EXTERNAL EVALUATION – END OF PROJECT EVALUATION NEPAL

PROJECT CODE: WASH 2017-2018 - 2017-10-NP-DGD
DATE OF EVALUATION: JANUARY / FEBRUARY 2019
EVALUATOR(S): SHANA O'BRIEN (INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT (SOBRIEN44@GMAIL.COM)
EVALUATION MANAGEMENT TEAM (EMT):
NRCS: AMAR MANI POUDEL, KRISHNA SUBEDI (WASH) KRISHNA GHIMIRE, RAJU RAUT (FA)
BRCF: ELS SCHAPENDONK (COUNTRY REPRESENTATIVE) CHARLOTTE SCHELSTRAETE (WASH) LIEVE ADAMS (FA) DRIES GOEMINNE (HEAD, DC)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The evaluation is part of the programme 2017-2018 of the BRC-FL International Cooperation department financed by the Belgian Development Cooperation (DGD). The evaluation is focusing on the quality, the effectiveness and the sustainability of the Water and Sanitation (WASH) and First Aid (FA) programs in Nepal. Considering these are exit programs, the consultant has also looked at the sustainability of the WASH and FA divisions of the NRCS, after BRC-Fl leaves Nepal on the 1st of April 2019.

SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

BRC-Fl for the larger part agrees with the recommendations of the consultant. Recommendations given are general good practices that are hard to argue with. We do not always agree with all the underlying examples/explanations given though. Also, some of the underlying examples clearly indicate that BRC-Fl is already implementing accordingly.

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TABLE

Recommendation 1: Ensure that a project's Theory of Change, LogFrame, and M&E measures are aligned.					
Management response:[1] ☐ **Partially Accepted**	**Response rationale:[2]** Of course a perfectly aligned ToC, Logframe and M&E is the ideal which we strive for as much as possible. There might especially have been a discrepancy in the ToC and logframe of the FA project in Nepal. This is partially due to a standard ToC developed by BRC-Fl HQ which did not completely match the FARS project in Nepal, since this is the only BRC-Fl project that still includes RS in the FA project. Also, a very complete ToC helps us bring all factors into the picture for consideration when developing a proposal, but heaving all those factors over to the logframe may not be practical to report on in the field. Capacity in the field/among our local partner should also be taken into account; a perfectly aligned and complete ToC and Logframe do not serve its purpose if it cannot be reported on either. With regard to the baseline and endline of the FA project: a format has been designed by HQ to monitor the development of a FA division of our partner. This format is very comprehensive and will be used at the beginning and end of project to be able to monitor progress. In Nepal this format was analysed during and used at the end of the project as well. However, this format was only developed in 2016 and therefore not used when we started with FA in Nepal in 2001. At the beginning of the underlying project is was not filled in detail (as a baseline) due to time pressure with regard to the project activities of a 2 year project and because thorough familiarity with the situation in Nepal. The analysis done mid 2018 (to be able to steer in a direction if needed before the end of the project) did not bring any surprises with regard to the level of development, strengths and weaknesses of the division.				
Key action(s)		**Deadline**	**Responsible**	**Tracking**	
				Status	**Comments**
Indicators of a LogFrame should reflect effectiveness of the project and gender aspects as much as possible.		Future proposals	Project Manager		
1.2 FA projects should all monitor the development of a FA division at the beginning and end of FA project through the same format developed in HQ.		Future years of FA projects in other countries	Project Manager		

---

[1] Please indicate the management decision on the recommendation by putting a cross before the relevant response.

[2] Please explain why a certain response (accepted/partially accepted/rejected) was selected, especially if 'partially accepted' or 'rejected' was selected.

Recommendation 2: Include accountability to beneficiaries in M&E indicators and utilize participatory mechanisms.					
Management response: ☐ **Accepted**	**Response rationale:** Though NRCS includes accountability in their way of working on the basis of the RCRC Guide to Community Engagement and Accountability, BRC-FI did indeed not include these factors in their logframes of Nepal.				
Key action(s)		**Deadline**	**Responsible**	**Tracking**	
				Status	**Comments**
2.1 Indicators on CEA can be included in BRC-Fl logframes as well.		Future proposals	Project Manager		

Recommendation 3: Develop sustainability plans and measures for ensuring the sustainability of project outcomes, in collaboration with Partner National Societies.					
Management response: ☐ **Accepted**	**Response rationale:** BRC-Fl, with the support of CeBAP already works as much as possible evidence based and is committed to keep doing so in the future. Looking into the four components of sustainability as identified by the consultant to enhance sustainability is interesting. It may give a clearer picture of strengths and weaknesses that can/should be used or addressed. However, not all sustainability related issues may be possible to be resolved within a project or by BRC-Fl.				
Key action(s)		**Deadline**	**Responsible**	**Tracking**	
				Status	**Comments**
3.1 Within project proposals, BRC-FL could include an activity/workshop in which BRC-Fl and the local partner make a SWOT-analysis with regard to sustainability addressing the 4 components of sustainability as identified by the consultant.		Future years of projects in other countries or future proposals.	Project Manager		

Recommendation 4: Prepare a formal exit strategy when Partner National Societies leave a country.	
Management response: ☐ **Partially accepted**	**Response rationale:** We agree with the fact that local partners should have their policies/strategies in place to be able to deal with Partner National Societies leaving their country. As a Partner Society we find institutional and financial sustainability of departments/divisions we work with essential. Therefore, we do align our exit from a country as much as possible with policies form our local Partner Society. However, the core responsibility lies with the local partner's senior management. We are of the opinion that in Nepal we took the sustainability of the divisions very much into account. Though there was not a formal exit strategy as a separate document we can refer to, the underlying 2 year projects (and the FA project in particular) were developed as a exit strategy as such. Examples the consultant gives for funding the FA department through CoFA and

| a road safety network were at the core of BRC-FI project to make the FA department sustainable. Also, we have always been ready to support the local partner in finding new or additional donors through attending meetings, proposal writing support or identifying. The idea that there would be a donor that would always stay and assure financial sustainability of a department forever is not realistic. Staff capacity building trainings we are in support of and have already been included in projects. However, for us it makes more sense to provide them in projects then after we have left already. More extensive evaluations are useful and done by BRC-FI. Considering the fact that BRC-FI is leaving Nepal, and with that Asia, we allocated such considerable required funding to projects in Africa which will be more useful to us in the future. |

Key action(s)	Deadline	Responsible	Tracking	
			Status	Comments
4.1 Align an exit from a country as much as possible with policies and strategies of the local national society. A separate exit strategy outlining all considerations can be put on paper for future reference.	Future departures from other countries.	Country Representative		

Recommendation 5: Conduct a formal capacity assessment with Partner National Societies.				
Management response: ☐ **Accepted**	**Response rationale:** BRC-FI conducts formal capacity assessments of the FA divisions we work with. A standard tool was developed by BRC-FI HQ in 2016 which was also used in Nepal at the end of 2018 to determine the capacity of the FA division after investing in them for 18 years. If, in a country a WASH division appears weak, a tool as made for the FA division may be useful as well. In Nepal, where the WASH department is very experienced in following and implementing government policies and guidelines this was not applicable though. The OCAC is a respected RCRC tool which may provide interesting input. However, a need identified in the OCAC may be (money and time wise) a project as such and, therefore, not feasible as merely a component in a small scale development project targeting vulnerable people as beneficiaries. This tool may be more useful when deciding on a OD-project.			
Key action(s)	Deadline	Responsible	Tracking	
			Status	Comments
5.1 Take capacity of local partners into account when developing a project as much as possible. Use the FA-tool developed in HQ (or similar new tool for other department) or the OCAC if available and relevant.	Future project proposals.	Project Manager		