evaluation terms of reference (TOR), selection of the evaluation team members, and provision of methodological guidance. The LE will be responsible for the analysis/synthesis process, preparation of the draft and final evaluation reports, and coordinating the final stakeholder debriefing with the country office, RBAP, and national stakeholders.

- Associate Lead Evaluator (ALE): IEO staff who directly supports the LE in operationalizing the exercise, particularly during preparatory phase, data collection and analysis, and preparation of a draft report. Together with the LE, the ALE will backstop the work of other team members.

- Research Associate (RA): The IEO RA will provide background research, including portfolio and financial analysis. He/she contribute to the preparation of draft/final report, report annexes, and support any tasks as required by the evaluation team.

- National research institution/consultants: The IEO will explore partnering with a locally-
regionally-) based research institution, think tank or academia, to augment its data collection and analysis capacity in the country during COVID-related restrictions. Alternatively, 3 individual consultants (national and international) will be recruited to support the analysis of thematic areas.

**UNDP Country Office in Nepal:** The country office will support the evaluation team through liaising with national stakeholders; ensure that all necessary information regarding UNDP’s programmes, projects and activities in the country is available to the evaluation team; and provide factual verifications of the draft report on a timely basis. The country office will provide the evaluation team in-kind organizational support (e.g., arranging meetings and interviews with project staff and stakeholders). To ensure the confidentiality of the views expressed, country office staff will not participate in interviews and meetings with stakeholders. The country office will jointly organize the final stakeholder meeting via videoconference with the IEO, ensuring participation of key government counterparts, where findings and results of the evaluation will be presented. The country office will prepare a management response to evaluation recommendations and support the dissemination and use of the final evaluation report in the country.

**Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific (RBAP):** RBAP will support the evaluation through information sharing, facilitation of communication between the IEO and the country office, and participation in the final stakeholder debriefing. The Bureau will support and oversee the preparation of the management response by the country office and its implementation of relevant actions.

**EVALUATION PROCESS**

The evaluation will be conducted in the following five key phases:

- **Phase 1: Preparatory work.** The IEO prepares the evaluation terms of reference (define the scope, methodology and process), a list of projects, and an evaluation matrix; and launches document gathering with support of the country office. External consultants will be recruited to augment the work of portfolio analysis.
- **Phase 2: Desk analysis.** The evaluation team conducts desk reviews of reference material and preliminary analysis of the programme strategy and portfolio. The team will engage with country office staff through meetings and an advance questionnaire, administered to fill data gaps in documentation and seek clarification if any. Specific data collection instruments will be developed, e.g., interview protocols, based on the stakeholder and portfolio analyses.
- **Phase 3: Data collection.** The evaluation team will engage in virtual and remote data collection, such as interviews using Zoom and other online communication tools. At the end of the data collection phase, the evaluation team may hold a preliminary presentation on emerging findings to the country office, identifying areas requiring further analysis and any information and evidence gaps that may exist.
- **Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief.** Following the individual outcome analyses, the LE undertakes a synthesis process to prepare the ICPE report. The initial draft is subject to both internal and external reviews. Once the draft is quality cleared, the first official draft is shared with the country office and the RBAP for comments and factual corrections. The second draft, which considers their feedback, will then be shared with national stakeholders for further comments. The UNDP country office prepares a management response to the ICPE under the overall oversight of the Regional Bureau. The report is then be presented at a final debriefing where evaluation results are presented to key national stakeholders and UNDP’s ways forward are discussed. Considering the final set of comments collected at the stakeholder debriefing, the evaluation report will be finalized by incorporating the management response.
- **Phase 5: Publication and dissemination.** The ICPE report will be written in English. It will follow the standard IEO publication guidelines. The report will be widely distributed in both hard and electronic versions. The evaluation report will be made available to the UNDP Executive Board in time for its approval of a new CPD. It will be widely distributed by the IEO within UNDP as well as to the evaluation units of other international organisations, evaluation societies/networks and research institutions in the region. The country office will ensure the dissemination of the report to all relevant stakeholders in the country. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP IEO website as well as the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). RBAP will be responsible for monitoring and oversight of follow-up action implementation in the ERC.

**TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS**
The tentative schedule of the evaluation activities is summarized as below.37

| Table 3: Tentative timeframe for the ICPE process going to the Board in June* 2022 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| Activity | Responsible party | Proposed timeframe |
| **Phase 1: Preparatory work** | | |
| TOR completed and approved by IEO DeputyDirector | LE/ALE | March 2021 |
| Documentation collection for desk review | LE/ALE/CO | February-March 2021 |
| Selection of consultant** team members | LE/ALE | March-April 2021 |
| Compilation of stakeholder contacts (and initial notification by CO) | LE/ALE/CO | April-May 2021 |
| **Phase 2: Desk analysis** | | |
| Preliminary desk review of reference material | Evaluation team | April 2021 |
| Advance questionnaires to the CO | LE/ALE/CO | Mid-May 2021 |
| **Phase 3: Data collection** | | |
| Interviews with stakeholders | LE/ALE/Consultants** | Mid-May - June 2021 |
| Virtual preliminary briefing to CO/RBAP | LE/ALE/CO/RBAP | End June - July 2021 |
| **Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief** | | |
| Portfolio analysis completed | Consultants**/LE/ALE | July 2021 |
| Synthesis and report writing | LE/ALE | August 2021 |
| Zero draft for internal IEO clearance | LE/ALE | September 2021 |
| First draft for CO/RBAP comments | LE/ALE/CO/RBAP | October 2021 |
| Second draft shared with the government and other national stakeholders for comments | LE/ALE/CO | November 2021 |
| Draft management response | CO/RBAP | November 2021 |
| Final stakeholder debriefing via videoconference | IEO/CO/RBAP | December 2021 |
| **Phase 5: Publication and dissemination** | | |
| Editing and formatting | IEO | January- February 2022 |
| Final report and evaluation brief | IEO | January- February 2022 |
| Dissemination of the final report | IEO | March 2022 |

* Tentative; **consultants and/or national institution


37 The timeframe, indicative of process and deadlines, does not imply full-time engagement of evaluation team during the period.
## ANNEX 2. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Sub-questions and their linkages to rating criteria matrix</th>
<th>Data/Info to be collected</th>
<th>Data collection methods and tools (e.g.)</th>
<th>Data analysis (e.g.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ1. What did the UNDP country programme intend to achieve during the period under review?</strong></td>
<td>1.1 To what extent is the UNDP country programme relevant to the national development challenges, objectives, and SDG priorities? (Relevance 1A)</td>
<td>- UNDAF &amp; CPD</td>
<td>- Desk/literature review of relevant documents (including problem analysis conducted by the CO)</td>
<td>- Map a theory of change to identify the logic, sequence of events and assumptions behind the proposed programme, including hypothesis of unintended consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 To what extent has the UNDP country programme addressed the needs of vulnerable and marginalized groups and promoted LNOB principles, HR and GESI? (Relevance 1C)</td>
<td>- Indicative Country Office Results and Resources Framework (from CPD)</td>
<td>- Advance questionnaire to the CO</td>
<td>- Problem analysis of underlying development challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 How have the key principles of the Strategic Plan been applied to the country programme design? (Relevance 1B)</td>
<td>- Current Country Office Results and resources framework (if different from the one included in the CPD)</td>
<td>- Semi-structured interviews/focus groups with relevant stakeholders</td>
<td>- Mapping of key development actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 To what extent and how has the programme design and implementation changed from the initial CPD? To what extent and how do these changes affect the relevance of the CPD? (Relevance 1C)</td>
<td>- Explanation for revisions (if any) to country office results and resources framework, and of approval of these changes through the monitoring and programme board or Executive Board.</td>
<td>- Field studies-visits or survey to beneficiaries (as possible)</td>
<td>- Mapping of UNDP programmatic partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 To what extent does the UNDP country programme have a sound theory of change based on reasonable assumptions? To what extent is the portfolio composition appropriately supporting the theory of change and UNDP’s interventions strategy, e.g. theory of change (if available, or reconstructed) that maps an expected pathway of change, logic and assumptions, including plans detailing required financial resources and capacity for programme</td>
<td>- Data to validate CO explanation of changes in context since CPD approval (if any significant changes have occurred).</td>
<td>- Other as appropriate</td>
<td>- Stakeholder analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- UNDP’s interventions strategy, e.g. theory of change (if available, or reconstructed) that maps an expected pathway of change, logic and assumptions, including plans detailing required financial resources and capacity for programme</td>
<td>- Map a theory of change to identify the logic, sequence of events and assumptions behind the proposed programme, including hypothesis of unintended consequences.</td>
<td>- SMART analysis of CPD indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Problem analysis of underlying development challenges</td>
<td>- Triangulate data collected from various sources and means (e.g. cross check interview data with desk review to validate or refute TOC).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

38 For example, in the **Strategic Plan 2018-2021**, the key issues include: (1) 'Working in partnership': i) Within UN System; and ii) Outside UNS (South-South; civil society; private sector; and IFIs); (2) 'Helping to achieve the 2030 Agenda'; (3) '6 Signature Solutions': i) Keeping people out of poverty; ii) Strengthen effective, accountable, inclusive governance; iii) enhance prevention and recovery for resilient society; iv) promote nature-based solutions for sustainable plant; v) close the energy gap; and vi) strengthen gender equality; (4) 'Improved business models (Performance; and Innovation)
maximizing interlinkage for combined impact?  
(Relevant 1C and Coherence 2A)

1.6 To what extent does the UNDP country programme seek and benefit from synergy and partnerships with UNCT and other development actors (donors, IFIs, multilateral and bilateral agencies, I/NGOs, CSOs, private sector, etc.)?  
(Relevance 1B and Coherence 2B)

1.7 To what extent does the UNDP country programme optimize UNDP’s comparative advantage and strategic positioning in the country?  
(Relevance 1C and Coherence 2B)

1.8 What contextual changes are likely to occur in the next five years that would require UNDP to adjust its next country programme priorities and approach?  
implementation (and evidence of their provision)
- UNDP risk analysis matrix
- UNCT reports and workplans
- National data (e.g. SDG, human development data, ODA, national budget, etc.
- Literature on development and development cooperation in Nepal
## EQ2. To what extent has the programme achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 To what extent did UNDP achieve its specific objectives (CP outputs) as defined in the CPD and other strategies (if different)? (Effectiveness 4A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 To what extent and how did the achieved results contribute to (or are likely to contribute to) any outcomes in Nepal? (Effectiveness 4A, all Coherence and Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Which groups are / are not benefiting from UNDP’s support? To what extent did the UNDP country programme advance “Leave No One Behind”(^{39}) GEWE and Human Rights? (Effectiveness 4A, 4B and 4C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. To what extent did the implementation and results of the CPD adhere to sustainable development principles? (Effectiveness 4D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Are their signs that UNDP has helped developed the capacities and financial resourcing required to sustain results? (Sustainability 5A and 5B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Is there evidence that the initiatives supported by UNDP have scaled up beyond their funded targets? (Sustainability 5A and 5B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- CO self-assessment of performance
- Project documents, annual workplans, annual progress reports, audits and evaluations covering the agreed ICPE project list.
- Monitoring data, including performance against outcome and output indicators, and associated baselines and targets, and evidence of attribution of related changes to UNDP interventions
- Programme level audits and evaluations, if available.
- UNDP country programme’s social and environmental standards
- Perspectives of country office staff and key stakeholders, including their observation of results and unintended consequences
- UNCT documentation
- Desk/literature review of relevant documents
- Assessment of ROARs, GRES as well as indicators status to assess progress and trends
- Project QA data extraction
- Advance questionnaire to the CO
- Semi-structured interviews/focus groups with relevant stakeholders
- Field studies/visits or survey to beneficiaries (as possible)
- Other as appropriate
- Contribution analysis against TOC assumptions and hypothesis of unintended consequences
- Counterfactual analysis to check whether results could have been delivered without UNDP
- Analysis of evaluations and audits
- Stratification of results information by beneficiary type, including by m/f, disability, socio-economic status, age as far as possible. Thematic assessment to deepen results and fill gaps.
- Summary of outcome indicator and status
- Analysis of corporate surveys
- Trend analysis of ROARs & GRES
- Triangulate data collected from internal and external, primary and secondary information.

---

\(^{39}\) In Leave no one behind categories (UNDP Corporate Planning System): People living in peri-urban areas; People living in rural areas; People living in slums; People living in urban areas; Internally displaced persons; Migrants; Persons directly affected by natural disasters; Persons negatively affected by armed conflict or violence; Refugees; People living in multi-dimensional poverty; People living under the national poverty line; Unemployed persons; Key populations for HIV, tuberculosis and malaria; Minorities (e.g. race, ethnicity, linguistic, religion, etc.); Persons with disabilities (PwD); Sexual and gender orientation; Women; Youth.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ3. What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP’s performance and may influence the sustainability of results?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7. Were there positive or negative, direct and indirect unintended outcomes? (All Effectiveness and Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Relevant national data and reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other, as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 What design, implementation, and contextual factors have contributed to or hindered CPD Nepal’s results (output and outcome)? (All Effectiveness, Efficiency and Coherence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 What design, implementation, and contextual factors have influenced the way that women (and other groups of interest) experience and benefit from UNDP’s support? (Relevance 1C, Effectiveness 4B and 4C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4. To what extent has the UNDP country programme been implemented efficiently, and what effect have these factors had on results? (including timeliness, Human resources management, financial resources management, M&amp;E) (Efficiency 3A and 3B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and primary information in the following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project QA data extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Advance questionnaire to the CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Semi-structured interviews/focus groups with relevant stakeholders - focus on validating or refuting lines of inquiry - collecting perceptions and observations on the “why” and factors that influence or impede effectiveness;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Field studies/visits or survey to beneficiaries (as possible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Completion of a template of ‘factors’ with analysis of ‘strength of influence (extent the factors affect UNDP’s ability to achieve its objectives)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contribution analysis against TOC assumptions and unintended consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Counterfactual analysis to check whether results could have been delivered without UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Thematic analysis of evaluations and audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5. What design, implementation, and contextual factors have influenced the scale up achievement in the CPD?(^{40}) (All Sustainability, Relevance, Coherence and Efficiency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6. What design, implementation, and contextual factors have influenced the sustainability of results? (All Sustainability, Relevance, Coherence)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

areas, from internal and external sources\(^{41}\):
- Programme design information (especially alignment with national priorities; mix of up/downstream interventions; short/long term, use of evidence, ToC and workplans)
- Partnerships - lists, agreements, results-data, and post-project reviews
- Innovation, knowledge management, use of lessons learned and South-South and Triangular Cooperation
- Sustainability (incl. exit strategies, national ownership, piloting and scaling-up)
- Design, reports and audits on Social & Environment Standards’ (incl. human rights, GEWE, environment sustainability, targeting and coverage)
- Use of financial, human and other resources
- Implementation and oversight (incl. NIM/DIM, portfolio management, risk

- Spot check status of implementation of recommendations from previous ADR/ICPE
- Tabulation of corporate surveys data
- Survey(s) to cover gaps or validate preliminary findings
- Other as appropriate

- Thematic analysis of corporate surveys
- Trend analysis of ROARs & GRES
- Cross-check interview data with desk review to validate or refute lines of inquiry – highlighting data on the “why” and factors that influence or impede effectiveness; (check for unintended outcomes)
- Triangulate data from desk review and interviews with survey to close gaps and findings

\(^{40}\) See the UNDP Guidance Note on Scaling-Up Development Programmes (2013)

\(^{41}\) See the factor assessment sheet for the ‘working definition’ of the factor typology.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ4: To what extent has UNDP been able to adapt to the COVID-19 pandemic and support country’s preparedness, response and recovery process?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 To what degree has UNDP’s COVID support been relevant to the needs of Nepal? (Relevance 1A and 1C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 How well has UNDP’s support and response been aligned with government plans and support from other UN agencies, donors, and NGOs/CSOs? (All Relevance and Coherence 2B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 How well UNDP has supported the country to develop responses that reduced loss of life and protected longer-term social and economic development? To what extent were these responses equitable? (All Effectiveness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 To what extent were UNDP’s funding decisions informed by evidence, needs management, flexibility, M&amp;E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other important factors relevant to UNDP Nepal country programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Internal information on design, targeting, implementation, and results of UNDP COVID response, including the mini-ROARs, COVID-19 monitoring dashboard, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- External information on design, targeting, implementation, and results of national COVID response, including those of UN agencies, donors, and NGOs/CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- External information on national COVID recovery plans across health and key social and economic sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Desk/literature review of relevant documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assessment of mini-ROARs and end of year ROARs, UN/UNDP COVID-19 response indicators, monitoring dashboard, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Key informant interviews with health, social and economic sector stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Advance questionnaire to the CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Key informant interviews with UNDP staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Comparison of UNDP’s COVID response plans with national, sectoral, and partner plans, with a focus on links, additionality, gaps, duplications or conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of UNDP and national COVID response targeting plans and associated coverage data, with stratification of most vulnerable/often excluded groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of UNDP COVID implementation reports for efficiency information – timeliness of response, sufficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis, risk analysis and dialogue with partners? To what extent did the decisions made support efficient use of resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Relevance 1A and 1B, and Efficiency 3B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 To what extent has the support contributed to the development of social, economic and health systems in Nepal, and for them to be equitable, resilient and sustainable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(All Effectiveness and Sustainability, and Relevance 1C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Information on national social, economic and health systems in Nepal, including associated implementation capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Government and external partners’ perspectives on UNDP’s COVID support, including their observation of results and unintended consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contribution and thematic analysis of stakeholder perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Counterfactual analysis to check whether results could have been delivered without UNDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Triangulate data from desk review and interviews with survey to close gaps and findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and use of financial resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 3. PEOPLE CONSULTED

Government of Nepal (51 individuals: 10 women, 41 men)


ADHIKARI Basant, National Project Manager, Project Office, Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs

ADHIKARI Chiranjibi, National Project Manager, Project Office, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development

ADHIKARI Madhusudhan, National Project Director/ Executive Director, Alternative Energy Promotion Center (AEPC)

ARYAL Bhagwan, Joint Secretary, Development Cooperation Coordination Section, National Reconstruction Authority (NRA)

ARYAL Bishwa Parkah, Joint Secretary, National Disaster Risk Reduction & Management Authority (NDRRMA)

BANSTOLA Narayan, Focal Point, Provincial Ministry of Industry, Forest and Tourism, Pokhara province

BASNET Anant, Under-Secretary, Ministry of Land Management, Cooperatives and Poverty Alleviation (MoLCPA)

BHANDARI Kewal Prasad, Secretary, National Planning Commission (NPC)

BHATTARAI Shyam Kumar, Joint-Attorney, Office of the Attorney General

BUHJEL Chandra, Provincial Micro Enterprise Development Specialist, Sub-national Government, Hetauda Sub-metropolitan City, Bagmati Province

BHATTA Bhim Bahadur, Provincial Micro Enterprise Development Specialist, Sub-national Government, Hetauda Sub-metropolitan City, Bagmati province

DAWADI Narayan Prasad, Joint Secretary/National Project Director, Ministry of Industry, Commerce & Supplies

DHAUBHADEL Sarita, Provincial Micro Enterprise Development Specialist, Sub-national Government, Pokhara-lekhnath Metropolitan City

DHUNGANA Sindhu, Focal Point, Secretary of Ministry, Provincial Government. Ministry of Industry, Tourism, Forest and Environment, Hetauda Sub-metropolitan City, Bagmati Province

DHUNGEL Madhab, Vice Chair, National Youth Council
DHUNGEL Surya, Commissioner, National Human Right Commission
GARTAULA Deepak, Provincial Micro Enterprise Development Specialist, Sub-national Government, Karnali province, Birendranagar municipality
GAUTAM Bharat Raj, Secretary General, Federal Parliament
GAUTAM Ishwori, Principal Scientist, Nepal Agricultural Research Council
GAUTAM Phanindra, NPD/Joint Secretary, Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliament Affairs
KC Bijaya, Member, Provincial Assembly, Bagmati Province, Hetauda Sub-metropolitan City
KHADKA Shraswati, Deputy Mayor, Sub-national Government, Kirtipur Municipality
KHANAL Beda Nidhi, Joint Secretary, National Disaster Risk Reduction & Management Authority (NDRRMA)
KHANAL Gopi, NPD /Joint Secretary, Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration
KHAREL Murari, Acting Secretary/NPD, National Human Right Commission
KOIRALA Sabita, Provincial Micro Enterprise Development Specialist, Sub-national Government, Province 1, Biratnagar Metropolitan City
LAMSAL Rita, Section Officer, Development Cooperation Coordination Section, National Reconstruction Authority (NRA)
GAUTAM Satish, National Programme Manager, RERL Project Office, Alternative Energy Promotion Centre
LEKHAK Dilli Raj, Under Secretary, MoF/National Project Manager, Project Office, Ministry of Finance
NEUPANE Himal, Deputy National Project Manager, EFDC II Project Office
NEUPANE Ramji, National Project Manager, Technical Assistance for Micro- Enterprise, Project Office, Ministry of Industry, Commerce & Supplies
PANT Rajan Raj, CILRP Focal Point, Municipal Government, Gorkha Municipality
PANTHA Gokarna Raj, Senior Divisional Engineer (Under Secretary), AEPC Focal Point, Ministry of Energy, Water Resources and Irrigation
POKHREL Anil, Chief Executive, National Disaster Risk Reduction & Management Authority (NDRRMA)
REGMI Dhananjay, CEO/National Project Director, National Tourism Board
SHAKYA Pushpa Lal, National Project Manager, Project Office, AISN Project Office, National Planning Commission
SHAHI Raj Bahadur, Speaker, Provincial Assembly, Karnali, Surkhet Municipality
SHARMA Dhani Ram, Joint Secretary & Chief, International Economic Cooperation Coordination Division (IECCD)/National Project Director, Ministry of Finance/IECCD
SHRESTHA Kundan Das, National Project Manager, Project Office, Election Commission of Nepal
SHRESTHA Nikila, GESI and Outreach Advisor, Project Office, Election Commission of Nepal
SHRESTHA Raj Kumar, Joint Secretary/Focal person, ECN, Election Commission of Nepal
SHRESTHA Uttam, Provincial Micro Enterprise Development Specialist, Sub-national Government, Dhangarhi Sub-metropolitan City
SUMAN Manish Kumar, Chair, Planning and Finance Committee, Provincial Assembly, Sub-national Government, Province 2
TAMANG Bansa Lal, CILRP Focal Point, Municipal Government, Sindhupalchowk (Indrawati) Municipality
TAMANG Tej Bahadur, CILRP Focal Point, Municipal Government, Nuwakot (Panchkanya) Rural Municipality
THAPA Kriti, Gender and Social Inclusion Specialist, Project Office, Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration
TIMSENA Chiranjivi, Under Secretary/National Project Manager, Project Office, Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration
THARU Krishni, Deputy Speaker, Provincial Assembly, Lumbini Province, Butwal Sub-metropolitan City
VERMA Rajesh, Provincial Micro Enterprise Development Specialist, Sub-national Government, Province 2, Janakpur Sub-metropolitan City
WAGLE Radha, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Forests and Environment
YADAV Nandalal Ray, Under-secretary, Provincial Government. Ministry of Industry, Tourism, Forest and Environment, Province 2, Janakpur Sub-metropolitan City

Civil Society and Non-Profit Organizations / Private Sector / Academia (27 Individuals: 7 women, 20 men)
ACHARYA Naresh, Manager, District Agriculture Cooperative Federation – Makwanpur
ACHARYA Nilkantha, CILRP Focal Point, Co-operation Society Nepal
ACHARYA Ram Chandra, Chairperson, District Cooperative Union, Dhading
ADHIKARI Bishnu, Governance Director, The Asia Foundation
AYER Jagdish, President, Association of Youth Organizations Nepal
BARAL Ashesh, Deputy General Manager, Chaudhary Foundation
BASNET Raju, General Secretary, National Federation of the Disabled Nepal
CHAUDHARU Tara, Manager, Gramin Fresh Vegetable Producer Cooperatives, Chitwan
CHAUDHARY Sadiksha, Deputy General Manager, Chaudhary Foundation
DESAI Rajendra, Joint Director, Center for Ecocentric Development & People’s Action (CEDAP)
DEVKOTA Bhumi, Executive Director, System Development Service Center (SDSC)
DHAKAL Manjeet, LDC Support, Climate Analytics
JOSHI Dipesh, Head of Climate and Energy Program, WWF
K.C. Sarita, Mitini Nepal
MAJHI Chini Maya, Secretary, Nepal Federation of Indigenous Nationalities
NEUPANE Gokarna Nath, Chairperson, District Cooperative Union, Nuwakot
PAUDEL Hari Prasad, Chairperson, District Cooperative Union Chitwan,
PAUDEL Lila Mani, Secretary General, Nepal Bar Association
PYAKUREL Hari, Secretary, Agriculture Seed, Vegetable and Fruits Central Cooperative Federation Limited
RANJIT Merina, Deputy General Manager, Chaudhary Foundation
REGMI Bimal, Team Leader, OPM
RIJAL Kedar, Prof Kedar Rijal, CDED/CES - Tribhuvan University
SEN Netra Pratap, Executive Director, FORWARD Nepal
SHARMA Dilip, Chairperson, District Cooperative Union, Kavre
SHARMA Mitra Lal, President, National Federation of the Disabled Nepal
SHRESTHA Bhumika, Mitini Nepal
SUBEDI Menuka, Chairperson, Sasakta Women Agriculture Cooperative Ltd, Bhiman, Sindhuli

**Donors and Bilateral Partners (17 individuals: 7 women, 10 men)**
AKBAR Kamran, Senior Disaster Risk Management Specialist, World Bank, Kathmandu
ARORA Nishi, Second Secretary (DP & Reconstruction), Indian embassy
ASTUDILLO Eloisa, Deputy Head of Cooperation, EU delegation to Nepal
DANYO Stephen, Sector Leader for Sustainable Development, and Senior Environmental Specialist, World Bank, Kathmandu
DHUNGANA Raj Kumar, Senior Advisor, Good Governance, Royal Norwegian Embassy in Kathmandu
GEMMER Marco, Head of Cooperation, EU delegation to Nepal
IRWIN Craig, Statistical Advisor, FCDO, British Embassy
KAYASTHA Piush, Program officer, EU ECHO
KIM JinHwa, Deputy Country Director, KOICA Nepal
LEE Tae Hyun, Lead Country Economist, World Bank, Kathmandu
MANANDHAR Pushkar, Senior Project Officer/Energy, Asian Development Bank
MJOS Dagny, Minister Counsellor, Royal Norwegian Embassy in Kathmandu
PRADHAN Bigyan, Senior Operations Officer, World Bank, Kathmandu
SAITO Yoshiro, Public Sector Specialist, World Bank, Kathmandu
STRELKOVA Lada, Operations Advisor, World Bank, Kathmandu
YAKTHUMBA Kamakshi Rai, Program Manager, Australian Embassy, Kathmandu
YU Giebbum, Programme Coordinator, KOICA Nepal

**UNDP (35 individuals: 11 women, 24 men)**

ARYAL Sudip, Policy Analyst (Head of Field Office), Butwal, UNDP Nepal
BASNYAT Bijendra, Project Coordinator, BIOFIN Nepal, UNDP Project Office
BISTA Dinesh, RBM Analyst, UNDP Nepal
CHAND Dhan Bahadur, Field Office Coordinator, Janakpur, UNDP Nepal
CHHETRI Rina, HR manager, UNDP Nepal
COCCO Bernardo, DRR, UNDP Nepal
DHANCHHA Shrutina, GESI officer, UNDP Project Office
DHUNGANA Kedar, GESI focal person, UNDP Project Office
GYAWALI Bisam, Accelerator Lab, UNDP Nepal
HASSAN Bushra, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, RBAP
KAFLE Bhasker, National Project Manager, UNDP Project Office
KARKI Binita, Youth Officer, UNDP Nepal
MAGAR Binda Kumari, Policy Advisor (GESI), UNDP Nepal
MANANDHAR Suman, National Project Manager, UNDP Project Office
MEDAGANGODA-LABE Ayshanie, Resident Representative, UNDP Nepal
MEYER Renaud, Former Country Director, UNDP Thailand
MOHANTY Ruchi, RBAP, Regional Private Sector Partnership Specialist, RBAP
NARASIMHAN Ramraj, National Project Manager a.i & Disaster Risk Management Specialist, UNDP Project Office
PAUDEL Bal Ram, Operations Manager, UNDP Nepal
PUNJALI Khum Raj, Strategic Advisor - Government Relations, UNDP Nepal
RAI Pragyajan-Yalamb, Portfolio Lead (Resilient Environment), UNDP Nepal
SARKAR Kalpana, Portfolio Lead (Inclusive Growth), UNDP Nepal
SHARMA Yam Nath, Former Governance Advisor, UNDP Timor Leste
SHERCHAN Gopal, National Coordinator, UNDP Project Office
SHREEVASTAV Bitu, Parliament Affairs Officer, Province 2, UNDP Project Office
SHRESTHA Raj, National Project Manager, UNDP Project Office
SIDDQUI Raifeequ Ahmad, Policy Analyst (Head of Field Office), Surkhet, UNDP Nepal
SIGDEL Kamal Raj, Communications Analyst, UNDP Nepal
SINGH Baijanti Giri, Policy Analyst (Head of Field Office), Dhangadi, UNDP Nepal
SINGH Vijaya, Policy Advisor (Resilience & Disaster Preparedness), UNDP Nepal
SUTTON Kate, Head of Regional Innovation Center RBAP, RBAP
SWARNARAK Dharma, Policy Advisor (Livelihood), UNDP Nepal
TAMATA Tek Ram, Portfolio Lead (Governance), UNDP Nepal
TAMRAKAR Niranjan, CILRP Team Leader, UNDP Project Office
VALLEJ Marta, Strategic Planning Advisor, RBAP

Other UN Agencies (13 individuals: 8 women, 5 men)
BARAL Sulab, Programme Officer, UNV
BEGUM Hashina, Deputy Representative, UNFPA
GYANWALI Bisam, Country Coordinator, UNV
HEISELBERG Stine, RCO Head, RCO
JULLIAND Vallerie, Former Resident Coordinator, RCO
LAMA Lhaurang, Programem Assistant, UNV
NEPAL Saroj, National Program Coordinator, UNCDF
NEUPANE Nita, Senior Program Officer, ILO Nepal
NYANTI Sara Beysolow, Resident Coordinator, RCO
PERDOMO Maria, Regional Manager for Asia, Inclusive Digital Economies, UNCDF
SECK Amadou, Chief of Planning & Monitoring, UNICEF
SHRESTHA Sama, Programme Specialist, UN Women
SINHA Navanita, Gender Specialist, UN Women
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Baral, Samiksha, ‘Fed up with injustice and inaction, women march to demand end to impunity,’ The Kathmandu Post (daily), 13 February 2021, available at https://kathmandupost.com/national/2021/02/13/justice-justice-justice, accessed on 2 September 2021
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**ANNEX 5. PROJECT LIST**

*This is a full portfolio coverage, so all relevant projects were reviewed.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Output ID</th>
<th>Output Title</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>End Year</th>
<th>2018-2021 Budget</th>
<th>2018-2021 Expenditure</th>
<th>Implementation Modality</th>
<th>Gender Marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00102540</td>
<td>Cooperative Market Development Project (CMDP)</td>
<td>00104559</td>
<td>Cooperative Market Development</td>
<td>Feb 2018</td>
<td>Dec 2022</td>
<td>$6,711,417</td>
<td>$4,498,432</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00102540</td>
<td>Cooperative Market Development Project (CMDP)</td>
<td>00121578</td>
<td>COVID-19 Economic Response</td>
<td>Apr 2020</td>
<td>Dec 2022</td>
<td>$455,240</td>
<td>$41,699</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00088895</td>
<td>Value Chain Development (VCDP)</td>
<td>00121321</td>
<td>COVID-19 Recovery Support</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>Dec 2022</td>
<td>$408,128</td>
<td>$196,441</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00075193</td>
<td>Micro-Enterprise Development Programme (MEDEP) IV</td>
<td>00088357</td>
<td>Cap dev.of diff. stakeholders</td>
<td>Aug 2013</td>
<td>Oct 2018</td>
<td>$2,673,726</td>
<td>$2,417,927</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00075193</td>
<td>Micro-Enterprise Development Programme (MEDEP) IV</td>
<td>00087243</td>
<td>System develop for ME creation</td>
<td>Aug 2013</td>
<td>Dec 2018</td>
<td>$144,465</td>
<td>$128,194</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00075193</td>
<td>Micro-Enterprise Development Programme (MEDEP) IV</td>
<td>00105121</td>
<td>Capacity for policy advocacy</td>
<td>Jan 2017</td>
<td>Dec 2018</td>
<td>$17,917</td>
<td>$9,063</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00106411</td>
<td>Transitory Support to MEDEP to MEDPA (MEDPA TA)</td>
<td>00107174</td>
<td>Transitory Support to MEDEP to MEDPA (MEDPA TA)</td>
<td>Oct 2018</td>
<td>Mar 2021</td>
<td>$3,057,614</td>
<td>$2,349,941</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00061320</td>
<td>Comprehensive Disaster Risk Management Programme (CDRMP)</td>
<td>00117172</td>
<td>Urban DRR-ECHO 2</td>
<td>Feb 2011</td>
<td>Mar 2021</td>
<td>$1,420,599</td>
<td>$1,035,022</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00076958</td>
<td>Renewable Energy for Rural Livelihoods (RERL)</td>
<td>00117173</td>
<td>RERL-ADB</td>
<td>Jul 2019</td>
<td>Dec 2021</td>
<td>$2,316,684</td>
<td>$1,357,194</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00076958</td>
<td>Renewable Energy for Rural Livelihoods (RERL)</td>
<td>00088046</td>
<td>Renewable Energy for Rural Liv</td>
<td>Jan 2014</td>
<td>Dec 2019</td>
<td>$1,281,395</td>
<td>$1,134,202</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00111755</td>
<td>Sustainable Tourism for Livelihood Recovery (STAR)</td>
<td>00110601</td>
<td>Tourism for Livelihood Recovery</td>
<td>Jan 2021</td>
<td>Dec 2023</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$409,983</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00094218</td>
<td>Leveraging Tourism for the SDGs in Nepal (Digo Paryatan)</td>
<td>00098385</td>
<td>Inclusive&amp; sustainable Tourism</td>
<td>Jul 2019</td>
<td>Dec 2020</td>
<td>$181,029</td>
<td>$31,424</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OUTCOME 1:** By 2022, impoverished, especially economically vulnerable, unemployed and under-employed and vulnerable people, have increased access to sustainable livelihoods, safe and decent employment and income opportunities.
| Project ID   | Project Title                                                                 | Output ID   | Output Title                          | Start Year | End Year | 2018-2021 Budget | 2018-2021 Expenditure | Implemen| | Gender Marker |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|------------|----------|------------------|----------------------|---------|------------|
| 00133945    | Promoting Green Recovery through effective and improved waste management (PRGP) | 00125681    | Green Recovery and Waste Mgmt          | Jan 2021   | May 2022 | $811,560         | $450,798              | DIM     | GEN2       |
| 00133945    | Promoting Green Recovery through effective and improved                        | 00127647    | Cycling for Healthy Cities             | Jan 2021   | May 2022 | $35,320          | $27,012               | DIM     | GEN2       |
| 00085885    | Support to knowledge and lifelong learning skills-SKILLS                       | 00093365    | Support to knowledge and life          | Feb 2015   | Mar 2021 | $617,604         | $578,293              | NIM     | GEN2       |
| 00085885    | Support to knowledge and lifelong learning skills-SKILLS                       | 00121580    | COVID 19 Skills Response               | May 2020   | Mar 2021 | $58,300          | $37,990               | NIM     | GEN2       |
| 00133700    | Prayash: Temporary Basic Income for Marginalized and Exc (TBI)                 | 00125505    | Temporary Basic Income Support         | Jan 2021   | Jan 2022 | $280,041         | $85,784               | DIM     | GEN3       |
| 00133700    | Prayash: Temporary Basic Income for Marginalized and Exc                        | 00125506    | Cash-based Support to Women            | Jan 2021   | Jan 2022 | $355,784         | $250,998              | DIM     | GEN3       |
| 00074154    | Strengthening National Planning & Monitoring Capacity                          | 00086686    | NPC & CBS improved capacity            | Jul 2013   | Dec 2019 | $ 25,004         | $ 5,872               | NIM     | GEN2       |
| 00074154    | Strengthening National Planning & Monitoring Capacity                          | 00086687    | GoN increased capacity to dev          | Jul 2013   | Aug 2019 | $10,000          | $4,024                | NIM     | GEN2       |
| 00074154    | Strengthening National Planning & Monitoring Capacity                          | 00108160    | Facilitating Pursuit of SDGs (FPSN)    | Jul 2013   | Feb 2020 | $662,594         | $563,360               | NIM     | GEN2       |
| 00120726    | Accelerator Lab – Nepal                                                        | 00116797    | Accelerator Lab – Nepal                | Jul 2019   | Dec 2021 | $336,501         | $199,023              | DIM     | GEN1       |
| 00136724    | CDRIL Capacity Dev of LGs for Resilient Infra and Liveli                       | 00127548    | Capacity Building of LG                | Jun 2021   | Dec 2022 | $246,200         | $159,304              | DIM     | GEN2       |
| 00126669    | Effective Development Financing and Coordination II (EDFC II)                   | 00120661    | Capacity for Innovative Financ         | Mar 2020   | Dec 2024 | $1,083,866       | $734,320              | NIM     | GEN2       |
| 00087654    | Effective Development Financing & Co-ordination (EDFC I)                       | 00094591    | Aid Effectiveness                      | Jan 2016   | Dec 2020 | $1,291,940       | $1,072,438             | NIM     | GEN1       |
| 00114483    | Accelerating implementation of SDGs in Nepal (AISN)                            | 00112484    | SDG planning, budgeting & moni         | Jan 2020   | Dec 2023 | $749,723         | $428,594              | DIM     | GEN2       |
| 00114483    | Accelerating implementation of SDGs in Nepal (AISN)                            | 00116781    | Resilient & innovative financi         | Jan 2020   | Dec 2023 | $609,438         | $152,120              | DIM     | GEN2       |
| 00114483    | Accelerating implementation of SDGs in Nepal (AISN)                            | 00121846    | COVID 19 Recovery & Response           | Jan 2020   | Dec 2023 | $124,120         | $32,282               | DIM     | GEN2       |
| 00085642    | Management Support to Country Programme Implementation                        | 00123547    | Reorienting Public Finance SDG         | Jan 2021   | Mar 2021 | $769,004         | $20,418               | DIM     | GEN2       |

Sub Total Outcome 1

$36,403,336  $25,780,357
# 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Output ID</th>
<th>Output Title</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>End Year</th>
<th>2018-2021 Budget</th>
<th>2018-2021 Expenditure</th>
<th>Implementation Modality</th>
<th>Gender Marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00087656</td>
<td>Provincial and Local Governance Support Programme (PLGSP)</td>
<td>00094592</td>
<td>Provincial&amp;Local Governance Pr</td>
<td>Nov 2019</td>
<td>Dec 2023</td>
<td>$4,735,977</td>
<td>$2,957,713</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00049635</td>
<td>Support to Participatory Constitution Building in Nepal (PSP)</td>
<td>00122787</td>
<td>COVID Response by Parliament</td>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>Dec 2022</td>
<td>$279,732</td>
<td>$266,968</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00081509</td>
<td>Strategic Plan Support Project (SPSP) - National Human Rights Commission</td>
<td>00090739</td>
<td>Strategic Plan Support Project</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Dec 2021</td>
<td>$998,577</td>
<td>$949,010</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00081509</td>
<td>Strategic Plan Support Project (SPSP) - National Human Rights Commission</td>
<td>00122721</td>
<td>COVID-19 Response HRMonitoring</td>
<td>Jul 2020</td>
<td>Dec 2020</td>
<td>$91,746</td>
<td>$91,003</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00078361</td>
<td>Local Governance and Community Development Programme (LGDCDP)</td>
<td>00112244</td>
<td>Transition to SubNational Gove</td>
<td>Jul 2018</td>
<td>Mar 2020</td>
<td>$1,735,750</td>
<td>$1,603,563</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00078361</td>
<td>Local Governance and Community Development Programme (LGDCDP)</td>
<td>00106350</td>
<td>LGDCDP II Transition</td>
<td>Jul 2017</td>
<td>Oct 2018</td>
<td>$1,376,826</td>
<td>$925,877</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00085642</td>
<td>Management Support to Country Programme Implementation</td>
<td>00115498</td>
<td>Fostering Partnership for SDG</td>
<td>Apr 2019</td>
<td>Mar 2021</td>
<td>$2,050,412</td>
<td>$1,913,409</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00060493</td>
<td>Conflict Prevention Programme (SCDP)</td>
<td>00098538</td>
<td>Strengthening Social Cohesion</td>
<td>Jan 2016</td>
<td>Mar 2020</td>
<td>$682,683</td>
<td>$662,627</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00087857</td>
<td>Global Programme for Electoral Cycle Support Phase II</td>
<td>00094771</td>
<td>GPECS Phase II - Gender</td>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
<td>Dec 2021</td>
<td>$190,511</td>
<td>$62,817</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00085642</td>
<td>Management Support to Country Programme Implementation</td>
<td>00112909</td>
<td>Policy for PWD Strengthened</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
<td>Mar 2021</td>
<td>$293,880</td>
<td>$153,281</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00085642</td>
<td>Management Support to Country Programme Implementation</td>
<td>00126727</td>
<td>UNPRPD 4th round Inception Pha</td>
<td>Feb 2021</td>
<td>Dec 2021</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$40,866</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Output ID</td>
<td>Output Title</td>
<td>Start Year</td>
<td>End Year</td>
<td>2018-2021 Budget</td>
<td>2018-2021 Expenditure</td>
<td>Implement Modality</td>
<td>Gender Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00106402</td>
<td>Enhancing Access to Justice (A2I)</td>
<td>00107162</td>
<td>Legal Aid System Strengthened</td>
<td>Jul 2018</td>
<td>Jun 2021</td>
<td>$4,299,380</td>
<td>$3,874,004</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00086790</td>
<td>Transitional Justice (TJP)</td>
<td>00093987</td>
<td>Transitional Justice</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
<td>Apr 2020</td>
<td>$138,797</td>
<td>$177,630</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00096755</td>
<td>Global Programme - Rule of Law &amp; Human Rights</td>
<td>00100685</td>
<td>RoL/Human Rights - Peace &amp; Dev</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>Dec 2024</td>
<td>$762,025</td>
<td>$299,163</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub Total Outcome 2 $25,757,950 $ 20,774,943

OUTCOME 3: By 2022, environmental management, sustainable recovery and reconstruction, and resilience to climate change and natural disaster are strengthened at all levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Output ID</th>
<th>Output Title</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>End Year</th>
<th>2018-2021 Budget</th>
<th>2018-2021 Expenditure</th>
<th>Implementation Modality</th>
<th>Gender Marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00061320</td>
<td>Comprehensive Disaster Risk Management Programme (CDRMP)</td>
<td>00121373</td>
<td>COVID19 Preparedness &amp; Response</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>Dec 2020</td>
<td>$129,441</td>
<td>$ 68,025</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00057322</td>
<td>Livelihood Recovery for Peace (LRP/CILRP)</td>
<td>00111262</td>
<td>Livelihood Recovery through</td>
<td>Jul 2018</td>
<td>Mar 2021</td>
<td>$3,136,748</td>
<td>$2,963,930</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00057322</td>
<td>Livelihood Recovery for Peace (LRP/CILRP)</td>
<td>00095746</td>
<td>Fostering Rural Livelihoods</td>
<td>Jun 2015</td>
<td>Dec 2019</td>
<td>$2,780,723</td>
<td>$2,374,032</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00057322</td>
<td>Livelihood Recovery for Peace (LRP/CILRP)</td>
<td>00111230</td>
<td>Community WASH Improvement</td>
<td>Jun 2018</td>
<td>Dec 2019</td>
<td>$241,254</td>
<td>$197,138</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001126716</td>
<td>Support for Preparedness and Response to COVID-19 Outbreak</td>
<td>00121264</td>
<td>COVID-19 Socio Economic Assess</td>
<td>Mar 2020</td>
<td>Jun 2021</td>
<td>$64,200</td>
<td>$64,199</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00058298</td>
<td>Support to Nepal’s transition</td>
<td>00101729</td>
<td>Common Feedback Project</td>
<td>Jul 2016</td>
<td>Dec 2019</td>
<td>$614,349</td>
<td>$ 477,035</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00088893</td>
<td>Capacity Strengthening of NRA for Resilient Reconstruction (CSNRA)</td>
<td>00095357</td>
<td>NRA’s institutional capacity</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>Dec 2019</td>
<td>$180,874</td>
<td>$164,041</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00075193</td>
<td>Micro-Enterprise Development Programme (MEDEP) IV</td>
<td>00095805</td>
<td>Rapid Enterprise and Livelihood</td>
<td>Jun 2015</td>
<td>Jun 2019</td>
<td>$166,835</td>
<td>$ 7,981</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00106015</td>
<td>NAP Agriculture Nepal</td>
<td>00120002</td>
<td>Programme A: Biodiversity</td>
<td>Jan 2020</td>
<td>Dec 2020</td>
<td>$102,219</td>
<td>$ 28,423</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00124739</td>
<td>SIDA UNDP Strategic Collaboration on Env and CC</td>
<td>00120005</td>
<td>ProgC: Climate Change &amp; Energy</td>
<td>Jan 2020</td>
<td>Dec 2020</td>
<td>$159,632</td>
<td>$43,288</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00072738</td>
<td>Assisting LDCs to advance their NAPs</td>
<td>00097779</td>
<td>NAP Agriculture Nepal</td>
<td>Mar 2016</td>
<td>Mar 2019</td>
<td>$198,306</td>
<td>$183,747</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00112026</td>
<td>Achieving 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in AP</td>
<td>00125990</td>
<td>O1.5_COVID_RFF_DigitalV</td>
<td>Feb 2021</td>
<td>Dec 2021</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$56,806</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub Total Outcome 3

$34,298,732
$25,773,006

Grand Total

$ 96,455,018
$72,326,295

*Source: Data from Power BI as of December 9 2021.*
# ANNEX 6. SUMMARY OF CPD INDICATORS AND STATUS

*As reported by the Country Office*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression) 2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1: By 2022, impoverished, especially economically vulnerable, unemployed and under-employed and vulnerable people, have increased access to sustainable livelihoods, safe and decent employment and income opportunities.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.1. Proportion of population living below the national poverty line</td>
<td>Indicator 1.1.1. Proportion of population living below the national poverty line</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>21.6 (Progress)</td>
<td>18.7 (Progress)</td>
<td>16.7 (Progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.2. Share of bottom 40 percent in total income</td>
<td>Indicator 1.2.1. Share of bottom 40 percent in total income</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0% (Regression)</td>
<td>11.9% (Progress)</td>
<td>20.3% (Exceeded target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>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</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.1. Percentage of Universal Periodic Review recommendations implemented</td>
<td>Indicator 2.1.1. Percentage of Universal Periodic Review recommendations implemented</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>31% (Progress)</td>
<td>80% (Exceeded target)</td>
<td>87% (Exceeded target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.2. Number of vulnerable people accessing formal justice system</td>
<td>Indicator 2.2.1. Number of vulnerable people accessing formal justice system (total)</td>
<td>37,694</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>41,994 (Progress)</td>
<td>42,847 (Progress)</td>
<td>63,388 (Progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.2.2. Number of vulnerable people accessing formal justice system (Male)</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,747</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>20,065 (Regression)</td>
<td>20,665 (No change)</td>
<td>22,091 (Progress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


43 Accordin to Economic Survey 2019/20, the proportion of population living below the national poverty line is 16.7%. It is the head count ratio of poverty.

44 Source: Annual household survey, CBS

45 The annual household survey was not conducted by CBS.

46 According to SDG Progress Report prepared by National Planning Commission, the share of the bottom 40% in total income has increased from 11.9% (in 2019) to 20.3%, already exceeding the target of the CPD periods.

47 Source: Joint alternative UPR report of NHRC, 2020

48 UPR report has already been submitted by the Government to the Human Rights Council. New recommendations will be received once the SUR is conducted in November.

49 Source: Central Legal Aid Data and Supreme Court Data

49 The report of supreme court will be included in this section. The report of SC is not published until March end.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression) 2018</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression) 2019</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression) 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.2.3.</td>
<td>Number of vulnerable people accessing formal justice system (Female)</td>
<td>13,947</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>24,929 (Progress)</td>
<td>25,182 (Progress)</td>
<td>29,450 (Progress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome 3: 2022, environmental management, sustainable recovery and reconstruction, and resilience to climate change and natural disaster are strengthened at all levels.**

| Indicator 3.1. | Number of losses of human life compared to average annual loss between 2005 and 2015 | 900 | 350 | 479 (Progress) | 482 (Regression) | 554 (Regression) |
| Indicator 3.1.1. | Number of losses of human life compared to average annual loss between 2005 and 2015 | 900 | 350 | 479 (Progress) | 482 (Regression) | 554 (Regression) |

| Indicator 3.2. | Percentage reduction in direct annual economic loss due to damage and/or loss of agriculture, housing and critical infrastructure | 2% | 0.4% | 0.14% | 0.54% | 0.52% |
| Indicator 3.2.1. | Percentage reduction in direct annual economic loss due to damage and/or loss of agriculture, housing and critical infrastructure | 2% | 0.4% | 0.14% | 0.54% | 0.52% |

51 The Disaster Damage and Loss Database established with support from UNDP in 2019 is integrated into BIPAD platform of GON/MoHA. Now the portal is capturing the real time data.
53 The baseline refers to the actual annual average disaster loss against GDP for 2015.
54 The targets and milestones might differ in case of catastrophic events.
55 In 2020, the actual loss was estimated against GDP using MOHA actual damage figure and the MoF real GDP for 2020. Actual Damage data from MOHA, DRR Portal till December 2020: NPR 2 Ar. Total 1,959 infrastructures were also damaged during 2020.
### Output 1.1. Policy institutional and capacity development solutions lead to improved disaster and climate resilient livelihoods productive employment and increased productivity in rural areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1.1.1.</strong> Number of full-time equivalent jobs created with UNDP-supported interventions (SDG 8.2)(^{56})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Total</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>26,674 (Progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>6,585 (Progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Female</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>20,089 (Progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Youth</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>33,600</td>
<td>19,096 (Progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dalit</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>6,862 (Progress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Indicator 1.1.2.** Number of households with energy access with UNDP-supported interventions\(^{58}\) | | | |
| 1. Number of households benefited by micro-hydro power plants in targeted provinces | 89,054 | 119,054 | 118,111 (Progress) | 123,877 (Exceeded target) | 125,608 (Exceeded target) |

### Output 1.2. Municipalities adopt disaster and climate-resilient urban policies that promote access to safe and decent employment and income opportunities for vulnerable groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1.2.1.</strong> Urbanization strategy implemented for disaster and climate-resilient service delivery and economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Action plans adopted by # of targeted municipalities(^{60})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0 (No change)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{57}\) In 2020, 22,841 full time jobs created through 19,930 MEs supported by UNDP interventions (MEDPA: 10,019 jobs (7478 MEs), TRAC II: 11863 jobs/MEs and MPTF: 999 jobs (629 MEs) . Among them, 60% were women, 20% were Dalit and 88% were youths.

\(^{58}\) Source: Alternative Energy Promotion Centre

\(^{59}\) In 2020, additional 1731 households benefited from electricity access (Mini Hydro – 1396 HHs and Solar Mini Grid – 365 HHs).

\(^{60}\) Source: Provincial Government website [http://moial.sudurpashchim.gov.np/node/291](http://moial.sudurpashchim.gov.np/node/291)

\(^{61}\) As of December 2020, all the provinces have completed the formulation process of their DRR Policy and Strategic Action Plans. However, only Sudurpashim, Bagmati and Province II have endorsed the DRR Policy and SAP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Output Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression)</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development (SDG 11.a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1.2.2.</strong> Number of targeted municipalities with risk-informed planning, budgeting and service delivery capacities strengthened (SDG 11.b)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 (Progress)</td>
<td>2 (No change)</td>
<td>6 (Progress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.3.</strong> Improved national capacities in planning, monitoring, financing and reporting on 2030 agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1.3.1.</strong> Extent to which updated and disaggregated data is being used to monitor progress on national development goals aligned with the SDGs (SDG 17.18)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (No change)</td>
<td>2 (Progress)</td>
<td>2 (No change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1.3.2.</strong> National integrated financing framework for 2030 Agenda is in place</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 (No change)</td>
<td>1 (Progress)</td>
<td>1 (No change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1.3.3.</strong> Ease of ‘doing business in Nepal’ improved in three areas: starting a business; getting electricity; and getting credit</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>0 (No change)</td>
<td>94 (Regression)</td>
<td>94 (No change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


62 UNDP had developed electronic building permit (eBPS), an automated system helps in ensuring compliance of the building to national building code and local bye-laws. Also, the tracking mechanism and database system helps significant improvement in service delivery of the municipalities. In 2020, UNDP collaborated for establishment of eBPS in four municipalities, namely Changunarayan, Bhimdatta, Tulsipur and Madhyapur Thimi.


64 UNDP supported CBS for the development of Online Data Portal (ONDP) including a section on SDGs.


66 Source: The World Bank Report [https://www.doingbusiness.org/en/rankings](https://www.doingbusiness.org/en/rankings) Economies are ranked on their ease of doing business, from 1 – 190. A high ease of doing business ranking means the regulatory environment is more conducive to the starting and operation of a local firm. The rankings are determined by sorting the aggregate scores on 10 topics, each consisting of several indicators, giving equal weight to each topic.


68 Source: UNDP had developed electronic building permit (eBPS), an automated system helps in ensuring compliance of the building to national building code and local bye-laws. Also, the tracking mechanism and database system helps significant improvement in service delivery of the municipalities. In 2020, UNDP collaborated for establishment of eBPS in four municipalities, namely Changunarayan, Bhimdatta, Tulsipur and Madhyapur Thimi.

69 Nepal’s global ranking in ‘ease of doing business’ in 2020 is 94. The ranking for starting a business, getting electricity and getting credit are 135, 135 and 37 respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Output Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression)</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2.1.</strong> National level executive and legislative branches of the Government and commissions have the capacities and tools to implement the constitution including peaceful transition to federal structure</td>
<td><strong>Indicator 2.1.1.</strong> National level comprehensive capacity development plan implemented to enable the federal and subnational governments to function in the federal set up</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No (No change)</td>
<td>No (No change)</td>
<td>Yes (Target reached)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. National level comprehensive capacity development plan prepared to enable the federal and subnational governments to function in the federal set up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Activities of National level comprehensive capacity development plan implemented to enable the federal and subnational governments to function in the federal set up</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0% (No change)</td>
<td>0% (No change)</td>
<td>0% (No change)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicator 2.1.2.</strong> Number of laws drafted/reviewed in an inclusive and participatory manner to implement the constitution</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36 (Progress)</td>
<td>83 (Target exceeded)</td>
<td>113 (Target exceeded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

70 Source: [http://plgsp.np/node/144](http://plgsp.np/node/144)
71 Draft Capacity development plan is in place and being implemented. The capacity development plan has outlined the modes operandus of the capacity building of local government. And for all layers of the government, the PLGSP programme is being implemented.
72 The capacity development has just been developed. Will be implemented in the year to come.
73 Source: Draft Progress Report of PLGSP 2020 [http://plgsp.np/node/144](http://plgsp.np/node/144) and PSP MIS
74 A total of 30 laws were drafted/reviewed with UNDP supported in 2020.
**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

**Indicator 2.2.1.** Number of subnational governments with planning, monitoring and oversight systems and procedures for accountable government functions and inclusive risk-informed service delivery.\(^{75}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 (No change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (Target exceeded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (No change)(^76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 2.2.2.** Number of subnational governments with planning, monitoring and oversight systems and procedures for accountable government functions and inclusive risk-informed service delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 (No change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35 (Progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35 (No change)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{75}\) Source: [http://plgsp.np/node/144](http://plgsp.np/node/144)

\(^{76}\) Support provided to all 7 Provincial Governments to develop provincial SDG baseline reports which will serve as the guiding documents for planning, monitoring and oversight system for accountable government functions.

\(^{77}\) Two provinces (Sudur Paschim Province and Province no. 2) drafted the right to information bill.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Output Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression) 2018</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression) 2019</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression) 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>government institutions that ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation, international agreements and best practice in the region</td>
<td>institutions that ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation, international agreements and best practice in the region</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0 (No change)</td>
<td>0 (No change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of local government institutions that ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation, international agreements and best practice in the region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.3. Civic space for engagement voice and participation of youth women and vulnerable groups broadened at all levels</td>
<td>Indicator 2.3.1. Number of women benefitting from private and/or public measures to support women’s preparedness for leadership and decision-making roles</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>3,056</td>
<td>15,713 (Exceeded target)</td>
<td>2,186 (Regression)</td>
<td>2,399 (Progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 2.3.2. Number of civil society organizations using open platforms and</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9 (Exceeded target)</td>
<td>46 (Progress)</td>
<td>10 (Regression)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

78 Few of the local government are drafting the legislation on right to information. And the laws will be helpful in enhancing transparency.

79 Source: Parliamentary Support Project MIS data

80 213 (183 Women MPs and 30 government staffs) were supported for leadership roles in 2020.

81 10 CSO were partnered to promote voices of marginalized people in decision making process (Nepal Bar Association, Federation of Nepalese Journalists, NGO Federation of Nepal, ACORAB, AYON, Mitini Nepal,
Koshish, Karnali Foundation, Working Women Journalists, Mandala theater). A total of 85 ad hoc networks comprised of 450 members established to monitor the human rights situation during COVID pandemic.

81 Source: NHRC's Human Rights Situation during Covid-19: A Brief Assessment and PSP’s MIS

82 Source: Event Reports of ESP

83 Due to the urgent need and priority given to address and support COVID-19 related response, ESP provided support on COVID response and reached out to 790 people (40% women) through 8 webinars conducted on GESI issues.


85 The legal aid was provided through the legal aid committees and legal lawyers. A total of 5694 people were benefitted by the integrated legal aid services in 2020.

86 The legal aid was provided through the legal aid committees and legal lawyers. A total of 1426 men were benefitted by the integrated legal aid services in 2020.

87 The legal aid was provided through the legal aid committees and legal lawyers. A total of 4268 women were benefitted by the integrated legal aid services in 2020.

88 Training Report of Psychosocial counselling and metal health conducted by SPSP project

89 In 2020, a total of 181 conflict affected victims (110 women) of seven provinces provided training on psychosocial counselling and mental health that geared up collaboration of victims and provided the opportunity to conflict affected group and people discuss more on key issues, challenges and opportunities related to justice to transitional justice.
### Output 3.1

In 2020, a total of 181 conflict affected victims (110 women) of seven provinces provided training on psychosocial counselling and mental health that geared up collaboration of victims and provided the opportunity to conflict affected group and people discuss more on key issues, challenges and opportunities related to justice to transitional justice.

#### Indicator 3.1.1

1. **Disaster damage/loss database, disaggregated by age and sex maintained, analysed, disseminated and applied in decision-making**
   - **Baseline**: No
   - **Target 2022**: Yes
   - **Status (Progress/Regression) 2018**: No (No change)
   - **Status (Progress/Regression) 2019**: Yes (Progress)
   - **Status (Progress/ Regression) 2020**: Yes (Progress)

2. **Number of disaster reports analysed, disseminated and applied in decision-making**
   - **Baseline**: 0
   - **Target 2022**: 19
   - **Status (Progress/Regression) 2018**: 1 (Progress)
   - **Status (Progress/Regression) 2020**: 1 (Progress)

#### Indicator 3.1.2

1. **Number of risk and vulnerability assessments conducted for priority sub-watersheds, sectors and municipalities**
   - **Baseline**: 12
   - **Target 2022**: 19
   - **Status (Progress/Regression) 2018**: 15 (Progress)
   - **Status (Progress/Regression) 2020**: 15 (No change)

2. **Number of risk and vulnerability**
   - **Baseline**: 3
   - **Target 2022**: 2
   - **Status (Progress/Regression) 2018**: 4 (Progress)
   - **Status (Progress/Regression) 2020**: 5 (Progress)

---

91 Source: DRR Portal, Ministry of Home Affairs bipad.gov.np
92 Disaster Damage and Loss Database established with support from UNDP in 2019 is integrated into BIPAD platform of GON (MOHA). At the national level, an online platform has been developed t NDRRMA for monitoring national achievement against Sendai Framework for DRR as well as DRRM investments of a wide range of stakeholders in the country (Source: https://bipadportal.gov.np). Similarly, UNDP has innovated an online system in generating disaster profiles based on historical data. The system, is named by NDRRMA as NEP-DAT-Profile is being tested and is planned to be launched by the NDRRMA in January 2021. [http://bipad.gov.np/](http://bipad.gov.np/)
93 In additional to the Biannual reports, Annual reports are also prepared.
94 Source: DRR policy and strategic action plan documents of the provinces.
95 During DRR policy and strategic action plan formulation process, Risk profiles of all seven provinces have been developed. Strategic Action Plans for 2 municipalities approved. LDCF/GEF project yet to implement, hence there is zero progress. Risk and vulnerability assessment of watershed to be undertaken of the lower Dudh Koshi watershed as an output of ‘Climate resilient livelihoods in the vulnerable watershed’ in 2021
96 LDCF/GEF project to be implemented in 2021, hence there is zero progress.
### Output 3.2. Policy and institutional mechanisms strengthened for integrating gender responsive CCA/DRR and environment management in national and key sector's development planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Output Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Reports produced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 (Progress)</td>
<td>4 (Progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of risk and vulnerability assessments conducted for municipalities(^97)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 (Progress)</td>
<td>1 (No change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 3.2.1. Number of sectoral ministries integrate CCA/DRR in their plans based on National Planning Commission mainstreaming guidelines(^100)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38 (Progress)</td>
<td>59 (Progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 3.2.2. Number of rural and urban municipalities in targeted provinces having local development plans that integrate CCA/DRR(^102)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0 (Regression)</td>
<td>0 (No change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 3.2.3. Number of persistent organic pollutants (POPs) covered under new regulatory mechanism</td>
<td>19.45%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>30.66% (Progress)</td>
<td>30.24% (Regression)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output 3.3. Mechanisms in place to enable the Government and private

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Output Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

\(^96\) Source: Department of Forests and Soil Conservation Annual Report, Ministry of Forests and Environment

\(^98\) Source: DRR policy and strategic action plan documents of the municipalities, GIS based map atlas prepared for Bhimeshwar and Bharatpur

\(^99\) Source: During DRR policy and strategic action plan formulation process, risk profiles of 16 municipalities including all seven provincial headquarter have been developed.

\(^100\) Source: Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development

\(^101\) None at federal level in 2020; Risk Informed Public Investment Framework for provincial and municipal level developed and in a process of endorsement at MoFAGA

\(^102\) Source: Final EU/BBB Project Report submitted to the donor. Interim report submitted to ECHO


\(^105\) The Fiscal Year Budget 2019/20 allocated 30.3 % of climate relevant budget from the total annual budget. The FY 2020/21 allocated 32.4 % of climate relevant budget from the total annual national budget. The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Output Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sector to increase investment in CCA/DRR recovery and environment management</td>
<td>expenditure for climate risk management and recovery in selected sectors[^104]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for climate risk management and recovery in selected sectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Percentage of expenditure against annual allocation for climate risk management and recovery in selected sectors</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td>43% (Regression)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.43% (Exceeded target)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91% (Exceeded target)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 3.3.2. Public-private partnership strategy in place for increased investments for CCA/DRR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No (No change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (No change)</td>
<td>No (No change)</td>
<td>No (No change)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3.4. Capacities of subnational governments and communities for effective preparedness and response environment management CCA/DRR</td>
<td>Indicator 3.4.1. Number of people benefitting from ecosystem services through enhanced management of natural resources, biodiversity and watersheds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 3.4.2. Number of functional emergency operation centres[^108]</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20 (No change)</td>
<td>25 (Progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 (Progress)[^109]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^104]: expenditure of FY 2019/20 on climate relevant budget was 91% of total allocation.

[^108]: Source: Ministry of Finance, Financial Comptroller General Office

[^107]: Strategy on private sector financing for climate solutions being prepared.

[^106]: None of the existing project contributing this indicator.

[^109]: None of the existing project contributing this indicator.

[^108]: Source: Interim report submitted to ECHO, Handover of MEOC materials

[^109]: 1 MEOC in Lalitpur Metropolitan City is functional with secondment of Information Management Officer. Likewise 2 MEOCs in Bhimeshwor and Bharatpur are setup and established (inauguration planned for January 2020). Also, Chitwan DEOC, Dolakha DEOC and Gorkha DEOC
### Output 3.4.3. Flood risk reduced in number of potentially dangerous glacial lakes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 (No change)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output 3.5. Improved capacities of communities and government for resilient recovery and reconstruction.

#### Indicator 3.5.1. Percentage of new private houses meeting minimum compliance for earthquake resilience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>58.3% (Progress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Indicator 3.5.2. Number of people benefitting from livelihood-related recovery measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>278,110 (Progress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Indicator 3.5.3. Number of municipal and village councils that have strengthened recovery assessment, planning and coordination functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8 (Progress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

110 A joint report on potential dangerous glacial lakes has been published. No project directly contributing to the indicator.

111 Source: Monthly Factsheet of the Nepal Housing Reconstruction Project, submitted to the donor.

112 In 2020, completed reconstruction and received third tranche, which measures their compliance to the government set technical norms for seismic resilience.

113 Source: CDRMP and CILRP Projects MIS data.

114 2,832 Hhs supported through EU funded BBB initiative in Sindhupalchok and Dolakha. 17,448 Hhs supported in 7 earthquake affected districts through CILRP.

115 Source: Monthly reports of the Nepal Housing Reconstruction Project, submitted to the donor.

116 Supported 2 municipalities in effectively coordinating housing recovery and reconstruction.

117 Supported 6 Rural Municipalities in effectively coordinating housing recovery and reconstruction.

In 2019, UNDP was able to strengthen recovery assessment, planning and coordination functions of 8 rural municipalities through community based DRM plans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Output Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
<th>Status (Progress/Regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coordination functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source:

IRRF_CPD_SP_Indicators
Outcomes

Outputs

Date: December 8, 2021
ANNEX 7. COUNTRY AT A GLACE

Chart 1 - GDP per capita - Nepal 2006-2020, PPP (constant 2017 international dollar)

![GDP per capita chart](chart1.png)

Source: World Bank

Chart 2 - Poverty headcount ratio at $1.90 a day & $5.50 a day – Nepal (% of the population)

![Poverty headcount ratio chart](chart2.png)

Source: World Bank

Chart 3 – Net ODA received – Nepal, Constant 2018 USD in millions

![Net ODA received chart](chart3.png)

Source: World Bank
Chart 4 - Human Development Index Trends, 1990-2019: Nepal & South Asia

Source: UNDP, Human Development Report

Chart 5 – Human Development Index at National and Subnational Level

Source: Nepal Human Development Report 2020
Chart 6 – Targets and achievements in inequality measures (Gini coefficient)

Source: Voluntary National Review 2020

Chart 7 - IHDI values and overall losses due to inequality at the national and subnational levels

Source: Nepal Human Development Report 2020

Chart 7 - Nepal’s status on the LDC criteria, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>GRADUATION THRESHOLD</th>
<th>ACTUAL VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita GNI ($)</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAI</td>
<td>Above 66</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health index</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education index</td>
<td>20.4*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVI</td>
<td>Below 32</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure index</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock index</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The value of the education index has declined since 2019 due to changes in the definition of secondary education, which is defined as class IX to class XII.

Source: Nepal Human Development Report 2020

Source: Worldwide Governance Indicators


Concurrent between federal and provincial governments
25 powers (e.g., civil and civil work procedures, price control, family affairs, land policy, tourism, medicine, bankruptcy and insolvency, etc.)

Concurrent among all 3 tiers of government
15 powers (e.g., Cooperatives, education, health, agriculture, disaster management, management of landless, social security, etc.)

Note:
Schedule 5 of the Constitution states: “Issues not listed in the federation, province, and local level power or concurrent level power lists, along with other issues not mentioned in this constitution and law” belong to the Federal government (power 35). This is a form of ‘holding together federalism’ as opposed to one of ‘coming together’ (such as that evident in the United States of America) (see Breen, 2018).