



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

**Mid-term evaluation for
People to People Support for Building
Community Resilience through
Recovery and Reconstruction in Nepal Project**

Author: Louise Jönsson Andersson

International Organization for Migration (IOM)

October 2019

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This internal mid-term evaluation of the Royal Thai Government funded project ‘People to People Support for Building Community Resilience through Recovery and Reconstruction in Nepal’ was conducted between 22nd July and 30th September 2019. Through this project, the International Organization for Migration – UN Migration Agency is supporting eight rural and urban municipalities in Nepal in building resilience to natural hazards and man-made disasters. It does so through three outputs: 1) construct multi-purpose evacuation centres in each of the eight municipalities to be used by the community during normal circumstances and by vulnerable populations in the community during disasters; 2) identify and map open spaces using Geographic Information System; and 3) train newly elected local government officials and community members to mainstream reconstruction in local development plans. This evaluation was carried out through a desk review of relevant documents, such as monthly progress reports, as well as through interviews conducted with individuals representing different relevant stakeholder groups.

Key findings of this evaluation include:

- This project is aligned with national policy and legislation including the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act 2017 and the National Policy for Disaster Risk Reduction 2018. It is also aligned with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 – 2030 Priority 1: Understanding disaster risk; and Priority 4: Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response, and to Build Back Better in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction. Moreover, the project is aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals 11.7 for providing open spaces to women and vulnerable populations; 11.B for supporting Local Governments’ capacity to adopt and implement policies and plans aligned with the Sendai Framework; and 13.1 for strengthening resilience and adaptive capacity to disasters and natural hazards.
- Risk factors that were not initially accounted for in the Results Matrix surfaced during the project implementation, including land identification and availability. Some of the lands initially provided by Local Governments were located in National Parks and community owned forests, meaning that LGs do not have the authority to permit construction.
- Community awareness raising events that have been conducted during the course of the mid-term evaluation are considered a success.
- Gender is partially addressed in the project as a part of the government official disaster risk reduction and management training manual as well as cooperation with UN Women. The project ranks 1 on the Gender Marker scale as it includes gender in outcome and activities but not in a needs assessment.

Key recommendations of this evaluation include:

- For future projects in the planning phase, identify and eliminate risk factors regarding land identification and selection in terms of ensuring that the land is under LG jurisdiction to avoid delays.
- The larger community awareness raising events could have been conducted more strategically to coincide with the construction to further sensitize the purpose and use of the building.
- The gender aspect in this project could have been stronger with regards to the government official disaster risk reduction and management training manual that is described as gender aware rather than gender sensitive. A majority of the people included in this mid-term review have been male, giving a primarily male perspective to the level of gender inclusion as a whole in the project.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BBB	Building Back Better
CCCM	Camp Coordination and Camp Management
DRRM	Disaster Risk Reduction and Management
FG	Federal Government
GESI	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion
GIS	Geographic Information System
GLOF	Glacial Lake Outburst Flood
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IOM	International Organization for Migration
LG	Local Government
LPSC	Local Project Steering Committee
MoFAGA	Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration
MoHA	Ministry of Home Affairs
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MoUD	Ministry of Urban Development
MoWCSC	Ministry of Women, Children and Senior Citizen
P2P	People to People
PPR	Project Performance Review
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals

I. INTRODUCTION

The People to People Support for Building Community Resilience through Recovery and Reconstruction in Nepal Project (hereby referred to as the P2P Project) is funded by the Royal Thai Government and implemented by the International Organization for Migration (IOM). This project formed a Project Steering Committee (PSC) at a federal level. The PSC consists of one Joint Secretary each from the Ministry of Urban Development (MoUD), the Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration (MoFAGA) and the Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA), as well as the IOM Chief of Mission. There is also a Local Project Steering Committee (LPSC) in each of the eight project locations, consisting of local representatives including the Mayor, Deputy Mayor, Chief Administration Officer, Ward President and IOM Project Team staff. The steering committees were formed in order to ensure smooth project implementation and for efficient problem-solving purposes. This mid-term evaluation was commissioned by the IOM Country Office Nepal and was conducted internally within the IOM Program Unit. The evaluator and assisting colleague were chosen having no previous direct affiliation with the P2P Project. The evaluator conducted the mid-term evaluation and the colleague assisted with translation. This mid-term evaluation covers the first year of implementing the P2P Project in eight rural and urban municipalities in Nepal.

2 CONTEXT AND PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

2.1 CONTEXT

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) is the leading inter-governmental organization in the field of migration with 173 member states and another 8 states holding observer status. Nepal has been a member state of IOM since 2006, and the IOM Nepal Country Office manages a wide range of migration-related projects on topics including disaster risk reduction and resilience, emergency response and Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM).

Nepal is ranked the 20th most multi-hazard prone country in the world, and respectively 4th, 11th and 30th in terms of climate change, earthquake, and flood risk respectively. Other recurring hazards in Nepal include drought, storm, hailstorm, wildfire, cold-waves, and glacial lake outburst flood (GLOF). The 2015 Gorkha earthquakes claimed the lives of over 8,500 persons, destroyed over 600,000 homes and caused damage to thousands of structures including historical monuments, schools, health care facilities and government buildings. In the aftermath, approximately 2.8 million people were reported as displaced and in need of humanitarian assistance,¹ and 117,700 people in the 14 severely affected districts resided in camps, makeshift tents, and shelters.² Unorganized urban sprawl, unplanned land use, inadequate monitoring of building construction and insufficient open space policies altogether contributed to the widespread impacts of the earthquakes. IOM had 83 pre-identified open spaces in Kathmandu Valley, all of which were immediately used. 38 were still in use a week after the earthquakes, housing no less than 36,104 people.

In this context, the Royal Thai Government funded the two-year P2P Project that was undertaken by IOM. The project is supporting eight rural and urban municipalities in building resilience against natural hazards

¹ UN OCHA, *Flash Appeal Nepal Earthquake 2015* (2015). Available from https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/nepal_earthquake_2015_revised_flash_appeal_june.pdf

² IOM Nepal, *Displacement Tracking Matrix – Nepal Earthquake 2015* (2015). Available from <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/2015-06-15%20-%20Nepal%20EQ%20DTM%20Report%20Round%202.pdf>

through the construction of eight multi-purpose evacuation centres (hereby referred to as ‘evacuation centres’). The overall aim of the project was to minimize the challenges Nepal is facing regarding natural hazards and displacement, and building resilience through sustainable recovery. The intended project outcome for the targeted communities were safer infrastructure, evacuation and collection points and a focus on sustainable reconstruction through the principle of building back better (BBB).³

2.2 EVALUATION PURPOSE

This mid-term evaluation was conducted internally in order to identify any strengths or weaknesses encountered during the project’s first year of implementation that can be brought into the second half of the project. Identifying and highlighting strengths and weaknesses ensures an implementation as efficient and successful as possible, which was the intended outcome of this evaluation. Furthermore, this evaluation was an opportunity for project stakeholders to raise any commendations, concerns or other feedback regarding the project and its implementation, assuring their participating role during the implementation phase. The evaluation was conducted internally in order to lift insights from what had been done, good practices, lessons learnt and potential improvements to what had yet to be done.

This internal mid-term evaluation was conducted after twelve months of project implementation in order to examine the baselines established during the inception of the project for each outputs and measure against the indicators developed in the results framework at the district and community levels. The main objective of this evaluation was to allow the project to adapt the activities and inputs to meet the changing context, if necessary.

2.3 EVALUATION SCOPE

The geographical scope of this evaluation covers the following eight municipalities: Gosaikunda rural municipality in Rasuwa district; Neelkantha municipality in Dhading district; Gorkha municipality in Gorkha district; Chautara Sangachowkgadi municipality in Sindhupalchowk district; Bhimeswor municipality in Dolakha district; Changunarayan municipality in Bhaktapur district; Lalitpur Metropolitan City in Lalitpur district; and Shankharapur municipality in Kathmandu district. The evaluation covers the first half of the project period up until the duration of the evaluation, i.e. June 2018 to September 2019.

2.4 EVALUATION CRITERIA

The five main criteria of this evaluation are as listed below:

1. **Relevance:** assesses the extent to which the project’s objective and intended results remain valid and pertinent either as originally planned or as subsequently modified;
2. **Effectiveness:** assesses the extent to which a project achieves its intended results;
3. **Efficiency:** assesses how well human, physical and financial resources are used to undertake activities, and how well these resources are converted into outputs;
4. **Impact and sustainability:** assesses the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the project, intentionally or unintentionally; and the durability of the project’s results and continuation of the benefits; and

³ “The use of the recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction phases after a disaster to increase the resilience of nations and communities through integrating disaster risk reduction measures into the restoration of physical infrastructure and societal systems, and into the revitalization of livelihoods, economies and the environment.” UNDRR, *Terminology*. Available from <https://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/terminology>

5. Cross-cutting issues: assesses gender mainstreaming, environmental sensitivity and sustainability, and project results sustainability.

3 EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION

Both qualitative and quantitative data collection methodologies were used for this mid-term evaluation, and both primary and secondary data were used. Purposive sampling was applied for choosing the interviewees as well as the locations for field visits, i.e. selection was based on project affiliation.

1. Desk review: a desk review was conducted with for the project directly relevant documents such as project proposal, monthly project reports, as well as other documentation as the 'Planning, Conducting and Using Project Performance Reviews (PPR)' and the 'IOM Project Handbook, Module 6: Evaluation'. The desk review enabled familiarization with the project and the structure of conducting a mid-term evaluation in accordance with internal guidelines for IOM.
2. Structured interviews: a total of 14 interviews were conducted between the 7th August and 27th September. The structured interviews were held with individuals affiliated to the project including mayors, wards, engineers and project staff. The evaluator grouped the interviewees into three: LPSC, PSC and IOM project team and produced four questionnaires, one for each group plus one for the IOM consultant that is conducting the needs and capacity assessment. The questionnaires were based on the five criteria as listed and described above.
3. Field visits: the evaluator conducted one field visit to Gorkha (27th August) as well as field visits within Kathmandu Valley for interview purposes.

The evaluation is aligned with the IOM Data Protection Principles, UNEG norms and standards for evaluations, and relevant ethical guidelines.

3.2 DATA ANALYSIS

The information collected from the interviews as well as from the desk review of the monthly reports and project updates were compiled and analyzed in order for the evaluator to answer the questions related to the evaluation criteria.

3.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

One limitation was the factor that the evaluator does not speak the language and needed translation assistance for some of the interviews. 5/14 interviews needed to be shortened to between 20 and 35 minutes, resulting in a selection of the most relevant questions. The selection of which questions to ask and which to disregard was made in consultation between the evaluator and the translator. Finally, with some interviewees it was challenging confirming an interview date which delayed the data collection.

4 FINDINGS

The findings of this mid-term evaluation are presented below clustered in the five evaluation criteria.

4.1 RELEVANCE

The project has provided a clear Results Matrix in which the inputs from project stakeholders have been considered and accounted for. There is consensus among the project stakeholders regarding the relevancy and accuracy of the indicators and targets in the Results Matrix, however there have been raised concerns

about missing components for Output 1.1,⁴ such as the construction of a canteen, a place for meditation or adding heritage features. Instead, the responsibility of any additional funding and construction in relation to the multi-purpose evacuation centres falls on the LGs. This in mind that the project was designed to reinforce critical structures but instead ended up constructing new evacuation centres. This because the critical structures in the municipalities were already being reconstructed or reinforced, so the construction of evacuation centres was agreed upon in the project locations. Onwards, while the stakeholders are content with the Results Matrix, there have been activities that were delayed or not performed altogether. For Output 1.1, activity ii⁵ was not fulfilled as by the time the project was launched in the districts, reconstruction of critical structures were already being conducted as mentioned above. Thus, the need for reconstruction diminished and it was decided there would be construction of new evacuation centres instead. This, in turn, created partial causes for delays for activity v,⁶ as all evacuation centres were planned to be built simultaneously, i.e. delays in one municipality would affect the other seven as well. As for initial delays in the work plan, the project approval took longer than anticipated by the IOM Project Team. The delayed project approval caused budgetary risks that were not anticipated during the formation of the project. The delay affected the budget due to the rising prices of building materials, meaning that for the same budget the project will construct smaller evacuation centres than was initially planned within the same budgetary frame. This has in turn caused some concerns among the stakeholders whom were expecting larger constructions.

The Results Matrix presents assumptions but no risk factors or mitigation strategies. While there have been changes in the terms for the assumptions, as some of them are no longer holding true, the interviewees still lifted that they are manageable. This includes the project timeline and the delays in the work plan. The project stakeholders have displayed different opinions concerning the delays as well as root causes and solutions, but at the current stage of the project a common standpoint is to initiate and finish the construction as efficiently as possible in order to ensure completion of the evacuation centres on time. As referred to above concerning land identification and selection, one of the risk factors not accounted for was that a few LGs wanted to build the evacuation centre on land that was located within National Parks and community owned forests. The LGs in question were certain of their role as autonomous bodies with the power to utilize the land in their territory, whereas such is not the case with National Parks and community owned forests which fall under federal government control. Convinced of their power, the LGs wanted to proceed with the chosen land while new land had to be allocated with respect to the federal government's authority. This situation caused delays in the work plan. In this scenario, it is evident that the transition phase to the three tier federalism government structure has also been a challenge for the project.

When viewing this project in a larger context in relation to local, national, regional and global strategies, the knowledge among the interviewees has varied quite much. 7/10 of the PSC and LPSC interviewees have linked the project with national and global policies and strategies such as the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act 2017, the Disaster Risk Reduction National Strategic Plan of Action 2018-2030, the National Policy for Disaster Risk Reduction 2018, as well as the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. The construction of the evacuation centres has been linked by interviewees as

⁴ Output 1.1: Rebuild or reinforce existing critical infrastructure or community centers to provide safe places for evacuation and recovery following a disaster.

⁵ Output 1.1, Activity ii: Conduct rapid assessment in the project districts.

⁶ Output 1.1, Activity v: Reconstruction and reinforcement of eight critical or communal structures in the districts.

being aligned with the National Building Code. In other cases, the interviewees have displayed lacking knowledge about the project's link to legislative and policy frameworks. The development of training materials and conducting capacity development trainings for local government officials (activities ii and iii⁷ for Output 1.3)⁸ are planned for the fourth quarter of 2019.

4.2 EFFECTIVENESS

The effectiveness of the project implementation has been affected by some factors from the start. The project approval and funding provision took longer than anticipated, more than a year, which in turn caused a delay in the overall implementation. As for the delay in the work plan and construction, there has been much input from the interviewees regarding how to ensure the effectiveness of the second half of the project. Emphasis was placed on working hard and with dedication. There has also been a focus on the construction company, as stakeholders have highlighted that a good and efficient company that is familiar with the area and settings can enable the project to make up for the time lost. Effective collaboration has been another factor that has been lifted, both with the construction company and IOM field colleagues, and with the LGs in terms of being proactive and in general for monitoring purposes. As for the LGs need to be proactive, the interviewees have raised that as implementing partners, the LPSC have tended to commit too much to the evacuation centres while failing to provide what is necessary for the continuation of the project implementation such as land development and road access. It has also been highlighted that the LPSC have contrasted in comparison to other stakeholders due to different expectations from the project, such as a larger project budget and size of the evacuation centres. These restrictions of the project could be communicated to and understood by the LPSC.

It should be emphasized that not all parties involved have experienced the construction delay as a major part of this project, or even as an identified delay at all. 3/8 LPSC interviews highlight no perceived delays, whereas the other five placed emphasis on the delays in their interviews. Moreover, many of the challenges that caused the delay have been overcome by now that the project is more than halfway through. In order to ensure smooth implementation and to minimize the risk for further delays, five field supervisors with technical expertise have been employed by IOM to monitor and have a decision-making function with their competences and presence. This will greatly assist the IOM Project Team, as missing a technical expert in the team has been lifted as a problem at times when technical issues have surfaced.

“There have not been any delays I have seen yet, because we have to follow the procedure and cannot implement randomly.”
- Mayor, Neelkantha municipality

Moreover, all of the PSC and LPSC interviewees have confirmed regular and well documented meetings with the committees. Some of the LPSC members have highlighted that they have separate monitoring systems, supervision units and technical staff appointed at a municipal level to ensure the quality of the project implementation and the construction. While the construction delay has been highlighted during the interviews, the interviewees also raised their confidence that the construction of the evacuation centres (Output 1.1), once delivered, will contribute to the project's results and the local disaster preparedness. Much emphasis has been placed on the delays and what needs to be done to have them rectified, however the interviewees have also pointed towards the project activities that are running

⁷ Output 1.3, Activity ii: Development of training curriculum and training materials, and Activity iii: Conduct trainings for Government officials.

⁸ Output 1.3: Orient and train newly elected local government officials and community members to mainstream reconstruction within local development plans to increase effectiveness and sustainability.

smoothly. Output 1.2⁹ is being smoothly implemented and has identified potential open spaces that can be used for humanitarian purposes in the five districts outside Kathmandu Valley. The open spaces identification has been undertaken in consultation with a multitude of relevant actors, including the communities, LGs, Nepal Security Forces and local agencies (activity i). The project has completed its first round of consultations in the five districts (activity ii), and is currently mapping services surrounding the open spaces such as WASH (water, sanitation and hygiene), transport and warehouses (activity iii). Moreover, Geographic Information System (GIS) maps for the identified open spaces (activity iv) are currently under development. The project is also developing a mobile application and a web portal for the identification of open spaces, that will notify users of open spaces and services/facilities that serve a humanitarian purpose in the event of a disaster. The PSC interviewees have highlighted regular meetings and documentation. However, it was lifted that conducting more meetings than the committee currently do would be an advantage. In terms of project coordination, it has been raised that it would be useful for PSC members to receive monthly updates with the planned activities for the upcoming month to enable the PSC members to plan accordingly and thus be able to attend more of the activities.

4.3 EFFICIENCY

The project is regularly monitoring the budget and have made several revisions as per the factors explained above in chapter 4.2 *Effectiveness*. The delays affected the budget due to rising prices of construction materials, resulting in revising the size of the planned evacuation centres in order not to exceed the budget. These revisions were made following the internal procedures. The level of efficiency has varied in the different stakeholder groups as well as among the municipalities in which the evacuation centres are being constructed. While all LGs have provided much valuable support and input for the project, some ideas were omitted due to being out of scope of the purpose of the project, as well as exceeding the available budget. Moreover, there have been varying priorities in the municipalities as some have prioritized providing land to IOM for the evacuation centres, whereas other municipalities have experienced more political tension in the matter as they would rather see the land most ideal for construction being used for other kinds of structures, such as large municipal meeting halls. In some of the municipalities, the LGs were proactive in providing resources for the construction of boundary walls and canteen in some cases. Regarding land availability, it proved more challenging to attain land in urban centres in comparison to the other locations due to the very high land price values.

As for the recruitment of a construction company, there were some misunderstandings in the process. A hiring advertisement was published in a national newspaper both (Nepali and English) and the recruiting was open for any contractor, local or national. Due to a misperception no local contractors applied. Once the recruitment process was ongoing there were still some misunderstandings with the LGs as to whether the contractor had been recruited by IOM or not. Finally, as a contractor was selected following the standard IOM procedure, IOM made sure to inform the LGs about them as well as brought the contractors to the LGs for introductions and to provide official letters of selection to mitigate any future misunderstandings regarding this process.

4.4 IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY

⁹ Output 1.2: Identify and map open spaces using a Geographic Information System (GIS) to safeguard open spaces for use as evacuation centres and shelter by communities and government.

It is evident that the stakeholders perceive the project as resilient, underlining that there are no identified external factors that might jeopardize or have a negative impact on the project implementation and a complete absence of negative impacts on beneficiaries from the project, as confirmed by all interviewees. However, it is pointed out that in order to strengthen the community impact of the project, more engagement activities such as more awareness events and facilitating meetings for e.g. women's or children's groups, are needed after the construction has been initiated and finalized.

“We also have common understanding between IOM that IOM support to construct center, and the municipality will add money to build other structures like a kitchen.”

- Mayor, Shankarapur municipality

As for the sustainability of the project results, the interviewees have revealed different understandings of how the evacuation centres will be managed after project closure and handover. Among the LPSC, some have raised their own responsibilities in terms of maintenance and budget allocation, while others demonstrate a greater reliance on further financing from external sources, including an

outspoken wish for future collaboration with and financing from IOM. Target b for Output 1.3, *At least 2% of development budget allocated for reconstruction at a local level*, is recognized by several interviewees as being beyond the control of the project as well as being immeasurable. This is due to that the project was drafted before the endorsement of the DRRM Act 2017, as the Act has aimed the responsibility for reconstruction at a provincial and federal level, not at a local level. In other words, prior to the endorsement of the DRRM Act 2017 there was another need for Local Governments to finance reconstruction as compared to today. This explains why Target b for Output 1.3 is less relevant today as compared to when the project was first planned. Still, a majority of the LGs (7/8) refer to having a program and/or funds allocated at a local level for reconstruction purposes. There is an overall strong political will among the LGs to focus on impact and sustainability in the operation of the evacuation centres. To strengthen the LGs in the handover phase, there will be operational and maintenance guidelines developed and disseminated, and the project will also conduct a training to the LGs on care and maintenance of the evacuation centre to ensure its smooth long term running.

Moreover, as mentioned under chapter 4.2 *Effectiveness*, the project is developing a web portal for the identification of open spaces. The portal was initially planned to be independent, but after a meeting with MoHA it was suggested to merge it with a web portal that MoHA is managing. Integrating the IOM web portal with the government portal would strengthen the capacity, ensure the sustainability and continuous use of the information, and institutionalize open spaces work and information. Also the training module that will be used to train the local governments is being owned by the Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration. This will also contribute to sustainability of the project as more trainings could be conducted beyond the project duration and project area.

4.5 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

There is more or less consensus among the interviewees regarding the integration of gender in the project. While gender parity has not been even in the evaluation itself, as a majority of the interviewees have been male, strong emphasis has been placed on gender integration in the project from design to implementation. Four interviewees said while gender is integrated in the project, such as gender parity among IOM Project Team members, it could have been stronger. Design wise, it is a Gender Code 1 project, meaning that the project includes gender in outcome and activities, but not in a needs assessment. What has been raised as a potential issue is how to mainstream gender at a community level, and in order to reach a gender mainstreaming level the project would need to achieve Gender Code 2a level, which also includes the gender component in a needs assessment. In order to do so, there will also

need to be follow-ups at the local level once the construction of the evacuation centres is finalized, and then approached through trainings and awareness raising on how women and other vulnerable groups would be treated at the evacuation centres in case of disaster; that would need to be considered when developing the operational guidelines for the evacuation centre and its use. It is noteworthy that MoFAGA has a separate department working specifically with GESI (gender equality and social inclusion), and brings this component into the projects that MoFAGA is involved in. Furthermore, it has been highlighted that gender issues would be more successfully integrated by achieving a higher level of female representation in the project, including in the ministries. As for the government official disaster risk reduction and management training manual (hereby referred to as the 'training manual') that is currently under development for future use of government officials, there could be stronger focus on gender in terms of transforming training participants from gender neutral or gender aware to being gender sensitive. However, it is also pointed out that the training manual's first and foremost purpose is to strengthen DRRM capacity at a local level.

The interviews have clearly indicated good environmental practices and that both negative and positive environmental impacts have been considered. An environmental assessment checklist was used during the identification of open spaces and construction sites to rule out any negative environmental impacts. When asked about project actions to raise awareness and visibility of its actions, the interviews show a discrepancy in understanding and consideration of the project's awareness raising. Interviews with LPSC members have shown a focus on the construction and the delays at a greater extent when compared to the other interview groups, while also a minority of the LPSC interviewees have addressed awareness altogether. This in mind that not all municipalities at the time of this evaluation had conducted its community awareness raising event. Interviewees have raised the need for interactive programs with the community members, beneficiaries, stakeholders and municipalities, as well as how arranging community awareness raising event upon completing of the evacuation centre construction would help sensitize the community. As for the PSC, the community awareness raising events are considered an achievement. The community awareness raising events have been a part of the project's focus on accountability towards the project beneficiaries. Information about project activities and planned results have also been communicated through info boards about the construction next to the construction sites, dissemination of project info sheets that provide the core project information and Outputs, and project launch meetings with the LPSCs.

"[The] project did [raise awareness] through different activities like awareness-raising and drama in the community which was supportive to people to better understand the disaster and its response."
- Mayor, Shankarapur municipality

There have been a number of lessons learnt, good practices and success stories from the first year of this project implementation. Arranging the agreements regarding land and construction in beforehand with the municipalities has been lifted as a strong lesson learnt, as it would spare those involved from the communication issues and save time. The need for a technical expert on the team, as already mentioned above, was also highlighted as a lesson learnt that should be considered for future projects. This technical expertise would prove useful especially during the building design phase. Moreover, parts of the Results Matrix became obsolete due to the delay between the initial drafting of the Results Matrix until the project approval. Hence, some project outputs are no longer within the control of the project, but will affect the final evaluation of the project's achievements. As for Output 1.3, even if the project performs all planned activities it cannot ensure mainstreaming of reconstruction as it ultimately depends of the local dedication to the matter. There were also more generalized lessons learned lifted during the

interviews such as avoiding delays already during the project design phase, always aiming to be as transparent as possible and always to over budget.

“All community members will support and [feel] ownership. The public were asking us when we would start building the construction. They are eagerly waiting to see and to use the building.”
- Mayor, Changunarayan municipality

As for good practices and success stories, the most referred to is the strong ownership among the project stakeholders and beneficiaries, and how the local community would become engaged in the project. Interviewees also highlighted that there had been no communication gap since the project start, which goes hand in hand with the formation of the PSC

and LPSC and the regular meetings that they held, which also has been highlighted as a very positive aspect of the project. Furthermore, it was emphasized that all staff involved have been supportive and helpful, and that the project has enabled local hazard and disaster risk identification. The documentation procedure has been described as thorough and regular, the close working relationship with the LGs including the use of district focal points further improved the communication procedures, and lastly applying modern technology in the open spaces mapping when using drones instead of satellite maps which ultimately improves the quality of the images.

In terms of project implementation, it was suggested that IOM for future projects leave more responsibility to the municipalities in terms of planning and implementation, or ask for a small buy-in as to strengthen the sense of ownership in the project. In this context, it was explained that the municipalities become accustomed to external assistance in projects like the P2P Project, and the way to break that dependence is to provide small areas of responsibilities that will increase over time. That would not only increase ownership, but also ensure the sustainability of the project.

6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The interviews have shown how the P2P Project is aligned with national policy and frameworks. Clear connections can also be drawn between the P2P Project and global frameworks. It is aligned with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 – 2030, in particular under Priority 1¹⁰ through the trainings of government officials and the community awareness raising events, and Priority 4¹¹ under the promotion of resilient construction and BBB. Moreover, the P2P Project is aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in particular Goal 11, *Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable*, Target 11.7¹² through the identification and protection of open spaces, and Target 11.B¹³ through the support to Local Governments to enhance their local DRRM policy and resilient construction. The P2P Project is also aligned with Goal 13, *Take urgent actions to combat climate change and its impacts*, Target 13.1-3¹⁴ as the evacuation centres, open spaces and increased awareness about them strengthens the resilience, knowledge and capacity in the eight municipalities where the project is being implemented.

¹⁰ Sendai Framework Priority 1: Understanding disaster risk.

¹¹ Sendai Framework Priority 4: Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to “Build Back Better” in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction

¹² SDG 11.7: By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities

¹³ SDG 11.B: By 2020, substantially increase the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, and develop and implement, in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, holistic disaster risk management at all levels

¹⁴ SDG 13.1: Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries; SDG 13.2: Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning; SDG 13.3: Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning.

The conclusions and related recommendations below have been drawn both by the evaluator and been specifically been raised by interviewees during the data collection.

Risk factors: A number of risk factors that were not initially accounted for or had risk mitigation strategies developed for surfaced during the course of the project. These risk factors have had synergy effects that have come to affect the project implementation as a whole. The restructuring to the three tiers of government and the new governmental roles that come with it has proven challenging for the project. Difficulties in land allocation for the construction of the evacuation centres in some municipalities caused delays in the work plan. In those cases, the LGs allocated land located in National Parks or community forests, which are under federal government control and would require much time for acquiring the necessary building permits. That delay, in turn, affected the budget allocated for the project as inflation resulted in higher construction expenditures than initially planned for. The building design had to be revised at multiple occasions to ensure the construction cost would be aligned with the rising prices of construction materials in order to not exceed the project budget. As the local partners and beneficiaries of the LPSC were expecting buildings the size of the initial planning, concerns were raised when the size of the evacuation centres needed to be reduced to avert exceeding the budget. **Recommendation:** Due to the changing roles of the three tiers of government being implemented after the project design the risk would have been hard to avert. Legislative issues can be mitigated by ensuring that the project is aligned with both local and federal legislation, as well as selecting the land early on in the project. In the current state of the project, the above mentioned risk factors have been dealt with and sorted out together with the stakeholders. As for ensuring smooth project implementation during the second year, the hiring of five field supervisors with technical expertise will gain the project as a whole, as they will be able to address and facilitate any issues immediately and make informed decisions regarding the construction. This will mitigate delays during the construction phase. This will in turn help achieving Output 1.1.

Roles and responsibilities: The findings demonstrate some discrepancies among the Local Project Steering Committees and their understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the different project partners and stakeholders. While some LPSC are very initiative in terms of establishing their own project and construction monitoring systems, hiring their own technical experts for the construction, adding features to the evacuation centres and having an exit strategy, other LPSC are displaying more dependency on IOM and wish for continued partnership and funding. **Recommendation:** For the second half of the project implementation, the assigned roles as agreed upon through the signing of the MoU should be highlighted in order to prepare the LPSC for the takeover of the project. When developing and conducting the trainings for Output 1.3 for the local government officials (activities ii and iii), the sustainability and ownership aspects of the project need to be stressed. Moreover, giving the municipalities more responsibility in the project implementation, such as through responsibility for some project activities, could raise their sense of ownership and thus strengthen the sustainability of the project results.

Awareness raising and sensitizing the communities: Community awareness raising events were being conducted in the communities during the course of this evaluation. While conducting the awareness raising events halfway through the project can provide the LPSCs a focus on the whole of the project rather than just the construction delay, it may be more difficult for the community members to understand the purpose of the evacuation centre itself when it has not yet been constructed. **Recommendation:** Conduct more awareness raising initiatives after the evacuation centres have been constructed in order to further sensitize the communities on how the evacuation centres can be utilized. IOM can coordinate with different stakeholders to conduct trainings and orientations to cover how the

center works and will function in the event of a disaster. Moreover, programmes can be held at the evacuation centre on days such as World Environment Day 5th June or International Day for Disaster Reduction 13th October.

Gender: Gender has been reflected in the project activities and outcomes, namely in output 1.3, activity iv,¹⁵ making it a Gender Code 1 project. UN Women has been involved to bring in capacity building on gender and gender-specific response during disasters. As for the government official disaster risk reduction and management training manual that is currently being developed by IOM, there is an integration of gender wherever possible, but gender is not a focus area of the training manual, though it is currently being reviewed by UN Women. **Recommendation:** In order to make gender a long-term part of the evacuation centres and their use for the community, it has been suggested that UN Women could bring in the Ministry of Women, Children and Senior Citizen (MoWCSC) for their buy-in in the project in order to ensure their involvement in developing training modules. This could make a change at the operational level for women. Furthermore, it was also suggested to provide separate trainings that focus exclusively on gender and protection issues during disaster. The training would highlight the special needs of primarily women, adolescent girls and children, and would highlight how these groups can become integrated in local governance processes to bring in their perspective into local decision making. At a project level, it was suggested that women and adolescent girls are involved from the project design phase as well as included in all data collection to ensure their visibility.

¹⁵ Output 1.3, Activity iv: Orientation and awareness raising on DRR, human trafficking and gender equality for community members.

7 ANNEXES

7.1 LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

International Organization for Migration

2015. *IOM Gender Equality Policy 2015 – 2019*.

2015. *Rights-Based Approach to Programming*.

2017. *IOM Project Handbook, Module 6: Evaluation*.

2019. *Planning, Conducting and Using Project Performance Reviews (PPR)*.

Consolidated Monthly Project Updates from IOM Project Team

7.2 LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

No.	Date	Title
1	7 th August 2019	Mayor of Bhimeswor municipality
2	15 th August 2019	Under Secretary at MoFAGA
3	16 th August 2018	Mayor of Neelkantha municipality
4	21 st August 2019	Mayor of Changunarayan municipality
5	22 nd August 2019	Engineer/DRR Focal Person, Lalitpur municipality, Lalitpur district
6	23 rd August 2019	IOM Project Team
7	25 th August 2019	Mayor of Gosaikunda rural municipality, Rasuwa district
8	26 th August 2019	Mayor, Chautara Sangachowkgadi municipality, Sindhupalchowk district
9	26 th August 2019	Mayor, Shankharapur municipality, Kathmandu district
10	27 th August 2019	Engineer, Gorkha municipality, Gorkha district
11	3 rd September 2019	IOM Project Team
12	20 th September 2019	IOM Project Team
13	25 th September 2019	MoHA Under-Secretary
14	27 th September 2019	MoUD Joint Secretary

7.3 INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRES

QUESTIONNAIRE: LOCAL PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE

1. Is the results matrix clear and logical and does it show how activities will effectively lead to results and outcomes? If not, why not?
2. Is the work plan available and used? If not, why not?
3. Are the assumptions still holding true? Are risk management arrangements in place?
4. Is the project linked to a country and/or regional IDPs/DRRM strategy and if so, how?
5. Has the planned timeline been kept during the first half of the project implementation? Are there any delays, and how will they be rectified?
6. Are the LPSC meetings/decisions well documented?

7. Are implementing partners managing their role/contribution effectively? Is there any control in place to monitor the work of the implementing partners?
8. Are the delivered outputs likely to contribute to the intended results/outcomes?
9. To what extent has the project adapted or is able to adapt to changing external conditions in order to ensure project outcomes?
10. Did the programme management take/planned to take appropriate measures to counter any unplanned negative effects on target groups (e.g. related to environment, gender, human rights, governance, or others)?
11. Did changes in policies and stakeholders priorities affect the implementation of the project and how well is it adapting in terms of long-term needs for support?
12. Were there any unplanned positive effects on the results? To what extent has this contributed/is expected to contribute to improve project results?
13. Are the project objective(s) (and outcomes) consistent with beneficiaries' needs and supportive of partner government policies and programmes?
14. Was the project designed with the beneficiary inputs in the design (e.g. communities, local government etc.)? Do the beneficiaries participate to implementation and how?
15. Do/will all target groups have access to the project outcomes, i.e. the evacuation centres?
16. Do all key stakeholders still demonstrate effective commitment (ownership)?
17. Does the project benefit from the present capacity of the local partners? Does it contribute to improve it?
18. To what degree are inputs provided/available to/from all parties involved to implement activities and at planned cost?
19. Have all partners been able to provide their financial and/or human resources contributions?
20. Are there any in-kind contributions? If so, are they being acknowledged?
21. What impacts are already apparent or very likely to be reached (expected/unexpected and positive/negative) and can they be specifically attributed to the project?
22. Are there any external factors likely to jeopardize project impact?
23. Did the project take timely measures to mitigate any unplanned negative impacts?
24. Is there any possible indirect impact that deserves to be taken into account?
25. If relevant, are funds likely to be made available to institutionally support the results after closure of the project? If so, by whom?
26. Is there a phase-out strategy or exit strategy that is in place or being developed?
27. Do the target groups have any plans to continue making use of the services/products produced in the project framework?
28. Are project partnerships being properly developed (technically, financially and managerially) for continuing to deliver the project's benefits/services?
29. Will a part of the local development budget have a reserve for reconstruction at a local level? If so, how much (%)?
30. Are there ways to better integrate gender considerations that could lead to improved outcomes of the project?
31. Have vulnerable groups such as women, PWD, elderly been considered in the physical planning of the evacuation centres and other activities of this project?
32. Will the project contribute to further the realization of any relevant rights (such as rights of vulnerable populations (women, PWD, children, elderly) or the promotion of the rights of IDPs)?
33. Do any interested parties and observers raise concerns related to possible violation of rights?
34. Are particularly vulnerable and/or excluded groups able to participate during the implementation of the project? How is this ensured?

35. Have possible environmental damages/contributions been considered adequately in the project design?
36. Are good environmental practices followed in project implementation (in relation to use of water and energy and materials, production of wastes, etc.)?
37. Are some activities of the project or lack of proper planning increasing the risks of environmental damages?
38. Did the project implement certain actions to increase awareness on project achievements as well as visibility of its actions?
39. Has the project already identified some good practices or success stories?
40. Are there already some lessons to be learned from the project?
41. Does the project contribute to the transition to reconstruction and development?

QUESTIONNAIRE: PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE

1. Is the results matrix clear and logical and does it show how activities will effectively lead to results and outcomes? If not, why not?
2. Are the indicators/targets used to measure progress in reporting?
3. Is the work plan available and used by the project management and other relevant parties? If not, why not?
4. Are the assumptions still holding true?
5. Are narrative reports submitted regularly and on time?
6. Is the project linked to a country and/or regional migration/DRRM strategy and if so, how?
7. Has the planned timeline been kept during the (first half of the) project implementation? Are there any delays, and how will they be rectified?
8. Do the PSC meetings contribute to effective project implementation? Are the meetings/decisions well documented?
9. Are implementing partners managing their role/contribution effectively? Is there any control in place to monitor the work of the implementing partners?
10. Are the delivered outputs likely to contribute to the intended results/outcomes?
11. To what extent has the project adapted or is able to adapt to changing external conditions in order to ensure project outcomes?
12. Did the programme management take/planned to take appropriate measures to counter any unplanned negative effects on target groups (e.g. related to environment, gender, human rights, governance, or others)?
13. Did changes in policies and stakeholders priorities affect the implementation of the project and how well is it adapting in terms of long-term needs for support?
14. Were there any unplanned positive effects on the results? To what extent has this contributed/will contribute to improve project results?
15. Are the project objective(s) (and outcomes) consistent with beneficiaries' needs and supportive of partner government policies and programmes?
16. Was the project designed with the beneficiary inputs in the design (e.g. communities, local government etc.)? Do the beneficiaries participate to implementation and how?
17. Do/will all target groups have access to the project outcomes, i.e. the evacuation centres?
18. Do all key stakeholders still demonstrate effective commitment (ownership)?
19. Does the project benefit from the present capacity of the local partners? Does it contribute to improve it?

20. To what degree are inputs provided/available on time to/from all parties involved to implement activities?
21. Are project resources monitored regularly and managed in a transparent and accountable manner to guarantee efficient and cost-effective implementation of activities?
22. Have all partners been able to provide their financial and/or human resources contributions?
23. Are there any in-kind contributions? If so, are they being acknowledged?
24. What impacts are already apparent or very likely to be reached (expected/unexpected and positive/negative) and can they be specifically attributed to the project?
25. Are there any external factors likely to jeopardise project impact?
26. Did the project take timely measures to mitigate any unplanned negative impacts?
27. Is there any possible indirect impact that deserves to be taken into account?
28. Are funds likely to be made available to institutionally support the results after closure of the project? If so, by whom?
29. Is there a phase-out strategy or exit strategy that is in place or being developed?
30. Do the target groups have any plans to continue making use of the services/products produced in the project framework?
31. Are project partnerships being properly developed (technically, financially and managerially) for continuing to deliver the project's benefits/services?
32. Has a gender analysis been incorporated in the needs assessment, stakeholder analysis and all other assessments and analyses? If not, why not?
33. Are there ways to better integrate gender considerations that could lead to improved outcomes of the project?
34. Have vulnerable groups been considered in the physical planning of the evacuation centres and other activities of the project?
35. groups or the promotion of the rights of IDPs?
36. Do any interested parties and observers raise concerns related to possible violation of rights?
37. Are particularly vulnerable and/or excluded groups able to participate during the implementation of the project? How is this ensured?
38. Have possible environmental damages/contributions been considered adequately in the project design?
39. Are good environmental practices followed in project implementation (in relation to use of water and energy and materials, production of wastes, etc.)?
40. Are some activities of the project or lack of proper planning increasing the risks of environmental damages?
41. Did the project implement certain actions to increase awareness on project achievements as well as visibility of its actions?
42. Has the project already identified some good practices or success stories?
43. Are there already some lessons to be learned from the project?

QUESTIONNAIRE: IOM PROJECT TEAM

1. Are the assumptions in the results matrix still holding true?
2. There are no identified risks in the results matrix. Have any risk factors surfaced during the first half of the project implementation? If so, are there any mitigating strategies?
3. To what extent has the project adapted or is able to adapt to changing external conditions in order to ensure project outcomes?
4. How will the delays during the first half of the project be rectified during the second half?

5. Are implementing partners managing their role/contribution effectively? Is there any control in place to monitor the work of the implementing partners?
6. Are the delivered outputs likely to contribute to the intended results/outcomes?
7. Did programme management take/planned to take appropriate measures to counter any unplanned negative effects on target groups (e.g. related to environment, gender, or others)?
8. Did changes in stakeholder priorities affect the implementation of the project and how well is it adapting in terms of long-term needs for support?
9. Are the project objective(s) (and outcomes) consistent with beneficiaries' needs and supportive of partner government policies and programmes?
10. Was the project designed with the beneficiaries' inputs in the design (e.g. communities, local government etc.)? Do the beneficiaries participate in the implementation and how?
11. Do all key stakeholders still demonstrate effective commitment (ownership)?
12. Does the project benefit from the present capacity of the local partners? Does it contribute to improve it?
13. Does the project consider donor priorities and input?
14. To what degree are inputs provided/available on time to/from all parties involved to implement activities and at planned cost (or lower than planned)?
15. Are project resources monitored regularly and managed in a transparent and accountable manner to guarantee efficient and cost-effective implementation of activities?
16. Are all contractual procedures clearly understood, including by implementing partners, and are they being followed during project implementation? Are the financial reports submitted regularly and on time?
17. Have all partners been able to provide their financial and/or human resources contributions?
18. Are there any in-kind contributions? If so, are they being acknowledged?
19. What impacts are already apparent or very likely to be reached (expected/unexpected and positive/negative) and can they be specifically attributed to the project?
20. Did the project take timely measures to mitigate any unplanned negative impacts?
21. Are project partnerships being properly developed (technically, financially and managerially) for continuing to deliver the project's benefits/services?
22. Are there ways to better integrate gender considerations that could lead to improved outcomes of the project?
23. Have vulnerable groups been considered in the physical planning of the evacuation centres and other activities of the project? If so, how?
24. Do any interested parties and observers raise concerns related to possible violation of rights?
25. Are particularly vulnerable and/or excluded groups able to participate during the implementation of the project? How is this ensured?
26. What capacities exist (within project, project partners and project context) to deal with critical risks that could affect project effectiveness?
27. Have the IOM communication and visibility guidelines been respected by the project?
28. Did the project implement certain actions to increase awareness on project achievements as well as visibility of its actions?
29. Have there been any good practices or lessons learnt during the first half of the project?

QUESTIONNAIRE: CONSULTANT FOR TRAINING MODULE DEVELOPMENT

1. What is your role in this project?
2. To what extent will the training module follow the IOM Gender Equality Policy as well as other gender related instructions and guidance?

3. How will gender be incorporated into the training manuals?
4. As of now, are there better ways to incorporate gender in the formation of the training manual as well as into the project as a whole?
5. Will the training module contribute to further the realization of women's and vulnerable populations' rights and security?
6. Will the target groups be able to participate during the design of the training module? How will that be ensured?
7. How is gender and protection incorporated into the needs and capacity assessment (of government officials in the districts)?
8. Does the training module address and support gender empowerment? If so, how?
9. How will the training manual sensitize gender issues at a community level?