

# **Annexes to the Independent Evaluation of SDC Nepal Country Programmes 1993–2004**

<b>Annexe A</b>	<b>Approach Paper</b>
<b>Annexe B</b>	<b>Record of meetings held and scheduled in Nepal – by sector and category of interlocutor</b>
<b>Annexe C</b>	<b>Bibliography</b>
<b>Annexe D</b>	<b>Matrix for the analysis of the programme</b>
<b>Annexe E</b>	<b>Consolidated Programme Output Statement 1993–2004</b>
<b>Annexe F</b>	<b>Evaluation Team Interpretation of Results chain – sector (sub) programmes</b>
<b>Annexe G</b>	<b>Characteristics of SDCs Programme approach – based on nature of Outputs aiming to deliver through Sector Programmes</b>
<b>Annexe H</b>	<b>Project portfolio</b>
<b>Annexe I</b>	<b>District Indicators of development Exercise – basis for analysis of development trends in SDC focus districts (1993–2003)</b>
<b>Annexe J</b>	<b>Findings Table – Institutional change context: focused on Decentralisation &amp; Democracy</b>
<b>Annexe K</b>	<b>Findings Table – Nepal's progress towards the MDGs</b>
<b>Annexe L</b>	<b>Findings Table 4 – Relevance of SDC Country Programme „intervention areas“ to development process in Nepal</b>

**Annex A:**

**NEPAL**

**Independent Evaluation of SDC Country  
Programme**

**Approach Paper**

14. July, 2004

- 1 Background
- 2 Why an Evaluation and Why Now? – Rationale
- 3 Purpose, Objectives and Focus
  - 3.1 Purpose
  - 3.2 Objectives
  - 3.3 Focus
- 4 Key Questions
  - 4.1 Context
  - 4.2 Evolution of SDC Programme Nepal
  - 4.3 Programme Relevance
  - 4.4 Programme Effectiveness
  - 4.5 SDC Response to the (emerging) Conflict in Nepal
- 5 Recommendations
- 6 Expected Results
  - 6.1 At Output Level
  - 6.2 At Outcome Level
- 7 Partners
  - 7.1 Organisational Set-up and Respective Roles
  - 7.2 Core Learning Partnership (CLP)
  - 7.3 Broad Learning Partnership (BLP)
- 8 Process
  - 8.1 Methodology
  - 8.2 Main Steps – Schedule
  - 8.3 Evaluation Team
- 9 Reference Documents

Annex: Brief Information on PARC and the Consultants

## Background

Nepal and Switzerland have a long-standing association in development cooperation. The origin of Swiss assistance dates back half a century. Nepal ranks among the major overall recipient countries of Swiss aid. In Nepal, SDC implemented its first project and many approaches were pioneered there. Many of the present top echelon of SDC and other Swiss development organisations started their career in Nepal. Also, one of the main Swiss debates about the usefulness of international aid referred to Nepal as main case study and led to a parliamentary enquiry in the 80s.

The special relationship between Nepal and Switzerland is based on a certain affinity between the two countries. Swiss assistance to Nepal started in the 50s and was initially channelled through NGOs and multi-lateral agencies. After its foundation in 1961, SDC became active in Nepal through SATA, a joint venture with the Swiss NGO Helvetas. Swiss assistance concentrated on the hills with emphasis on rural development with projects and programmes in agriculture, forestry, rural infrastructure, social services (health, education). The significant involvement in transport infrastructure started with the construction of trail bridges and was later expanded to roads. Another important component from early on was vocational training, both in rural and urban areas.

With a view of making Swiss assistance more coherent, focused and effective, the first SDC Country Programme for Nepal was elaborated, covering the period 1986-1992. In the early nineties the separation of the joint programme of Helvetas and SDC was concluded. The second SDC Country Programme, 1993-1997 was influenced by the optimism of the democracy movement of 1990, an optimism that was not borne out by the political instability that was to follow and to eventually lead to the beginning of the Maoist uprising in 1996.

The third SDC Country programme, 1998-2004, formalised the shift, initiated earlier, from rural development to Natural Resource Management and continued the diversification of partners. As overarching programmatic thrust the SDC assistance is to contribute to a more open, pluralistic and egalitarian society. The main characteristics of the formulated SDC programme approach are:

- Concentration on the three sectors: Transport, Occupational Skill and Enterprise Development (OSED) and Natural Resource Management
- Two transversal themes: Gender Balanced Development and Poverty Orientation
- Partner diversification: Central government, local government, NGOs, private enterprises
- Geographical concentration on the hilly districts in Nepal

The present conflict whose manifest onset is usually associated with the Maoist uprising in February 1996, has had a major impact on development cooperation in Nepal. In the second quarter of 2002 SDC organised a Country Programme and Mid-Term Review and Planning (MTPR) Workshop during which SDC actions and reactions regarding the conflict and a re-orientation of the programme were exhaustively discussed. An **Addendum to the SDC Country Assistance Programme** was subsequently elaborated and finalised in August 2003. The Addendum spells out adjustments and amendments to the SDC Country Programme for three scenarios. In addition, the Addendum introduced Peace Building and Governance as overarching programme approach and it extended the period covered by the Third Country Programme by one year to the end of 2005 (instead of 2004). Apart from the conflict situation, this prolongation also takes into account that a new management team has started its tour of duty in Kathmandu in June 2003 and that catalytic projects in governance, peace support and equity have recently

been initiated. To put things in perspective, it needs to be added that the recent adjustments are not SDC specific but correspond with strategy changes in the whole donor community.

In 2003, Nepal ranked in 6th place of recipient countries of Swiss assistance, and in third place if only bilateral development cooperation is considered. SDC disbursement for bilateral development cooperation in Nepal in 2002 amounted to just under 20 Mio. CHF, or about 3.5% of total bi- and multilateral aid to Nepal. Due to the long standing relationship between the two countries, the reputation of Switzerland as a donor is probably better reflected by its total engagement over the last half a century than by any annual percentages.

## **Why an Evaluation and Why Now? – Rationale**

In SDC at least one independent evaluation of a country assistance programme is conducted per year. Nepal was selected for two reasons.

Firstly, the planning process for Swiss assistance beyond the period covered by the present SDC Country Programme will be initiated in the second semester of 2004 and concluded in 2005. The evaluation is thus scheduled in such a manner within the programme cycle that its recommendations can be expected to contribute to the planning process for future Swiss assistance.

Secondly, the on-going conflict between Maoists and Government has seriously affected political stability, personal security and well-being in Nepal and thus presents a major challenge for development cooperation. In this situation an evaluation is expected to contribute to the analysis of SDC's response to the conflict and to the reflection on how to best approach future Nepali-Swiss development co-operation. Lesson drawn from Nepal might also help SDC in addressing similar problems elsewhere.

## **Purpose, Objectives and Focus**

### **Purpose**

The evaluation is to assess relevance and effectiveness of Swiss assistance to Nepal during the period covered by the Second and the Third SDC Country Programme (1993 to present). The evaluation is expected to provide findings, conclusions and recommendations that can (a) assist the planning of Swiss assistance to Nepal in the period after 2005, and that (b) illuminate the role and response of development cooperation and development organisations, in particular SDC, in times of severe conflict.

### **Objectives**

- To assess relevance and effectiveness of SDC assistance to Nepal from 1993 to the present
- To assess the response of SDC management and programme to the conflict in Nepal
- To (a) formulate recommendations for the orientation of SDC assistance to Nepal beyond 2005 and to (b) draw lessons from the SDC response to the conflict situation in Nepal

## **Focus**

The evaluation shall primarily focus on the SDC programme and strategy but will also draw from lessons derived through individual projects.

## **Key questions**

### **Context**

A brief introduction into the Nepalese context will introduce working hypotheses of the evaluation.

### **Evolution of SDC Programme Nepal**

A short analysis of continuity and change within the SDC Nepal programme 1993 to the present will provide a first basis for an assessment of programme relevance and effectiveness

- 1) What were/are the dynamics of the SDC Programme and the relevant actors within the Nepalese context?
- 2) How were the processes of learning organised in the SDC Nepal programme and what were the most important lessons learned?

### **Programme Relevance**

The question of relevance invariably needs to first determine the yardstick by which relevance can be assessed. In the case of the SDC programme Nepal the following five dimensions seem to be important (others may be added by the evaluation team):

Relevance

- in view of SDC guiding principles and strategy in poverty alleviation, gender and governance
- in terms of contributing to national priorities as for example expressed in the Five-Year-Plans;
- measured in terms of contributing to policy dialogue and policy development;
- in terms of addressing what are today commonly deemed to be the root causes and core issues of the conflict situation in Nepal;
- in terms of the views and needs of the people

Again considering the period 1993 to the present, the evaluation will focus on the question of the relevance of the SDC programme in terms of

- 3) sectors in which SDC is active and the contributions made within these sectors?
- 4) transversal themes pursued (gender, poverty/equity, governance/decentralisation, peace building) and how they are understood and dealt with both as themes per se and within the sectors?
- 5) partners chosen? Which partners chosen have been/are most effective? Special emphasis needs to be given to the relationship with Helvetas.
- 6) approaches chosen (approaches sometimes correspond with partners chosen, i.e. government, private, NGO, CBO)
- 7) geographical areas chosen?
- 8) overall programmatic approach and how it was/is pursued (summarising the points above)?

## **Programme Effectiveness**

This evaluation with its focus on the SDC programme will not be expected to analyse all individual projects. Meta-analysis of existing project reviews and portfolio analysis are possible tools for evaluating programme effectiveness and sustainability.

Assessment of effectiveness of the SDC programme at the level of the

- 9) sectors of the programme?
- 10) transversal topics?
- 11) overall programme level?
- 12) What is the role of SDC COOF and HQ in donor cooperation, harmonisation and multilateral efforts (from human security to PRSP and MDG)?

## **SDC Response to the (emerging) Conflict in Nepal**

The following questions pertain to the conflict situation in Nepal. The assessment may also draw from aspects mentioned under 4.1-4.4.

- 13) How did SDC deal with the following issues related to the social and political conflict in Nepal?
  - political authority?
  - democratic movement?
  - imperfect democracy?
  - Maoist insurrection?
  - governance?
  - human rights?
  - conflict resolution and peace building?
  - gender?
  - equity issues and exclusion?
  - poverty issues?
  - caste/ethnicity?
- 14) How did the conflict affect the programme and vice versa? Was the programme harmed, hindered or fuelled by the conflict?
- 15) What is the effect of the conflict on the durability of the programme and its projects?
- 16) What adjustments were made in the SDC programme in response to the emerging social and political conflicts, including humanitarian aid? Were the adjustments timely and appropriate?
- 17) Were/are the management structure and processes of the SDC HQ and COOF and the changes initiated in COOF adequate for dealing with the conflict?
- 18) Was/is SDC HQ and COOF portfolio management, monitoring and evaluation adequate for dealing with the conflict?
- 19) How is thematic and strategic support extended by SDC HQ to the COOF assessed?
- 20) How useful were instruments such as MERV and FAST in dealing with the emerging conflict?
- 21) How did SDC coordinate with other Swiss actors, federal administration and NGOs in order to address the conflict situation?

- 22) How did SDC coordinate and relate with other donors in order to address the conflict situation?
- 23) To what extent did SDC capitalise on its long-standing relation with Nepal and its good reputation for contributing to conflict resolution? How has SDC historically and currently been viewed by Nepali people – the general public as well as project recipients?

## **Recommendations**

Based on the findings and conclusions of the independent evaluation

- 24) What are the recommendations for the continuation of Swiss assistance in general and in terms of content (sectors, transversal topics, geographical focus), structure and process?
- 25) What are the key experiences, insights and results the SDC programme should capitalise on?
- 25) What are the lessons drawn from the analysis of SDC's response to the conflict in Nepal?

## **Expected Results**

### **At Output Level**

- A fit to print evaluation report containing findings, conclusions and recommendations not exceeding 30 pages plus annexes and including an executive summary.
- A summary according to DAC-Standards not exceeding 2 pages produced by the evaluation team and edited by SDC Division E&C
- An Agreement at Completion Point including the response of the CLP (cf. 6.1) to the recommendations and, if essential, to the key conclusions of the evaluation. This response takes the form of an SDC Management Response.
- Lessons drawn by the CLP.
- Dissemination of lessons learned to the BLP (cf. 6.2) and over the internet.

### **At Outcome Level**

The independent evaluation of the SDC Nepal Country Programme is expected to contribute to

- to the analysis of the characteristics, strengths and weaknesses of Swiss assistance in Nepal
- to the planning process for Swiss assistance for the period following the presently effective SDC Country Programme (after 2005)
- the shaping of cooperation among Swiss actors in Nepal
- the SDC approach in donor cooperation in Nepal
- the discussion within SDC on how to best act and react in emerging conflict situations in SDC partner countries

## Partners

### Organisational Set-up and Respective Roles

- The **Core Learning Partnership** (CLP) ensures that the consultants have access to all necessary information (documents, interviews). It comments on the evaluation design and the draft evaluation report (feedback to consultants about whether additional research needs to be done). During the Completion Point Workshop, it discusses the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations and negotiates and approves the Agreement at Completion Point and the Lessons Learned. It decides who should be targeted for dissemination.
- The **Broad Learning Partnership** (BLP) may be interested in the evaluation results and will be targeted for dissemination.
- **Consultants** contracted by SDC E&C Division elaborate an evaluation working plan, carry out the evaluation, submit the draft report to the CLP, take on board comments as appropriate and finalize their evaluation report.
- Within SDC, a Management Response on the Agreement reached at Completion Point is provided by **department-level** management along with the **General Director** in a COSTRA meeting.
- A small **Steering Group**<sup>1</sup> to accompany the evaluation process, sort out practical problems and link with organisational units (Jörg Frieden and Eak Bahadar Gurung, both SDC COOF Kathmandu; Markus Schäfer and Samuel Wälty, both SDC HQ)
- **Division E&C, SDC**, commissions the independent evaluation and is the focal point for any questions and issues concerning the evaluation (contact: Samuel Wälty, when absent: Holger Tausch)

### Core Learning Partnership (CLP)

The Core Learning Partnership will consist of the following members in Switzerland<sup>2</sup>

At SDC Headquarter:

- Asia II Division: 3 members
- Division Conflict Prevention: 2 members
- Division Governance: 1 member
- Division Social Development: 1 member
- Division SOSA: 1 member
- Division Evaluation and Controlling: 2 members
- Division Development Policy: 1 member
- Department Humanitarian Aid: 1-2 members

Representatives from other Swiss Organisations as observers

- Political Directorate IV of Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Helvetas
- University

---

<sup>1</sup> consisting of (tentative) Jörg Frieden, NPO?? Markus Schäfer, Samuel Wälty

<sup>2</sup> List not yet finalised



The Core Learning Partnership will consist of the following members in Nepal

- SDC Country Office
- government (ad personam)
- civil society
- academia

### **Broad Learning Partnership (BLP)**

In addition to the Core Learning Partnership the Broad Learning Partnership includes

- SDC divisions concerned with conflict resolution and peace building
- Swiss NGOs active in Nepal
- Bilateral and multilateral donors active in Nepal

## **Process**

### **Methodology**

In recent years there have been a considerable number of studies and enquiries conducted and reports produced that address international cooperation in Nepal in light of the present situation of social and political conflict. It is thus expected that the evaluation utilizes the documented analysis and findings and avoids duplication.

- Review of SDC documents pertaining to SDC strategy and to Swiss assistance in Nepal
- Review of documents pertaining to the conflict situation in Nepal and its implication for international cooperation in Nepal
- Interviews with relevant persons at SDC headquarter and other Swiss stakeholders
- Evaluation mission to Nepal including interviews, workshops and focus groups with representatives of Country Office Kathmandu, CLP Nepal, representatives of government, civil society, NGOs, academia, and other donors; field visits to SDC project and programme areas including interviews with beneficiaries, project personnel and others.
- Evaluation mission briefings and debriefings in Kathmandu and Berne
- Analysis of data and report writing

## Main steps – Schedule

Activity	Date 2004	Responsible
Pro Memoria: Workshop Internal Conflicts COPRET Mission	February Feb/March	
Preparatory Mission E&C to Nepal	March 5-12	E&C/COOF
Call for offers	April	E&C
Review of existing reviews/evaluation reports and/or poverty study to be discussed by COOF/Asia II	May -?	COOF/Asia II
Selection of Evaluators	June	E&C
1 <sup>st</sup> CLP/Nepal meeting: Finalisation of Approach Paper	July 8th	CLP/Nepal/COOF
1 <sup>st</sup> CLP/Switzerland meet: Finalisation of Approach Paper	July 12th	CLP/Switzerland/E&C
Contracts signed with evaluators	July	E&C
Thematic preparation of evaluation	July-Sept	Eval. team
Logistic and administrative preparation of evaluation mission	July-Sept	COOF
Evaluation mission first stage	Sept 27 - Oct 8	Eval. team
Interviews with stakeholders in Switzerland	Oct 20-22	Eval. team/E&C
2 <sup>nd</sup> CLP/Switzerland meeting: First stage of evaluation mission: first results and open questions	Thu Oct 21	CLP/Switzerland/E&C
Evaluation mission second stage	Nov 25 - Dec 4	Eval. team/COOF
2 <sup>nd</sup> CLP/Nepal meeting: Debriefing of evaluation mission	Dec 3	CLP/Nepal
Draft report	Dec 22	Eval.team
	<b>Date 2005</b>	
3 <sup>rd</sup> CLP/Nepal meeting: Discussion of Draft Report	Jan ??	CLP/Nepal
3 <sup>rd</sup> CLP/Switzerland meet: Discussion of Draft Report	Wed Jan 12	CLP/Switzerland/E&C
Final report	Jan 31	Eval.team
4 <sup>th</sup> CLP/Nepal/Switzerland: Agreement at Completion Point	Thu Feb 17	Both CLPs/E&C
COSTRA	March (tentative)	E&C
Publication	April	E&C

## Evaluation Team

The evaluation team is to consist of two international evaluators and two local evaluators. The team should comprise both genders and have evaluation expertise and subject matter expertise in the following areas:

- Conflict resolution and peace building, governance, human rights,
- Development cooperation, in particular rural development including two of the three sectors with SDC activities in Nepal: natural resource management, occupational skills/enterprise development, rural transport
- Context knowledge of international cooperation in Nepal and of Swiss development cooperation

Entrusted with the evaluation is the Performance Assessment Resource Centre (PARC) in Birmingham UK (see Annex)

## Reference Documents

SDC Bern                      Strategy 2010  
SDC Bern                      Guiding Principles

SDC    Country Programme for Nepal 1993-1997  
SDC    Country Programme for Nepal 1998-2004  
SDC    Report on the MTRP Workshop April 29 – May 2, 2002, Godavari Nepal  
SDC    Addendum to the Country Programme Nepal valid for 2002-2005  
SDC    Annual Programmes for Nepal

SDC Kathmandu (1995): SDC Transport Sector Strategy - Nepals  
SDC Kathmandu (1999): Poverty Orientation Guidelines  
SDC Kathmandu (1999): Natural Resources Management. Sector Concept  
SDC Kathmandu (2001): Gender Guidelines  
SDC Kathmandu (2001): Occupational Skills and Enterprise Development (OSED).  
Conceptual Framework 2001-2005  
SDC Kathmandu (2003): Governance Concept Nepal

Rana, Ratna S. and Sharad Sharma (2004): Swiss experiences in the Nepalese contexts (prepared for Workshop on "Causes of internal conflicts and means to resolve them: Case study Nepal) and other material prepared for this workshop held in February 2004-Workshop to be held end of February 2004, other material forthcoming

Report on Joint Mission PD IV and SDC/COPRET on Conflict and Human Rights in Nepal, February 19 to March 5, 2004

Review Team (2002): Review of Development Partnerships in Nepal. Main findings and recommendations

DFID: Country Assistance Plan 2003-2007

Upreti, H. (2002) Nepal. A Nation in Search of Peace and Development. Paper submitted to SDC. (long and short version available)

Högger, R. (2001): Contributing to new strength – An Analysis of Threats and Opportunities in the Development Cooperation between Nepal and Switzerland, SDC Kathmandu

## **ANNEX: Brief Information on PARC and the consultants**

### **Performance Assessment Resource Centre, Birmingham/UK**

The parc supports international efforts to improve performance assessment in international development practice. In this way the parc hopes to help develop the quality, effectiveness and sustainability of poverty-focused interventions. The parc has been set up to support the evaluation work of development partners in both the South and the North. Intended beneficiaries include developing country governments, agencies providing and receiving international aid, project managers and consultants. Parc offers information, consultancy, training and seminar services.

### **Consultants**

Dr Chandra Kala Bhadra is a senior consultant with extensive experience of researching and reporting on gender rights, poverty alleviation and women in conflict, among many areas of expertise relevant to this evaluation. A holder of a PhD from Oregon State University, she is an Associate Professor at Tribhuvan University in Kathmandu, and works extensively on gender issues with the UN and a number of other national and international agencies.

Mr Julian Gayfer (team-leader) is an experienced consultant and practitioner on aid effectiveness and aid management. Has led an independent Country Strategy Review for DFID in Vietnam and is supporting the development of performance management systems. Sectoral knowledge in broad aspects of rural development including forestry, rural access, enterprise development and complimented by a strong governance perspective. Undergraduate studies in forestry and agriculture have been complemented by a more recent (1995) Masters in Business Administration, which included selective modules on gender in management and cross-cultural communication. Mr. Gayfer is director of IOD Ltd, a consultancy company working primarily in the field of development cooperation and currently running the PARC (Performance Assessment Resource Centre). PARC was established in the UK with DFID funding. From 1991-.1994 Mr. Gayfer was team leader of a Community Forestry Project in Nepal.

Mr Raghav Raj Regmi is a consultant with extensive regional and international experience, with a strong focus on poverty alleviation, project design and management, and vocational training. He has contributed to and/or evaluated development projects in most areas of Nepal and has excellent understanding of the constraints faced by rural development programmes in this and other countries.

Mr Pierre Robert, a graduate of the Sorbonne University and holder of two Masters Degrees, has over 18 years' experience as an international policy research expert with practical experience of democratisation, awareness raising and social development processes, conflict prevention assessment and expertise international organisations, project management and human rights, with a strong background in political and social issues. Mr Robert has considerable experience in designing, leading and evaluating major international projects, ensuring capacity building and team coordination in sensitive assignments, including conflict situations. As a former senior manager with Amnesty International, he has detailed knowledge of civil society organisations worldwide. Mr Robert also lectures on human rights and diplomacy at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London. Most recently Mr. Robert has led a team of the European Commission in Nepal entrusted with designing a conflict mitigation programme.

## **Annex B**

**Record of meetings held and scheduled in Nepal -  
by sector and category of interlocutor.**

**Record of meetings held and scheduled in Nepal - by sector and category of interlocutor**

	<b>Central govt</b>	<b>SDC staff/TA/ Project Mgrs</b>	<b>Implementing Partners</b>	<b>Peer donors</b>	<b>Key informants</b>	<b>Project evaluations.</b>	<b>Beneficiaries (local stakeholders)</b>
<b>Transport</b>	-	Sector Head DRSP SMDP NPO	DOR DOLIDAR Helvetas TBSSP	DFID (RAP) ADB DFID		BBLL & TBSSP DRSP	DRO/DRSP staff/DDC
<b>OSD</b>	MOIC DOLE	Sector Head TFE (TA) TITI (TA) NPO	BTTC TFE FSKILL TITI CTEVT Helvetas	ILO ADB	WEAN FNCCI Central FSCIN	CTEVT/ Skill Testing TITI	Private Dairy JTS Automobile Mechanics Association
<b>NRM</b>	MFSC	Sector Head NSFCP (PM) SSMP (TA, PM) RHDP (TA, PM) NPO	DoF Helvetas CFDP Forest Action Group	DFID (LFP)	Forest Action Group	PHD-MCP/ RHDP NSCFP SSMP IUCN	DFO, 2 FUGs FECOFUN/Dolakaha NGOs Tuki Association. Health user Group DHO Hospital Committee/Jiri
<b>Governance</b>	MLD	Sector Head NPO	Pro Public IDG FEDO	DASU	NAVIN ADDCN "Chinton" HURON NHRC Water UG Assoc Irrigation UGs Assoc	Too early to be assessed	-
<b>Context/ General</b>	NPC MoF	Country Dir Deputy CD	-	CIDA SNV UNDP DFID	Pitamber Sharma Harka Gurung SWC Dr Belbase CLP (Nepal) Chhaya Jha Bishnu Upreti	-	Media NGOs Ex Chair/DDC FNCCI/Dolakaha

A group consultation was held with partner and Non partner NGOs.

## **Annex C**

### **Bibliography**

## **Bibliography**

N. B.: This Annex does not list the project proposals (Kreditanträge) developed since 1993 – the evaluators had access to a complete collection of these (see list of projects in Annex H).

### **General Background: Nepal**

Acharya, Dr M. (1997) Review of politico-economic developments in Nepal – Probable future trends and their development implications. Report for SDC

Hutt, Michael (ed.) (1993) Nepal in the Nineties: Versions of the past, visions of the future. Oxford University Press. Papers include; Drafting the 1990 Constitution, M. Hutt, The general elections of May 1991, J Whelpton, Fatalism and Development in Nepal, A Macfarlane, Democracy and development in Nepal, D Seddon.

### **SDC policy & programming papers, internal SDC documents (non-project)**

SDC (1992) The Guidelines of the SDC

SDC (1993) Country programme 1993-1997

SDC (1994) Guidelines North-South, Report on Switzerland's North-South Relations in the 1990s

SDC (1995) Transport sector strategy – Nepal

Afful, Dr K (1996) Country Programme Revision; Report of exposure trip and workshop for the launch of country programme revision.

Interdisciplinary Analysts (1997) Support strategies of SDC – peripheral support vs institutional strengthening: experiences and lessons learnt.

SDC (1998) Country Programme for Nepal 1998 – 2004

SDC (1999) Guiding Principles

SDC Coof Nepal (1999) Poverty orientation guidelines

SDC (1999) Natural resources management sector concept – country programme for Nepal

SDC (2000) Strategy 2010

SDC Coof Nepal (2001) Gender Guidelines

SDC (2001) Occupational skills and enterprise development – a conceptual framework

SDC Coof Nepal (2001) Gender Guidelines



Egger, Paul (2002) Report on the Nepal Development Forum 2002

SDC (2002) Report on the Mid-term review and planning (MTRP) Workshop.

SDC (2003) SDC Nepal Portfolio information

SDC (2003) Addendum to the Country programme – valid for 2002 – 2005

Egger, Paul (2003) Report on Trip to Nepal

SDC (2003) Governance Concept Nepal

SDC (2003) Switerland's International Cooperation Annual Report 2003

SDC (2003) SDC's bilateral engagement in the poverty reduction strategy paper (PRSP) process

SDC (2003) Gender Equality, a Key for Poverty Alleviation and Sustainable Development

SDC (2003) Gender in Practice, A Toolkit for SDC and its Partners

SDC (2003) Peacebuilding, SDC Guidelines

Egger, Paul (2004) Trip report Nepal

Schläpfer, Adrian (2004) Dienstreise Bericht Nepal und Südkorea

SDC/COPRET and PD IV Joint Mission on Conflict and Human Rights in Nepal Report (2004)

SDC (2004) Annual Programme 2004 Nepal

SDC (2004) Annual programme 2005 Nepal (draft)

SDC (2004?) Implementation SDC Strategy 2010 (Concept E-Department)

SDC 2004 Evaluation of SDC's Human Rights and Rule of Law Guidance Documents

SDC (2004) Integrating Human Rights and Poverty Reduction, Towards a Human Rights-based Approach for SDC

DEZA (2004) Milleniums-Deklaration und Milleniums-Entwicklungsziele

### **Conflict and poverty in Nepal, other country-level reviews, HMG documents**

Högger, Ruedi (2001) Contributing to new strength: an analysis of threats and opportunities in the development cooperation between Nepal and Switzerland

DFID Nepal (2002) Programme-Level Conflict Assessment, Tony Vaux ed.

DFID Nepal (2002) Nepal Country Strategy Review (Hari K. Upadhyaya, Saurabh Sinha, Sumitra Manandhar Gurung)

DFID Nepal (2002) A study of Accountability in Development Cooperation; Organisation Development Centre

DFID Nepal 2002 A Review of Positive Lessons Learned from Donor Co-operation in Nepal; Organisation Development Centre

SDC (2002) Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment of SDC's Country Programme in Macedonia

SDC (2002) Nepal - A Nation in Search of Peace and Development - Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment of SDC Co-operation Programme in Nepal

HMG (2003) The Tenth Plan, 2002-2007 (PRS Paper)

Moderator report (2003) Seminar for Nepali participants on conflict resolution and peace building

Gersony, R (2003) Sowing the wind... history and dynamics of the maoist revolt in Nepal's Rapti hills

SDC (2004) The contribution of SDC activities to poverty reduction (1<sup>st</sup> draft report)

SDC Coof Nepal (2004) SDC Experience of Poverty Orientation in Nepal; Manju Tuladar

CIDA (2004) Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment, Nepal; by Chhaya Jha and Tracy Vienings

Asian Development Bank (2004) Country Assistance Programme Evaluation for Nepal

Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva (2004) Causes of Internal Conflicts and Means to Resolve Them - Nepal: A Case Study

Swisspeace: Quarterly Risk Assessments (FAST), 2004

Helvetas Nepal (undated) Learning and Sharing Series: 1. Empowering Dalits; 2. Empowering Women; 3. Local Resource Persons: Community Technicians; 4. Local Resource Persons: "Birth of an Organisation"; 5. Strengthening Local Governments; 6. Stengthening Local Institutions: Networks

### **Project evaluations and reviews:**

Poverty welfare and self-reliance: Evaluation of the User Group Support Programme in Nepal (1994)

External Review: Primary health care – mother child health and family planning project (1996)

CTEVT Review Mission report (1997)

NFSCP Third Phase: Self Evaluation (1999)

RHDP Evaluation/ KAP Study – measurable effects of RHDP (2000)

“Standing up against the wind”: RHDP External evaluation on empowerment and its consequences (2001)

DRSP Self Evaluation report (2001)

CTEVT/ Skill Testing Evaluation (2002)

TBSSP Self Assessment Workshop report (2002)

SSMP 1<sup>st</sup> Phase External Evaluation (2002)

TITI External Evaluation (2003)

RHDP Self Evaluation (2003)

NFSCP External review (2003)

Rural development Tuki Association (2003) Independent Evaluation Report

External Review of bridge building programme (2003)

External evaluation: IUCN Nepal programme (2003)

NFSCP's Journey from 1996 – 2002 – an assessment of the projects achievements against its objectives; an internal review (2003)

Despite political chaos in the country, community forestry is advancing in Nepal's hills (2003) Project Note NFSCP

Community forestry in the hills; the potential impact of the new finance ordinance 2003 (2003) Working paper for NFSCP

Mid Phase review of the Trail Bridge Sub-sector Project (TBSSP) Nepal, Main report (2004)

Forests and people's livelihoods: benefiting the poor from community forestry (2004). Paper Pokharel & Nurse in Journal of Forest and Livelihood 4(1), July 2004

Forest Governance and Community Forestry Development Project in Nepal: Phase 1 Evaluation report (2004)

Beyond TBSSP/2006, Concept Paper on Local Level Transport Infrastructure Project

## **Annex D**

### **Matrix for the analysis of the programme**

## Matrix for the analysis of the programme

QUESTION	RESOURCES	METHODS/ APPROACHES/ EVIDENCE
<b>1. CONTEXT – what was the context within which the country programme was developed and implemented</b>		
1.1 What were the “drivers for change” within Nepal 1993 – 2004 ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CP analysis</li> <li>• Conflict analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time line</li> </ul>
1.2 What were the major changes and events within SDC HQ 1993 – 2004 ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SDC statements (incl strategy on concentration countries)</li> <li>• Interviews with HQ staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time line</li> </ul>
1.3 What was SDC’s policy towards cross cutting issues (poverty, gender, environment, HIV/AIDS) 1993 – 2004 ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SDC Policy &amp; Strategy Papers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy summaries and implementation strategies</li> <li>• Monitoring of compliance approaches</li> </ul>
1.4 What were the wider Nepal and Switzerland influences on the programme ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview Swiss Embassy officials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholder views</li> </ul>
1.5 What progress has been made in terms of poverty and development outcomes since 1993 ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WB and UN reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tracking trends 93-04</li> </ul>
<b>2. STRATEGY – Was SDC’s strategy “right” ?</b>		
2.1 What was SDC’s strategy for Nepal; how was it justified and how did it evolve ? <i>To what extent was it responsive to the evolving context in Nepal ?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of SDC strategy documents &amp; logframes</li> <li>• Interview SDC staff</li> <li>• Interviews with key partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timeline</li> <li>• Table: Shifts in approach</li> <li>• CP Logframe comparison</li> </ul>
2.2 What was the process of consultation in drawing up the strategies ? To what extent did SDC seek and secure local contributions to/ feedback on/ ownership of the strategies ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview SDC staff</li> <li>• Interview local partners</li> <li>• Review strategy documentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ownership indicators</li> <li>• Process mapping</li> </ul>
2.3 Were the objectives and desired outcomes of the strategy (programme level objectives) clearly stated, monitorable, and monitored ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of CP documents and prog monitoring reports</li> <li>• Interview SDC staff (Coof &amp; HQ ?)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logframe development and testing</li> <li>• OVI/MOV potential, realism</li> </ul>
2.4 What alternative strategies were considered and appraised ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of CP (strategy) development documents/ files</li> <li>• Interview SDC staff (former Coof &amp; HQ)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Counterfactuals</li> </ul>
2.5 How were cross cutting/ transversal themes (poverty, gender, environment, HIV/AIDS) taken into account within the strategy ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of SDC documents (Prog &amp; Project)</li> <li>• Interview SDC staff (Prog &amp; Project – current &amp; former)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SDC Guidelines/ checklists and compliance</li> <li>• Use of gender resource (local &amp; int)</li> </ul>
2.7 Was SDC’s strategy and its evolution <u>relevant</u> , balanced, coherent, appropriately focused/comprehensive, consistent, responsive and realistic given the context (as assessed above), changes in the context, SDC corporate objectives and Nepal (HMGN) priorities and strategy ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CP Evaluations / strategic reviews</li> <li>• Interview SDC staff</li> <li>• Interview partners (HMGN, donors) &amp; commentators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development nexus</li> <li>• Change mapping (alterations/ response)</li> </ul>
<b>3. PROGRAMME – did SDC do the “right” things ?</b>		
3.1 What was SDC’s programme (projects and other activities) ? How and why did it evolve ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of project monitoring system data</li> <li>• Interview SDC staff</li> <li>• Project Documents (logframes)</li> <li>• Financial information (expenditure data)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risks/ Assumptions review (Programme level)</li> <li>• Spend against CP outputs over time</li> <li>• Project History “map”/ timeline</li> </ul>

3.2 How were interventions identified, appraised and selected ? To what extent did SDC seek and secure local participation in this process ? Were objectives realistic ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview SDC staff</li> <li>• Project reviews and reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rejected/ discontinued projects/ initiatives</li> </ul>
3.3 How were cross cutting issues (poverty, gender, environment & HIV/AIDS) taken into account within the programme ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of project documents</li> <li>• Interview SDC staff</li> </ul>	
3.4 Was SDC's programme and its evolution relevant, high quality, coherent, appropriately focussed/comprehensive, consistent, responsive, and realistic given the strategy, guidelines and context ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview SDC staff</li> <li>• Interview local partners</li> <li>• Interview – dev scene watchers (key informants)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map projects against strategy (CP) components – spend and number</li> <li>• Development nexus ? – link between development process/ HMG agenda and SDC programme areas of contribution</li> </ul>
<b>4. PROCESS AND ORGANISATION – did SDC operate in the “right” way (i.e most effective way ?)</b>		
4.1 Who have been SDC's main partners ? Why these ones ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of project information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholder analysis</li> <li>• Selection process/ criteria ?</li> </ul>
4.2 What has been the nature and effectiveness of partnerships in the programme as perceived by partners and by SDC ? How has this changed over time ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnership reports</li> <li>• Interview SDC staff</li> <li>• Interview local partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gaps between actual/ desired – SDC/ Partner perceptions</li> </ul>
4.3 How is SDC perceived by its partners, both absolutely and relative to other donors ? In what specific ways is SDC seen as different from (better than/ worse than) other donors ? What distinguishes what SDC is/does now from other donors ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partner perspective review</li> <li>• Donor peer review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparative advantage analysis</li> </ul>
4.4 How has SDC monitored and evaluated the quality of its partnership ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview SDC staff</li> <li>• Project monitoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methods, results, implications</li> <li>• Summary of Strengths and weaknesses</li> </ul>
4.5 What is the evidence of local ownership of SDC's programme ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project studies</li> <li>• Interview SDC staff</li> <li>• Interview local partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ownership indicators</li> </ul>
4.6 How did the relationship between SDC HQ and SDC Nepal change between 1993 – 2004 ? Was it well managed ? Have SDC's human resources been appropriately deployed (skills, location and comparative advantage) and developed ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview SDC staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roles and responsibility development</li> </ul>
4.7 Did the programme make best (most efficient) use of SDC's comparative advantage and available human and financial resources (in Bern and Nepal) ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CP documents &amp; reviews</li> <li>• Interview SDC staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Human resources</li> </ul>
4.8 How was change managed within projects and programme ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Programme &amp; Project files</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response mapping</li> </ul>
4.9 How has SDC monitored and evaluated (a) projects/ initiatives and (b) the programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of files, system</li> <li>• Interview SDC staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Case studies</li> <li>• Compliance reviews (Internal audit)</li> </ul>
4.10 How are lessons identified, integrated into planning and implementation, monitored ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Final Reports</li> <li>• CP documents</li> <li>• Interview SDC staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• System analysis</li> <li>• Awareness and use of lessons</li> </ul>

<b>5. OUTCOMES – how effective was the programme in achieving the desired outcomes ?</b>		
5.1 How effective was the programme in achieving <u>project</u> outputs and purposes ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Project scoring” system ?</li> <li>• Project evaluation reports</li> <li>• Project self-evaluation study (?)</li> <li>• Interview local partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mapping “achievement” ratings over time and against CP Outputs</li> <li>• Strengths and weakness analysis</li> <li>• Lessons synthesis</li> </ul>
5.2 How effective was the programme in achieving the overall <u>strategy</u> objectives and desired (intermediate) outcomes ? Was greater progress made in some CP intermediate outcome (output) areas, and if so why ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project survey</li> <li>• Interview local partners</li> <li>• Annual Prog reviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of CP logframes with SDC</li> <li>• Strengths and weakness analysis</li> <li>• Lessons synthesis</li> </ul>
5.3 To what <u>development changes</u> (country outcomes) has the programme made a significant contribution ? What is the evidence for this contribution ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview SDC staff</li> <li>• Interview local partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
5.4 To what extent has the SDC programme influenced <u>government</u> policy and programmes ? What would have happened if SDC had <u>not</u> engaged/ contributed (the counterfactual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview SDC staff</li> <li>• Interview local partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify influencing aims (explicit/ implicit)</li> <li>• Livelihood analysis framework (Policies, Institutions, transformational processes)</li> </ul>
5.5 To what extent has SDC contributed to changes in <u>donor</u> co-ordination and harmonisation ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview donor peers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify changes in donor coordination/ harmonisation over the period and assess SDC role &amp; contribution</li> </ul>
<b>6. CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>		
6.1 Overall, what significant <u>value</u> did SDC add to the development and/or poverty reduction process in Nepal ? What difference has SDC’s programme made ?		
6.2 What have been the main <u>strengths and weaknesses</u> of the SDC programme ? How did the programme perform overall, in respect of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• its contribution to development outcomes ?</li> <li>• the relationships with partners and stakeholders ?</li> <li>• the quality of its processes ?</li> <li>• its own learning and organisational development ?</li> </ul>		
6.3 What are the main <u>lessons and implications</u> for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>for SDC’s future programme</li> <li>the CP planning and review process</li> <li>M&amp;E systems and processes</li> <li>SDC more generally (e.g incentives, culture, organisation, human resources) ?</li> </ol>		

## **Annex E**

### **Consolidated Programme Output Statement 1993 – 2004**



### Consolidated Programme Output Statement 1993 – 2004

SDC “Sector”	Output statements (max 5 per sector) – our interpretation of what results SDC aiming to deliver within HMG led reform path – includes merging of sequential CP Outputs				
<p><b>Transport (Rural Access) sector</b></p> <p><b>(93 – 04)</b></p> <p><b>Spend 33 %– 47% of total disbursement</b></p>	<p>O1. A more effective and efficient national road maintenance system established and maintained.</p> <p>(O3). Appropriate procedures and technologies for <i>strategic</i> road maintenance and rehabilitation developed and implemented.</p>	<p>O2. Private sector involvement in <i>local and district suspension bridge</i> building strengthened.</p> <p>(O5). Planning and maintenance procedures (developed earlier) for <i>main trail suspension bridges</i> applied routinely and efficiently.</p>	<p>(O1). Policy framework for sustainable management – in the Nepal economic context - of the <i>road network</i> established.</p>	<p>(O4). System for the efficient planning and implementation (incl maintenance, rehabilitation and construction) of <i>district roads</i> developed.</p>	<p>(O6). A sustainable basis for the (97on – large scale) construction and maintenance of <i>local (trail) bridges</i> developed.</p>
<p><b>Occupational Skills and Enterprise Development sector</b></p> <p><b>(93 - 04)</b></p> <p><b>Spend 11% - 26% of total disbursement</b></p>	<p>O4. CTEVT role as an effective policy maker, quality standard setting and co-ordinating body established.</p>	<p>(O7). An enabling environment (policy framework, co-ordination structures) for the public (CTEVT) occupational skills development system.</p>	<p>(O8). Improvement in the quality of training delivered by TEVT (Technical Education and Vocational Training) sector (OS) institutions in Nepal.</p>	<p>(O9). (in 99) Through a focus on the enabling environment .. an improved long term competitiveness of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in regard to potential for earning profit and creation of job opportunities for people with lower education backgrounds.</p>	<p>(O10). Local stakeholder advocacy initiatives for <b>policy</b> refinement and enforcement in the OSED sector.</p>

<p><b>Rural Development/ NRM &amp; health sector</b></p> <p><b>(93 – 04)</b></p> <p><b>Spend 21% - 25% of total disbursement</b></p>	<p>O5. Practical application (<i>locally adapted and affordable</i>) of a gender balanced and participatory approach to local resource management (forest resources/ family farm systems/ health care system)</p>	<p>(O11). Greater emphasis on commercial aspects (the production, processing and marketing of forest resources) <i>within an expanded (SDC) Community Forestry programme</i></p>	<p>(O12) Improvement in soil fertility and productivity in bari dominated farming systems in mid-hills.</p>	<p>(O13). Participatory development of a locally adapted and affordable (health care ) system</p>	
<p><b>Governance &amp; Peace Building sector</b></p> <p><b>(since 2002)</b></p>	<p>O.15.. Capacity of (other) stakeholders in governance and decentralisation strengthened</p>	<p>O16. The effectiveness of civil society organisations and the media in their drive for advocacy and awareness building in all areas of public life improved</p>	<p>O17. (02) Accountability and transparency of service of MoES, MoH and MoAC promoted.</p>	<p>O18. A policy / legal framework and social environment conducive to the implementation of decentralisation developed</p>	

## **Annex F**

### **Evaluation Team Interpretation of Results chain – sector (sub) programmes**

## Evaluation Team Interpretation of Results chain – sector (sub) programmes

### Transport

Overall Prog Goal	Poverty alleviation through: a system of decentralised government, an empowered society exercising civil rights, good use of human resources and sustainable land management (in the hills).				
Country Programme Purpose	HMGN's decentralisation policy embedded – through the strengthening of governmental institutions, particularly at those levels which are most immediately relevant for the projects beneficiaries.  Institutional mechanisms established which ensure that the use of public resources is effective and transparent.				
Prog Purpose (Intermediate Outcome)	<b>Road and trail network improved on a sustainable basis</b>				
Prog Outputs 98 – 04	(O3). Appropriate procedures and technologies for <i>strategic</i> road maintenance and rehabilitation developed and implemented.	(O5). Planning and maintenance procedures (developed earlier) for <i>main trail suspension bridges</i> applied routinely and efficiently	O1). Policy framework for sustainable management – in the Nepal economic context - of the <i>road network</i> established	(O4). System for the efficient planning and implementation (incl maintenance, rehabilitation and construction) of <i>district roads</i> developed	(O6). A sustainable basis for the (97on – large scale) construction and maintenance of <i>local (trail) bridges</i> developed.
Prog Outputs 93-97	O1. A more effective and efficient national road maintenance system established and maintained.	O2. Private sector involvement in <i>local and district suspension bridge</i> building strengthened.	-		
Prog Activities (Projects 93-04)					

### Occupational Skills & Enterprise Development (OESD)

Overall Prog Goal	Poverty alleviation through: a system of decentralised government, an empowered society exercising civil rights, good use of human resources and sustainable land management (in the hills).			
Country Programme Purpose	HMGN's decentralisation policy embedded – through the strengthening of governmental institutions, particularly at those levels which are most immediately relevant for the projects beneficiaries.  Institutional mechanisms established which ensure that the use of public resources is effective and transparent.			
Prog Purpose (Intermediate Outcome)	<b>Employment opportunities for socially and economically disadvantaged people enhanced</b>			
Prog Outputs 98 – 04	(O7). An enabling environment (policy framework, co-ordination structures) for the public (CTEVT) occupational skills development system	(O8). Improvement in the quality of training delivered by TEVT (Technical Education and Vocational Training) sector (OS) institutions in Nepal	(O9). (in 99) Through a focus on the enabling environment .. an improved long term competitiveness of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in regard to potential for earning profit and creation of job opportunities for people with lower education backgrounds.	(O10). Local stakeholder advocacy initiatives for <b>policy</b> refinement and enforcement in the OSED sector
Prog Outputs 93-97	O4. CTEVT role as an effective policy maker, quality standard setting and co-ordinating body established -			
Prog Activities (Projects 93-04)				

## Rural Development / Natural Resources Management + Health

Overall Prog Goal	<p>Poverty alleviation through: a system of decentralised government, an empowered society exercising civil rights, good use of human resources and sustainable land management (in the hills).</p> <p>&lt; More secure livelihoods of small farmers through sustainable management of natural resources &gt;</p>		
Country Programme Purpose	<p>HMGN's decentralisation policy embedded – through the strengthening of governmental institutions, particularly at those levels which are most immediately relevant for the projects beneficiaries.</p> <p>Institutional mechanisms established which ensure that the use of public resources is effective and transparent.</p>		
Prog Purpose (Intermediate outcome)	<p><b>Organisational capacity of communities and the ability of farmers to interact with service providers [and markets ?] improved.</b></p> <p><b>Stabilisation of the forest area in the hills through sustainable forest management</b></p>		
Prog Outputs 98 – 04	(O11). Local people able to fully harness the socio-economic potential of forests	(O12) Improvement in soil fertility and productivity in bari dominated farming systems in mid-hills.	(O13). Participatory development of a locally adapted and affordable (health care) system
Prog Outputs 93-97	O5. Practical application ( <i>locally adapted and affordable</i> ) of a gender balanced and participatory approach to local resource management (forest resources/ family farm systems/ health care system)		
Prog Activities (Projects 93-04)			

## **Annex G**

**Characteristics of SDCs Programme approach –  
based on nature of Outputs aiming to deliver through Sector Programmes**

### Characteristics of SDCs Programme approach – based on nature of Outputs aiming to deliver through Sector Programmes

SDC “Sector”	Output statements (max 5 per sector) – our interpretation of what results SDC aiming to deliver within HMG led reform path – includes merging of sequential CP Outputs				
<b>Transport (Rural Access) sector</b>	Scope: strategic road network  <i>Intervention: Systems development: &amp; tech. dev. Strategic road network</i>	Scope: local & district (i.e main trail) suspension bridges  <i>Institutional roles re-defined &amp; strengthened</i>	Scope: road network policy framework  <b>Policy framework development</b>	Scope: district roads  <b>Approach to (+ scaling up ?) of User driven service delivery</b>	Scope: local (trail) bridges  <b>Approach to + scaling up of User driven service delivery</b>
<b>Occupational Skills and Enterprise Development sector</b>	Scope: CTEVT – national apex institution  <b>Institutional role strengthening</b>	Scope: occupational skills policy framework  <b>Policy framework development</b>	Scope: TEVTsector (OS) institutions  <i>Institutional role: client focus performance improvement</i>	Scope: enabling environment for SMEs  <i>Institutional broadening: servicing new client groups</i>	Scope: stakeholder advocacy initiatives for policy process.  <b>User voice –into policy process</b>
<b>Rural Development/ NRM &amp; health sector</b>	Scope: gender balanced and participatory approach to local resource management  <i>Piloting HMGs policy agenda</i>	Scope: forest resource management/ utilisation.  <b>Technology development/ User driven service delivery</b>	Scope: land resource management – productivity  <i>Technology development / User driven service delivery</i>	Scope: Locally adapted and affordable (health care) system  <b>User driven service delivery</b>	
<b>Governance &amp; Peace Building sector (since 2002)</b>	Scope: Capacity of (other) stakeholders in governance and decentralisation strengthened.  <i>Institutional development</i>	Scope: Civil society strengthening.  <i>Institutional development</i>	Scope: Institutional reform –MoES, MoH and MoAC.  <i>Institutional development</i>	Scope: Decentralisation policy & legislation.  <i>Policy &amp; Legislation: enabling environment</i>	



## **Annex H**

### **Project portfolio** (v. updated Jan 10th)

**Project portfolio** (v. updated Jan 10th)

1986 – 1992	1993 – 97	1998 - 2004
<b>Transport sector</b>		
<i>Charnawati Rehabilitation Project (ITECO, 12/87-12/91)</i>		
(road) Maintenance and rehabilitation co-ordination unit – MRCU (SDC/ODA/HMG-DOR, FRISA/O’Sullivan 11/90 - 01)	Road maintenance and rehabilitation project (93-98) <i>parallel financing IDA &amp; ODA...</i> RMRP (SDC/HMG-DoR, 94 – 04) incl MRCU Phase 3 (00-01)	Strengthened Maintenance Divisions Program (SMD)
Arniko Highway (Rehabilitation) Project – AHMP (ITECO/HMG-DOR: Start of preparation 4/89, start of implementation 1/93 – 01, Phase IV (02-03)		
		District Roads Support Program (DRSP) (99 – 02, Phase 1 & 02- 06, Phase 2)
Lamsangu-Jiri road (SDC, 89 – 95)		
Suspension Bridge project “Bruckenbau” (SDC – HELVETAS/HMG, 81 – 04)		
(Trail) Bridge Building at the Local level (BBLL) HELVETAS Pilot Prog (89 –93) & 1 <sup>st</sup> implementation phase (94-96) <i>Helvetas financed, SDC finance from 96</i>	Bridge Building at the local level - BBLL Phase II (SDC/ HELVETAS/HMG, 97-01)	(02 on) Trail bridge sub-sector project (TBSSP)
		Transport Sector Support (TSS)
<b>Technical Education &gt; Occupational skills and enterprise development (OSED) sector</b>		
<i>Kirtipur Institute of Education, Mathematics Dept – teacher training</i>		
Engineering Education Project – EEP (SDC/WB/CIDA, HMG – Inst of Eng. TU, 8/89 – 99) <i>co-financing</i>		
Technical Education & Vocational Training Development Project (SDC/ ADB,OPEC/ HMG-CTEVT, 90-97 ?) <i>co-financing</i>		CTEVT/ Strengthening Skill Testing Activities (STC/CTEVT)
Training Institute for Technical Instruction –TITI (SDC/SwissContact/ HMG-CTEVT, 7/91 – 04>)		Support to the Training Institute for Technical Instruction (TITI): Phase 4 (2003-07)
Jiri Technical school (SDC/HMG-CTEVT 81-01)		
Balaju Technical Training Centre (BTTC).. (SDC/HMG-CTEVT, 74-00)		
Berufsschul – Lehrerausbildung <i>Professional Teacher Training</i> (SDC, 90-97)		
	Small Industries Promotion Programme (SIP-P)..HIF Programme (SDC/SwissContact/ HMG - MoI, Business Membership Organisations ?, 96-04+)	Small Industrie Promotion Programme (SIP-P) Phase 3 (? , 99-2003) <i>part of a 15 yr programme</i>
		Training for employment (T for E) Orientation Phase (SDC/ Alliance Nepal, 00-02+)
		Global Credit OSED sector
		Franchising SKILL approach (F-Skill)
		VSBK and Alternative building materials (VSBK)
<b>Rural Development/ Health &gt; Natural resources management sector</b>		
<i>Integrated Hill Development Project – IHDP (ended 6/90)</i>		
Palpa development (SDC/HELVETAS, 89-97)		
<i>Narayani III Irrigation (COFIDA, up to 1994)</i>		
<b>Health services</b>		
<i>Natural Family Planning project (Family Planning Association of Nepal, NGO, ended 12/91)</i>	HIV/AIDS Awareness (Prevention ?) programme (SDC/ Nepal Red Cross, xx >)	
<i>Health Laboratory services (WHO, 89 &amp;</i>		

92-93)		
Support to Jiri Hospital		
Primary Health Care - Mother Child Health and Family Planning project (PHC – MCH/FP) (HMG, 2/92 – 97))	Rural Health Development Project (RHDP) 1997 start ... (SDC/HMG-MoH) .. Phase 3 (01-05)	
<b>Agriculture</b>		
	User group Support – UGS then Tuki Association Support Project (Local NGO – RDTA & TASK, 9/91 – 04)	Tuki Association Support Prog, Phase 4 (? , 2000 – 2003)
National potato development (SDC, 77-97,	96-97 “Potato Post Project Support”	97on - “Potato Post Project Support” – NARC/CIP) <i>regional budget project</i>
	Hill Maize Research Project (NARC/ CIMMYT, 98 – 04 ?)	
	Sustainable Soil Management Programme (SSMP): Phase 1 (HELVETAS, 99-02)	Sustainable Soil Management Prog (SSMP): Phase 2 (? .03-07)
<b>Forestry</b>		
Community forestry – DRCFDP then NSCFP (HMG-DOF, 90 – 04 on)		
		Forest Resources Promotion Project (FRPP)
		Forestry Governance Project (RECOFTC)
<b>Environment</b>		
National Conservation Strategy Implementation – NCS (IUCN/HMG - NPC, 1/86 – 04)		
<b>Governance and equity related projects</b>		
Nepal Law Society now “Local self-government and Decentralisation” (SDC/NGO,N – NLS, 93-04)		Self Governance + Decentralisation support .Phase 5 (?), (SDC/ Inst for Governance and Development)
		Good governance programme – pro-public (“governance development project)
		Trust Fund for Peace and development Initiative (2002-04)
		Anti Corruption project (SDC/ Transparency International Nepal Chapter) Phase III (2002 –05)
		Institutional and Capacity building of the Human Rights Commission (SDC/ NHRC, xx >)
		Civil Society Support Program (CSSP) to the Governance Reform programme (GRP) Phase 1 (2002-05)
		Constitution making, power and society (Just Vote ?)
		Study on conflict and its resolution
<b>Other</b>		
Self-reliant Drinking Water Support programme formerly “Community water supply and sanitation” (HELVETAS, 75 - 02) later known as Drinking water West Region (HELVETAS, 94-01).		
		People and resource dynamics project (PARDYP) <i>Regional</i>
		HIMAWANTI, Sustainable NRM in the Hindu-Kush Vegetable seed project, <i>Regional</i>
Salleri Chialsa Electricity Company (SCECO, formerly SELUP), (SDC/ITECO & NEA, local shareholders, 82-01)		
<b>Humanitarian Aid/ Disaster Relief</b>		
		IFRC Monsoon Floods relief 2002
	Dolakha Disaster Flood Relief Project (SDC, 97-98)	Reconstruction Floods 2002
<b>Co-ordination Office</b>		
Kathmandu co-ordination (SDC, 94-04)		

## **Annex I**

**District Indicators of development Exercise – basis for analysis of development trends in SDC focus districts (1993-2003)**

## District Indicators of development Exercise – basis for analysis of development trends in SDC focus districts (1993-2003)

This paper, on hand, briefly discusses the trends of development in SDC districts based on some demographic data/information compiled from the SNV/Nepal – ICIMOD Publication, 'Districts of Nepal: Indicators of Development' published in 1997 and updated in 2003. For the purpose of relating to the SDC evaluation, only the comparative data on SDC districts (Dolakha, Ramechhap, Sindhupalchowk, Kabhrepalanchok and Okhaldunga) is presented in this paper.

**Table 1. Comparison of the overall ranking of the districts of Nepal**

Districts	Overall ranking		Districts	Overall ranking		Districts	Overall ranking	
	2003	1997		2003	1997		2003	1997
Kathmandu	1	1	Makawanpur	26	40	Ramechhap	51	48
Chitwan	2	11	Gulmi	27	24	Parsa	52	53
Jhapa	3	4	Surkhet	28	32	Rasuwa	53	49
Bhaktapur	4	10	Solukhumbu	29	31	Kapilbastu	54	54
Lalitpur	5	3	Banke	30	36	Bara	55	55
Kaski	6	5	Bhojpur	31	27	Dadeldhura	56	58
Dhankuta	7	6	Gorkha	32	20	Darchula	57	45
Palpa	8	14	Taplejung	33	19	Siraha	58	60
Syangja	9	8	Bardiya	34	43	Jajarkot	59	66
Manang	10	2	Kanchanpur	35	33	Rukum	60	63
Morang	11	16	Nuwakot	36	41	Sarlahi	61	56
Ilam	12	9	Nawalparasi	37	29	Baitadi	62	64
Rupandehi	13	38	Khotang	38	28	Dailekh	63	67
Sunsari	14	21	Okhaldhunga	39	30	Rolpa	64	62
Kabhrepalanchok	15	35	Kailali	40	46	Mahottari	65	61
Tanahu	16	15	Dolakha	41	47	Doti	66	70
Terhathum	17	7	Arghakhanchi	42	25	Dolpa	67	59
Sankhuwasabha	18	18	Udayapur	43	39	Rautahat	68	65
Mustang	19	13	Dhading	44	37	Jumla	69	69
Parbat	20	12	Salyan	45	51	Kalikot	70	74
Dang	21	34	Dhanusa	46	57	Bajura	71	68
Lamjung	22	17	Saptari	47	52	Achham	72	75
Panchthar	23	23	Sindhupalchowk	48	50	Bajhang	73	71
Baglung	24	26	Sindhuli	49	44	Humla	74	73
Myagdi	25	22	Pyuthan	50	42	Mugu	75	72

Source: Districts of Nepal: Indicators of Development; ICIMOD 2003

District	1997	2003	Remarks
Sindhupalchok	50	48	Improved by two level
Dolakha	47	41	Improved by six level
Okhaldhunga	30	39	Decreased by nine level
Kabhrepalanchok	35	15	Improved by 20 levels
Ramechhap	48	51	Decreased by three level

The overall ranking is calculated based on three major clusters of indicators related to 1) Poverty and Deprivation, 2) Socio-economic and Infrastructural Development and 3) Women's Empowerment. A table with comparison of some relevant parameters for the year 1997 and 2003 is presented on next page.

**The best district is ranked 1 and worst district is ranked 75. The positive change or negative change is also influenced by the performance of other districts. Some have done better and some done worst in the comparison years compared to the reference district.**

**Table 2. Comparison of 1997 and 2003 figures on development indicators for SDC districts (75 Worst; 1 Best)**

Aspects/Indicators	Dolakha			Sindhupalchowk			Ramechhap			Okhaldhunga			Kabhpalanchowk		
	1997	2003	Change	1997	2003	Change	1997	2003	Change	1997	2003	Change	1997	2003	Change
Overall Ranking	47	41	6	48	50	-2	51	48	3	39	30	9	35	15	20
Poverty deprivation	53	47	6	60	60	0	45	53	-8	29	32	-3	34	18	16
Women's Empowerment	47	41	6	41	43	-2	50	50	0	35	37	-2	36	21	15
Socio-economic & Infrastructure Dev.	58	25	33	59	50	9	55	62	-7	28	34	-6	34	12	22
Gender Discrimination Index	52	42	10	29	45	-16	59	56	3	36	48	-12	38	26	12
Per Capita Food Production	72	67	5	67	40	27	57	51	6	60	37	23	19	21	-2
Drinking Water facilities	36	34	2	32	36	-4	51	46	5	47	49	-2	53	39	14
Toilet Facilities		11	-		35	-		47	-		20	-		13	-
% of Forests User HHs	41	9	32	49	14	35	35	12	23	11	7	4	23	43	-20
% of Educationally Disadvantaged Popn	42	10	32	56	70	-14	48	38	10	31	33	-2	54	2	52
% of Marginal Farm Households	61	41	20	65	45	20	24	40	-16	19	23	-4	44	32	12
Rank According to Health Dev Index	27	6	21	33	34	-1	39	54	-15	40	40	0	29	13	16
Contraceptive prevalence	37	5	32	38	36	2	50	56	-6	57	42	15	21	10	11
Broad Occupational Structure	54	25	29	56	60	-4	66	63	3	68	69	-1	38	22	16
Agricultural Credit	59	32	27	22	47	-25	34	50	-16	28	31	-3	29	35	-6
Farm Size	57	43	14	59	47	12	31	30	1	20	4	16	41	46	-5
Livestock per Farm Household	59	38	21	55	41	14	45	31	14	21	15	6	61	40	21
% of Irrigated Land Area	47	38	9	28	33	-5	69	51	18	71	67	4	36	57	-21
Infrastructural Development Index	49	22	27	48	25	23	18	17	1	9	6	3	10	5	5
Road Density*	4.42	8.12	3.70	4.31	8.14	3.83	0.00	2.20	2.20	0.00	1.58	1.58	7.82	27.58	19.76
Bank Density	62	56	6	39	64	-25	23	33	-10	34	61	-27	28	15	13
Cooperatives Density	17	16	1	15	13	2	25	15	10	38	42	-4	3	4	-1
Health Institutions Density	49	37	12	43	30	13	25	27	-2	7	3	4	20	7	13
Post Office Density	53	37	16	43	30	13	10	27	-17	4	2	2	14	15	-1
% share of girls enrolled at Primary Level	48	47	1	45	38	7	49	44	5	36	41	-5	38	5	33

\* Road density: Sum of different types of motorable road per 100 square kilometre of total surface area.

- Bank Density is reduced in some district over the period of time because many Bank branches from the rural areas have been relocated to the head quarters or closed because of insurgency.

## **Annex J**

### **Findings Table - Institutional change context: focused on Decentralisation & Democracy**



**Findings Table - Institutional change context: focused on Decentralisation & Democracy**

	1990 - 92	1993 – 1997	1998 - 2002	2003 On
Policy & Legislation; institutional structures	<p>1991 New Constitution</p> <p>1992 DDC-VDC Municipality Act</p> <p>1991 First General Election</p> <p>1992 First local elections</p>	<p>1994 General Elections</p>	<p>1999 Local Self-Govt act</p> <p>1999 DDC Association, VDC Association, Municipality Association</p> <p>1999 General Election</p> <p>2000 National Human Rights Commission</p> <p>2001 FENWWR Fed of elect and nomin women</p> <p>2002 Dalit Commission</p> <p>2002 Women's Commission</p> <p>2001 Mid-term expenditure framework started</p> <p>2001 Formation of Decentralisation Implementation Monitoring Committee DIMC</p> <p>2001 Formation of DIP Decent Implementation Plan</p> <p>2001 Parliament dissolved, local bodies' term not extended</p> <p>2000 Foreign Aid policy (concept of donor harmonisation)</p>	<p>2003 PRSP (renewed commitment to decentralisation as "an important means to bring development closer to the poor")</p> <p>2003 Janjati Academy</p>
Civil Society actions ( <i>drivers for change</i> )	<p>1990 Democracy Movement</p>	<p>Emergence of Dalit, women movements, civil society associations</p>	<p>1999 Kamaiya liberation movement</p> <p>2002 Official ban on bonded labour</p>	

Maoist conflict		<p>1996 Declaration of the "People's War"</p> <p>1997 Local elections partially blocked</p> <p>1998 Armed revolution declared</p>	<p>2001: Emergency</p> <p>2001 Mobilisation of RNA</p> <p>2002 Brief ceasefire, first peace talks</p>	2003 Second peace talks, brief ceasefire
SDC Country Programming processes – key events/ milestones/ strategy shifts including ref. To the conflict	1992 Sectoral approach developed	1993-98 Country programme (democracy - "long-term fundamental learning and institutional building process ahead")	<p>1999-2004 Country programme (recognises Maoist insurgency as "potential threat to political stability and social peace due to increasing contrast")</p> <p>from 1999 Transversal themes guidelines</p> <p>2002 Mid-term Review workshop</p>	<p>2003 Addendum to Country programme (recognises a "crisis situation")</p> <p>2004 Strategy for 2005 Programme (recognises long-term impact of conflict)</p>

## **Annex K**

### **Findings Table - Nepal's progress towards the MDGs**

## Findings Table - Nepal's progress towards the MDGs

*Q. Context: Has Nepal been developing over the period 1993 – 2004 as a result of the international development effort of which SDC has been partner ? Where is Nepal on track/ off track ? where may new approaches to development be required ?*

International Development Goals and related targets – arising from the UN global conferences of the 1990's – formed the basis for the Millennium Declaration signed in 2000 (of which Nepal is a signatory). From this the designation of Millennium Development Goals emerged (which incorporate the IDTs). Goals/ Targets in bold are those which SDC Nepal Country programme support over the period 1994-2004 has been aligned to and for which SDC as part of the wider international development effort has sought to make an effective contribution.

<b>Goals</b>	<b>Trend over SDC Evaluation period (1990 – 2000 data)</b>	<b>Assessment Will Development Goal be reached</b>	<b>2002 Assessment of status of supporting environment</b>
<b><i>Eradicate extreme Poverty and hunger</i></b> <b>Target 1. Halve between 1990 and 2015 the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day</b>	Positive  <i>Per capita growth rate in the agricultural sector, the mainstay for rural livelihoods, increased only by 0.5% in 1997 a "normal year".</i>	Unlikely	Weak
<b>Target 2. Halve the proportion of people who suffer from hunger between 1990 and 2015</b>	Positive  <i>Major regional differences</i>	Unlikely	Weak

<p><b><i>Achieve Universal Primary Education</i></b>  <b>Target 3. Ensure that by 2015 children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling</b></p>	<p>Positive   <i>Slower progress than expected</i></p>	<p>Unlikely</p>	<p>Fair</p>
<p><b><i>Promote Gender equality and empower women</i></b>  <b>Target 4. Achieve equal access for boys and girls to primary and secondary schooling by 2005, and to all levels of education no later than 2015</b></p>	<p>Positive   <i>Just off-target</i></p>	<p>Unlikely</p>	<p>Fair</p>
<p><b><i>Reduce child mortality</i></b>  <b>Target 5. Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under 5 mortality rate</b></p>	<p>Positive   <i>Rate off reduction has decreased</i></p>	<p>Potentially</p>	<p>Fair</p>
<p><b><i>Improve maternal health</i></b>  <b>Target 6. Reduce by two-thirds between 1990 and 2015 the maternal mortality rate</b></p>	<p>Positive   <i>Note. Significant gap between “target” % of deliveries attended by health care providers</i></p>	<p>Unlikely</p>	<p>Weak but improving</p>

<p><b><i>Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria and other diseases</i></b>  <b>Target 7. Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS</b></p>	<p>An accurate assessment is not possible due to lack of updated, reliable data.</p> <p><i>Estimated infection rate among high risk groups has risen from &lt;1% in 1992 to 50% among injecting drug users and 17% among female sex workers in Kathmandu.</i></p>	Unlikely	Weak but improving
<p><b>Target 8. Have halted by 2015, and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria, and other major diseases</b></p>	<p>Positive (Malaria)</p> <p>Higher prevalence figures for (Tuberculosis) likely to reflect more intensive case finding measures and indicates increasing effectiveness of the programme.</p>	Unlikely	Weak
<p><b>Ensure environmental sustainability</b>  <b>Target 9. Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources</b></p>	<p>Mixed signals</p> <p><i>Some positive progress in drinking water, forest sector and environmental protection legislation and protected area provision.</i></p>	Lack of data	Weak
<p><b>Target 10. Halve by 2015 the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water</b></p>	Positive	Probably	Strong

Source: Adapted from MHG Nepal/ UNDP Progress report 2002. Millennium Development Goals Nepal

## **Annex L**

### **Findings Table 4 Relevance of SDC Country Programme “intervention areas” to development challenges and development process in Nepal**

**Findings Table 4 - Relevance of SDC Country Programme “intervention areas” to development challenges and development process in Nepal**

Commentary on significant developments and gaps (national level) over period 1994 – 2004 highlighting where progressive change / gaps ... and evidence of a SDC Contribution (significant/ partial/ limited/ not engaged).

<b>(SDC Intervention areas) – “sectors”</b>	<b>HMG Policy Development</b>	<b>HMG Strategy</b>	<b>Legal Framework</b>	<b>Institutional structures/ capabilities to deliver strategy</b>			
				<b>Enabling agency</b>	<b>Service Delivery agency</b>	<b>Users</b>	<b>Civil Society</b>
<b>Agriculture</b>	Comprehensive	<i>APP (good)</i>	Very poor	MOAC: unchanged	<i>Partial devolution to DCC</i>	<i>Many groups, weak</i>	Little support for land reform
<b>Forestry</b>	<i>Progressive, major gaps</i>	Move towards sector approach, OK c'ty forestry	adequate, some gaps in non-c'ty for	MFSC: in a muddle, classical mindset	<i>(DOF: little change indiv. vs. org)</i>	<i>FUGs: explosion, often strong</i>	<i>FECOFUN, etc: dynamic, emerging</i>
<b>Health</b>	Good, open	SWA: OK	Decentralisation weak	MOH: changing	<i>DOH: struct'l change, weak delivery</i>	<i>Patchy</i>	Safer Motherhood Network, HIV/AIDS, reprod health OK, rest weak
<b>Transport (Rural Access): roads, trails, bridges</b>	<i>Good, loan driven</i>	<i>OK: accept green, rural road concept</i>	<i>Outdated</i>	<i>MOPP: messy responsibilities</i>	<i>DOR: corruption, but changing organisation</i>	<i>Little organised groups</i>	None
<b>Occupational Skills and Enterprise Dev.</b>	<i>No clear policy</i>	<i>Fragmented</i>	N/A	<i>Many ministries: overlap and duplication</i>	<i>Many - same problems</i>	No such concept	N/A

*Italics: areas where SDC contributed.*