

# International Youth Cooperation Project



Nepal Red Cross Society



Japanese Red Cross Society

## Final Evaluation Report

Submitted To:



International Federation of Red Cross and Red  
Crescent Societies (IFRC)

Submitted By:

**Thakur Prasad Bhatta, PhD**

Independent Consultant

Kathmandu-14, Kalanki

Email: [thakurpbhatta@gmail.com](mailto:thakurpbhatta@gmail.com); [tpbhatta@yahoo.com](mailto:tpbhatta@yahoo.com)

Phone: 9841811264

October, 2023

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to IFRC and Japanese Red Cross Society (JRCS) CO for entrusting me to carry out the final evaluation of the International Youth Cooperation Project. My sincere thanks go to Mr. Sushil Subedi, Project Coordinator at JRCS CO, for his cooperation throughout the evaluation process. I highly appreciate the support of Mr. Prawesh Neupane, Project Officer, JRCS CO, for providing me with the necessary information and for his support in planning and managing the field work. Similarly, I am thankful to Ms. Ambika Rimal, Program Officer at the Nepal Red Cross Society (NRCS) Junior and Youth Department, for coordinating and managing the field work.

I am grateful to Mr. Dharma Dutta Bidari, Director at NRCS's Junior and Youth Department, for his views and kind suggestions regarding the evaluation.

There was warm support from the NRCS's district chapters in the project districts. For this, my sincere thanks go to Mr. Rudra Bahadur Rimal, President at NRCS's DC Parbat and his team, and Mr. Dinesh Aryal at NRCS's DC Syangja and his team for their participation and support in the field work of the evaluation. This evaluation became possible with the support of all of the respondents from all stakeholders in the project, namely schools' teachers, management committees, students organized in Junior/Youth Circles and Child Clubs, and local communities. I would like to thank them all for their time and input. I had the occasion to meet and get information on the concept of The Change Maker campaign, for which I would like to thank Mr. Khem Raj Nepal and Mr. Herve Gazeau at the IFRC Nepal Office.

Last but not least, I would like to acknowledge and thank Ms. Suzuki Ayane, Deputy Director, JRCS and Ms. Fujii Rio, Program Coordinator, JRCS for their participation during the field work and in the debriefing, and providing valuable suggestions.

Thakur Prasad Bhatta, PhD

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACCRONYMS AND ABBREVIATION.....	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	5
1. INTRODUCTION.....	8
1.1 Introduction .....	8
1.2 Project Overview.....	8
1.3 Evaluation Objectives and Scopes .....	8
2. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS .....	10
3. FINDINGS.....	12
3.1 Relevancy .....	12
3.2 Effectiveness .....	13
3.3 Efficiency .....	16
3.4 Impact .....	17
3.5 Sustainability.....	17
3.6 Inclusion of the Cross-cutting Themes.....	18
4. CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED.....	20
4.1 Conclusion.....	20
4.2 Recommendations and Lesson Learned .....	20
ANNEXES .....	22
Annex 1: Achievement of Expected Outcomes.....	22
Annex 2: Checklists for FGD and KII .....	23
Annex 3: List of organizations visted and persons interviewed .....	30
Annex 4: Terms of Reference.....	35

## ACCRONYMS AND ABBREVIATION

CC	Child club
CO	Country Office
DC	District Chapter
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
JR/YC	Junior Red Cross/ Youth Circle
JRCS	Japanese Red Cross Society
NRCS	Nepal Red Cross Society
PTA	Parents Teachers Association
RC	Red Cross
RM	Rural Municipality
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SMC	School Management Committee
WASH CC	WASH Coordination Committee
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The International Youth Cooperation Project (IYCP) was implemented by the Junior and Youth Department of the Nepal Red Cross Society with the support of the IFRC/Japanese Red Cross Society (JRCS). The IYCP had been implemented in Bhirkot Municipality, Syangja, and Jaljala Rural Municipality, Parbat, from July 2020 to June 2023 in the Gandaki Province of Nepal. In the selected wards of these two local levels, the project supported 52 schools in total. The overall goal of the IYCP project was to create a better educational environment at schools by improving WASH facilities, promoting total sanitation behavior, and building up better coordination mechanisms among local stakeholders (LG, schools, SMCs, PTAs, and community members) for the sustainability of the project outcomes.

The overall purpose of this evaluation was to assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the project in relation to the objectives (and supporting outcomes and outputs) set out in the program documents and, based on the findings, develop a set of key recommendations. The evaluation primarily employed a qualitative research approach with a complementary use of a quantitative method. The sampling method for the evaluation was the purposive sampling. The evaluation study was carried out at both local levels in the both project districts. There were four wards and eight sample schools considered as sample sites for the evaluation.

Though the project period was three years, the project was implemented full-fledged for about six months in the final year because of the adverse situation due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the internal management issue of the Nepal Red Cross Society. The project was quite relevant to address the needs of water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) and was aligned with the Sustainable Development Goal, national priorities, and local needs.

The project performed well as per the revised plan, which came into practice because of the adverse situation of COVID-19 and the internal management of NRCS. As per the revised plan, the project achieved most of its targets (see Annex 1). The achievement varies from 87% to 179%; only one activity is below, and the rest are all above 100%. However, the project could not implement two important project outcomes: improvement of total sanitation practices (outcome 3) and enhancement of institutional capacity for equitable and sustainable WASH (outcome 4). Nevertheless, while assessing the high level of achievement of the targets under Outcome 1 and Outcome 2, the project achievement that was achieved within the six-month period in the final year was remarkable.

Mainly, the project imparted knowledge and skills to schoolchildren and young people on WASH (Outcome 1) by conducting various activities. It was found that the students who were in JR/YCs were aware of improved hygiene and sanitation practices. There was various support from the project to develop child, gender, and disabled friendly basic school WASH facilities (Outcome 2). Mainly, such support was for the tippy taps and repair of toilets, including water tanks. The project could not implement the key activities under the outcome 3 and 4 namely the establishment of total sanitized communities, and ward-level WASH CC and ward-level total sanitation strategic plan which were not included in the revised plan.

Indeed, most of the project's activities were implemented in a short period of six months, and *the total expenditure of the project is 61.6% of the initial budget and 69.59% of the approved budget*. It would be too early to evaluate the impacts of the project, as the project came into full-fledged implementation in the last six months of the final year of the project. However, some potential impacts were observed, mainly in practicing improved hygiene and sanitation practices. As mentioned above, outcome 3 and 4 of the project were not fully implemented, the major challenge of this project is the sustainability of using and maintaining WASH facilities and the continuation of WASH behaviors among students in the future.

Based on the findings, selected key recommendations and lessons learned are listed below:

- There should be clear school selection criteria and a funding policy specifying clear criteria to provide financial support to schools in improving WASH facilities to ensure the inclusion of the more needy schools.
- The project funding should be determined as per the concept and need for total sanitation. This suggests examining whether the support is partial or piecemeal or whether it is adequate as per the objectives of the project.
- WASH resource center should be established with clear objectives, operating guidelines, and orientation to stakeholders, determining its target benefits.
- There should be clarity regarding the techniques of disposing of menstrual pads in a safe and acceptable way, consulting the national policy-level agency and key stakeholders working on it, and it should be communicated to the local stakeholders.
- There should be coordination with the local municipalities and their education sections to establish WASH CC at the municipal, ward, and school levels as per the national guidelines on schools' WASH to achieve the goal of total sanitation.
- It is necessary to consider what type of materials should be used in the toilet floors, walls, and tippy taps to maintain hygiene and sanitation, where a large number of students are users.
- There should be training and orientation for SMCs and PTAs on the knowledge and skills of WASH. Such a training package can be developed by taking references from leading WASH agencies and considering the government policy on WASH, particularly the School WASH Guideline.
- There should be technical personnel to support the implementation of hardware parts of the WASH facilities.
- The social mobilizers should be educated in the field of social mobilization with some experience in it, or they need to be selected on the basis of their relevant educational background and trained well in participatory development work. Alternatively, while taking fresh social mobilizers from the local community, they should be provided with intensive field-based (community-based) training to enable them to undertake the responsibility of WASH social mobilizers.
- There should be a sustainability plan developed, consulting key stakeholders, to be implemented before the end of the project. For this, there should be a formal memorandum of understanding between the local municipality, including the education of its respective wards, and the Red

Cross District Chapter. Since the project was implemented in a limited time and major outcomes remained unimplemented, there is a need for complementary phases of the project to fulfill the requirements of the project. Such a phase needs to consider the above points, particularly the contextual situation analysis of the needs and the supporting modality based on them.

- One of the lessons learned from the project is that children or students can be a change agent in providing WASH at school and community levels. Particularly, the role of JR/YCs and child clubs can be instrumental if they are provided knowledge and skills in an appropriate way.
- Mobilization of technicians is essential, while supporting the improvement of WASH facilities is also a learning experience that can be drawn from the experience of the local implementers.
- The needs of the schools are multiple and diverse, and even a small amount of support can generate enthusiasm among the stakeholders to improve the situation.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Introduction

This evaluation report is the outcome of the final evaluation of the International Youth Cooperation Project (IYCP) carried out in October 2023. This report is organized into implemented by the Junior and Youth Department of the Nepal Red Cross Society four chapters including this introduction chapter. This introduction chapter gives the overview of the project and the objectives and scopes of the final evaluation. The second chapter presents the evaluation approach and methods used in the evaluation. Findings are presented and discussed in the third chapter. The final fourth chapter presents the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. At the end, there is an annex section of the report.

### 1.2 Project Overview

The International Youth Cooperation Project (IYCP) was implemented by the Junior and Youth Department of the Nepal Red Cross Society with the support of the IFRC/Japanese Red Cross Society (JRCS). The IYCP had been implemented in Bhirkot Municipality, Syangja, and Jaljala Rural Municipality, Parbat, from July 2020 to June 2023 in the Gandaki Province of Nepal. In the selected wards of these two local levels, the project supported 52 schools in total. The wards where the project was implemented were- in the Virkot Municipality's ward no. 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of Syangja and Jaljala Rural Municipality's ward no. 2, 3, 4, 7 and 8 of Parbat districts. The overall goal of the IYCP project was to create a better educational environment at schools by improving WASH facilities, promoting total sanitation behavior, and building up better coordination mechanisms among local stakeholders (LG, schools, SMCs, PTAs, and community members) for the sustainability of the project outcomes. Specifically the project expected outcomes were as follows:

Outcome 1: Increased knowledge and skills of school children and young people for better Hygiene and sanitation practices by the end of Project 2023.

Outcome 2: Develop child, gender, and disabled (CGD) friendly basic school WASH facilities by the end of Project 2023.

Outcome 3: Decrease the incidence of WASH-borne disease by improving total sanitation practices.

Outcome 4: Enhanced institutional capacity for equitable and sustainable WASH by the end of project 2023

It should be noted that the project had faced a range of implementation challenges, including the impacts of COVID-19 and NRCS governance and management crisis, that were enforced to achieve the limited project results. However, the project adapted to the changed context through need-based planning revising its original plan and applied IFRC temporary operation modality for project implementation from January 2023. Thus, the project came to implementation in a period of six months as per the revised plan and budget.

### 1.3 Evaluation Objectives and Scopes

The overall purpose of the evaluation was to assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the project in relation to the objectives (and supporting outcomes and outputs)



set out in the program documents and, based on the findings, develop a set of key recommendations. Following were the specific objectives of the evaluation:

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

Regarding the scope of the evaluation, it covered the project in its entirety both in terms of timeline (1st July 2020 – 30th June 2023) and geographic coverage of Jaljala Rural Municipality ward 2,3,4,7 and 8 of Parbat district; and Vhirkot Municipality wards 5,6,7,8 and 9 of Syangja district. The evaluation focus was on the complete range of engaged stakeholders primarily, school children, Junior and youth circles, School management committees, parents teacher associations, local authorities, and Nepal Red Cross Society (HQ and district chapters).

## 2. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS

### Methodological Procedures

The evaluation primarily employed a qualitative research approach with a complementary use of a quantitative method. As a whole, quantitative and qualitative data were integrated to produce a comprehensive and credible evaluation report. Based on the given Terms of Reference, the evaluation approach was guided by the objectives, evaluation criteria, and scope of the evaluation.

**Sampling:** The sampling method for the evaluation was the purposive sampling. The evaluation study was carried out at both local levels in the project districts. From each local level, two wards were selected as study wards. From the selected wards, two schools per ward were selected, either basic or secondary, in an alternative way as the sample school sites. Thus, there were four wards and eight sample schools for the evaluation.

District/ Municipality	Sample ward	Sample School	FGD- JR/YC	FGD- SMC/PTA	KII-Local Municipality	KII- NRCS District Chapter
<b>Parbat- Jajjala</b>	<b>3</b>	School-1: Beni Bazar Basic School	√	√		√
	<b>3</b>	School-2: Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School	√	√	√ ( with RM Chair)	
	<b>7</b>	School-3: Farse Dhairing Secondary School	√	√		
	<b>4</b>	School-4: Phadkedhunga Basic School	√	√	√	
<b>Bhirkot- Syangja</b>	<b>7</b>	School-1: Balbarsa Basic School	√	√	√	√
	<b>7</b>	School 2: Mahedra Jyoti Secondary School	√	√		
	<b>8</b>	School-3: Public Academy Secondary School	√	√		
	<b>6</b>	School-4: Bhagyodaya Secondary School	√	√		

Then, the sample respondents for key informant interviews and focus group discussions were selected by considering criteria like representations in terms of stakeholder groups, gender, social inclusion, and involvement with the project. The table above gives the composition of the sample for the evaluation.

Interviews with Nepal Red Cross Society headquarter volunteers, staff, and representatives of the IFRC/JRCS CO were conducted separately after the field work in their respective offices in Kathmandu, which was as follows:

Entity	Key Informant/ Group Interviews
NRCS- HQ- Junior and Youth Department	2
JRCS CO	1
IFRC	2

**Documents Review:** Various documents, particularly the review of documents such as project proposals and documents, annual reports, project final reports, and baseline results, were quickly reviewed, and these documents were consulted throughout the evolution as and when necessary during data analysis and the preparation of the report.

**Preparation of the checklist:** The evaluation was carried out using the well-known criteria of evaluation: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and cross-cutting issues. The checklist was prepared for the above-mentioned categories of respondents from various stakeholders, which are based on the basic questions given in the table below. The checklists that were used to collect data from various respondents are given in *Annex 1* to this report.

**Data Analysis:**

Qualitative data analysis was carried out using the field notes, listening to audio recordings, coding the texts, and generating themes from the field data. Quantitative data was analyzed based on the indicators of the project taken from the project’s sources.

### 3. FINDINGS

In this chapter, evaluation findings are presented and discussed, organizing them into the evaluation criteria, namely relevancy, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and cross-cutting themes. Though the project period was three years, the project was implemented full-fledged for about six months in the final year because of the adverse situation, as mentioned earlier, due to the epidemic of COVID-19 and the internal management issue of the Nepal Red Cross Society. Hence, in analyzing the findings, this aspect has been considered. While presenting the respondents, Red Cross officials are categorized into two groups: respondents from NRCS's district headquarters are indicated as DC officials, and all respondents from NRCS headquarters, IFRC, and JRCS CO are named as RC Officials.

#### 3.1 Relevancy

The project was quite relevant to address the needs of water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH). The project is aligned with Sustainable Development Goal 6 of clean water and sanitation as well as national priorities on the same. Particularly, the project adheres to the government's school WASH policy, which aims to promote sustainable water, sanitation, and hygiene in all schools and create an enabling environment for better education. Similarly, the project is in line with one of the objectives of the NRCS, which is to promote and improve health conditions, prevent diseases, and reduce suffering. In view of one of the aims of the IFRC/JRCS's country programs in Nepal to 'improve school educational environment through school WASH facilities and by sustainably strengthening the capacities of the NRCS to provide impactful humanitarian services to the most at-risk populations in the country', the IYCP project was found to be well designed to contribute to this aim.

While reviewing the context of the schools, it was found that the schools supported by the project were in poor condition in terms of WASH facilities before the project's intervention. Though WASH was an urgent need, the local governments had been spending their budgets on other infrastructure projects as their needs were various. The project reached mainly the schools of marginal communities, which were also located in some relatively remote parts of the municipality and district centers. So, from the perspective of all stakeholders, the project was found relevant in addressing the WASH needs of the schools. It was reflected in the high level of enthusiasm of project stakeholders, mainly schools and DCs.

However, though the project supported mainly community schools with students from marginal communities, it also supported, in some cases, relatively well-off schools. So, when examining relevancy in the particular context of the schools, the project support was provided in the same manner, which would be more effective and need-based if the support was provided by carrying out the situation analysis of the schools involving the key stakeholders and support provided as per the particular needs of the schools in their own context.

Probably, it might be the reality that no school says no to any kind of external support. Hence, it is essential to analyze the needs and abilities of the schools while providing external support to make the support properly relevant in terms of more urgent local needs. For instance, it was found that a private school and a few well-established schools managed by influential people were also supported by the project, while one school, which was in worse condition with students from the Dalit community, did not get support as there was inadequate funding to meet the needs of this particular school.

Hence, this suggests a proper analysis of the situation and meaningful involvement of the stakeholders to channel the support to more needy schools. Nevertheless, the project helped to make the stakeholders, mainly the local government, aware that WASH at schools is a basic and urgent priority. It was reflected as “there is demand from the schools from other wards and municipalities for similar support on the school’s WASH” (KII- DC Official). As a whole, the project support for schools’ WASH was not only relevant; it had generated awareness among stakeholders about it; otherwise, it was getting less priority due to the temptation of the local government and stakeholders to invest in new infrastructure.

### 3.2 Effectiveness

The project performed well as per the revised plan, which came into practice because of the adverse situation of COVID-19 and the internal management of NRCS. As per the revised plan, the project achieved most of its targets (see Annex 1). The achievement varies from 87% to 179%; only one activity is below, and the rest are all above 100%. However, the project could not implement two important project outcomes: improvement of total sanitation practices (outcome 3) and enhancement of institutional capacity for equitable and sustainable WASH (outcome 4). Nevertheless, while assessing the high level of achievement of the targets under Outcome 1 and Outcome 2, the project achievement that was achieved within the six-month period in the final year was remarkable.

Mainly, the project imparted knowledge and skills to schoolchildren and young people on WASH (Outcome 1) by conducting various activities. It was found that the students who were in JR/YRCs were aware of improved hygiene and sanitation practices. For instance, the respondent students from the basic to secondary levels were aware of the need for hand washing (FGD-JR/YRCs and CCs), and they were practicing it. They highly appreciated the LSB training, as it provided them with WASH knowledge and skills. The hand washing practice in schools was enhanced with the support of the project in installing the tippy taps. Before the project, there were one or two taps, which were highly inadequate for hand washing in groups, particularly during the tiffin hour (FGD-JR/YRCs and CCs). To impart knowledge and skills on WASH, two WASH resource centers, one in each project district, were established, but it was simply the handover of some equipment and materials. No orientation or guidelines for the operation were provided, and there was no clarity on how these resource centers served other schools in the municipality. Similarly, there was minimal use of IEC materials on WASH in schools. In such a context, there is a need for further efforts to sustain the knowledge and skills imparted by the project in the future when the trained JR/YC members leave the schools.

There was various support from the project to develop child, gender, and disabled friendly basic school WASH facilities (Outcome 2). Mainly, such support was for the tippy taps and repair of toilets, including water tanks. Regarding the Tippy Tap, the support given by the project was found to be insufficient (around NPR 20,000) in most of the schools that were visited during the evaluation. In reality, the schools did not install the tippy tap as suggested by the project, as they thought that it would be a weaker one. With changes in the design, the cost of the tippy tap increased by an additional 20 to 40 thousand NPR. This suggests that the design of the tippy tap, as suggested by the project, was not matching the needs of the schools, or in some cases, there was less consultation on it, though as a formal process, schools should submit estimates to get funding. In one school, girls' complaints were that the tippy tap location was not good for girls, as adjoining with this were boys' toilets and urinals, which were uncomfortable for the girls (FGD-JR/YRC and CC). This suggests a

proper analysis of the particular situation and meaningful involvement of the girls and students in planning the WASH facilities.

The schools visited during the evaluation fieldwork found their compounds clean, and there were bins for waste. The JR/YCs and child clubs reported that they motivate the students to keep the school premises clean, putting the waste in the garbage bins. Similarly, the project supported improving the school toilets by fixing doors, providing a water tank, painting the walls, etc. This had certainly improved the existing worst conditions of the toilets. However, the toilets were not as clean as in other parts of the school. For instance, in a newly constructed school, the project provided support for water tanks and taps in the toilet. But it was not sufficient to improve the sanitary condition in the toilet, as the floor and urinals were covered with very rough cement plaster, and there was a very bad smell in the toilet.

But in another school where the project provided support to improve the girls' toilet, it was clean and appreciated by the girls as the project supported floor tiles there. The students were so aware and concerned that one girl student in a basic-level school suggested that "it would be good to keep separate sandals to use in the toilet to keep the floor always clean" (FGD-JR/CC). Assessing the different kinds of support provided to schools, it was revealed that the project support was determined by the budget, and the support was partial in terms of improving WASH as per needs. Further, in one school, the toilet buildings were located on fragile slopes, and a road was constructed close to them at a lower level than the toilet building. The project supported these toilets, which were indeed "considered to be risky for land slide and need to be transferred to a safe place" (FGD-SMC/PTA). This also suggests a serious situation analysis while providing any support.

The WASH facilities were found to be largely child, and gender-friendly. However, the facilities were not designed to make them disabled-friendly. In fact, the schools visited reported that there were no disabled students who needed separate facilities so far. Regarding the gender-friendly facilities, as mentioned above, a girls' toilet was improved well with tile floors. Similarly, menstrual pad-making training was found to be a useful skill and best practice among the girl students. "We were buying sanitary pads in the market before, but now we are using both" (FGD—JR/YRC, CC). Some girl students even preferred the home-made pad as it is reusable and there is no problem disposing of it. In some schools, there was a shortage of bins for menstrual pad disposal in toilets (FGD-JR/YRC and CC). More than this temporary shortage issue, regarding the disposal of the pad, there was confusion among teachers and students about its safe disposal, mainly the commercially made pad. In one school, it was reported that "Sister (helper personnel) disposes of the menstrual pads; we do not know where or how it is done" (FGD—JR/YRC, CC). This suggests that this issue should be well discussed to find appropriate and accepted disposal techniques for the menstrual pad. Though most of the tippy taps were found to be child-friendly, in one school, the opening-closing valve of the tap was found to be rather tight. According to the JR/YC members, the senior students helped the junior students open and close the tap. This only suggests that WASH facilities be designed to be accessible to people of all ages.

One of the project outcomes was to decrease the incidence of WASH-borne disease by improving total sanitation practices (Outcome 3). The project was found to be able to implement only one of the key activities under this outcome (see Annex 1). Mainly, the project formed JR/YRCs in all 52 schools as per the target and trained their members on WASH knowledge and skills. It was assumed that the trained Junior/Youth Red Cross circles' members disseminate the WASH information for

better hygiene and sanitation at the community level. However, the project could not implement other key activities, namely the establishment of total sanitized communities, providing sanitary unit support costs, and building washing platforms, /Kitchen Gardening and kitchen gardens, which were not included in the revised plan.

In spite of this, the trained students shared messages on WASH with their families and communities in sporadic ways. The WASH message was found to be transferred from trained students to households and communities to some extent in a sporadic way. For instance, one of the parents mentioned that “my two children are studying in school—one son in eighth grade and one daughter in second grade. My son is somewhat introverted, but my daughter shares what she learned in school. She has taught us to wash hands as she was told in the school” (A Dalit parent-community observation). This suggests that transferring messages through children is an effective way to reach the community level. There were also views from students that there is a need for training community members to make them fully aware, as it was viewed that “though we are also disseminating messages to our parents, it would be good if training were provided to community members to promote WASH” (FGD-JR/YRC and CC).

But it was found that there was less training provided to SMC/PTA on WASH. “We have not participated in any orientation or training organized by the projects. It was provided to students as far as we know” (FGD-SMC/PTA). It was agreed that “we could not implement activities from school to community” (KII-RC Official). In another school, it was mentioned that “the project provided training to students, but the message did not expand to the community level” (FGD-SMC/PTA). Further, it was added that “the project did not appear more participatory than expected; if there was participatory planning, more resources could be generated; indeed, there was no collaborative model. In fact, we were hopeful to get more WASH knowledge and skills than the small physical support” (FGD-SMC/PTA). This indicates the rising awareness of WASH in SMC/PTA and the participatory collaborative approach in project planning and implementation. Otherwise, the general trend is to demand physical infrastructure buildings, ignoring needs like WASH and improving education quality.

Similar to outcome third, the fourth outcome of the project, which was to enhance the institutional capacity for equitable and sustainable WASH, also remained largely unimplemented. Of the key targets under this outcome, only the formation of JR/YRC was completed by 100%. The other two major targets of the ward-level WASH CC and ward-level total sanitation strategic plan remain uncompleted, as they were even not included in the revised plan. Regarding the JR/YCs, it was observed that there was an overwhelming attraction among students to take part in JR/YRCs. For instance, in one basic-level school, there were three candidates for the presidency of JRC. In the basic-level school, it was a noticeable event to be in competition to be president. Similarly, in some schools, students were found composing poems and singing songs related to the Red Cross with messages and works of the Red Cross movement. In one school, JR/YC was found collecting funds and helping people who were victims of disasters or lost family members.

As mentioned earlier, the role of JR/YCs was found to be instrumental in maintaining sanitation and hygiene at school levels and in the community to some extent. Regarding capacity building, students and teachers capacity was enhanced through WASH, LSB, and first aid training. However, SMC/PTA capacity was found to be low in this regard. Overall, there is a need for a plan to sustain this enthusiasm after the project, particularly establishing and institutionalizing the various stakeholders,

namely WASH CC at school and ward levels, promoting JR/YCs, and conducting regular organizational activities to transfer the capacity to future students in the long term.

### 3.3 Efficiency

The project had mobilized its resources to achieve efficiency. For instance, most of the training for the stakeholders was conducted locally. In addition, Training of Trainers (TOT) was provided to develop local resource persons to provide training and service locally. The project team was found to be of minimum size, as there was one WASH officer and four local social mobilizers in each project district, and one program officer at the central level assigned to look after the project. "We provided only materials to use for WASH facilities procuring through a competitive process instead of direct transfer of cash, which we found an efficient way to do as we bought materials in less than the estimated amount" (KII-DC Official). Such measures reflect the use of both financial and human resources in an economic way.

Indeed, most of the project's activities were implemented in a short period of six months, and expenditures were made during this period. This indicates the intensive and efficient mobilization of resources. According to the Plan of Operation, July 2020 to June 2023, the total budget as the initial plan for the project was 27,600,000. However, the approved budget, as mentioned in the project completion report, is 24443,665.67, which is only 11.5% less than the initially planned budget. The total expenditure of the project is 17011164.73, which is 61.6% of the initial budget and 69.59% of the approved budget. The expenditure level of the project, though significantly low in view of the approved budget, is not so if it is assessed in terms of time period.

Regarding the mobilization of human resources, there was a lack of engineering technicians to support the construction and repair work of the WASH facilities, which also hindered the mobilization of financial resources, including the technical support to the schools, on time. "It was very time-consuming and difficult as we have to submit an estimate even for a small amount of tippy tap, and we do not have technicians for this" (FGD-SMC/PTA). Similarly, it was reported that "we have to reconstruct some construction works due to the unavailability of the technician to guide the work. Even in making logos for wall painting, we did it three-four times to get it correct" (FGD-SMC/PTA). However, in spite of the lack of engineering technicians for civil work to estimate, construct, and approve the completed work, the DC and schools took on the coordination of local technical personnel. It suggests that if there are technicians supported by the project, the expenditure level could be increased in the case of WASH facilities.

Further, in the case of the WASH officer managing and guiding the whole implantation process efficiently, the Parbat DC faced difficulty. The situation, as stated, was that the Parbat DC chapter faced difficulty due to the absence of a field-based WASH officer to support the DC in the last year of the project, when most of the activities of the project were implemented. Though there was a WASH officer assigned to both districts, he was stationed in another district and did not serve the Parbat district. This caused us not to complete some activities. This indicates the need for proper planning and mobilization of key staff for better performance and efficiency in the project. Further, the mobilizers, who were local and active, were not well experienced to work effectively and efficiently. It was viewed that "social mobilizers were very new, and indeed they learned from the project. We can hope they can do better in future projects" (KII-DC Official).

Regarding the allocation of funds for school WASH facilities, as mentioned earlier, it was partial support, and in some cases, it was in the form of partial support rather than an allocation made to



make the work fully complete. Though there was use of local funds at the school level to complete the activities, in addition to the project support, there should be an analysis on whether to provide small support to many schools or to provide an adequate level of support to more needy schools based on the situation analysis of the schools and consultation with wider stakeholders, keeping in view the cost efficiency in mobilization of both financial and human resources.

### 3.4 Impact

It would be too early to evaluate the impacts of the project, as the project came into full-fledged implementation in the last six months of the final year of the project. It was viewed that “since the training was provided recently, the impact has yet to be observed” (KII-RC Official). Similarly, it was viewed that “we provided knowledge, but it is yet to be brought into full practice” (KII-DC Official). However, some potential impacts were observed, mainly in practicing improved hygiene and sanitation practices.

Particularly, hand washing and improved menstrual hygiene were the changes demonstrated among the students. For instance, talking about menstruation and the use of menstrual pads were secret matters in the past, but now this is openly shared and discussed in schools and families, which was reflected well during the various FGDs with JR/YCs, CCs, and even with the SMCs/PTAs. One father of a student said that “in our family, daughters talk about their menstrual conditions and needs for pads with me too, not only to their mother” (FGD-SMC/PTA). Though the project made a good contribution to the increased level of awareness of WASH and practices of certain WASH behaviors, it was argued that “for the impact of the project, it should be continuously implemented for a period of at least 3 to 4 years” (KII-RC official). Indeed, for the full impact of the project, the concept of total sanitation should have been implemented, which was left unimplemented.

Nevertheless, the project’s role was found to be effective in achieving visibility of the Red Cross at school levels, which resulted in an increased level of awareness of the Red Cross movement. It is argued that “there is high visibility of the red cross, even despite the project’s small support (KII-DC Official). The enthusiasm among the Red Cross volunteers in the project district was observed, which can be considered an important social capital the project generated with a small amount of support and within a short time of implementation. This would, however, depend on whether it is sustained in the long term or if it is only an instant short-term effect due to the project support and may end after the project withdrawal. Hence, it is not the right time to assess the impact of the project, which largely depends on the sustainability of the project.

### 3.5 Sustainability

Since the project itself was implemented in a hurry within a short time period, in the final year of the project, the sustainability issue was found to be less discussed and addressed with priority. It was viewed that “we took many schools, and the time available for implementation was very short, and there was no time even to review it (KII-RC Official). Indeed, a project exit strategy or sustainability plan were not prepared. The whole focus of the project was to implement the activities as per the revised plan. As mentioned above, outcome 4 of the project, which was related to the sustainability of the project, remained largely unimplemented. Hence, the major challenge of this project is the sustainability of using and maintaining WASH facilities and the continuation of WASH behaviors among students in the future.

Even during the evaluation field work, some problems were reported and observed in the functioning of WASH facilities. For example, in some schools, toilets were jammed, which caused students to queue to use another working toilet (FGD-JR/YCs and Child Club). Similarly, in one school, the toilet doors were not functioning. Further, in one school, taps were leaking for a month but have not been fixed yet. Though these are minor problems that occur everywhere, such conditions show a lack of quick-fixing mechanisms at the school level. This all suggests a sustainability plan with an institutional capacity for equitable and sustainable WASH, as stated in the project's outcome 4..

It was observed that there was a good possibility of sustainability for the WASH facilities as there was good recognition and willingness from the local governments regarding the project's work (KII-RM Chair and Ward Chairs). It was viewed that "as Red Cross's small budget of around 60–70 thousand worked well to improve the situation in this school, we have learned that we can also do the work the same way in the future. It has been a learning experience for us" (KII, Local Government Official). Similarly, it was also suggested that "it would be good if Red Cross provided WASH training to the female community health workers and Ward Committee members and mobilized such a team with the coordination of the respective ward" (KII: Local Government Official). Further, it was viewed that "our rural municipality has focused on transformation in education. All sectoral service agencies are working for schools. In my view, it would be good to cover all schools coordinating local government, and it would be appropriate to have coordination between local government and Red Cross DC for effective monitoring after phasing out of the project" (KII, Local Government Official).

Thus, though there was a possibility of collaboration with the local governments, there was no formal collaboration policy or agreement in practice because of the very short time available to the project to deal with and establish such collaboration because of the above-mentioned causes—COVID-19 and NRCS's organizational dispute for a considerable time. In view of the reputation of the Red Cross, particularly its role in the COVID-19 epidemic, and the recognition by the local governments of the project's support for schools, the role of the local government seems to be instrumental for the sustainability of the WASH facilities if it is well facilitated in this direction. Indeed, as per the new constitution of Nepal, the overall responsibility of school management lies with the local governments.

### 3.6 Inclusion of the Cross-cutting Themes

In this section, the participation of stakeholders, gender and inclusion, and transparency and accountability are considered. Of these, the theme of gender and inclusion is presented and discussed above in the section on effectiveness, i.e., 3.2. Regarding the participation of stakeholders, the participation of one key stakeholder, the SMC, was good in some schools, while it was low in many cases. Transparency and accountability were found to be largely dependent on the level of participation of SMCs. Where there was good participation from SMCs, they were found involved in the implementation process and were informed about the support of the project. But in other cases, the SMCs and PTAs were not informed well. For instance, it was reported that "I am a member of the PTA, but I do not know what the materials support provided to the schools" (FGD-SMC/PTA). Further, it was expressed that "there was no orientation to SMC/PTA on the project procedures and WASH. No SMC meetings were called, and no agendas were presented related to the project" (FGD-SMC/PTA). It also viewed that "the RC approach was more directive than service-oriented. It was

like, If you do so much work, you will get so much money. Indeed, it should be participatory. There was no meeting about it. SMC was not involved in the process” (FGD-SMC/PTA). The public hearings were found to be practiced to a limited extent in some schools. Indeed, there were no public information boards about the support the project provided to schools. Thus, though there was good visibility of the Red Cross message and its fundamental 7 principles in most of the schools, the transparency aspect was found to be weaker.

## 4. CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

### 4.1 Conclusion

The project, which was found quite relevant in view of the SDG, national priorities, and local needs, However, the project faced challenges during its implementation period because of COVID-19 and internal management issues at the NRCS. It resulted in the revised plan, which covered only the last six months of the project's three-year period. As per the revised plan, the project achieved most of its targets (see Annex 1). The achievement varies from 87% to 179%; only one activity is below, and the rest are all above 100%. However, the project could not implement two important project outcomes: improvement of total sanitation practices (outcome 3) and enhancement of institutional capacity for equitable and sustainable WASH (outcome 4). Nevertheless, while assessing the high level of achievement of the targets under Outcome 1 and Outcome 2, the project achievement that was achieved within the six-month period in the final year was remarkable. Mainly, the project imparted knowledge and skills to schoolchildren and young people on WASH and improved the WASH facilities in schools.

However, the project could not implement the key activities under outcomes 3 and 4, namely the establishment of total sanitized communities, ward-level WASH CC, and ward-level total sanitation strategic plan, which were not included in the revised plan. Indeed, most of the project's activities were implemented in a short period of six months, and *the total expenditure of the project is 61.6% of the initial budget and 69.59% of the approved budget*. It would be too early to evaluate the impacts of the project, as the project came into full-fledged implementation in the last six months of the final year of the project. However, some potential impacts were observed, mainly in practicing improved hygiene and sanitation practices. As outcomes 3 and 4 of the project were not fully implemented, the major challenge of this project is the sustainability of using and maintaining WASH facilities and the continuation of WASH behaviors among students in the future.

### 4.2 Recommendations and Lesson Learned

- ▶ There should be clear school selection criteria and a funding policy specifying clear criteria for providing funding to support schools in improving WASH facilities to ensure the inclusion of the more needy schools. For this, there should also be a policy for categorizing schools based on their financial and physical conditions, abilities, and access to financial resources. Based on this analysis, schools need to be categorized into schools needing both software and hardware support and schools needing only software support. It is important to clarify whether support is to be provided or not to profit-making private organizations or schools. At the same time, analysis should be carried out to determine whether support creates a dependency syndrome or reinforces an existing tendency in the organizations that get support. Moreover, while providing support it should be guided by the Red Cross's principles of serving vulnerable and marginal communities.
- ▶ The project funding should be determined as per the concept and need for total sanitation. This suggests examining whether the support is partial or piecemeal or whether it is adequate as per the objectives of the project. In the case of collaborative funding between the project and other project stakeholders like local government, schools, and local communities, it should be

determined in advance. It is recommended to have a specific situation analysis as per the context to provide funding and support, not as a generalized blanket policy.

- ▶ WASH resource center should be established with clear objectives, operating guidelines, and orientation to stakeholders, determining its target benefits.
- ▶ There should be clarity regarding the techniques of disposing of menstrual pads in a safe and acceptable way, consulting the national policy-level agency and key stakeholders working on it, and it should be communicated to the local stakeholders.
- ▶ It is necessary to consider what type of materials should be used in the toilet floors, walls, and tippy taps to maintain hygiene and sanitation, where a large number of students are users.
- ▶ There should be training and orientation for SMCs and PTAs on the knowledge and skills of WASH. Such a training package can be developed by taking references from leading WASH agencies and considering the government policy on WASH, particularly the School WASH Guideline.
- ▶ There should be technical personnel to support the implementation of hardware parts of the WASH facilities.
- ▶ The social mobilizers should be educated in the field of social mobilization with some experience in it, or they need to be selected on the basis of their relevant educational background and trained well in participatory development work. Alternatively, while taking fresh social mobilizers from the local community, they should be provided with intensive field-based (community-based) training to enable them to undertake the responsibility of WASH social mobilizers.
- ▶ There should be coordination with the local municipalities and their education sections to establish WASH CC at the municipal, ward, and school levels as per the national guidelines on schools' WASH to achieve the goal of total sanitation.
- ▶ There should be a sustainability plan developed, consulting key stakeholders, to be implemented before the end of the project. For this, there should be a formal memorandum of understanding between the local municipality, including the education of its respective wards, and the Red Cross District Chapter. Since the project was implemented in a limited time and major outcomes remained unimplemented, there is a need for complementary phases of the project to fulfill the requirements of the project. Such a phase needs to consider the above points, particularly the contextual situation analysis of the needs and the supporting modality based on them.
- ▶ One of the lessons learned from the project is that children or students can be a change agent in providing WASH at school and community levels. Particularly, the role of JR/YCs and child clubs can be instrumental if they are provided knowledge and skills in an appropriate way.
- ▶ Mobilization of technicians is essential, while supporting the improvement of WASH facilities is also a learning experience that can be drawn from the experience of the local implementers.
- ▶ The needs of the schools are multiple and diverse, and even a small amount of support can generate enthusiasm among the stakeholders to improve the situation.

## ANNEXES

### Annex 1: Achievement of Expected Outcomes<sup>1</sup>

Indicators	Initial target	Revised target	Progress on revised target	Achievement in %
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Increased knowledge and skills of school children and young people for better Hygiene and sanitation practices by the end of Project 2023.				
# of people have increased their awareness level of WASH and disseminated the message of WASH's importance to the public.	3086	3086	4303	139
# of people from JYRC members/Teacher Sponsors/RC volunteer /community leaders have trained to promote and educate on health, hygiene, environmental sanitation, management of WASH facilities, and household sanitation improvement	1812	1470	1280	87
# of JYRC members from 53 Junior/Youth Red Cross Circle have increased knowledge on WASH and leadership developed.	583	583	1042	179
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Develop child, gender, and disabled (CGD) friendly basic school WASH facilities by the end of Project 2023.				
# of basic school WASH facilities (CGD WASH Facilities, Group HW, POU ) repaired and maintained at 53 School	53	14	16	114
# of tippy tap installed at project School	10	10	11	110
# of WASH resource centers/ corners established at school.	10	2	2	100
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Decrease the incidence of WASH-borne disease by improving total sanitation practices.				
# of total sanitized communities declared	2	0	0	NA
# of Junior/Youth Red Cross circle/local stakeholder activity involved in the dissemination of WASH information for better hygiene and sanitation at the community level.	53	52	52	100
# of HHs received Sanitary Unit support cost and build Washing Platform/Machan /Kitchen Gardening	700	0	0	NA
<b>Outcome 4:</b> Enhanced institutional capacity for equitable and sustainable WASH by the end of project 2023				
# of JRC/RCY Circle formed or reformed.	53	52	52	100
# of Ward WASH CC formed /reformed at the project area.	10	0	0	NA
# of Ward WASH-CC has a total sanitation strategic plan.	10	0	0	NA

<sup>1</sup> Source: IYCP project completion report (draft)

## Annex 2: Checklists for FGD and KII

### Respondents: SMC/PTA

- ❖ Who were the target beneficiaries of the project? How were the target beneficiaries selected?
  - ❖ What were the needs and priorities of the students and schools that the project addressed? To what extent was the project's support found relevant?
  - ❖ Are there any prominent needs that you think the project should have addressed?
  - ❖ Did the project address the different needs of the beneficiaries and school in a consistent manner?
  - ❖ What was your role in project planning and implementation?
  - ❖ How was the condition of WASH in the school before three years? What are the basic WASH facilities for students now at the school? How do you assess the functionality of these WASH facilities?
  - ❖ How has the project addressed the inequalities in school? What are the facilities for children, girls, and children with disabilities in the school? How is menstrual hygiene managed in the school? Are there any ways to improve the reduction of inequality and gender mainstreaming in the next project cycle?
  - ❖ What are the changes in the knowledge and skills of schoolchildren and young people for better hygiene and sanitation practices?
  - ❖ Is there a School WASH Coordination Committee in this school? If yes, what was its role in the promotion of WASH in the school?
  - ❖ What were the successful activities and best practices of the project, and why?
  - ❖ Which activities of the project were found to be ineffective, and why?
  - ❖ How well have the resources been used to produce achievements and results?
  - ❖ To what extent did the project successfully adapt to the changed context (COVID-19) and the other challenges?
  - ❖ How do you assess the project contribution to empower the students to boost their knowledge in WASH?
  - ❖ To what extent is the project likely to contribute to positive changes in the conditions of the students and improve their learning environment in school?
  - ❖ What are the changes in the surrounding communities of schools due to the work of the project?
  - ❖ What are the processes and mechanisms developed by the project to sustain the results achieved by the project?
  - ❖ What activities are likely to be continued after the end of the project? Specifically, to what extent does the Junior/Youth circle (J/YRC) play their role, especially in terms of continuing essential activities and promoting school WASH activities?
  - ❖ What are the unintended consequences of the project?
  - ❖ As a whole, which good practices and lessons learned need to be considered or integrated into future projects?
  - ❖ What are your overall recommendations to improve similar projects in the future?
-

**Respondents: JR/YC**

- ❖ When was your circle established? What are the main activities you carry out?
  - ❖ What were the needs / priority of the students and schools that the project addressed? To what extent the project's support was found relevant?
  - ❖ Are there any prominent needs that you think the project should have addressed?
  - ❖ How are you involved in project activities at school? What was your role in project planning and implementation?
  - ❖ What kind of training did you get from the project? To what extent did the project help in the capacity building of your circle and its members?
  - ❖ How do you put the learning from the training into practice in your daily life?
  - ❖ How was the condition of WASH in the school before three years? What are the WASH facilities for students now at the school?
  - ❖ What were the facilities for children, girls, and children with disabilities in the school? How is menstrual hygiene managed in the school?
  - ❖ What were the successful activities and best practices of the project, and why?
  - ❖ Which activities of the project were found to be ineffective, and why?
  - ❖ How do you assess the project contribution to empower the students to boost their knowledge in WASH?
  - ❖ To what extent is the project likely to contribute to positive changes in the conditions of the students and improve their learning environment in school?
  - ❖ What are the changes in the surrounding communities of schools due to the work of the project?
  - ❖ How do you assess the functionality of WASH facilities in schools?
  - ❖ Is there a plan to continue the WASH system in schools after the end of the project?
  - ❖ Are there any negative things that resulted from the project?
  - ❖ As a whole, what are the best practices and lessons learned from the project that can be considered to be included in similar projects in the future?
  - ❖ What are your recommendations to improve similar projects in the future?
-



***Respondents: Local Municipality/Ward***

- ❖ Who were the target beneficiaries of the project? How were the target beneficiaries selected?
  - ❖ What were the needs and priorities of the students and schools that the project addressed? To what extent was the project's support found relevant?
  - ❖ Are there any prominent needs that you think the project should have addressed?
  - ❖ Did the project address the different needs of the beneficiaries and school in a consistent manner?
  - ❖ What was your role in project planning and implementation? Who are the main stakeholders in WASH promotion in schools, and how do they collaborate?
  - ❖ Could you tell about the School WASH policy of the government? Are there WASH Coordination Committees at municipal and school levels? If yes, how is their role in promoting WASH?
  - ❖ How do you assess the collaboration between schools and local government in implementing WASH activities? How do you ensure the ownership of project activities?
  - ❖ How was the condition of WASH in the school before three years? What are the WASH facilities for students now at the school?
  - ❖ What were the facilities promoted by the project for children, girls, and children with disabilities in the school? How is menstrual hygiene managed in the school?
  - ❖ What were the successful activities and best practices of the project, and why?
  - ❖ Which activities of the project were found to be ineffective, and why?
  - ❖ Which good practices and lessons learned need to be considered or integrated into future projects?
  - ❖ To what extent is the project likely to contribute to positive changes in the conditions of the students and improve their learning environment in school?
  - ❖ What are the changes in the surrounding communities of schools due to the work of the project?
  - ❖ How do you assess the functionality of WASH facilities in schools?
  - ❖ What are the processes and mechanisms developed by the project to sustain the results achieved by the project? What would be the role of local government for this?
  - ❖ Are there any unintended consequences of the project?
  - ❖ What are your recommendations to improve similar projects in the future?
-

**Respondents: NRCS, District Chapter**

- ❖ How was the project initiated in this district? What was your role in project planning and implementation?
- Who are the main stakeholders in the project? What was the mechanism of coordination and collaboration among the stakeholders? Are there any kinds of WASH coordination committees in schools and municipalities?
- ❖ Who were the target beneficiaries of the project? How were the target beneficiaries selected?
- ❖ What were the needs and priorities of the students and schools that the project addressed? To what extent was the project's support found relevant?
- ❖ How was the project initiated in this district? What was your role in project planning and implementation?
- ❖ Who are the main stakeholders in the project? What was the mechanism of coordination and collaboration among the stakeholders?
- ❖ Who were the target beneficiaries of the project? How were the target beneficiaries selected?
- ❖ What were the needs and priorities of the students and schools that the project addressed? To what extent was the project's support found relevant?
- ❖ Are there any prominent needs that you think the project should have addressed?
- ❖ Did the project address the different needs of the beneficiaries and school in a consistent manner?
- ❖ How was the condition of WASH in the school before three years? What are the WASH facilities for students now at the school?
- ❖ What were the facilities promoted by the project for girls and children with disabilities in the school? How is menstrual hygiene managed in the school?
- ❖ What measures has the project taken to contribute towards the reduction of inequalities in schools? Are there any ways to improve the reduction of inequality and gender mainstreaming in the next project cycle?
- ❖ How do you assess the progress in the implementation of the project activities and the achievements of the project's objectives? What were the successful activities and best practices of the project, and why? And which activities of the project were found to be ineffective, and why?
- ❖ How do you assess the project contribution for the capacity building of RC Units for equitable and sustainable WASH?
- ❖ How well have the resources been used to produce achievements and results? Were activities cost-efficient? To what extent did the project successfully adapt to the changed context (COVID-19) and the other challenges?

- ❖ To what extent is the project likely to contribute to positive changes in the conditions of the students and improve their learning environment in school?
  - ❖ What are the changes in the surrounding communities of schools due to the work of the project?
  - ❖ What activities are likely to be continued following the withdrawal of the program from target areas? Specifically, the functioning of the Junior/Youth circle (J/YRC), especially in terms of continuing essential activities and promoting school WASH activities,
  - ❖ How do you assess the functionality of WASH facilities in schools? Will the benefits last? Identify the factors that may influence sustainability in the short, medium, and long term.
  - ❖ What are the processes and mechanisms developed by the project to sustain the results achieved by the project?
  - ❖ Are there any unintended consequences of the project?
  - ❖ As a whole, which good practices and lessons learned need to be considered or integrated into future projects?
  - ❖ What are your recommendations to improve similar projects in the future?
-

**Respondents: NRCS HQ- Junior Youth Dept, IFRC, JRC CO**

- ❖ What was the context for initiating the project? And how did the project select target beneficiaries? Were the criteria for targeting appropriate to the needs and context?
- ❖ To what extent were the specific interventions relevant to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries?
- ❖ Did the project address the different needs of the beneficiaries and school in a consistent manner?
- ❖ To what extent did the project complement the national, provincial, and local government development priorities and SDGs in a local context? And how was it aligned with the NRCS and IFRC's goals and priorities?
- ❖ What were the main approaches to the project that were used to achieve the expected outcomes of the project? How were these approaches integrated to reinforce each other?
- ❖ To what extent did the project implement its planned activities?
- ❖ To what extent has the project achieved the expected results?
- ❖ What was the effectiveness of the implemented activities in terms of quality, quantity, and timing?
- ❖ What were the factors that contributed to achieving or not achieving the expected results?
- ❖ What were the successful activities and best practices of the project, and why?
- ❖ Which activities of the project were found to be ineffective, and why?
- ❖ How do you assess the collaboration between schools and local government in implementing WASH activities? How do you ensure the ownership of project activities? What was the role of key stakeholders in WASH promotion, especially the various WASH CCs?
- ❖ What were the facilities promoted by the project for children, girls, and children with disabilities in the school? What measures has the project taken to contribute towards the reduction of inequalities in schools? Are there any ways to improve the reduction of inequality and gender mainstreaming in the next project cycle?
- ❖ To what extent had resources (financial, human, institutional, and technical) been allocated strategically and used efficiently to achieve the results in a timely manner?
- ❖ To what extent did the project successfully adapt to the changed context (COVID-19) and the other challenges?
- ❖ What are the internal and external factors that affected the efficiency of implementation in a positive or negative way?
- ❖ To what extent did the project create actual synergies among agencies and involve concerted efforts to optimize results and avoid duplication?

- ❖ To what extent was the existing project management structure appropriate and efficient in generating the expected results?
  - ❖ To what extent have the project implementation approach and strategy been efficient and cost-effective? What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the project's implementation process?
  - ❖ What are the changes in the surrounding communities of schools due to the work of the project?
  - ❖ To what extent is the project likely to contribute to positive changes in the conditions of the students and improve their learning environment in school?
  - ❖ What activities are likely to be continued following the withdrawal of the program from target areas? Specifically, to what extent would the Junior/Youth circle (J/YRC) function, especially in terms of continuing essential activities and promoting school WASH activities?
  - ❖ Will the benefits last? Identify the factors that may influence sustainability in the short, medium, and long term.
  - ❖ How do you assess the functionality of WASH facilities in schools?
  - ❖ What are the processes and mechanisms developed by the project to sustain the results achieved by the project?
  - ❖ What are the unintended consequences of the project?
  - ❖ As a whole, which good practices and lessons learned need to be considered or integrated into future projects?
  - ❖ What are your recommendations to improve similar projects in the future?
-

### Annex 3: List of organizations visited and persons interviewed

Name	Organization and Address	Organizational Unit
Mr. Asif Bakas	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	JRC
Mr. Murtuza Raja	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	JRC
Mr. Sudarshan Nepali	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	JRC
Mr. Gaurav Pariyar	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	JRC
Mr. Gulan Mustafa	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	JRC
Mr. Sandesh Pariyar	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	JRC
Ms. Manisha Kumari Pundit	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	JRC
Ms. Tirisha Pariyar	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	JRC
Ms. Princi Santyal	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	JRC
Mr. Nishar Miya	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	JRC
Ms. Asiya Hushar	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	JRC
Mr. Narendra Bahadur Thapa	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Chandra Bahadur Karki	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Mukunda Regmi	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Rahaman Khan	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Chitra Raj Regmi	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Hira Bahadur GC	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Dil Bahadur Baruwal	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Man Rup BK	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Ganga GC	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Bal Bahadur GC	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Thakur Prasad Regmi	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Yam Prasad Tiwari	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Ajit Joshi	Beni Bazar Basic School; Jaljala-3, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Ms. Sabina Joshi	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Ms. Gita Darji	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-4, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Ms. Dhan Kumari Baruwal	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-2, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Ms. Ganga GC	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-4, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Bishnu GC	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-2, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Ek Bahadur Gharti	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-2, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Raghunath Acharya	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Hira Bahadur Baruwal	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-2, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Indra BK	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Kasmit Sunar	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Sachin Sunar	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Resham Bhandari	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Sanam Pariyar	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Adarsha Karki	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Bikram Ghatan	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Sushank Baruwal	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Sijal Khatri	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Sandhya GC	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Rabina Nepali	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Nirmita Shrestha	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Yamuna Pariyar	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Sandhya Pariyar	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Nikky Bohora	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization and Address</b>	<b>Organizational Unit</b>
Ms. Aayusha Adhikari	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Yasudha Pariyar	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Alisha BK	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Dikshya BK	Bidhya Jyoti Secondary School, Jaljala-3, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Dixit Hamal	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Aayushma Giri	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Pranish Hamal	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Amrit Sunar	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Basudev Giri	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Aaryu GC	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Sandesh Pariyar	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Kismat Sonam	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Sadhana Paudel	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Simran Pariyar	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Kajal Sonam	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Bharat Bahadur Chetri	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala, Parbat	SMC/ Ward Chair
Mr. Bel Bahadur GC	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala, Parbat	SMC/ Ward Rep.
Mr. Tej Damai	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala, Parbat	SMC/ Ward Rep.
Ms. Babi Subedi	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala, Parbat	SMC/ Ward Rep.
Ms. Jamuna Malla	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala-4, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Ms. Babi Subedi	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala-4, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Ms. Tika Hamal	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala-4, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Ms. Gita Giri	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala-4, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Ms. Mina Shahi Malla	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala-4, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Nanda Bahadur Hamal	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala-4, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Tunganath Paudel	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala-4, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Ms. Manu Kumari Malla	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala-4, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Krishna Prasad Paudel	Phadkedhunga Basic School, Jaljala-4, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Ms. Sopiya Khatri	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Anup Joshi	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Sudipti Sharma	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Samip Acharya	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Nabina Acharya	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Rojit Acharya	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Rojit Nepali	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Bipsa Poudel	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Pramisha Giri	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Roshani Sharma	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Rojita Sharma	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Himlal Upadhyaya	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Nande Damai	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Chakrapani Vayadi	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Bholanath Upadhyaya	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Dhurba Prasad Vayadi	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Ms. Dilsara BK	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Ms. Yasodha Acharya	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Bibek Pariyar	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Hari Prasad Acharya	Farse Dhairing Secondary, Jaljala-7, Parbat	SMC/PTA
Mr. Raju Prasad Acharya	Jaljala Rural Municipality,, Parbat	Chair, RM
Mr. Rudra Bahadur Rimal	NRCS Parbat	DC Executive Committee
Mr. Govinda Prasad Padha	NRCS Parbat	DC Executive Committee

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization and Address</b>	<b>Organizational Unit</b>
Mr. Bhisma Malla	NRCS Parbat	DC Executive Committee
Mr. Aasis Joshi	NRCS Parbat	DC Executive Committee
Mr. Pitambar Adhikari	NRCS Parbat	DC Executive Committee
Mr. Tara Prasad Aryal	Bhirkot Municipality-7, Syangja	Ward Chair/SMC Member
Mr. Pursottam Wagle	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Meghnath Poudel	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Prem Darji	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms Mayadevi Damai	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Nira Pariyar	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Tika Pariyar	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Sarba K. Pariyar	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Sarita Aryal	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Anjana Hamal	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Pabitra Aryal	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Manju Pariyar	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Jeevan Aryal	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Manju Pariyar	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Ranjana Gaha Magar	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Sandip Pariyar	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Sisir Pariyar	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Rajani Pariyar	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Dipson Aryal	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Sulmaya Pariyar	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Siba Kumar Pariyar Sapkota	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Apeksha Pariyar	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Shristi Pariyar	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Ramesh Adhikari	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Bipan Thapa Magar	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Ranjita Adhikari	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Sudiksha Pariyar	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Nirjan Pariyar	Balbarsa Basic School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Kushum GC	Mahendrajyoti Secondary School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Anjal	Mahendrajyoti Secondary School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Anjan	Mahendrajyoti Secondary School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Saksham Roka	Mahendrajyoti Secondary School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Ankit Thapa	Mahendrajyoti Secondary School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Sushant Sunar	Mahendrajyoti Secondary School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Amit BK	Mahendrajyoti Secondary School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Gita Rokaha	Mahendrajyoti Secondary School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Sangam Rokaha	Mahendrajyoti Secondary School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Sabita Thapa Magar	Mahendrajyoti Secondary School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Keshar Bahadur KC	Mahendrajyoti Secondary School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA



<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization and Address</b>	<b>Organizational Unit</b>
Mr. Khem Bahadur Karki	Mahendrajyoti Secondary School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Dambar Roka	Mahendrajyoti Secondary School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Ek Bahadur Khatri	Mahendrajyoti Secondary School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Tara Bahadur	Mahendrajyoti Secondary School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Sujata Aryal	Mahendrajyoti Secondary School, Bhirkot-7, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Ujjwal Thapa	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Manjuldip Aryal	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Sushil Kangeni	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Manish Aryal	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Kushum Regmi	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Tulsi Rokaha	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Prakriti Rokaha	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Indira Khanal	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Bhimkumari SK	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Kamala Khanal	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Kamala Pangen	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Sarita Regmi	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Maya Rana	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Narayan Prasad Aryal	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Churamani Neupane	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Kala Vayadi	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Parbati Gautam	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Punam Regmi	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Chamaram Khana	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Sujata Aryal	Bhagyodaya Secondary School, Bhirkot, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Namrata Gurung	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Bhagwati Regmi	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Upasana Thapa	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Pratigya Bhujel	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Sadikshya Rayamajhi	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Keshab Bahadur Thapa	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Sujal Bhujel	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Mr. Suraj Gurung	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Dipshana Shrestha	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Helon Gurung	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Kushum Thapa	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	JR/YC/CC
Ms. Sita Regmi	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	SMC/PTA

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization and Address</b>	<b>Organizational Unit</b>
Ms. Sun Maya Gurung	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Luk Maya Gurung	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Manju Khanal	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Laxmi Bhujel	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Shanta Thapa	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Ms. Gita Roka	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Nagendra Roka	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Bijaya Kumar Sharma	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Tara Bahadur Thapa	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Jagat Prasad Regmi	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Yubraj Regmi	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Nawaraj Aryal	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Chun Bahadur KC	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Padam Bahadur BK	Public Academy Secondary School, Bhirkot-8, Syangja	SMC/PTA
Mr. Dinesh Aryal	NRCS Syangja	DC Members
Mr. Ramchandra Aryal	NRCS Syangja	DC Members
Mr. Mahesh Bahadur Thapa	NRCS Syangja	DC Members
Mr. Sushil Subedi	JRCS CO	Project Coordinator
Ms. Ambika Rimal	NRCS , Junior & Youth Department	Program Officer
Mr. Herve Gazeau	IFRC , Country Delegation Nepal	Program Coordinator
Mr. Khem Raj Nepal	IFRC, Country Delegation Nepal	Program Manager
Mr. Dharma Dutta Bidari	NRCS , Junior & Youth Department	Director

## Annex 4: Terms of Reference

## Final Evaluation of *International Youth Cooperation Project*

### 1. Summary

<p><b>1.1 Purpose:</b> To assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the International Youth Cooperation project in relation to the objectives (and supporting outcomes and outputs) set out in the Programme Documents, and based on the findings, develop a set of key recommendations.</p> <p><b>1.2 Audience:</b> IFRC/ Japanese Red Cross and Nepal Red Cross Society</p> <p><b>1.3 Commissioner(s)<sup>1</sup>:</b> This evaluation is commissioned by the IFRC/ Japanese Red Cross <i>in compliance with the IFRC framework for evaluation.</i></p> <p><b>1.4 Reports to</b> FUJII Rio, JRCS HQ, Japan, and Mona Aryal (Director), Junior/Youth department of Nepal Red Cross Society.</p> <p><b>1.5 Duration of evaluation:</b> <i>The working time in days is a maximum of 20. working days, out of which the field trip part is 6. days; including travel days.</i></p> <p><b>1.6 Time frame:</b> The Evaluator’s work will take place in September and October and the fieldtrip should be completed by 25<sup>th</sup> September. The Evaluator should start their assignment no later than 11<sup>th</sup> September 2023.</p> <p><b>1.7 Location:</b> Home/desk-based work with travel to project site (Parbat and Synagja District).</p>

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

The IFRC/Japanese Red Cross society (JRCS) has been supporting the Nepal Red Cross Society (NRCS) in the implementation the development programmes and emergency operations for more than four decades. Currently JRCS is participating with the NRCS in two development projects which are i) international youth cooperation project (IYCP) under Junior & Youth Department and ii) Community Led Disaster Risk Reduction project (ComLed DRR) under Disaster Management Department. The IYCP Project is now in its final stages (project agreement ended in June 2023) and is in the final evaluation process. The IFRC/JRCS’s country programmes in Nepal aim to build resilience of highly vulnerable and marginalized communities through the implementation of localized, inclusive, and climate-smart disaster risk reduction (DRR) efforts, improve school educational environment through school WASH facilities and by sustainably strengthening the capacities of the NRCS to provide impactful humanitarian services to the most at-risk populations in the country.

The project targets 52 schools (27 schools of Bhirkot Municipality, Shyanja and 25 schools of Jaljala Rural Municipality, Parbat with 5,886 school children and school staffs as a direct beneficiary and 33,749 community people (Females: 16,912 and Male:16,837) as an indirect beneficiaries living in two LGs, and NRCS staff and volunteers.

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

The overall goal of the IYCP project was to create a better educational environment at schools through improving WASH facilities in schools, promoting total sanitation behavior, and buildup better coordination mechanisms among local stakeholders (LG, Schools, SMCs, PTA, community people) for sustainability of the project outcomes. The project has the following four expected outcomes:

1. Increased knowledge and skills of school children and young people for better Hygiene and sanitation practices by the end of Project 2023.
2. Develop child, gender, and disabled (CGD) friendly basic school WASH facilities by the end of Project 2023.
3. Decrease the incidence of WASH-borne disease by improving total sanitation practices.
4. Enhanced institutional capacity for equitable and sustainable WASH by the end of project 2023

The project has faced a range of implementation challenges, including the impacts of COVID-19 and NRCS governance and management crisis, that were enforced to achieve the limited project results. However, when feasible, the project adapted to the changed context through need-based planning and applied IFRC temporary operation modality for project implementation from January 2023. The Evaluator/Team Leader will be working together with an NRCS staff member with a relevant background, who will be part of the evaluation team.

### **3. Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation**

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

- to carry out an evaluation to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the project to date.
- Reveal reasons for achievement/non-achievements verified in the final report.
- to assess efficiency and cost-effectiveness as part of the final evaluation.
- Develop a set of key recommendations for future collaboration with Nepal Red Cross and future formulation of the Youth cooperation project.

#### **Scope:**

The evaluation will cover the project in its entirety both in terms of timeline (1<sup>st</sup> July 2020 – 30<sup>th</sup> June 2023) and geographic coverage of Jaljala Rural Municipality ward 2,3,4,7 and 8 of Parbat district; and Vhirkot Municipality wards 5,6,7,8 and 9 of Syangja district. The evaluation will focus on the complete range of engaged stakeholders primarily, school children, Junior and youth circles, School management committees, parents teacher associations, local authorities, and Nepal Red Cross Society (HQ and district chapters).

#### **4. Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions** *Details the evaluation criteria and the questions to be answered.*

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

##### 1. Relevance:

- *How the programme selected target beneficiaries? Were the criteria for targeting appropriate to the needs and context?*
- *To what extent were the specific interventions relevant to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries?*
- *Is the project addressing the different needs of the beneficiaries/school in a consistent manner?*

##### 2. Effectiveness:

- *To what extent has the project objectives and outputs been achieved? Is it likely that the programme will have the planned impact?*
- *To what extent has any significant unplanned results been achieved (positive or negative)?*
- *Assess the technical quality of key programme activities.*

- *Which good practices and lessons learned need to be considered or integrated in future projects?*
- *What conditions facilitated the achievement of results? What conditions were obstacles to achieving the results?*

### 3. Efficiency:

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

### 4. Impact:

- *What has happened/changed as a result of the project? What impact did the project have on the support provided to the vulnerable in the targeted areas?*
- *What were the factors that enabled or hindered the wanted impact?*
- *Define how the project contributed to improve capacity of school Childrens beyond the Red Cross activities, particularly in addressing water sanitation and hygiene (WASH) awareness and need in school.*

### 5. Sustainability:

- *How sustainable are the project outcomes? In particular, to what extent are the project outcomes functioning thanks to the project?*
- *To what extent does school, and local government (outside the Red Cross movement) have ownership of project activities?*
- *What activities are likely to be continued following withdrawal of the programme from target areas? Specifically, examine:*
  - i. *To what extent are the Junior/Youth circle (J/YRC) as they have been formed/reformed, sustainable, especially in terms of continuing essential activities and promote School WASH activities?*
- *Will the benefits last? Identify the factors that may influence sustainability in the short, medium and long-term.*

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

- *What measures has the project taken to contribute towards reduction of inequalities in schools? Are there any ways to improve reduction of inequality and gender mainstreaming in the next project cycle?*

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

The evaluation will use the following data sources:

#### Reference documents:

- Project Proposal/document
- Annual Reports
- Project Final Report
- Baseline results

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

- Review of secondary data and key reference documents
- Briefing with the IFRC/FRC to discuss the ToR and the time schedule.
- Briefing at NRCS Headquarters

- Desk study of relevant project documents and reports
- Interview and focus group discussions with NRCS staff and volunteers, members of Junior/youth circles, School management committee (SMCs), Local government and district chapter.
- Visits to NRCS district chapters (Parbat and Syangja) and project areas including observations, transit walk, beneficiary interviews. (Max 6. days)
- Focal/ Focus Groups interviews with J/YRC and School Management Committee
- Interviews with key stakeholders such wards and municipality representatives, Nepal Red Cross Society headquarter, Nepal Red Cross Society District Chapter volunteers and IFRC/ Japanese Red Cross Country Office (IFRC/JRCS CO)

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

## 6. Proposed Timeline, Roles & Responsibilities

The evaluation is expected to take place in September and October 2023 and the field work needs to be completed by 25<sup>th</sup> September. The debriefing and Drat report should be completed 4<sup>th</sup> October 2023. The final evaluation report presenting the main findings, conclusions and recommendations is to be submitted by 15<sup>th</sup> October 2023.

The Evaluator/Team Leader will be engaged for a total of 20 working days (including field travel days) in September 2023. The following work break-down shows how the days will be distributed as 20 days of work including 2 days for travel to project area.

The scheduled timeline for the final evaluation report is:

- Review of documents and inception report (max 8 pages) 5 days.
- Briefings in Kathmandu, and fieldwork including travel from Kathmandu to field locations and back, 6 days.
- Debriefing in Kathmandu, 1 day.
- Writing of draft report, 4 days
- Report finalization and presentation of final report,4 days

The Evaluator/Team Leader will work in close coordination with the NRCS and IFRC/ Japanese Red Cross Country Office in Nepal. IFRC/ Japanese Red Cross and NRCS HQ shall:

- Provide all key reference documentation and facilitate connections between the evaluator and the district chapters and the schools
- Provide technical oversight of the evaluation; together with the JRCS HQ
- Review the inception report and draft evaluation report, together with JRCS HQ as needed.
- Provide support in the organization of the field trip and debriefings and facilitate all logistics arrangements (transportation, accommodation, appointments) as per IFRC Policy.

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

The Evaluator/ evaluation team will provide:

1. An inception report following the desk work and prior to the mission to demonstrate a clear understanding and realistic plan of work for the evaluation. The inception report outlines how s/he will lead the evaluation, work plan and detailing the planned methodology, incl. criteria setting for informant selection and participants, field data collection and analysis. The report is subject to NRSC HQ and JRCS HQ approval.
2. A kick-off meeting with the NRCS HQ and JRCS
3. A debriefing to the NRCS team and IFRC/JRCS (incl. JRCS HQ team) at the end of the mission to discuss the initial findings, conclusions and recommendations – ideally immediately after the visit. Feedbacks from the debriefing will be integrated in the evaluation report.
4. A draft final evaluation report within 7 days of return from the field visit. The draft will be shared with the NRCS HQ, JRCS country office and HQ and other relevant stakeholders for comments. The comments from NRCS HQ, JRCS country office and HQ and the relevant stakeholders to be forwarded to the Evaluator within 5 days after receiving the draft.

5. A final (corrected) evaluation report to be submitted to NRCS HQ and JRCS HQ within 5 days of receiving the comments. The report will have a maximum length of 25 pages, including an Executive Summary. The report will include recommendations to the NRCS HQ, the JRCS HQ and possibly to other stakeholders. The final evaluation report is subject to approval from the NRCS HQ and JRCS HQ.

## 8. Evaluator's qualifications.

The Evaluator/Team Leader shall have:

- *University degree/s at the post-graduate level in relevant fields of study (e.g. health, water and sanitation, social development, social sciences, management).*
- *Proven experience with solid technical knowledge in WASH methodologies and approaches in development programming including School WASH.*
- *Proven experience in evaluating development cooperation programs or projects, including analyzing development impacts.*
- *Knowledge of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement preferred.*
- *Good knowledge of written and spoken English is a must.*
- *Strong knowledge and experience in humanitarian and development contexts.*
- *Good knowledge of the international humanitarian and development context and where possible some experience with the Red Cross/Crescent Movement*

## Application procedures

Interested applicants should submit their expression of interest/details proposal to the following email: **aliza.baidya@ifrc.org**, by 3rd September 2023 (10 days from the first publication). Applicant must submit the following documents:

1. Curriculum Vitae (CV)
2. Cover letter clearly summarizing your experience as mentioned above
3. Narrative and financial proposal
4. Sample Report- Please provide a copy of the previously written evaluation report (A similar type of report submitted to any organization in the past)