Innovative Challenge 3 (IC3)

Nepal -2ndface-to-face meeting

An interaction program on "Evaluation in Nepal: Current Situation and Challenges" 12March 2015, Kathmandu, Nepal





Supported by:



Organized jointly by:







Parliamentarians Forum for Development Evaluation

2nd event on the auspicious occasion of International EvalYear-2015



International Evaluation Partnership Initiative (Eval Partners) launched a project - Innovative Challenge 3 (IC3) with a main objective to enabling environment of evaluation, and supported through International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE). Partners of the IC3 project are European Evaluation Society (EES), Parliamentarian Forum on Development Evaluation in South Asia (PE), Pakistan Evaluation Association (PEN) and Community of Evaluations – South Asia (CoE-South Asia).

Community of Evaluators – Nepal (CoE-Nepal) jointly with Community of Evaluators – South Asia and National Parliamentarian Forum on Development Evaluation Policy in Nepal organized the 2nd face-to-face meeting entitled "An interaction program on Evaluation in Nepal: Current Situation and Challenges" as a part of IC3 project. The main objective of the meeting was to identify the current situation, challenges and way forward of evaluation in Nepal from the perspectivesofGovernment of Nepal (GON), Parliamentarian, National &InternationalCivil Society Organizations and Evaluation Practitioners. The program was also considered as the 2nd event of CoE-Nepal on the auspicious occasion of International EvalYear-2015.

The program was managed by Mr. Prabin Chitrakar, Nepal country catalyst for the project and a Board Member of CoE-Nepal. Mr. Chitrakar provided the introduction of the IC3 project and the objectives of the program. The master of ceremony for the program was Mr. Thakur Bhatta, Board Member of CoE-Nepal.

The meeting was chaired by Hon. Sher Dhan Rai, CA Member, CPN (UML) and a member of Nepal Parliamentarian Forum on Development Evaluation Policy in Nepal. Hon. Rai emphasized the importance of Monitoring & Evaluation in Development and Good Governance. He also emphasized the necessity of regular dialogs and meetings in different levels. He further said thatwe should make the Eval Year 2015 and the Global Week a success.

Hon. Sita Gurung, CA Member, Nepali Congress and a member of Nepal Parliamentarian Forum on Development Evaluation Policy in Nepal during her welcome speech highlighted the need of coordination and effective monitoring & evaluation system in Nepal Government for its planning and activities.

In the meeting, experts from different fields presented papers in different topics.

Dr. Teertha Raj Dhakal, Joint Secretary and Chief of M&E Division at National Planning Commission presented a paper on "Learning through evaluations for informed policy decisions: GON perspectives". Dr. Dhakal in his presentation mentioned about the current M&E system, evaluation practices, and M&E capacity in the government of Nepal. He also shared the recommendations from the Evaluation Network Meeting 2014 which was coordinated by National Planning Commission of Nepal. The recent efforts and way forward was also covered in the presentation.

Dr. Gana Pati Ojha, Chairperson of CoE-Nepal and Vice Chairperson of CoE – South Asia presented a paper on "Eval Year: A Glance". Dr. Ojha in his presentation highlighted about the Eval Year 2015 and

the Global Week that is going to take place in 23-27 Nov, Kathmandu, Nepal. Presentation included the name of organizers, detail schedule, and fees of the event and also the Global Agenda 2016-2020.

Dr. Ramesh Tuladhar, General Secretary of CoE-Nepal presented a paper on "Management Response to Evaluation (MRE): Sharing Experience and Learning from Nepal". Dr. Tuladhar in his presentation shared the experience and learning from MRE study in Nepal focusing on Overall findings of the MRE study, Evolution of MRE index framework, and status of MRE index of State and Non-state organization in Nepal.

Representatives from ministries of Nepal, Parliamentarian Forum, National Planning Commission, UNDP, UNICEF, Asian Development Bank, Mercy Corps Nepal, CoE-Nepal, Nepal Evaluation Society, Equal Access Nepal, Nepal Red Cross Society, FECOFUN Nepal, and evaluation practitioners were participated in the meeting and shared their views, thoughts and suggestions in the meeting.

Finally, the meeting was concluded with the closing remarks by Mr. Ram Chandra Khanal, Vice Chairperson of CoE-Nepal. Mr. Khanal in his remarks said that this is the beginning and should continue the dialog further, and also highlighted the importance of knowledge and evidence based in decision making process.

Issues and challenges regarding M&E discussed – evaluation standards, good evaluation practices and utilization of evaluation findings

Current Situation (Strengths) of M&E in Nepal

- National M&E guidelines is available from 2013 under National Planning Commission
- Some other Acts/Rules/Regulations have provision for evaluation
- There is a Provision for revising guidelines
- The Result-based M&E (Logframe) is mandatory
- There is a provision for capacity building of Government of Nepal staff
- There is a practice of using of M&E results in decision-making
- There is a committed and knowledgeable leadership in Government of Nepal
- Provision for Third party involvement in evaluation
- The Tribhuwan University of Nepal has started evaluation course under the Faculty of Education
- Interest of policy makers (parliamentarian) in the national policy of M&E
- There is growing realization of necessity of sound M&E in the GON
- Active evaluation network in the GON

Challenges of M&E in Nepal

- No specific Acts/Rules/Regulation for evaluation is available in Nepal
- Less value and priority given to evaluation
- Environment for quality evaluation should be build
- The available guidelines focus only on government M&E, anddoes not covers for other sectors
- Absence of high level political commitment
- Personal interest based environment
- Weak coordination between government agencies
- No specific M&E training for M&E staff

- No adequate M&E training received by M&E staff
- Indicator-based monitoring Not enough