

## Final Evaluation of *Nepal Resilience Project*

### 1. Summary

- 1.1 Purpose:** To assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project in relation to the objectives (and supporting outcomes and outputs) set out in the Programme Documents, and, based on the findings, develop a set of key recommendations.
- 1.2 Audience:** Finnish Red Cross and Nepal Red Cross Society
- 1.3 Commissioner(s)<sup>1</sup>:** This evaluation is commissioned by the Finnish Red Cross *in compliance with the FRC learning and evaluation framework.*
- 1.4 Reports to:** Finnish Red Cross Sari Autio (evaluation manager) / FRC Nepal Country Manager Sushma Shrestha (technical oversight)
- 1.5 Duration of evaluation:** *The working time in days is maximum 25 working days, out of which the field trip part is 8 days; including travel days.*
- 1.6 Time frame:** The Evaluator's work will take place in March/April and the fieldtrip in Nepal by March 31. The Evaluator should start their assignment no later than 1 March 2023.
- 1.7 Location:** Home/desk-based work with travel to Nepal and project site.

### 2. Background *Brief background of the project to be evaluated including major changes in the context or implementation of the project.*

The Finnish Red Cross has supported the Nepal Red Cross Society (NRCS) programmes and operations for decades, currently through The Integrated Community Resilience Project (ICRP), which is now in its final stages. The FRC's country programmes in Nepal aim at build resilience of highly vulnerable and marginalized communities through the implementation of localized, inclusive, and climate-smart disaster preparedness (DP) and disaster risk reduction (DRR) efforts, and by sustainably strengthening the capacities of the NRCS to provide impactful humanitarian services to the most at-risk populations in the country, along with a determined focus on PGI as an integral part of DPDRR.

The main aim of the FRC supported 42-months ICRP project is to support vulnerable communities in their efforts to strengthen resilience using an integrated community-based approach that includes improving access to Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), health and livelihood opportunities of vulnerable communities, sexual reproductive health rights (SRHR) and strengthening the capacity of the affected communities and Nepal Red Cross Society (NRCS) in inclusive disaster risk reduction and preparedness and climate change adaptation. The project targets 44,760 people (22,114 Male; 22,646 Female) as direct beneficiaries, living in 6 rural communities of Darma Rural Municipality in Salyan district and 6 rural communities of Madi rural municipality in Rolpa district in Nepal, as well as 88 Nepal Red Cross Society staff and volunteers. The project is supported by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland.

Overall goal of the project was to enable healthy, safer and resilient living of targeted communities. The project had following five expected outcomes:

---

<sup>1</sup> Commissioner organizes, finances, selects and contracts the evaluation team.

1. Improved practice of sexual and reproductive health, nutrition and child immunization
2. Disadvantaged societal groups (women, youth, person with disability and elderly citizens, marginalized and excluded people) have increased economic opportunities, inclusive community participation and access to public infrastructure
3. Communities have adopted climate risk informed and environmentally responsible practice
4. Targeted communities have increased access to safe drinking water improved sanitation facilities and hygiene practices
5. Targeted NRCS district chapter and subchapter have provided core humanitarian services through sustainable financing, responsible and responsive governance and management structure

The project has faced a range of implementation challenges, including the impacts of COVID-19. However, when feasible, the project adapted to the changed context through a proactive and need-based planning and implementation modality. In addition, two researchers from the Lund university are currently conducting academic research in ICRP project areas on how approaches to resilience building, such as those of the Red Cross Societies, be informed by traditional practices and knowledge systems. The Evaluator/Team Leader will be working together with an NRCS staff member with a relevant background, who will be part of the evaluation team.

### 3. Purpose<sup>2</sup>, Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

The **general purpose** of the final evaluation is

- to carry out an evaluation to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the project to date;
- reveal reasons for achievement/non-achievements verified in the endline;
- to assess efficiency and cost-effectiveness as part of the final evaluation;
- develop a set of key recommendations for future collaboration with Nepal Red Cross and future formulation of community resilience programmes

More specifically, the evaluation will place special focus on the project Outcome 3 and SRH aspects of the project under Outcome 1, with a purpose

- to assess the appropriateness of the project's community based integrated DRR approach and processes, including its Gender and Social Inclusion aspects
- evaluate the effectiveness of interventions focused on disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptations in local planning and community resilience
- to examine the effectiveness/ impact of the SRH/ women health related project interventions in the targeted women and adolescent girls

I

*Scope:*

The evaluation will cover the project in its entirety both in terms of timeline (1st July 2019 - 31st December 2022) and geographic coverage (Darma of Salyan district; and Madi of Rolpa district). The evaluation will focus on the complete range of engaged stakeholders primarily, local communities and authorities, Community Disaster and Climate Resilience Committees (CDCRCs) and Nepal Red Cross Society.

**4. Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions** *Details the evaluation criteria and the questions to be answered. The FRC uses the standard OECD DAC evaluation [criteria](#).<sup>3</sup>*

The evaluation shall examine but not necessarily be limited to the following areas/questions:

#### 1. Relevance:

<sup>2</sup> The FRC is committed to meet criteria for quality in the development projects and operations the FRC is involved in. Evaluations uphold FRC commitment to organisational learning and the results will be used while programming new initiatives.

<sup>3</sup> The new and revised evaluation criteria were approved by the DAC in December 2019.

- *How the programme selected target beneficiaries? Were the criteria for targeting appropriate to the needs and context?*
- *To what extent were the specific interventions relevant to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries?*
- *Is the project addressing the different needs of the beneficiaries/communities in a consistent manner? I.e. is the project considering the different needs of women, men, girls and boys, different social and ethnic groups as well as disability issues?*

## 2. Effectiveness:

- *To what extent has the project objectives and outputs been achieved? Is it likely that the programme will have the planned impact?*
- *To what extent has any significant unplanned results been achieved (positive or negative)?*
- *Assess the technical quality of key programme activities*
- *Which good practices and lessons learned, including that on DRR, CCA and GESI interventions (especially SRHR), need to be taken into account or integrated in future projects?*
- *What conditions facilitated the achievement of results? What conditions were obstacles to achieving the results?*
- *Have the capacity building support/activities/efforts contributed to the effectiveness of the project activities?*

## 3. Efficiency:

- *How well have the resources been used to produce achievements and results?*
- *Were activities cost-efficient? Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives? Were objectives achieved on time?*
- *To what extent did the project employ new options/technologies/ideas to develop and implement activities in the most efficient and impactful way?*
- *To what extent did the project successfully adapt to the changed context (covid-19) and the other challenges?*
- *What are the internal and factors that affected the efficiency in implementation in a positive or negative way?*

## 4. Impact:

- *What has happened/changed as a result of the project? What impact did the project have on the support provided to the vulnerable in the targeted areas?*
- *What were the factors that enabled or hindered the wanted impact?*
- *Define how the project contributed to community development beyond the Red Cross activities and empowerment of communities. particularly in addressing deeper social problems such as child/ early marriage and women's health, and in strengthening local voluntary network and capacities*

## 5. Sustainability:

- *How sustainable are the project outcomes? In particular, to what extent are the project outcomes functioning thanks to the project?*
- *To what extent does communities, local government and other partners (outside the Red Cross movement) have ownership of project activities?*
- *What activities are likely to be continued following withdrawal of the programme from target areas? Specifically, examine:*
  - i. *To what extent are the local committees (Water User Group Committees, Community Disaster and Climate Resilience Committees (CDCRCs) as they have been established, sustainable, especially in terms of continuing essential activities and prevent development of community dependency?*
  - ii. *To what extent are local Red Cross units are strengthened to continue its core functions and influence community stakeholders in undertaking basic disaster resilience measures*
  - iii. *To what extent are spaces and linkages established for communities and authorities to engage in discussion and cooperation regarding DRM issues likely to sustain beyond the end of the project?*

- iv. *To what extent has the Disaster Risk Management and overall capacity of Nepal Red Cross Society District local units been improved by the project, particularly in continuing its core functions to influence community stakeholders in undertaking basic disaster resilience measures (including collaboration and cooperation with authorities and other partners)?*
- *Will the benefits last? Identify the factors that may influence sustainability in the short, medium and long-term.*

7. Inclusion of the cross-cutting objectives in the entire project cycle (*protection, gender and inclusion, climate resilience, and community engagement and accountability in the project implementation.*)

- *What measures has the project taking to contribute towards reduction of inequalities? Are there any ways to improve reduction of inequality and gender mainstreaming in the next project cycle?*
- *To what extent and how has the project ensured community engagement and accountability in its implementation?*
- *How was the project addressing climate resilience? Did it reduce climate change induced risks and vulnerabilities? Did it consider do-no-harm approach in terms of climate resilience? Are there any ways to improve climate resilience in the next project cycle?*

## **5. Evaluation Methodology** *Outlines the key data sources, and methods of data collection and analysis*

The evaluation will use the following data sources

### Reference documents:

- Project log frame
- Monitoring and evaluation plan
- Annual Reports
- Baseline and End line survey results
- NRCS strategy

This final evaluation shall be carried in close collaboration between NRCS and the Finnish Red Cross. Methods of data collection and analysis are to be discussed and defined by the Evaluator/Team Leader together with NRCS and FRC Country Manager in Nepal, but can include at least:

- Review of secondary data and key reference documents
- Briefing with the FRC to discuss the ToR and the time schedule
- Briefing at NRCS Headquarters
- Desk study of relevant project documents and reports
- Interview and focus group discussions with NRCS staff and volunteers, members of CDCRCs, and Water User Groups (WUGs) and other local community groups
- Visits to NRCS local units (Rolpa and Salyan) and project areas including observations, transit walk, beneficiary interviews. (max 8 days)
- Focal/ Focus Groups interviews with community people who benefitted from project's drinking water scheme, small-scale hazard mitigation support, and people directly reached through livelihood support.
- Interviews with key stakeholders such wards and municipality representatives, Nepal Red Cross Society headquarter, Nepal Red Cross Society District Chapter and sub-chapter's volunteers and Finnish Red Cross Country Office (FRC CO)

All findings should be evidence based and methodology used explained in the inception report and in the final evaluation report.

## **6. Proposed Timeline, Roles & Responsibilities**

The evaluation is expected to take place in March/April, and the field work and debriefing in Kathmandu needs to be completed by 31<sup>st</sup> March. The final evaluation report presenting the main findings, conclusions and recommendations is to be submitted by 30 April 2023.

The Evaluator/Team Leader will be engaged for a total of 25 working days (including two days for travel) during March/April 2023. The following work break-down shows how the days will be distributed as 23 days of work and 2 days for travel.

The scheduled timeline for the final evaluation report is:

- Review of documents and inception report (max 8 pages) 5 days
- Briefings in Nepal, and field work including travel from Kathmandu to field locations and back, 8 days
- Debriefing in Kathmandu, 2 days.
- Travel to Kathmandu and back, 2 days
- Writing of draft report, 4 days
- Report finalization and presentation of final report (can be done long-distance), 4 days

The Evaluator/Team Leader will work in close coordination with the Finnish Red Cross Country Office in Nepal and NRCS. FRC country office shall:

- Provide all key reference documentation and facilitate connections between the evaluator and the NRCS team and the communities
- Provide technical oversight of the evaluation; together with the FRC evaluation manager
- Review the inception report and draft evaluation report, together with FRC evaluation manager and FRC advisors at HQ and/or in the region as needed.
- Connect the evaluation team with the University of Lund research team to ensure linkages and coordination between the evaluation and the research
- Provide support in the organization of the field trip and debriefings and facilitate all logistics arrangements (transportation, accommodation, appointments)

**7. Deliverables** *Identifies the key deliverables or outputs from the evaluation; it is also recommended to identify specific dates for deliverables, as well as separate responsibilities when relevant.*

The Evaluator/ evaluation team will provide:

1. An inception report following the desk work and prior to the mission to demonstrate a clear understanding and realistic plan of work for the evaluation. The inception report outlines how s/he will lead the evaluation, work plan and detailing the planned methodology, incl. criteria setting for informant selection and participants, field data collection and analysis. The report is subject to FRC approval.
2. A kick-off meeting with the partner National Society
3. A debriefing to the NRCS team and FRC Country Office (incl. FRC regional team) at the end of the mission to discuss the initial findings, conclusions and recommendations – ideally immediately after the visit. Feedbacks from the debriefing will be integrated in the evaluation report.
4. A draft final evaluation report within two weeks return from the field visit. The draft will be shared with the partner National Society, FRC and other relevant stakeholders for comments. The comments from the FRC and the relevant stakeholders to be forwarded to the Evaluator within two weeks after receiving the draft.
5. A final (corrected) evaluation report to be submitted to the FRC within 1 weeks of receiving the comments. The report will have a maximum length of 20 pages, including an Executive Summary. The report will include recommendations to the partner National Society, the Finnish Red Cross and possibly to other stakeholders. Approval for the report from the FRC, partner NS.
6. A presentation of the evaluation report at the FRC by the Team Leader/Evaluation Manager.

## **8. Evaluator's qualifications.**

The Evaluator/Team Leader shall have:

- *University degree/s at the post-graduate level in relevant field of study (e.g. health, water and sanitation, disaster management, social development, social sciences, management; any specific area of expertise within the scope of National Society development).*
- *Proven experience with solid technical knowledge in integrated, community-based disaster risk reduction and health methodologies and approaches in development programming*
- *Proven experience in evaluating development co-operation programmes or projects, incl. analyzing development impacts.*

- *Knowledge of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement preferred.*
- *Good knowledge of written and spoken English is a must.*
- *Strong knowledge and experience of humanitarian and development context in Asia region.*
- *Good knowledge of the international humanitarian and development context and where possible some experience of the Red Cross/Crescent Movement*

Helsinki 20.01.2023

Sari Autio  
Evaluation Manager