

# Role of Joint Evaluations as a Tool for Boosting Development Effectiveness Country System

**Asian Evaluation Week**

**Bangkok**

**12 September 2023**

**Gambhir Bhatta**

# Background Information on Local Governance and Community Development Program, Nepal

Final Document

- Dramatic political changes in Nepal
- Ground level realities of needing to strengthen local governance
- Shifting perceptions and interests of development partners
- Dimensions of working with multitude of partners and entities



GOVERNMENT OF NEPAL

MINISTRY OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT

LOCAL GOVERNANCE AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME  
(LGCDP)

Programme Document  
11 July 2008

## Summary of the Programme

<b>Project Period</b>	16 July 2008 – 15 July 2012 (4 years)
	Approach Period: June to July 15, 2008
	Inception Period: July 15, 2008 to Jan 15, 2009
<b>Executing Agency</b>	Ministry of Local Development
<b>Implementing Agencies</b>	Local Bodies (District Development Committees, Municipalities and Village Development Committees) through Community Organisations and NGOs
<b>Geographic Coverage</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• DDCs - 75 districts</li><li>• VDCs - 3915</li><li>• Municipalities - 58</li></ul>

**Flagship government program, with nation-wide and comprehensive coverage**

## Development Partners

- ADB
- DANIDA
- CIDA
- Dfid
- UN System (UNDP, UNICEF, UNCDF, UNFPA, UNV etc.)
- Government of Norway
- SDC
- GTZ
- JICA
- World Bank
- Government of Finland

## Financial Resources

- Government of Nepal US\$ 260.8 million (Block Grant Allocation to LBs)
- Donors commitment US\$ 161.5 million

**ADB's share: US\$106.3 million  
(25% of total funding)  
(66% of donors' commitment)**

# Government Perspectives of Working with Development Partners (DPs)

- Convincing DPs of the ambition, and ownership, of LGCDP
- Donor coordination issues from the onset – too many of them, and too varied approaches on engagement
- Managing the DPs was a problem; smaller ones sought a disproportionate share of input and attention
- No clear leader among DPs; ADB could not be convinced to take the lead
- Differences in how DPs would raise issues, as well as which issues to raise
- Disagreements with some DPs on talking of the ‘elephant in the room’
- Transaction costs to government to respond to the DPs’ request for information
- Benefitting from piggy-backing on ADB as the largest donor to get through tricky decisions
- “*Like herding cats*”, particularly on important tasks, eg, mid-term evaluation