



# UNICEF Nepal and Nepal Red Cross Society Partnership for Humanitarian Action (Covid-19 Preparedness and Response)

Evaluation Report Annexes

---

Prepared for // UNICEF Nepal

By // IOD PARC Ltd

Date // November 2022

# Annex 1: Terms of Reference

## UNICEF Nepal Country Office (NCO)

### Terms of Reference for

### Evaluation of Partnership with Nepal Red Cross Society for Humanitarian Action

---

#### 1. BACKGROUND

Amid the pandemic caused by Covid-19, Nepal went into prolonged lockdown in May 2020. More than 60% of families with children lost income and livelihood in the first two months of lockdown<sup>1</sup>. The inevitable pause in the private and public sectors, and agricultural industries deepened poverty shifting income distribution of the population downward, and mostly affecting people who depend on daily wages. The economic impacts of Covid-19 directly affected children, women and vulnerable population. Particularly, households with more than 2 children and those with members who have a disability, female headed households, and those who belong to vulnerable and marginalized ethnic groups were affected more than others.

The economic growth was estimated to fall to a range between 1.5 % and 2.8 % in FY2020 and the World Bank's projections did not predict a significant economic growth in 2021.<sup>2</sup> Over 20 million people in Nepal are of the working age, and the employment rate is 11.4 %.<sup>3</sup> More than 60% of Nepali people work in the informal sector, 17.5 % in trade industry, 14 % in construction, 24 % in service and sales and 20 % in elementary occupations.<sup>4</sup> More than 8 billion remittances accounting for 28% of GDP were recorded in FY2018/2019 and women account for 8.5 % of the migration flows.<sup>5</sup> Most Nepali migrants work in India, and countries in the Middle East, including Malaysia. The majority of Nepalis work in the service sector of India, more than 80% of them depend on daily wages.<sup>6</sup> Due to the protracted pandemic, however, hundreds of thousands of migrants lost jobs and have been returning to Nepal. Covid-19 in the country led to significant economic losses with declining imports and exports, and halting tourism and agricultural industries.

---

<sup>1</sup> UNICEF. 2020. "Child & Family Tracer" <https://www.unicef.org/nepal/reports/covid-19-child-and-family-tracker-findings>

<sup>2</sup> *Nepal at a glance*, World Bank (<https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/nepal/overview>)

<sup>3</sup> *Labour Force Survey (NLFS III)*, National Planning Commission, Central Bureau of Statistics, International Labour Organization (Nepal, 2018)

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> *Impact of COVID-19 on Nepali Migrant Workers: Protecting Nepali Migrant Workers during the Health and Economic Crisis*, International Labour Organization, (Nepal, 2020).

<sup>6</sup> *NLFS III*.

Women, single mothers and female headed households are among those who are the most affected by unemployment.<sup>7</sup> Children living in the poorest households, female-headed households and marginalized ethnic groups barely took advantage of remote learning during lockdowns. Children in only 29% of surveyed households had access to distant learning, yet only half of them, mostly children living in high-income households, were able to take advantage of it. In 2020, Children in more than 20% of households had to compromise with their diets, changing the number and quality of food intake due to the economic losses of their families.

The pandemic's economic impacts will continue until it ends effectively, but it is not possible to stop it without responding to emerging issues and public health safety measures which heavily depend on people's behavior. In mid-2020, less than 50% of caregivers with children felt that they were at risk of catching Covid19 in Nepal. While handwashing frequently for 20 seconds and wearing a mask in public remained above 70% among caregivers with children, other safety measures such as maintaining distance from others and staying at home remained low and varied by provinces.<sup>8</sup>

To respond to children's needs emerging due to Covid-19 and to raise public awareness, UNICEF Nepal and Nepal Red Cross Society (NRCS) established a humanitarian partnership in May 2020. The partnership's main activities included reaching out to communities through risk communication and community engagement (RCCE) and advocacy activities; improving coordination and information management on COVID 19 preparedness and response in target municipalities; strengthening referral to health system and enable access to services for vulnerable groups; monitoring and responding to child protection concerns; providing critical water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) supplies and improving infection prevention and control (IPC) in school and communities; and, support in community-based surveillance on public health events related to Covid-19 at the ward and municipal levels.

The partnership's specific activities include:

- WASH, health, hygiene promotion
- Case investigation and contact tracing (CICT)
- Vulnerability assessment, community/event-based surveillance
- Support in vaccination, and services for home isolation and quarantine
- Support in system strengthening on COVID preparedness and response plan
- Information management with federal CIMS system and coordination mechanism

---

<sup>7</sup> CFT 2020

<sup>8</sup> UNICEF CFT 2020

- Supporting Unit Action Team to reach out communities on RCCE of HR at the NRCS HQ and field level offices for effective and timely program implementation.
- Identify unaccompanied, separated and other vulnerable children and support their integration with their families
- Transportation services for vulnerable returnees

As the pandemic continues, the partnership between UNICEF and NRCS was extended until December 2021. The partnership's core activities will continue, but also include the provision of support at points of entries (PoE), holding and isolation centers and transportation for vulnerable people and those who tested positive for Covid-19.

The partnership's intended results:

- Unaccompanied, separated and vulnerable children identified and reintegrated with their families or referred to appropriate services.
- Monitoring of child protection concerns for appropriate response, referrals and advocacy conducted.
- Children and their families affected by COVID-19 receive psychosocial services.
- Vulnerable and at-risk people reached with awareness raising messages on preventive, protective and social aspects pertaining to Covid-19.
- Ward monitoring mechanisms developed with community-based platforms.
- Coordination and information management on COVID 19 preparedness and response improved in target municipalities.
- Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) supplies are provided and contribute to improving infection prevention and control (IPC) in school and communities.
- Community-based surveillance of public health related events on Covid-19 is established in wards and municipalities.
- Strengthened health referral systems and increased access to services for vulnerable groups.

The partnership's budget is USD 348,892 with more than 70% of contribution from UNICEF.

Beneficiaries of the partnership are:

- 100,000 children, youths and adolescents through community engagement
- 200 unaccompanied, separated and vulnerable children
- 1,500 people for psychosocial support
- 21,860 beneficiary households of hygiene and IPC support

To learn from this partnership's performance during unprecedented pandemic, UNICEF commissioned its evaluation, which will primarily focus on its programmatic results, operations and overall, the management process. The evaluation results will be used to enhance UNICEF's operational and programmatic management of partnerships in the emergency contexts.

The audience of this evaluation are the Government of Nepal, development partners, UNICEF, UN Agencies, implementing partners and other stakeholders who will make use of the evaluation evidence to deliver better results for children and women.

## **2. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES**

The evaluation purpose is to contribute strengthening UNICEF's partnership management and the delivery of results in cooperation with NRCS. The evaluation objectives are to:

- Evaluate the performance of partnership activities and the extent to which its intended results were achieved.
- Assess good and bad lessons learned.
- Provide practical recommendations to improve the partnership management performance to deliver sustainable outcomes in the emergency situations in Nepal.

## **3. EVALUATION SCOPE**

The evaluation scope will include the review of the partnership's progress reports on 48 municipalities in Provinces, 2,5, Karnali and Sudurpaschim. Specifically, the key geographical locations are:

- Province 5: Krishnangar NP, Shivaraj NP, Suddodhan GP, Siddharthanagar NP, Lumbini Sanskritik NP, Sammarimai GP, Pratappur GP, Palhinandan GP, Gulariya NP, Gadawa GP, Narainapur NP, Nepalgunj SMP
- Karnali Province: Chhayanath Rara NP, Chandannath NP, Kanakasundari GP, Khadachakra
- NP, Raskot NP, Simta Rural Municipality, Birendranagar NP
- Sudur Paschim Province: Jayaprithivi NP, Badimalika NP, Trivini NP, Sanfebagar, Dasharathchanda NP, Purchaudi NP, Dhangadi Sub NP, Bajhani NP, Lamki Chuwa NP, Bhimdatta NP, Mahakali NP, Parshuram NP, Mahakal NP, Kamalbazar Municipality, Dhangadhi Sub-metropolitan, Lamki Chuha Municipality
- Province 2: Tilathi Koiladi GP, Kanchanrup NP, Shahidnagar NP, Kamala NP, Janaknandini, Mukhiyapatti NP, Jaleswor NP, Loharpatti NP, Malangawa NP, Gaur NP, Ishanath NP, Kalaiya Submetro, Jagarnathpur GP, Pokhariya NP

The evaluation scope will include primary and secondary data collection and analysis. Virtual focus group discussions and interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries of the partnership will be conducted.

The evaluation scope will be based on mixed-methods approach and cover analysis through the lenses of equity, gender and human rights. The key evaluation criteria are efficiency, effectiveness, connectedness, coherence, and coverage. In the evaluation of the partnership's efficiency and effectiveness, the evaluation will include brief comparison analysis between multiple and single programme partnerships. The evaluation scope will not include relevance as the partnership rationale in the context of Covid-19 is clear. It will also not include impact due to the intervention's purpose and nature, as it is a short-term partnership to respond to the emergency. The evaluation will not assess the partnership's sustainability, as the criterion of connectedness will cover its intended results and their connections between recovery and development in the long run.

#### **4. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND METHODS**

The partnership's evaluation will be formative and summative, looking at implemented results since May 2020. The evaluation framework will include the following criteria:

#### **4.1. Connectedness:**

- 4.1.1. What long-term consequences will the partnership have on the local government capacity to respond to the emergencies such as the pandemic caused by Covid-19?
- 4.1.2. To what extent did the partnership support action that contributed to gender and equity focused interventions in humanitarian settings?

#### **4.2. Coherence:**

- 4.2.1. To what extent did the partnership complement the national humanitarian policies relevant to the emergency situations such as the pandemic?

### **4.3. Coverage:**

- 4.3.1. To what extent did the partnership interventions cover all intended target groups?
- 4.3.2. Did the partnership's interventions meet the target groups' emerging needs as intended?

### **4.4. Efficiency:**

- 4.4.1. Are the partnership's financial, human, technical and material resources sufficient to achieve its intended results? Could other alternatives have provided the same or better results with less financial?
- 4.4.2. Is the partnership's operational management efficient in terms of time spent for financial and programmatic procedures? Were there delays and what caused them?
- 4.4.3. How did monitoring of the partnership's interventions used to keep track of progress and address bottlenecks in a timely manner?
- 4.4.4. Is multi programme partnership with the NRCS more efficient operationally and programmatically in comparison to single programme partnerships?

### **4.6. Effectiveness:**

- 4.6.1. To what extent were the partnership's intended results up to present achieved?
- 4.6.2. How did the partnership make a difference in the target groups' lives within its intended results? How did it differently help women, men, girls and boys, especially from vulnerable and marginalized groups?
- 4.6.3. Is multiple programme partnership with the NRCS more effective in delivering results in comparison to single programme partnerships?

#### *Data collection methods and analysis*

The evaluation will be primarily based on desk review of the programme documents, financial data, and monitoring reports.

#### *Interviews:*

The list of organizations and key informants where relevant staff members will be interviewed:

1. NRCS
2. Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration (MOFAGA)
3. Municipalities Mayor, chairperson and vice chair
4. Children, youths and adolescents through community engagement
5. People who received socio-psychological support
6. Households who received hygiene and IPC support

*Desk review:*

1. Budget and expenditures
2. Programme documents
3. Monitoring and progress reports
4. Studies
5. Assessment reports

*Sampling*

The evaluation team is welcome to propose a sampling strategy for the partnership's locations and target groups. In the current context, a representative sample size would be ideal, but not entirely possible for data collection.

*Evaluability and Limitations*

The partnership's interventions are evaluable to a limited extent as the fieldwork in the context of Covid-19 is not recommended due to public health safety concerns.

## **5. TASKS, PAYMENT PLAN AND DELIVERABLES**

#	Item	Duration	Payment
<b>1</b>	<b>Inception Phase</b>		
1.1	Programme documents review	5 days	<b>30 %</b>
1.2	Consultations with Planning and Monitoring Team; Emergency Team.	2 days	
1.3	Consultations with partners	3 days	
1.4	Draft inception report with data collection tools	5 days	
1.5	Final inception report and data collection tools	5 days	
<b>Total number of days for inception phase</b>		<b>20 days</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Data Collection and Analysis Phase</b>		
2.1	Interviews with UNICEF staff	15 days	<b>30%</b>
2.2	Interviews with partners		
2.3	Primary data collection		
2.4	Detailed desk review of budgets and programme documentation (preferably to be conducted simultaneously at the same time with interviews)		
<b>Total number of days for data collection and analysis</b>		<b>15 days</b>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Report Writing</b>		
3.1	Triangulating findings and combining analysis	10 days	<b>40 %</b>
3.2	Draft evaluation report		
3.3	Final evaluation report	10 days	
<b>Total number of days for evaluation report</b>		<b>20 days</b>	



## **6. DELIVERABLES:**

### **1 Inception Report**

The inception report is the deliverable of the research findings, interviews with UNICEF and stakeholders, and the review of the programme documents. The report must present the overall evaluation approach, detailed evaluation methodology, theory of change, evaluation matrix, process monitoring framework, final evaluation questions, data collection and sampling approach for the different data collection stages and types (including statistical power calculations for the household surveys) and timeframe for each proposed data collection method. The evaluation team must submit the first draft report by a required deadline. The draft report will be reviewed by UNICEF and the detailed list of comments, if any, will be shared with the evaluation team in 7 days. The evaluation team is expected to respond to the comments and revise the report in 7 days. Depending on the quality of the inception report, the evaluation team may be required to revise it more than once until it meets the UNICEF standards. The entire inception phase is the time when the Evaluation Team and UNICEF verify that the inception report covers every detail and clarify expectations.

### **2 Data collection tools**

### **3 Summary of Initial Findings from the Interviews, Desk Reviews and Secondary Data Analysis**

### **4 Copies of the Data Files and Analysis**

### **5 Evaluation Report**

The first draft evaluation report submitted to UNICEF will be reviewed and it usually takes from 7 to 10 working days to provide the Evaluation Team with comments. The Evaluation Team will be responsible for revising the report and resubmitting it within the requested timeline. Similarly, to the inception phase procedures, the writing phase of the evaluation report will include reviews and feedback by UNICEF. The timeline for the review and feedback on the first and second draft reports will take about 7 and 10 working days. The evaluation team must respond to all comments and revise the report in a required timeframe by UNICEF. The report should include background, detailed description of methodology, analysis of data which address each of the key evaluation questions and conclusions. Comments and suggestions gathered during the meeting shall be integrated into the draft final report. The length of the evaluation report must be between 30-40 pages. TOC, evaluation matrix, data collection tools, tables and graphs illustrating evaluation findings must be included in the report as annexes.

### **6 Presentation of the evaluation findings to UNICEF and partners**

The evaluation findings will be presented to UNICEF, and deliverables will include a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the evaluation process and findings.

**7. DURATION: 25 August 2021 - 30 November 2021 (55 days) with a possibility of extension**

**8. WORKING LOCATIONS: FIELDWORK (LOCATIONS ARE TBD), REMOTE WORKING**

## 9. PROPOSED PAYMENT SCHEDULE:

<i>No</i>	<b>Payment schedule</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Estimated Date</b>
1	Inception Report	30%	30 September 2021
2	Data collection and analysis	30%	30 October 2021
3	Evaluation Report	40%	30 November 2021

## 10. CONTRACT SUPERVISION:

The evaluation team will be supervised by Evaluation Specialist. Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) will be formed and consisted of experts from the Government, NRCS, UNICEF and other relevant partners. ERG members will provide support in quality assurance of deliverables through providing expert advice on the course of the evaluation direction, contents in the analysis, verification of findings and applicability of recommendations to the context of Nepal.

## 11. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE REQUIRED

A consultancy company must have a local partner or a team member fluent in Nepali; extensive experience in evaluations of humanitarian actions implemented between UN agencies, government and nongovernmental organizations.

- Strong track record in robust evaluations and research
- Extensive experience and strong track record in translating evaluation findings into actionable recommendations, as demonstrated by previous work.
- Demonstrated capacity to communicate evaluation findings to diverse audiences.
- Previous work with UNICEF or other development agencies in a similar area is desirable, but not essential.

The team should be composed of one Team Leader and a sufficient number of team members to ensure the successful implementation of the assignment. Team members proposed in any bidding document must be available for the duration of their assigned tasks.

The data collection team must be fluent in Nepali and play a facilitating role vis-à-vis non-Nepali-speaking team members. Where necessary, interpretation services will need to be subcontracted.

Team Leader will be the principal evaluation expert with an extensive experience in evaluating a humanitarian action. The Team Leader will carry out interviews and data analysis and oversee the entire process and be responsible for deliverables of excellent quality. The Team Leader must have:

- Advanced degree in international affairs and other social sciences related field.
- At least ten years' experience in managing, designing and conducting evaluations of humanitarian interventions.
- In-depth knowledge of and experience in the work of UNICEF and/or other similar UN organizations or development agencies.
- In-depth knowledge of human rights, equity and gender-based approaches to programming, policies and strategies.
- Demonstrated ability to deliver high-quality written reports in English and to engage effectively with stakeholders at all levels.

The Evaluation Team Members will support the Team Leader in interviews, desk research and secondary data analysis. They will be responsible for timely and accurate delivery of results.

- Members of the Team should have master's or bachelor's degree in international affairs, sociology, statistics and other social science related field.
- Data analyst must also be responsible for financial data evaluation and have at least 5 years of experience in statistical analysis.
- Qualitative expert must have at least 5 years of experience in conducting interviews and focus group discussions, including in qualitative data analysis and visualization.
- Team must be gender balanced.
- Fluency in English is essential.

- Fluency in Nepali and other languages in Nepal is essential.

## **12. APPLICATION AND EVALUATION PROCESS:**

In making the final decision, UNICEF considers both technical and financial aspects. The proposal that offers the best value for money will be recommended for award of the contract.

### **The Technical Proposal should include but not be limited to the following:**

#### **- Company Profile**

*Ensure to include information related to the experience of the company as required and outlined in item 10 of this document. Details of similar assignments undertaken in last three years including the following information*

#### **- Work Plan**

Proposed work plan showing detailed sequence and timeline for each activity and man days of each proposed team member

#### **- Team Composition**

Title and role of each team member

#### **- CV's:** CV of responsible officers and field coordinators (including qualifications and experience)

Ensure to include information related to the qualifications and experience of each proposed team member as required and outlined in item 10 of this document.

#### **- Any project dependencies or assumptions**

**The Financial Proposal should include but not be limited to the following:**

Bidders are expected to submit a lump sum financial proposal to complete the entire assignment based on the terms of reference. The lump sum should be broken down to show the detail for the following:

- **Human Resource cost:** This should include the cost related to project planning and coordination operational cost.
- **Data Entry Cost:** The data on Social Protection beneficiaries are collected by the local government and the firm should make data entry into the MIS system closely with the local government. This should include the cost of data entry per beneficiaries as the estimated number of data entry may vary.
- **Data verification cost:** It is recommended to provide per beneficiaries' data verification cost as exact number of entry may vary from estimation.
- **Travel Costs**  
All travel costs should be included as a lump sum fixed cost.  
For all travel costs, UNICEF will pay as per the lump sum fixed costs provided in the proposal. A breakdown of the lump sum travel costs should be provided in the financial proposal.
- **Any other costs (if any)** Indicate nature and breakdown
- **Copy of the company registration**
- **Recent Financial Audit Report:** Report should have been carried out in the past 2 years and be certified by a reputable audit organization.

**Technical evaluation criteria:**

A consultancy company must have a local partner or a team member fluent in Nepali; extensive experience in evaluations of humanitarian actions implemented between UN agencies, government and non-	10
---	----

<p>governmental organizations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong track record in robust evaluations and research</li> <li>• Extensive experience and strong track record in translating evaluation findings into actionable recommendations, as demonstrated by previous work.</li> <li>• Demonstrated capacity to communicate evaluation findings to diverse audiences.</li> <li>• Previous work with UNICEF or other development agencies in a similar area is desirable, but not essential.</li> </ul>	
<p>The Team Leader must have:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Advanced degree in international affairs and other social sciences related field.</li> <li>b. At least ten years' experience in managing, designing and conducting evaluations of humanitarian interventions.</li> <li>c. In-depth knowledge of and experience in the work of UNICEF and/or other similar UN organizations or development agencies.</li> <li>d. In-depth knowledge of human rights, equity and gender-based approaches to programming, policies and strategies.</li> <li>e. Demonstrated ability to deliver high-quality written reports in English and to engage effectively with stakeholders at all levels.</li> </ol>	15
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Members of the Team should have master's or bachelor's degree in international affairs, sociology, statistics and other social science related field.</li> <li>b. Data analyst must also be responsible for financial data evaluation and have at least 5 years of experience in statistical analysis.</li> <li>c. Qualitative expert must have at least 5 years of experience in conducting interviews and focus group discussions, including in qualitative data analysis and visualization.</li> <li>d. Team must be gender balanced.</li> <li>e. Fluency in English is essential.</li> <li>f. Fluency in Nepali and other languages in Nepal is essential.</li> </ol>	15
<p>Technical proposal:</p>	30

a. Comprehensive workplan	
b. Risk mitigation measures and contingency planning	
c. Ethic procedures	
d. Clear and precise evaluation approach and methods	
<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>
Only proposals which receive a minimum of 49 marks will be considered further for financial evaluation	

Bidders are required to estimate travel costs in the Financial Proposal. Please note that i) Air travel costs shall be calculated based on economy class fare regardless of the length of travel and ii) costs for accommodation, meals and incidentals shall not exceed the applicable daily subsistence allowance (DSA) rates, as propagated by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC).

## Annex 2: Addendum to IR



# Evaluation of Partnership with Nepal Red Cross Society for Humanitarian Action

## Addendum to Inception Report

LRPS-2021-9169043

Prepared for // UNICEF Nepal

By IOD PARC Nepal  
Sanepa  
Ward No 2  
Lalitpur  
Kathmandu

Contact: Joel Cutting, [joel@iodparc.com](mailto:joel@iodparc.com)

Date // 28<sup>th</sup> April 2022



# 1.0 Background and Rationale for Addendum

This Addendum to the UNICEF NRCS Partnership for Humanitarian Action Evaluation follows UNICEF's approval and sign off of the Inception Report (IR) on the 6<sup>th</sup> April 2022 and a subsequent meeting between the IODPARC Evaluation Team (ET) being Joel Cutting, (Team Lead), Sonia Perez, and Shusil Joshi, with the UNICEF Nepal Country Office Director James McQuen Patterson, and UNICEF staff Sunita Kayastha and Usha Mishra on the 11<sup>th</sup> April 2022.

At the meeting, UNICEF drew the ET's attention to the fact that UNICEF and NRCS had taken a decision to opt for a single multisectoral (rather than multiple sector) plan approach to the COVID-19 response and the partnership with NRCS, in the context of the unique characteristics of the COVID-19 emergency where there was a lot of overlap between thematic areas, and a situation which evolved rapidly on the ground. The decision to implement a multisectoral approach that brought all the components/thematic areas together in one suite to ensure better coordination and higher impact for beneficiaries diverged from UNICEF's and the Nepal Red Cross Society's (NRCS) usual policy of separate component responses that ensure rapidity and timeliness of humanitarian response for Nepal's more 'usual' disasters and shocks such as landslides, floods, and earthquakes.

The meeting highlighted that the core question for the evaluation is whether the higher cost and management burden of the multisectoral approach paid off by bringing lower overall financial cost and ensuring higher impact for beneficiaries through better operational synergies and coordination of effort between UNICEF and NRCS

This core issue was not explicit in the TORs for the assignment, and therefore had not been fully reflected in the final IR by the Evaluation Team.

In addition, the geographic spread (31 Districts 60 Municipalities) of the study needed highlighting following inputs from UNICEF to the draft IR.

This Addendum to the IR therefore adjusts and retunes the Evaluation Tools (Key Informant Interview and Focus Group Discussion checklists) set out in the IR, and states the localities for data gathering in line with the inputs from UNICEF during the meeting and in the IR draft stage.

## 2.0 Adjustments to Evaluation Tools

The evaluation tools have been modified to bring out the focus on the multisectoral approach. The checklist for the KIIs with local Disaster Management Committees and COVID-19 Response Committees have retained a very structured approach (with less use of very open questions relying on the interviewers deeper background knowledge of partnership documentation and assignment TORs), as it is in IODPARC's experience in conducting field data gathering with local enumerators that this helps interviewers establish clarity and manage the interview process.

### 2.1 Key Informant Interview (KII) checklist (UNICEF)

1. Greetings and introduction of the interviewer: purpose of the interview

2. How were you involved in the partnership's interventions?
3. There was a decision to take a different approach to the response in the face of the Covid crisis, by having an integrated multi-sector approach to providing the emergency response, rather than single multiple sectors/projects. What was your experience of this? [*prompt the interviewee to cover the impact of interventions, the management and admin arrangements, and costs/financial implications* ]
4. How was the relationship with NRCS? Were there any challenges or did anything go particularly well? Did the 'joined up' multiple sector approach help with this?
5. How did this approach affect engagement with Local Govts? And other local bodies?
6. Were you able to help the Local Govts be more ready for future emergencies? How? Or if not, why not? Did the 'joined up' multiple sector approach help with this?
7. What were the GESI issues in the response? How did you manage these? Would you say the interventions were inclusive? Did the 'joined up' multiple sector approach help with this?
8. Would you say you were able to meet the needs of target groups? Did the 'joined up' multiple sector approach help with this?
9. How did you monitor and keep track of progress? Did MEL systems help you identify and address bottlenecks in a timely way? Was MEL easier or more difficult to manage with the multiple sector approach (and why)?
10. What went well? And what went badly? What would you do differently in hindsight?

Thank you and close

## 2.2 Key Informant Interview (KII) checklist (NRCS)

1. Greetings and introduction of the interviewer: purpose of the interview
2. How were you involved in the partnership's interventions?
3. There was a decision to take a different approach to the response in the face of the Covid crisis, by having an integrated multi-sector approach to providing the emergency response, rather than single multiple sectors/projects. What was your experience of this? [*prompt the interviewee to cover the impact of interventions, the management and admin arrangements, and costs/financial implications* ]
  - a. What were the benefits and the challenges in managing human resources in multiple sector approach? How did the project address the competency gap in managing multiple sectors?
  - b. How has the integrated approach help in need assessment, design, implementation? What difference the community people experienced in integrated approach? How were the sectoral actions/activities linked to each other to achieve the overall project theory of change?
4. How was the relationship with UNICEF? Were there any challenges or did anything go particularly well? Did the 'joined up' multiple sector approach help with this?
5. How did this approach affect engagement with Local Govts? And other local bodies?

6. Were you able to help the Local Govts be more ready for future emergencies? How? Or if not, why not? Did the 'joined up' multiple sector approach help with this?
7. What were the GESI issues in the response? How did you manage these? Would you say the interventions were inclusive? Did the 'joined up' multiple sector approach help with this?
8. Would you say you were able to meet the needs of target groups? Did the 'joined up' multiple sector approach help with this?
9. How did you monitor and keep track of progress? Did MEL systems help you identify and address bottlenecks in a timely way? Was MEL easier or more difficult to manage with the multiple sector approach (and why)?
  - a. How did the MEL system assess social impact and cost effectiveness? How did the project ensure the value for money?
10. How well did the project manage risks? What went well? And what went badly? What would you do differently in hindsight?
11. How effective/efficient in listening to the most needed / vulnerable people (feedback mechanism?)
12. How the learning are documented, shared and used? How did the sectors learn from each other? What mechanism exist?

Thank you and close

### 2.3 Key Informant Interview (KII) checklist (focal person of Disaster Management Committees/COVID Preparedness and Response Committees)

1. Greeting and introduction – the purpose and background of the KII
2. How were you involved in the Disaster Management/Covid Response Committee? Who else was involved and what were their roles?
3. Tell me about how the Committee functioned, and how effective you think it was.
  - a. How frequently did you meet?
  - b. What was generally discussed in the meeting?
  - c. How did you make decisions?
4. Did the Committee prepare a disaster preparedness and response plan? How was the disaster preparedness and response plan developed?
  - a. Who was involved in the DRR planning, design, and implementing processes?
5. What support did you get from the UNICEF and NRCS partnership? What was especially useful? Was there anything not relevant or useful?
6. Are you aware of the UNICEF/NRCS partnership 'multisectoral' approach? Were there any benefits or drawbacks to UNICEF/NRCS taking a 'joined up' multisectoral as opposed to a multiple sector approach?
7. What were/are the capacity development activities Who supported them? What were the changes observed in the committee?
8. To what extent has UNICEF/NRCS partnership supported the development of capacity of the local government / committees in disaster risk reduction / management / humanitarian responses? How has it benefitted the government?
9. How were you implementing the plan? What were the challenges? How did you address the challenges?

10. Does the municipality have a GESI strategy / Plan? Would you please describe in brief what does it cover?
11. What were the GESI issues in the response? How did you manage these?
  - a. Was the Local Govt GESI strategy helpful?
  - b. Did and NRCS/UNICEF help with GESI, and how useful/effective was this?
12. How did the partnership contribute to the LG's disaster preparedness and response plan?
13. Was there any contribution from the partnership in developing local or provincial government policies and, systems?
14. What have been the partnership's contributions to central and local forums (cluster meetings, NGO forums)?
15. What were the mechanisms in the central and local level to avoid the duplication of effort by different agencies?
16. How timely has the partnership provided information to the LGs?
17. How beneficial was the Management Information System to the municipalities that was developed from this project?
18. Any final comments or observations?
19. Thank you

#### 2.4 Focus Group Discussion checklist (beneficiaries)

1. Greetings: Introduction of the enumerator: Purpose of the FGD
2. Round of introductions – ask participants to explain how they were involved in the partnership's interventions – What are the project activities the NRCS implementing in the partnership with UNICEF Nepal? How have these activities benefitting the people (people of different needs – elderly, pregnant women and lactating mothers, children, disabled) in your community?
3. What went well?
4. What went badly? What could the project have done differently to achieve more with minimum cost and time?
5. Which local level organisations did you have to deal with? How effective were they? How were you treated? What were your observations on how women, excluded castes, disabled people were treated?
6. Would you say the interventions met everyone's needs regardless of whether they are women/children/disabled or of excluded castes/groups? Please tell us more
7. The partnership was formed to respond to COVID and support people in a 'joined up' way, bringing together different aspects like health, WASH, information and so on, rather than doing these separately – do you think this had any effect on how well you were supported? How effective coordination among the sectors within the project and with other organisations?
8. What could have been done better?
9. How supportive, safe and efficient the feedback mechanism was?

Thank you and close

## 3.0 Localities

After further consultation with UNICEF and NRCS, the following localities were selected as providing a good cross-section of rural, urban, tarai, and hill perspectives. UNICEF's input to the IR to include Lumbini Province has been reflected.

<b>SN.</b>	<b>Province</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Municipality</b>
1	Lumbini	Dang	Gadhawa Rural Municipality
2	Lumbini	Bardiya	Gulariya Municipality
3	Sudurpaschim	Kailali	Dhangadhi Municipality Point of Entry Isolation Centre
4	Karnali	Kalikot	Raskot Municipality
5	Madhesh	Rautahat	Ishnath Municipality

## Annex 3: Evaluation Matrix

Judgment criteria	Indicators / checklist	Sources of information	Collection methods	Key questions (UNICEF)	Key question (KII with NRCS)	Key questions (LG officials)	Key questions (FGD with community people)
System / Mechanism Preparedness and Response Plan Disaster Management and Response Committees Capacity Development	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. #/% of LGs which have developed and implemented disaster preparedness and response plan with support from NRCS</li> <li>2. #/% of LGs with have functional MDMC and WDMC</li> <li>3. #/% of MDMC and WDMC which have received Disaster Management and Response Training</li> <li>4. #/% of WDMC which have formed / trained / mobilized local community groups for RNA, Rescue, Relief Distribution</li> <li>5. UNICEF &amp; NRCS partnership support to strengthen the capacity of NRCS in developing and executing disaster</li> </ol>	NRCS periodic report NRCS officials municipality focal persons MDMC / WDMC members	NRCS periodic report review KII with NRCS officials KII with municipality focal persons MDMC / WDMC members		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What was NRCS's contribution in the process?</li> <li>2. How sustain will this process be?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How has the disaster preparedness and response plan was developed?</li> <li>2. How did you feel the need of the plan?</li> <li>3. Who involved in the process?</li> <li>4. What was your responsibilities? What are others' responsibility?</li> <li>5. Who are in the committees? How frequently do you meet? What was generally discussed in the meeting? How do you make decisions?</li> <li>6. What was/is the capacity development activities? Who supported it? What was the changes observed in the committee?</li> <li>7. How are you</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are you aware of M(L)DMC/WDMC?</li> <li>2. What are their responsibilities?</li> <li>3. What are the positive (negative) outcome from the activities implemented by MDMC/WDMC?</li> <li>4. Are you aware about the preparedness and response plan?</li> <li>5. How did you participate in developing and implementing the plan?</li> </ol>

Judgment criteria	Indicators / checklist	Sources of information	Collection methods	Key questions (UNICEF)	Key question (KII with NRCS)	Key questions (LG officials)	Key questions (FGD with community people)
	preparedness and response plan 6. Approach/strategy adopted to sustain the activity in government system/process					implementing the plan? What were the challenges? How to you address the challenges?	
Situation assessment Gender sensitive and equity focussed humanitarian support Gender programming Participation Gender disaggregated monitoring GBV	1. Situation assessment (Rapid and Detail Need Assessment) have analysed situation and need of women, girls, disabled, elderly, pregnant women, lactating mothers and other vulnerable people 2. Response programme is gender sensitive (quantity, timing, material types) 3. Community Engagement have included women, girls, disabled, elderly, pregnant women, lactating mothers and other vulnerable (sharing information,	NRCS periodic report NRCS officials Municipality focal persons Women, girls and persons with disabilities	Document review KII with NRCS officials KII with municipality gender focal persons FGDs with women, girls and persons with disabilities		1. How inclusive the project team is? 2. What specific strategy do you have in gender equality and social inclusion? 3. What is your approach in strengthening capacity of the team in gender equality and social inclusion? 4. How do you rate your project activities from GESI perspective (gender blind, gender neutral, gender aware, gender transformative)? 5. How did you analyse the specific need of the	1. What long-term, short-term plan in GESI? 2. What support did you get from the UNICEF and NRCS partnership?	1. How has the project address your specific needs? 2. Were there any difficulties / easy in approaching the project team? Getting the project benefits? / providing the feedback? 3. How are you benefitted from the project? What changes do you observe in your family? community?

Judgment criteria	Indicators / checklist	Sources of information	Collection methods	Key questions (UNICEF)	Key question (KII with NRCS)	Key questions (LG officials)	Key questions (FGD with community people)
	<p>collecting feedback, involving in project design and implementation)</p> <p>4. IEC materials are developed and disseminated to reach the need/address the issues of women, girls, disabled, elderly, pregnant women, lactating mothers and other vulnerable people</p> <p>5. #/% of LGs which have developed and implemented GBV related reporting, responding, referring, rehabilitating mechanism during emergency</p>				<p>vulnerable people? How do you ensure they are benefitted?</p> <p>6. What support / feedback do you get from UNICEF in GESI</p>		
<p>Coordination with government agencies</p> <p>Participation in government</p>	<p>1. To what extent the programme is aligned with the Government Policy, Strategy, Plan</p> <p>2. Government policies/strategies/systems developed/</p>	<p>National, provincial and municipal officials</p>	<p>KII</p> <p>Document review</p>	<p>1. How does the project contribute to UNICEF's global/country strategy?</p> <p>2. How does the project contribute to Government's long-term strategy?</p>	<p>1. How does the project contribute in the LG's disaster preparedness and response plan?</p> <p>2. Does the LG's plan include the project</p>	<p>1. How does the project contribute in the LG's disaster preparedness and response plan?</p> <p>2. Does the LG's plan include the project</p>	

<b>Judgment criteria</b>	<b>Indicators / checklist</b>	<b>Sources of information</b>	<b>Collection methods</b>	<b>Key questions (UNICEF)</b>	<b>Key question (KII with NRCS)</b>	<b>Key questions (LG officials)</b>	<b>Key questions (FGD with community people)</b>
ent forums Advocacy Collaboration with others - in policy / strategy	modified as result of NRCS influencing activities 3. Contribution / participation of NRCS in national, provincial and local government forums / clusters Coordination and collaboration with LGs and other humanitarian organisations 4. How has the project connect with other programme projects being implemented by NRCS and UNICEF 5. Projects's effort to avoid the duplication of effort - in project districts				intervention? 3. Is there any contribution from the project in developing government policy, system? What has the changes in policy/system affected the project result? 4. What are the project contributions in central and local forums (cluster meetings, NGO forums)? 5. What are the mechanism in the central and local level to avoid the duplication of effort by different agencies?	intervention? 3. Is there any contribution from the project in developing government policy, system? What has the changes in policy/system affected the project result? 4. What are the project contributions in central and local forums (cluster meetings, NGO forums)? 5. What are the mechanism in the central and local level to avoid the duplication of effort by different agencies?	
Situation assessment Gender programming Disaggregated information	1. To what extent the programme have reached the most marginalised / vulnerable communities (geographically isolated, economically poor,	Beneficiary report Community people	Document review FGD with women, girls and other vulnerable people		1. How did you set the target of beneficiaries? 2. What different approaches did you adopt to benefit different group of people?		1. Are there any groups which needs the project support but not benefitted from the project? Why? What were the obstacles? 2. How could the project reach

Judgment criteria	Indicators / checklist	Sources of information	Collection methods	Key questions (UNICEF)	Key question (KII with NRCS)	Key questions (LG officials)	Key questions (FGD with community people)
on Participation in the process	<p>person with disabilities, women/child headed families, Dalit and other ethnic minorities, pregnant women, lactating mothers)</p> <p>2. What strategy/approach has project (design/implementation) adopted by the project to reach to the most marginalised/vulnerable</p> <p>3. Which groups/individuals could not be reached by the project intervention? Why? What efforts were made to include them in the project intervention?</p>						<p>them?</p> <p>3. How well the project designed/implemented to meet the needs of each of vulnerable groups?</p> <p>4. What changes (intended/unintended) were observed in their lives?</p>
Post distribution monitoring Relevance	<p>1. % of beneficiaries who reported that programme met their priority needs</p> <p>2. % of beneficiaries who</p>	Community people	Review of Post Distribution Monitoring report FGDs or				<p>1. Were the project support in time of your need?</p> <p>2. Were the project support address your need? Were there any activities</p>

Judgment criteria	Indicators / checklist	Sources of information	Collection methods	Key questions (UNICEF)	Key question (KII with NRCS)	Key questions (LG officials)	Key questions (FGD with community people)
Timelines	<p>reported that the quantity is sufficient</p> <p>3. % of beneficiaries who reported that the support was in time</p> <p>4. How has the project identified the needs of target group/</p> <p>5. How has the project ensure the needs of target group are met?</p>		HHS with community people				<p>that were not relevant to you?</p> <p>3. How project can do differently to benefit more?</p>
Efficiency	<p>1. Was there any effect on project scope (quality, quantity, time) as a result of insufficient (or excess) financial, human, technical and material resources? How was this managed? What were learning?</p> <p>2. Was there other alternative interventions discussed while project was designed? How was the intervention</p>	NRCS officials Municipal officials Community people Financial reports	KII FGDs Cost Effectiveness Analysis (VfM)	<p>1. How was the project intervention selected? Were there any evidence of the effectiveness of the project intervention?</p> <p>2. Did project experience any shortfalls that affected project scope (quality, quantity, time)? How did you manage it?</p> <p>3. How has partnership helped to manage such issues?</p>	<p>1. How was the project intervention selected? Were there any evidence of the effectiveness of the project intervention?</p> <p>2. Did project experience any shortfalls that affected project scope (quality, quantity, time)? How did you manage it?</p> <p>3. How has partnership helped to manage such issues?</p>		

Judgment criteria	Indicators / checklist	Sources of information	Collection methods	Key questions (UNICEF)	Key question (KII with NRCS)	Key questions (LG officials)	Key questions (FGD with community people)
	(effective based on past experiences/evidences) selected? 3. Did periodic review between partners discuss on the issue? What corrective actions were recommended to address the issue? 4. Cost efficiency (comparison with similar interventions conducted by UNICEF/NRCS/other actors.						
Procurement policy (request, approval, quality assurance, stock management mechanism) Waiver mechanism (if any)	1. Project deliverables were as expected/planned (quality, quantity and time). 2. Effective warehouse management system 3. Effective procurement policies / procedures 4. Delegation of	Internal policies, guidelines, rules Project team	Document review KII		1. How supportive is the internal policies/procedure/system to implement humanitarian programmes? Did project experience any difficulty in implementing projects due the internal policies, decision making process? 2. Do you have	1. How timely the project provides information to the LGs? 2. How has the project supported to develop MIS in LGs?	

Judgment criteria	Indicators / checklist	Sources of information	Collection methods	Key questions (UNICEF)	Key question (KII with NRCS)	Key questions (LG officials)	Key questions (FGD with community people)
	authority - decision making process 5. Changes in internal policies, procedure according to needs, address bottlenecks, align government policy				warehouse management system? How informative it is? Does it provide the information that is needed for management decisions?.....		
Stock piling Inventory management Distribution records Issue management	1. Result / M&E framework in place, agreed, shared/oriented to all concerns 2. Periodic reporting templates (inputs/process, outputs and outcomes level) 3. Regular review/reflections between all concerned 4. Recommendations/issues are documented/responded/tracked 5. Issue logs are maintained (with regular update on progress, responsible person and deadlines)	M&E framework, forms/formats, meeting minutes, issue log	Document review	1. What mechanism do you have to discuss on the progress and bottleneck? 2. How frequently do project stakeholders meet to discuss on progress? 3. How do you track/manage the project achievements (under achievements, quality concerns, people's perception/feedback)? What mechanism is there to address the issues?	1. What mechanism do you have to discuss on the progress and bottleneck? 2. How frequently do project stakeholders meet to discuss on progress? 3. How do you track/manage the project achievements (under achievements, quality concerns, people's perception/feedback)? What mechanism is there to address the issues?		

Judgment criteria	Indicators / checklist	Sources of information	Collection methods	Key questions (UNICEF)	Key question (KII with NRCS)	Key questions (LG officials)	Key questions (FGD with community people)
Synergy effect	1. How projects are complementing each other (programmatic - theory of change; human resources - reporting structure; review/reflections).	Project team	KII	1. What benefits and challenges did you face in multi programme partnership?	1. What benefits and challenges did you face in multi programme partnership?  2. How sustainable have the partnership's interventions been? How is this sustainability assessed?		
Planned vs Actual	1. #/% of outcomes achieved its milestones/targets 2. #/% of outputs achieved its milestones/targets 3. what could not be achieved / how was it managed?	Periodic report Project team	Document review KII with NRCS and UNICEF officials	1. What are the contributions from the partnership in developing government policies and systems at provincial and local levels?  2. What mechanism did you have to discuss on the progress and bottleneck?	1. How does the project contribute to the LG's disaster preparedness and response plan?  2. What were the partnership's contributions in central and local forums (cluster meetings, NGO forums)?  3. How frequently did project stakeholders meet to discuss on progress?		

Judgment criteria	Indicators / checklist	Sources of information	Collection methods	Key questions (UNICEF)	Key question (KII with NRCS)	Key questions (LG officials)	Key questions (FGD with community people)
					<p>4. How did you track/manage the project achievements (achievement of outcomes, under achievements, unforeseen positive or negative impacts/outcomes, quality concerns, people's perception/feedback)?</p> <p>5. What mechanisms were there to address issues?</p>		
Impact on vulnerable people	1. What changes in the target group/community (social, economic, political, technological, environmental) were observed? Were there any evidence of changes in target	Project team Community people	KII FGD	<p>1. To what extent the project has met its scope (people reach, outcomes/outputs, cost)?</p> <p>2. How has the project contributed to gender equality and social</p>	1. How do you rate partnership activities from a GESI perspective (gender blind - activities that do not recognize gender issues, gender neutral - activities that recognises gender		1. How have you benefitted from the project? What changes do you observe in your family? community?

Judgment criteria	Indicators / checklist	Sources of information	Collection methods	Key questions (UNICEF)	Key question (KII with NRCS)	Key questions (LG officials)	Key questions (FGD with community people)
	<p>group/community?</p> <p>2. Were there any unintended results?</p> <p>3. Specific intervention/approach to address the need of women, men, girls, boys, disabled, pregnant, lactating mothers, elderly people during emergency? Evidence the changes in their lives as a result of project intervention.</p> <p>4. Involvement/participation of the marginalised in project cycle.</p>			inclusion?	<p>issues but the activities do not address them and therefore reinforce inequalities, gender aware - addresses practical needs/issues by improving the conditions of women and girls, gender transformative - addresses strategical needs/issues by improving the social position to transform unequal power relations)?</p>		

# Annex 4: Documents Reviewed

## Background documents

The Government of Nepal and UNICEF (2018) Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2018-2022

UNICEF (2021) Nepal Humanitarian Situation Report No.1. Reporting Period: 1 January-31 May 2021.

UNICEF (2021) Nepal Humanitarian Situation Report No.2. Reporting Period: 1 January-30 June 2021.

UNICEF (2021) Nepal Humanitarian Situation Report No.3. Reporting Period: 1 July-31 July 2021.

UNICEF (2021) Nepal Humanitarian Situation Report No.4. Reporting Period: 1 August-31 August 2021

UNICEF (2021) Nepal Humanitarian Situation Report No.5. Reporting Period: 1 September-31 October 2021.

UNICEF (2021) Nepal Humanitarian Situation Report No.6. Reporting Period: 1 January-31 December 2021.

## Partnership agreements and documents

UNICEF and NRCS (2020) Humanitarian Programme Document with NRCS on COVID response - signed.

UNICEF and NRCS (2020) Humanitarian Programme Document. Programme Document Amendment Form. 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment. 31/12/2020

UNICEF and NRCS (2020) Final Humanitarian Programme Document with NRCS on COVID response Dec 2020.

UNICEF and NRCS (2021) Humanitarian Programme Document. Programme Document Amendment Form. 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment. 30/06/2021

UNICEF and NRCS (2021) Humanitarian Programme Document. Programme Document Amendment Form. 3<sup>rd</sup> Amendment. 31/12/2021

UNICEF Nepal and Nepal Red Cross Society (2014) MoU between UNICEF Nepal and NRCS for Emergency Preparedness, Response and Early Recovery.

NRCS (no. date) NRCS areas of collaboration for COVID preparedness and response.

NRCS (2020) Nepal Red Cross Society Covid-19: Contingency Plan.

UNICEF Nepal (2020) HACT Audit and Spot Check Recommendations Follow up. Name of IP: Nepal Red Cross Society.

## Programme Documents and reporting

UNICEF (2021) Programmatic Visit Report (2nd programmatic field visit report). 06/11/2021

UNICEF (2021) Programmatic Visit Report (3rd programmatic field visit report). 28/05/2021.

UNICEF (2021) Programmatic Visit Report (4th programmatic field visit report). 05/07/2021-09/07/2021.

NRCS (2021) Nepal Red Cross Society COVID-19 Preparedness and Response Programme 2021. Programme Reporting Period: December 2021. Progress report.

NRCS (2021) Disaster Management Department COVID-19 Preparedness and Response Programme: Programme Review and Lesson Learnt Workshop. 29th December 2021. Workshop minutes.

NRCS (2020) Final Budget. 9 May 2020. Finance approval. Excel sheet.

NRCS and UNICEF? (2021) Annex December 2021. Annex 1: Beneficiaries (direct and indirect tracking) details by mobilising Unit Action Team (UAT) members and NRCS volunteers; Annex 2 : Unit Action Team (UAT) mobilisation details; Annex 3: Conduction of vulnerability assessment. Excel Book.

NRCS and UNICEF? (2021) Indicator Tracking 2020-21. December 2021. Excel Book

## Other

Clare, A (2020) Covid-19 in South and Southeast Asia: A Quick Guide, Parliament of Australia Research Paper Series 2020-21 [COVID-19 in South and Southeast Asia: a quick guide \(aph.gov.au\)](https://www.aph.gov.au/research/papers/series/2020-21/covid-19-in-south-and-southeast-asia-a-quick-guide)

Dan Church Aid. (2020). "Covid-19 Impact on Migrant Workers" in Sudurpaschim Pradesh. DCA.

Gopinath, G. (2020), "The Great Lockdown: Worst Economic Downturn Since the Great Depression", available at: <https://blogs.imf.org/2020/04/14/the-great-lockdown-worst-economic-downturn-since-the-great-depression/>

Hardy B, Hudson B, Waddington E: (2003). Assessing Strategic Partnership: the Partnership Assessment Tool: Nuffield Institute

ILO Monitor: COVID-19 and the world of work. Second edition (2020), available at: [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/documents/briefingnote/wcms\\_740877.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/documents/briefingnote/wcms_740877.pdf)

IOD PARC (2021). Study on Local Government Bounce-back from Covid-19: Phase 1 Context (Resilience MEL Unit UK FCDO)

IOD PARC (2021) The Impact of Covid-19 on Poor and Vulnerable Groups in Nepal (Resilience MEL Unit UK FCDO)

Lowy Institute (2020) [Covid-19: The need to aid Asia to open up | The Interpreter \(lowyinstitute.org\)](https://www.lowyinstitute.org/publications/covid-19-the-need-to-aid-asia-to-open-up)

People in Need 2020 [Covid-Need Assessment Report-final-August 2020 with Graphics.pdf](https://www.pn.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Covid-Need-Assessment-Report-final-August-2020-with-Graphics.pdf)  
[Qatar Foundation and World Innovation Summit for Health \(WISH\) \(2022\) Our Duty of Care: A Global Call to Action to Protect the Mental Health of Health and Care Workers](https://www.wishsummit.org/our-duty-of-care) downloadable at [QFJ9259-02-Our-Duty-Of-Care-WEB.pdf](https://www.wishsummit.org/our-duty-of-care)

UNICEF (2021) COVID-19 Response and WASH lessons learned in Nepal

UNICEF (2021) Real Time Assessment of UNICEF's COVID-19 Response in South Asia, Regional Office for South Asia (ROSA) Evaluation Section

UNCDF (2020) Covid-19 Emergency Response: Local Government Finance [covid guidance-edition 4 supplement-english .pdf](https://www.uncdf.org/publications/covid-guidance-edition-4-supplement-english)

UNICEF (2021) *Direct and Indirect Effects of COVID-19 Pandemic and Response in South Asia* [4-page Summary Report.pdf \(unicef.org\)](https://www.unicef.org/south-asia/publications/direct-and-indirect-effects-of-covid-19-pandemic-and-response-in-south-asia)

UNESCAP (2020) Covid-19 and South Asia: National Strategies and Sub-regional Cooperation for Accelerating Inclusive, Sustainable and Resilient Recovery [South Asia Covid-19 Paper\\_5.pdf \(unescap.org\)](#)

UNSDSN. (2016). Bridging the humanitarian-development divide (Background Paper for the World Humanitarian Summit side event “Making the SDGs work for Humanitarian Needs”). UNSDSN [WHS-background-paper.pdf \(multiscreensite.com\)](#)

World Bank. (2020), The Economic Impact of COVID-19 on South Asia: The Cursed Blessing of Public Banks, Spring, Washington DC.

World Vision International (2021) Multi-sectoral Impact of Covid-19 Second Wave in Nepal WVI [Multi-sectoral impact of the COVID-19 second wave in Nepal, 2021 v2.pdf \(wvi.org\)](#)

## Annex 5: List of People Consulted

	Name	Organization Affiliated to	Tools
1	James McQuen Patterson	UNICEF	KII
2	Sunita Kayastha	UNICEF	KII
3	Abhilasha Gurung	UNICEF	KII
4	Toya N Subedi	UNICEF	KII
5	Samikshya Neupane	UNICEF	KII
6	Sanju Bhattarai	UNICEF	KII
7	Dipak Shrestha	UNICEF	KII
8	Ananta	WHO	KII
9	Rajendra Rokaha	NRCS	KII
10	Umesh Dhakal	NRCS	KII
11	Kshitiz Acharya	NRCS	KII
12	Tikaraj Poudyal	NRCS	KII
13	Bipul Neupane	NRCS	KII
14	Siddhi Shrestha	UNICEF	KII
15	Radha Gurung	UNICEF	KII
16	Bhim Kumari Pariyar	UNICEF	KII
17	Chandrama Dhamala		FGD Female Beneficiaries (Bardiya)
18	Junu Singh Thakuri		FGD Female Beneficiaries (Bardiya)
19	Nirmaya Tharu		FGD Female Beneficiaries (Bardiya)
20	Punam Godiya		FGD Female Beneficiaries (Bardiya)
21	Jyoti Pasi		FGD Female Beneficiaries (Bardiya)
22	Laxman Malla		FGD Male Beneficiaries (Bardiya)
23	Chandramal Gupta		FGD Male Beneficiaries (Bardiya)
24	Teke Kami		FGD Male Beneficiaries (Bardiya)
25	Bal Govinda Teli	Health post Assistant	FGD Male Beneficiaries (Bardiya)
26	Bali ram Teli		FGD Male Beneficiaries (Bardiya)
27	Sunita Thapa		FGD Unit Action Team (Bardiya)
28	Sarita Chaudhary		FGD Unit Action Team (Bardiya)
29	Sabita Gharti Magar		FGD Unit Action Team (Bardiya)
30	Lee Singh		FGD Unit Action Team (Bardiya)
31	Mukunda Aryal	Guleriya Municipality	KII
3 2	Mohana Kumari Joshi		FGD Unit Action Team (Kailali)
3 3	Sharada Bogati		FGD Unit Action Team (Kailali)
3 4	Aarti Acharya		FGD Unit Action Team (Kailali)
3 5	Krishna Kumari Rana		FGD Unit Action Team (Kailali)
3 6	Sahendra Chaudhary		FGD Unit Action Team (Kailali)
3 7	Yagya Raj Ojha		FGD Unit Action Team (Kailali)

	Name	Organization Affiliated to	Tools
38	Parbati Acharya		FGD Beneficiaries (Kailali)
39	Dinesh Basnet		FGD Beneficiaries (Kailali)
40	Amrita Malla		FGD Beneficiaries (Kailali)
41	Paurakh Malla		FGD Beneficiaries (Kailali)
42	Ganesh Bahadur Saud		FGD Volunteers (Kailali)
43	Dambar Singh Khati		FGD Volunteers (Kailali)
44	Sushila Chaudhary		FGD Volunteers (Kailali)
45	Govinda Raj Fulara		FGD Volunteers (Kailali)
46	Amar Bahadur Bista		FGD Volunteers (Kailali)
47	Mohan Bhandari	Head Teacher- Durga Basic School, Dhangadi 12	KII
48	Krishna Bahadur Bohora	Dhangadi Sub- Metropolitan City	KII
49	Bishni Kumal		FGD Female Beneficiaries (Dang)
50	Asha Kumal		FGD Female Beneficiaries (Dang)
51	Basanti Kumal		FGD Female Beneficiaries (Dang)
52	Biphani Kumal		FGD Female Beneficiaries (Dang)
53	Sundar Prasad Chaudhary		FGD Male Beneficiaries (Dang)
54	Balaram Kumal		FGD Male Beneficiaries (Dang)
55	Dil Bahadur Nepali		FGD Male Beneficiaries (Dang)
56	Pradip Poudel		FGD Male Beneficiaries (Dang)
57	Babu Ram Yadav		FGD Unit Action Team (Dang)
58	Lakhan Kumal		FGD Unit Action Team (Dang)
59	Kalidevi Kumal		FGD Unit Action Team (Dang)
60	Punaram Sharma	Gadhawa Rural Municipality	KII
61	Krishnanandan Kumar	Ishnath Municipality	KII
62	Ishrajul Kha	Ishnath Municipality	KII
6	Deepak Rauniyar	Ishnath	KII

	Name	Organization Affiliated to	Tools
3		Municipality	
6 4	Manoj Ram		FGD with Male Beneficiaries (Rautahat)
6 5	Bigu Ram		FGD with Male Beneficiaries (Rautahat)
6 6	Aman Ram		FGD with Male Beneficiaries (Rautahat)
6 7	Rakesh Shah		FGD with Male Beneficiaries (Rautahat)
6 8	Manish Das		FGD with Male Beneficiaries (Rautahat)
6 9	Umashanker Ram		FGD with Male Beneficiaries (Rautahat)
7 0	Ramdev Ram		FGD with Male Beneficiaries (Rautahat)
7 1	Nawaraj Ram		FGD with Male Beneficiaries (Rautahat)
7 2	Jangajala Devi Ram		FGD with Female Beneficiaries (Rautahat)
7 3	Anita Devi Ram		FGD with Female Beneficiaries (Rautahat)
7 4	Asha Devi Ram		FGD with Female Beneficiaries (Rautahat)
7 5	Pukari Ram		FGD with Female Beneficiaries (Rautahat)
7 6	Gangajala Devi Ram		FGD with Female Beneficiaries (Rautahat)
7 7	Ramati Devi Sada		FGD with Female Beneficiaries (Rautahat)
7 8	Charjyoti Devi Ram		FGD with Female Beneficiaries (Rautahat)
7 9	Keshima Devi Ram		FGD with Female Beneficiaries (Rautahat)
8 0	Devendra Shahi	Raskot Municipality Rural	KII NRCS (Kalikot)
8 1	Tej Bahadur Shahi	Raskot Municipality Rural	KII NRCS(Kalikot)
8 2	Tikaram Upadhyaya	Raskot Municipality Rural	FGD with Unit Action Team(Kalikot)
8 3	Bal Tiruwa	Raskot Municipality Rural	FGD with Unit Action Team(Kalikot)
8 4	Bimala Sanjel	Raskot Municipality Rural	FGD with Unit Action Team(Kalikot)
8 5	Hanshraj Baral	Raskot Municipality Rural	FGD with Unit Action Team(Kalikot)
8 6	Namraj Mahat	Raskot Municipality Rural	FGD with Unit Action Team(Kalikot)
8 7	Shankar Baral	Raskot Municipality Rural	FGD with Unit Action Team(Kalikot)

# Annex 6: Estimate of cross-component contributions

In order to carry out efficiency-effectiveness assessment through cost-contribution ratio, financial and beneficiary related data on activity levels for each sector within the partnership approach was gathered. Effectiveness analysis is built around the data on output, key activities, and budget with time frame of the intervention together, along with intensity rating on each activity. In the calculation table below, beneficiary numbers as well as the budget allocated for each activity for their respective sectors. Main calculation on cost contribution is achieved by the use of all three main variables received from the evaluation data:

$$\text{Cost – Contribution Ratio} = \frac{\text{Beneficiary} \times \text{Intensity}}{\text{Budget}}$$

		Sectors														
		Child Protection			Health			RCCE			DRR			WASH		
		Beneficiary	Intensity	Budget	Beneficiary	Intensity	Budget	Beneficiary	Intensity	Budget	Beneficiary	Intensity	Budget	Beneficiary	Intensity	Budget
Activity 1.1	Set up and activate Unit Action Team in all Wards of 44 local levels to support the Ward Disaster Management Committee and to								8.5	8,784,142						

	establish an information desk to engage with affected communities.															
Activity 1.2	Mobilize the Unit Action Team to implement the 4R approach (Record every member, recognize threats, Regulate recommended measures including lifesaving messages, & Report immediately) and offline social listening and rumor tracking during and after the lockdown								8	5,577,708						
Activity 1.3	Provide essential lifesaving relief materials and supplies including dignity kits and kishori (adolescent) kits.		9													

Activity 1.4	Support palikas to develop COVID preparedness and response plan at palika level (with participation of LDMC, Municipality stakeholders and vulnerable group including female representation)											6	764,775			
Activity 1.5	Support for the information management of COVID preparedness and response at palika level											8	1,750,000			
Activity 1.6	Organize regular coordination meetings with public and private sectors and media that can contribute towards a shared value engagement for preparedness and response.							5				7	764,775			

Activity 1.7	Program review and supervision/monitoring		8				972,795			6,325,087		8	511,065			1,145,935
Activity 1.8	Identify unaccompanied, separated and other vulnerable children and support their integration with their families.		9	1,000,000												
Activity 1.9	Monitoring of protection concerns (Province & Dcs Level)															
Activity 1.10	Promote and support cluster psychosocial interventions															
Activity 1.11	Transportation services for vulnerable returnees															
Activity	Strengthen and															

1.12	mobilize unit action team (support group) to reach out individuals and families with preventive and protective including hygiene messages															
Activity 1.13	Household & Ward/Pallika level interventions (CBS, CT & VA) by volunteers and their enabling & protection, done on event based and community-based surveillance, achievement was 76% of what was targeted, 8, 7, 6				500,000 CICT	7										
Activity 1.14	Documentation, special cased study of each component of the COVID-19			5,494,500			20,856,800			7,872,000				1,448,000		

	preparedness and response programme															
Output 1		9	6,494,500			21,829,595		7	28,558,937		7	5,238,615				1,145,935
Activity 2.1	Strengthening WASH cluster coordination				2	960,000								2		258,900
Activity 2.2	Ensure WASH services (including assessment, supplies)				9	20,786,000								9		33,393,650
Activity 2.3	Continuum of services (capacity building of own staff, service providers/ implementing partner at federal/provincial/local level)	7			10	364,000								10		200,000
Activity 2.4	Knowledge Management	6			6			9			8			6		180,000
Oth						544,500										

ers																
Output 2			8			8	22,654,500		8			8			8	34,032,550
Activity 3.1	In-country management & support staff pro-rated to their contribution to the programme (representation, planning, coordination, logistics, admin, finance)		8			8	7,495,600		8	19,927,499		8	1,965,100		8	9,133,900
Activity 3.2	Operational costs pro-rated to their contribution to the programme (office space, equipment, office supplies, maintenance)		8			8	745,500		8	2,268,500		8	65,000		8	621,000
Activity 3.3	Planning, monitoring, evaluation and communication, pro-rated to their contribution to the programme		8			8	899,000		8	4,248,000		8	158,000		8	211,000

	(venue, travels, etc.)															
Output 3			8			8	9,140,100		8	26,443,999		8	2,188,100		8	9,965,900
Total		1737	8	6,494,500	571807	7	53,624,195	1443543	7.71	55,002,936	1115981	7.63	7,426,715	947340	7.29	45,144,385

# Annex 7: Discussion on Efficiency and Effectiveness



Efficiency and  
Effectiveness.docx

# Annex 8: Participant Information Sheet and Informed Consent Form

## **Acknowledgments and Presentation of the Team:**

Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_, and I work with IOD PARC. We want to thank you for accepting the invitation to participate in this conversation, which will be of great importance for the evaluation we are conducting.

The interview with you will take about **[insert time]** to complete.

## **Presentation of the Evaluation**

IOD PARC, a UK-based consulting company, has been contracted by UNICEF Nepal to conduct an evaluation of the UNICEF and NRCS partnership, looking at implemented results in addition to operations and the overall management process of the partnership. The evaluation is predominantly for **learning** purposes.

The **three specific objectives** of the evaluation are to:

- Evaluate the performance of partnership activities and the extent to which its intended results were achieved.
- Assess good and bad lessons learned
- Provide practical recommendations to improve the partnership management performance to deliver sustainable outcomes in the emergency situations in Nepal.

## **Presentation of the Interview and Work Methodology**

We would like to clarify that there will be no immediate benefit of your participation in this evaluation, although in the long term it is expected that the results of the evaluation may improve the working of UNICEF and NRCS in future partnerships, especially in their response to future emergency situations. No incentive be offered for participating in this interview.

All interviews are confidential. The information will be used only in an aggregate form in our report and cannot be attributed to the people interviewed. No interviewee will be identified, except as part of a relationship or list of people interviewed, which will be included at the end of the evaluation document.

Participation is completely voluntary. You have every right to decide to participate or not. You will be provided with two copies of this Consent Form and asked to sign both and keep one for your records. You can ask to have the form read out to you and then sign. By signing you are indicating that you have understood your rights as a participant and that you agree to take part.

---

Participant's name

---

Participant's organisation

---

Participant's signature

Date

---

Name of person obtaining consent

Signature of person obtaining consent

Date

"I agree to participate in this research project"  
NO

YES

"I agree to the use of anonymous extracts from my interview  
in reporting"

YES

NO

"My views can be taken as representing my organisation"  
NO

YES

In case of questions or complaints about this evaluation, you can contact UNICEF through [Sevara Hamzaeve; Phone: 9802327205 Phone: or IOD PARC through Vijay Shresthra; Phone: 9851034719

I have some questions to guide our conversation. In the case that there is something that you feel is beyond your experience or knowledge, please let me know. To help the evaluation team remember our conversation today, I will be taking some handwritten notes. However, I will not be recording (audio) the meeting and will not take any photos.

Before we begin, do you have any questions or concerns related to the assessment or this interview?

