

May 2014

Evaluation Report of:

Catalytic Support on Land Issues

Author:

Fanny Dufvenmark,
The International Migration Law Unit (IOM)



IOM organized a focus group discussion with representatives from the Land Rights Forum in Belbari in the beginning of April, 2014.



UN HABITAT



Abbreviations

CPA	Comprehensive Peace Agreement
CSRC	Community for Self Reliance Centre
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DAO	District Administration Office
DCC	District Coordination Committee
GoN	Government of Nepal
IOM	International Organization for Migration
LPC	Local Peace Committee
LRIMS	Land Records Information Management System
MIS	Management Information System
MoLRM	Ministry for Land Reform and Management
MoPR	Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NLRF	National Land Rights Forum
NPTF	Nepal Peace Trust Fund
PUNO	Participating United Nations Organization
SOLA	Solutions for Open Land Administration
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UN-Habitat	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
UNPFN	United Nations Peace Fund for Nepal
UNPBF	United Nations Peacebuilding Fund
WDO	Women Development Office

Executive Summary

Land issues have existed for centuries and are deeply entrenched in the Nepalese society and linked to the structures of feudal land ownership and informal land tenure. Land issues are recognized as one of the root causes of the 10-year conflict. If left unaddressed, these issues could have adverse effects on the peace consolidation, political stabilization and socio-economic development of Nepal.

Recognizing the importance of addressing land issues in Nepal for sustainable peace and in accordance with the priorities mentioned in the interim constitution and the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), IOM, UNDP and UN-Habitat, as participating UN organizations (PUNOs), have come together with their technical expertise to address the highly sensitive land issues with impartiality and neutrality. The Catalytic Support on Land Issues Project is a two years project starting 15 March 2013, and financed by the UN Peace-building Fund, a global UN multi-donor trust fund supported by over 50 international donors and managed through the UN Peace Fund for Nepal. The PUNOs will work together with the concerned ministries of Government of Nepal (GoN) and other stakeholders to achieve their outcomes.

This report is the result of an internal evaluation conducted by a migration law expert from IOM HQ, Geneva and provides a compilation of findings and recommendations following a field visit in April, 2014. The evaluation looks at the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the project. Some of the strengths of the project include but are not limited to: the participation of all stakeholders, the excellent relationship among the PUNOs, between the PUNOs and MoLRM as well as with the donor, and a strong national ownership of the project. Some of the recommendations made in the report are: improved and strengthened efforts with political parties, increased participation of women, improved communication between the project and the land offices as well as to find a sustainable solution to one of the outcomes that is currently off track. With the exception of some concerns following the evaluation, the overall opinion is that the project satisfies relevance, effectiveness and sustainability.

Overview of the Project

Despite the political and democratic progress since the end of the conflict in 2006, Nepal continues to face multiple problems related to land. Exploitation of the landless tillers by land owners, a feudal system of land tenure, and a lack of political commitment and stability are the major factors which have contributed to a disruption of social cohesion within the Nepalese society. Moreover, the lack of automation of necessary land related data and a robust land information system, and knowledge on who has what rights to land and property in the districts, as well as the lack of institutional capacities has exacerbated the problem of land rights and access in Nepal. Finally, the weak institutional capacities in the districts, inability of existing mechanisms to deal with land disputes in a systematic and transparent manner and complex legal framework with more than 60 laws and policies on land, land rights and land use which are often repetitive and contradictory add to the already complex issues surrounding land reform in Nepal.

Recognizing the importance of addressing land issues in Nepal for sustainable peace and in accordance with the priorities mentioned in the interim constitution and the CPA, IOM, UNDP and UN-Habitat have come together with their technical expertise to initiate addressing the highly sensitive land issues.

The project targets several of the issues outlined above and it- aims to: 1, support consensus-building among Nepal's leaders to embark on land reform. As the issue is highly politicized and sensitive in the Nepali context, the project has sought to engage with key stakeholders including major political parties with a discrete and careful approach. 2, provide capacity building and technical assistance for Central, District, Village Development Committee and Municipality Level Land Use Implementation Committees to collect and analyze land-related data and prepare Land Use Plans in their prioritized areas in three districts. 3, prepare a draft unified land regulatory framework. The unified and comprehensive regulatory framework drafted will contribute towards the first step of drafting a proposed integrated land act by the GoN. The project through a participatory manner, desk research and stakeholders consultations, identifies gaps, overlaps and contradictions in the legal land regime to eventually produce one conciliated document. 4, assess and enhance land information systems in the three selected districts, and 5, improve capacity to resolve land issues in three target district by ensuring that the land officers are trained on dispute resolution, conflict management and reconciliation mechanisms as well as other important issues such as gender, to enhance capacities to resolve land issues. This will contribute to peacebuilding at the district level.

Objective and Methodology of the Evaluation

Objective of the evaluation

This evaluation is a mid-term assessment required by the UNPFN for all projects over US\$500,000. To ensure transparency and receive an external outlook and input on the project, the project team at IOM Nepal chose to request another colleague from IOM's International Migration Law Unit to carry out an evaluation of two IOM project rather than carrying out an self-evaluation. The evaluation focuses on the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the project in the current context of Nepal. In preparation for the evaluation ToR was drafted by the project team in consultation with the evaluator. The objectives of the mid-term assessment were to:

- o Reflect on the theory of change in original project proposal and assess whether activities and expected results remain valid;
- o Document lessons learned / good practices with regards to peace-building in Nepal and provide recommendations on how the project's contribution to the peace process could be strengthened, and;
- o Elaborate project's "exit strategies"

In addition, the evaluator was to examine the execution of project activities and achievements against the project's log frame and the UNPBF results framework; assess the project's overall contribution to peace building by preparing Nepal's leaders to progressively resolve land issues and establish mechanisms to facilitate this change; and examine the project's contribution in peace building process in Nepal.

Evaluation Methodology

Desk review and background research

In preparation of the evaluation all of the project documents (e.g. result matrix, quarterly and annual progress reports) and other relevant documents (e.g. UNPFN's guidance note on mid-term assessments) were reviewed in order to get familiar with the project, identify success and potential weaknesses, and draft questionnaires. These documents were all submitted to the project team in Nepal. In addition, independent research was carried out on the more general situation Nepal following the conflict with a particular focus on issues related to land faced by women and other marginalized groups.

Field visits

Between the 2nd and the 8th of April, 2104, the evaluator travelled from IOM's headquarters in Geneva to Nepal in order to meet with the project team directly as well as conducting structured interviews with the various stakeholders of the project. Individual questionnaires were prepared previous to the fieldwork and later used and adapted – when needed – for all interviews.

Structured interviews with direct and indirect beneficiaries and implementing partners

During the first day in Nepal, an informal meeting was conducted with the project team including representatives from IOM, UNDP and UN-Habitat as well as with the project's focal point at the Department of Survey. On the following day, the evaluator travelled to Morang and Jhapa together with two colleagues from IOM Nepal, including the Program Coordinator of the project, to meet with representatives from the Land Reform, Survey and Revenue offices in Biratnagar and Belbari as well as with the Land Rights Forum in Belbari. These interviews were held as focus groups in Nepali and interpretation was provided by the colleagues from IOM Nepal. Upon return to Kathmandu interviews were held with the representatives from the National Land Use Project, the Joint Secretary and focal point within MoLRM, the Director of the Nepal Peace Trust Fund (NPTF), and with the donor counterpart. All of these interviews were held in English mainly without any need for interpretation. Additionally, the evaluator sat in during a meeting between the political parties organized by UNDP. This meeting was held in Nepali and interpretation was provided for.

Problems encountered

The interviews conducted in Morang and Jhapa were for obvious reasons more challenging as they were held in a language that the interviewer does not speak. Nevertheless, the Program Coordinator was very helpful in interpreting and the evaluator managed to gather sufficient information for the evaluation. It is possible that some information was lost in translation, as answers were often summarized in the interest of time.

A problem encountered in Kathmandu was that the Joint Secretary of NPTF only had 15 minutes instead of one hour as scheduled to do the interview and thus the evaluator had to select the most relevant questions and drop other less, yet still relevant, questions.

Additionally, instead of conducting an interview with the political parties, a meeting was organized to demonstrate a typical engagement between the political parties and project, thus no questions could be asked directly to the focal points of the political parties. All this noting that it is a sensitive and complex process to deal with political parties on land issues.

Results of the evaluation

Findings of the Project:

Need for Land related project: Throughout the evaluation it became clear that there was a strong link between the conflict in Nepal and the issues related to land, which was also acknowledged in the CPA.¹ Nevertheless, there are no other projects or programmes which are aimed at facilitating land reform by working with all stakeholders involved from the political parties and MoLRM to local NGOs and victims groups. Although it is clear that two years will not be sufficient in order to bring about a major change in the system, it can certainly lay the ground work and hopefully, if funding is allocated, it can continue and provide support the environment for eventual land reform. The need for the project combined with the fact that no similar projects are currently being implemented gives IOM, UNDP, and UN-Habitat a leading role in this area of peace-building.

Participatory approach: Already in the project proposal, the importance of using a participatory approach throughout the project implementation was highlighted. The project has met with various stakeholders such as heads of former land reform commissions, land focal persons of the political parties and major civil society actors to establish and maintain a dialogue on land issues. Additionally the project has sought to involve NGOs such as Community Self Reliance Centre (CSRC), National Land Rights Forum (NLRF) and other local NGOs working on land Rights and land reform in some of the consultations and meetings to discuss land issues. In particular, the project conducted a context analysis exercise in the beginning of the project where NGOs for the first time were able to jointly identify issues with UN agencies. The overall perception from the evaluation is that these activities have provided an environment allowing all stakeholders to participate freely and meaningfully. The project will continue using a participatory approach for future activities. This is likely to benefit the project and is particularly important in relations to the consultations on the draft legal framework.

Good relationships among PUNOs, with MoLRM as well as with donor counterparts: It is clear that the liaison among the implementing partners (IOM, UNDP, UN-Habitat) have been productive and successful from the beginning and no apparent issues were identified during the field visit or from the quarterly or annual reports. Furthermore, the relationship between the project implementers and the MoLRM is very good with regular communication and cooperation. Throughout the field visit it was evident that MoLRM is very pleased with the collaboration with IOM, UNDP and UN-Habitat. A good relationship with MoLRM is essential for

¹ See para. 3.7. To adopt the policy to implement scientific land reform program by ending feudalistic system of land holding; and para .3.10. To adopt policy to provide land and other economic protection to landless squatters, Kamaiya, Halia, Harwa, Charwa and economically backward section.

the project to reach its results and also increases the chances for the beneficial impact of project to be sustainable. From the outset, the project has also had a successful and constructive relationship with the donor's focal point. This collaborative relationship provides transparency to the project and the guidance from the donor has proven to be highly valuable for the project team.

PUNOs bring different expertise: A great strength of the project is that it is implemented by three agencies/organizations with different areas of expertise in relation to peace-building and land programming. This allows the project to comprehensively address the issues related to land by engaging in dialogues with the political parties, supporting legal changes, as well as providing actual technical expertise and capacity building at a district and community level. Furthermore, the fact that IOM, UNDP, and UN-Habitat work together brings a lot of credibility to the project and highlights the importance of finding a sustainable solution to the issues related to land in Nepal.

Strong national ownership: The MoLRM has been involved from the beginning of the project and has been consulted throughout the planning and asked to participate in all activities that have taken place up to this point. Additionally, the project aims at facilitating a dialogue and discussion among the political parties as well as involving NGOs and civil society actors working on land rights issues. Involving the national key stakeholders directly in the project strengthens the national ownership of the project, which in turns increases the chances of a long-term and sustainable result of the project.

An innovative project: The project is very unique in that it takes on a mediating role and aims at reducing tension by engaging stakeholders in a dialogue about land problems in Nepal. It aims to do so by encouraging discussion among the political parties to find some sort of common ground in relation to the shared terminology and agenda on land. At the same time, the project provides assistance in more practical areas such as support in land use planning as well as compiling the existing relevant legislation in one legal framework. Moreover, the project is pioneering in that it, rather than only interacting at a central national level, interacts with local NGOs at a district level and involving them in the discussion about future land reform. Given the need for a project like this one and the exceptionality of it, it would be unfortunate if the project could not continue as a phase II.

Recommendations

Improve and strengthen the efforts with political parties: As also indicated in the quarterly and annual reports, it is evident that there has not been much progress for the activities under

outcome 1.² This largely was due to the political uncertainty related to the constitutional crisis, and then later in the year due to the November national elections. Despite the fact that, during this time, the situation was very politically sensitive and the project team was asked to pause engagement with the political parties, it would have been beneficial to inform the political parties of the advancement of the project (for instance by emails or newsletters) to keep the land issue on the political agenda. Since then, a public panel discussion seeking to map party positions on land reform issues has been held. Individual meetings with key land focal points from the major political parties and key civil society land experts have been held for their buy in on the project, and to prepare grounds for strategic engagement with the stakeholders, and during the field visits the evaluator sat in on a meeting between the project team and representatives from the political parties.

Way forward: It is evident that this outcome is the most challenging one to achieve however, now with new Constituent Assembly members on board it is a good opportunity for the project to involve the policy makers in highlighting the land issues. In order to be able to reach the results under outcome 1, it is important to start organizing more regular meetings with the focal points for the political parties and provide them with concrete points of discussion beforehand to avoid lengthy and repetitive political statements. In relation to output 1.1³ it would be good to suggest vocabulary and technical terms as a basis for the discussion rather than gathering this from the meetings. It is also suggested that meeting reports are produced after each meeting in order to analyse the areas where agreement could be possible and where more discussion is needed. These reports will also assist in keeping the following meetings on track and prevent to discuss the same issues twice. Although acknowledged that these issues have to be dealt with in a sensitive manner, there also has to be more concrete action taken and more pressure needs to be put on the political parties in order for this outcome to be achieved by the end of this project.

Increase participation of women and strengthen the gender perspective: From the result matrix it is apparent that real efforts have been made by the project to involve women in the project and the result matrix was revised in order to be more gender sensitive. Additionally, the project has actively sought the opinions and views of women. Nevertheless, the ratio of men participating in the activities of the project has been



© Fanny Dufvenmark

Focus group with the Land Rights Forum in Belbari, April, 2014.

² Outcome 1: Nepal's leaders have agreed on a set of principles to embark on national land reform.

³ Output 1.1: Nepal's leaders have developed shared vocabulary on land and property issues that contributes to the national implementation plan for land reform

consistently and significantly higher than women. For many of the outcomes and outputs of this project, it will be necessary to involve various groups of women into the consultations in order to identify their particular issues and needs in relation to land depending on other grounds than sex, e.g. caste, ethnic groups etc. This will be particularly important for the drafting of the legal framework because if it is not addressed in the draft produced by the project it is unlikely that it will ever be included in the legal framework.

Way forward: Continue to make real efforts to include as many women as possible for the consultations. Some measures that could increase the participation of women are: inform the potential participants well ahead so that they can make arrangements, provide childcare during the consultations or meetings to assist the women who cannot leave their children back home. For the legal framework, make sure that the consultant asks for input from NGOs, CSOs and local groups working on issues that women face in relation to land and that they are involved in the drafting and not just during the consultations. Even though outcome 3⁴ can be seen as a purely technical assistance activity, it is vital that this process is gender sensitive as the framework can directly address the land-related issues women and marginalized groups face and provide them with legal protection.

Find a solution for outcome 4: As indicated in the annual report, the activities under outcome 4⁵ have had to stop as there has been a delay in the implementation of SOLA by the MoLRM and it is now uncertain as to which MIS will be used. One option suggested by the MoLRM is to try two of these (LRIMS and SOLA) simultaneously to see which one is best. However, not only will this option be confusing for the staff of the land offices but it will also be duplication of resources. If a solution is not found to this problem it is very likely that it will have a negative impact on the project.

Way forward: Continue communicating with the MoLRM about the issue but inform them that a decision has to be made in the next few months about whether or not this outcome should be revised. If the outcome is changed completely there may be a good idea to allocate some of the budget to outcome 5⁶ and conduct more trainings as it became clear during the interviews that many of the stakeholders found these trainings to be extremely useful. In addition, provide training not only for the district officials but go back to the original idea suggested in the project proposal and provide training for Local Peace Committees (LPCs), the Women Development Office (WDO), the District Administration Office (DAO) as well as for CSOs and NGOs. The modules would obviously have to be modified but if the project could

⁴ Outcome 3: Draft unified land regulatory framework adopted

⁵ Outcome 4 : Land information systems in three districts assessed and enhanced

⁶ Outcome 5: Improved capacity to resolve land issues in the three target districts

further empower CSOs, NGOs and victims groups that would be highly beneficial for the indirect beneficiaries to the project.

Improve communication with the Land Offices: During the field visit it became evident that there was some gap in the communication between the District Land Offices and the MoLRM about the project and some of them had very limited knowledge about how the project will benefit them. As these offices are implementing partners to the project it is essential that they are informed and updated about the project and its activities in order for the project to be successful and sustainable.

Way forward: Try to keep a regular and more frequent communication with the relevant district land offices even when there are not many updates to brief them about so that they feel more included in project. As one of the problems that the Land Offices experience is the transfer of staff it is important that the project team provides easily accessible information about the project for new staff coming into the land offices e.g. brochures or info notes. Please note however that this information has to be easy to understand for outsiders and should provide information about the relevant parts of the project for the land offices only.



Land Survey and Revenue Offices in Belbari, April, 2014. © Fanny Dufvenmark

Conclusion: Relevance, Effectiveness, Sustainability

The definitions of relevancy, effectiveness, and sustainability are those used by the Development Assistance Committee within the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD-DAC)

Relevance

"The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries" requirements, country needs global priorities and partners" and donors" policies."

Considering that land was a central feature of Nepal's decade-long conflict it is obvious that this is an issue that has to be dealt with as part of the peace building process in the country. In that context, the overall objectives⁷ of the project are highly relevant. Moreover, the project addresses some of the main areas of concern in relation to land in Nepal, as for example the lack of political agreement and insufficient will among the main parties on land reform, little and inadequate quality of official data on land, contradictory and complex regulatory framework, and the lack of capacity to deal with disputes over land. As the project targets all of these problems rather than focusing on a particular one, it addresses the needs of the country in a comprehensive and holistic manner.

The only part of the project where relevance is questioned is the activities in relation to SOLA. What is also missing in relation to this outcome is a capacity building activity for using the new system. It became evident from the interviews that any modernization of the system must include training on how to use the new system. It is thus highly recommended that there is phase two to actually implement and roll out SOLA further in additional districts in order to include further capacity building activities.

Effectiveness

"The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance."

As mentioned above, there are definitely concerns about the progress in relation to outcome 1 and whether or not this will be achievable by the end of the project. Nevertheless, more progress has been made this year and the project team has a concrete

⁷ UNPFN Strategic Outcome: Nepal's leaders are prepared to develop a national transition plan for implementation of land reform and property return; and, Project Peace-Building Impact: Contention over land reform and land management issues reduced at the national and district levels

plan for the next year on how to engage with the political parties. As many of the issues related to land are very politicized and sensitive, this outcome is clearly the most challenging part of the project. Nevertheless, without a commitment from the political leaders it is highly unlikely that the project will be able to eventually reach its Strategic Outcome: *Nepal's leaders are prepared to develop a national transition plan for implementation of land reform and property return.*

One part of the project that has so far not been effective is outcome 4⁸ for the reasons already mentioned above. At this point, it is difficult to see how this can be achieved so it is suggested that the outcome is revised.

For all of the other outcomes, despite slight delays due to external factor, they are on track and as long as all of the national counterparts respect the deadlines so that the project team can go ahead and organize the various activities for the project, there are no reasons, except those mentioned, for why this project would not achieve its results on time.

Sustainability

"The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time."

From all of the stakeholder interviews it is very clear that the issue of land reform and property return has to be resolved before any peace process in Nepal can be sustainable and as already mentioned, this project certainly targets some of important aspects of land reform. However, it is not realistic to believe that two years will be sufficient for the project to provide sustainable benefits as land related issues are diverse and have been a problem in Nepal for centuries. The project definitely has the potential to bring about great change if it continues to support land reform as a phase II. Considering the political instability in Nepal and the sensitivity of these topics it would be important to continue the assistance to GoN to ensure that a transparent and just land reform takes place eventually. For example, to work towards a consensus among the political parties in relation to land can of course have a very positive and sustainable impact for a land reform in the future. However, this consensus may be at risk of coming to an end after the project unless there is still an organization or a mechanism that continues to facilitate a dialogue to maintain the consensus. Similarly for the regulatory legal framework, the project has just been asked to deliver the draft. As with all activities related to drafting legislation and policy, it is impossible to measure the potential sustainability of these activities. The draft could have a great sustainable impact if it is adopted and implemented however it is beyond the

⁸ Land information systems in three districts assessed and enhanced

control of the project and the draft may never be adopted and/or it may be changed to the extent that it does not correspond to the draft produced by the project. For the 24 month period of the project, the capacity building activities under both outcome 2⁹ and outcome 5¹⁰ are likely to be the undertakings that deliver the most sustainable beneficial impact as they directly deal with the beneficiaries who in turn will hopefully continue to apply what they have learnt. In order to increase the sustainability of these activities, it would be suggested to do more ToT activities.

⁹ Central, District, Village Development Committee and Municipality level Land Use Implementation Committees collect and analyze related data and prepare Land Use Plans in their prioritized areas in three districts

¹⁰ Capacity of institutions to reduce land issues strengthened and awareness for women's issues related to land increased through trainings

ANNEX II: Terms of Reference for the Evaluation

International Organization for Migration

Internal Mid Term Assessment

Role: To assess the “**Catalytic Support on Land Issues**” Project.

Duration: 7 working days

Background

A decade-long conflict in Nepal ended in November 2006 with the signing of a Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) between the Maoists and the Government of Nepal. Despite the political and democratic progress since the end of the conflict, Nepal continues to face multiple land issues. Land issues have existed for centuries and are deeply entrenched in the Nepalese society and linked to the structures of feudal land ownership and informal land tenure. Land issues are recognized as one of the root causes of the 10-year conflict. If left unaddressed, these issues could have adverse effects on the peace consolidation, political stabilization and socio-economic development of Nepal.

Recognizing the importance of addressing land issues in Nepal for sustainable peace and in accordance with the priorities mentioned in the interim constitution and the CPA, IOM, UNDP and UN Habitat have come together with their technical expertise to address the highly sensitive land issues with impartiality and neutrality. With financial support from the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (UNPBF), the joint project *Catalytic Support on Land Issues* was launched in March 2013 with an aim to unpack land issues in small steps that are not particularly contentious and ultimately lead to a holistic and meaningful future land reform.

Organizational Context

Under the direct supervision of the Chief of Mission of IOM and Program Coordinator, the evaluator will be responsible for the internal mid-term assessment of the “*Catalytic Support on Land Issues*” project, including assessing and examining the achievements, results under the project till date and their contribution to the peace-building process in Nepal. During the assignment, the evaluator will work closely with the staff of IOM, UNDP and UN Habitat in Kathmandu.

Objectives of Mid Term Assessment

- Reflect on the theory of change in original project proposal; assess whether activities and expected results remain valid
- Document lessons learned / good practices with regards to peace-building in Nepal and provide recommendations on how the project’s contribution to the peace process could be strengthened

- Further elaborate project's 'exit strategies'

Duties and Responsibilities

The main duties of the consultant will include:

- Examine the execution of “*Catalytic Support on Land Issues*” project activities and achievements against the project’s log frame and the UNPBF results framework;
- Assess the project’s overall contribution to peace building by preparing Nepal’s leaders to progressively resolve land issues and establish mechanisms to facilitate this change. This assessment will be conducted using the following analytical frameworks: the results framework and UNPBF Performance Management plan;
- Assess overall performance of the *Catalytic Support on Land Issues* project in terms of technical, financial management and its processes;
- Analyze the project’s contribution to the following three areas:
 1. Strategic Contribution to peace-building in Nepal
 2. Approach to peace-building
 3. Complementarity to national mechanisms and priorities

Expected Output

- A draft of the internal mid-term assessment report, including an executive summary and recommendations (electronic version);
- A final report to be presented to IOM Nepal. The report should make a clear distribution between findings, conclusions and recommendations and it should be between no more than 10 pages excluding annexes.

Methodology

- Field visit
- Structured interviews with beneficiaries
- Interview/ meetings with key stakeholders and partners
- Desk review of project documents and other relevant literature.

ANNEX III: Questionnaires

Questionnaire for Project Team IOM

Introduction	
• Could you please introduce yourself?	
• What is your role in the project?	

Outcome 3	
Draft unified land regulatory framework adopted	
• Has someone been hired as a legal consultant? • If yes, who has been hired? • Do you think that the selection process was fair and transparent?	
• What was the reason for the delay in hiring the legal consultant? • Has this had a negative impact on the achievement of outcome 3? • In your opinion was this negative impact mitigated by a solution implemented by the team?	

Output 3.1	
Comprehensive and integrated draft regulatory framework on land prepared	
• Have some of the technical consultations with relevant stakeholders including women for the development of the legal framework taken place? • How are these distinguished from the workshop?	
• How will you/have you ensured that relevant stakeholders include women? • Who are the women that you are targeting and how do you ensure that the environment is enabling and that they can express themselves freely during these consultations?	
• How do you ensure that the most marginalized groups (e.g women from rural areas) can participate in these consultations?	

Outcome 4	
Land information systems in three districts assessed and enhanced	
• In your last annual report you reported that you	

were off track with this outcome, how has this been addressed and has it improved? (are more of the outputs on track?)	
• Do you foresee any problems with the GoN piloting two MIS (SOLA and LRMIS)?	

Outcome 5 Improved capacity to resolve land issues in the three target districts	
Output 5.1 Capacity of institutions to reduce land issues strengthened and awareness for women's issues related to land increased through trainings	
• The baseline in the matrix only mentioned low level about land issues but what was the level of understanding of women's issues and was this assessed?	
• Why was it decided to possibly involve Land Management Training Centre as a collaborator • Why would this be beneficial?	
• Of the 200 officials that you are planning to train, how many do you expect to be women?	

UNPFN	
• What were the reasons for the changes in the result matrix? • Do you feel like the new matrix better reflect the strategic peace building impact/outcome and theory of change?	

General	
• How would you assess the collaboration among the various agencies?	
• How would you assess your collaboration and communication with the Nepalese government?	
• How would you assess their involvement in the implementation?	
• In particular if you are responsible to deal with one particular ministry or Governmental entity?	
• Do you feel that, to date, all stakeholders are on board to discuss Land Reform issues in Nepal? (Outcome 3 in A.R states mixed opinions related to the legal framework within MoLRM)	
• Do you feel like the current partnerships will allow land reforms to be sustainable in the long term?	
• Are these partners ready for an hand-over in a	

year?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In your opinion, what was the impact of the November 2013 Constituent Assembly election on the project? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the project proposal you identified 6 potential risk sand mitigating strategies, have any of these risks become a reality If yes, has the identified mitigating strategies been effective? Have you identified new risks and MS? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you feel like this project remains relevant to the current situation in Nepal? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have you faced any funding gap? If yes, why? And how was this addressed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Throughout this project, how do you ensure the participation of indirect beneficiaries such as women and vulnerable groups? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have you been trained on Security Council resolutions 1325 and 1820? Do you feel like there is a good gender balance in the project team? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In your opinion, is the project sufficiently sensitive to gender, conflict and inclusion? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In your opinion what has worked and what has not worked in this project? Can you tell me lessons learned and good practices? 	

Questionnaire for Project Team UN-Habitat

Introduction	
• Could you please introduce yourself?	
• What is your role in the project?	

Outcome 2	
Central, District, Village Development Committee and Municipality level Land Use Implementation Committees collect and analyze related data and prepare Land Use Plans in their prioritized areas in three districts	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why were your outcome and outputs completely changed? • You added as an outcome indicators “access of women and vulnerable groups in land use planning” – you feel like this improved the gender-sensitivity of your outcome? • How do you do this? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Output 2.2</u> – You identified pilot areas in 3 project districts. Who selected these and what was the critiera? • Were local authorities present during the consultative process (participatory land use planning (PLUP))? • How did you ensure the participation aspect of it? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In your opinion, what was the impact of the November 2013 Constituent Assembly election on the project? • How was this mitigated? • How is the situation since the recent election? • Have field visits and district level participatory workshops to select VDC taken place since? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you feel like the mitigating strategies you identified in the project proposal were helpful in addressing the impact of the elections? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the annual report you mention that you are implementing activities simultaneously, which are these? • Do you manage this? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where are you standing on Output 2.6 Draft comprehensive legal framework for land use planning completed and disseminated? 	

UNPFN	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the reasons for the changes in the result matrix? 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you feel like the new matrix better reflect the strategic peace building impact and outcome and theory of change? 	
--	--

General	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would you assess the collaboration among the agencies? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would you assess your collaboration and communication with the Nepalese government? • How would you assess their involvement in the implementation? • In particular if you are responsible to deal with one particular ministry or Governmental entity? • Do you feel that, to date, all stakeholders are on board to discuss Land Reform issues in Nepal? (Outcome 3 in A.R states mixed opinions related to the legal framework within MoLRM) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you feel like the current partnerships will allow land reforms to be sustainable in the long term? • Are these partners ready for a hand-over in a year? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In your opinion, what was the impact of the November 2013 Constituent Assembly election on the project? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the project proposal you identified 6 potential risk sand mitigating strategies, have any of these risks become a reality • If yes, has the identified mitigating strategies been effective? • Have you identified new risks and MS? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you feel like this project remains relevant to the current situation in Nepal? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you faced any funding gap? • If yes, why? • And how was this addressed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Throughout this project, how do you ensure the participation of indirect beneficiaries such as women and vulnerable groups? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you been trained on Security Council resolutions 1325 and 1820? • Do you feel like there is a good gender balance in the project team? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In your opinion, is the project sufficiently sensitive to gender, conflict and inclusion? 	

- In your opinion what has worked and what has not worked in this project?
- Can you tell me lessons learned and good practices?

Questionnaire for Project Team UNDP

Introduction	
• Could you please introduce yourself?	
• What is your role in the project?	

Outcome 1	
Nepal's leaders have agreed on a draft national implementation plan for land reform	
• Why did the outcome change from "agree upon" to "embark on to embark on national land reform"?	
• In your opinion, what was the impact of the November 2013 Constituent Assembly election on the project? How was this mitigated?	
• How is the situation since the recent election?	

UNPFN	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the reasons for the changes in the result matrix? • Do you feel like the new matrix better reflect the strategic peace building impact and outcome and theory of change? 	

General	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would you assess your collaboration and communication with the Nepalese government? • How would you assess their involvement in the implementation process? • In particular if you are responsible to deal with one particular ministry or Governmental entity? • Do you feel that, to date, all stakeholders are on board to discuss Land Reform issues in Nepal? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you feel like the current partnerships will allow land reforms to be sustainable in the long term? • Are these partners ready for a hand-over in a year? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In your opinion, what was the impact of the November 2013 Constituent Assembly election on the project? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the project proposal you identified 6 potential risk sand mitigating strategies, have any of these risks become a reality? • If yes, has the identified mitigating strategies 	

been effective?	
• Have you identified new risks and MS?	
• Do you feel like this project remains relevant to the current situation in Nepal?	
• Have you faced any funding gap?	
• If yes, why?	
• And how was this addressed?	
• Throughout this project, how do you ensure the participation of indirect beneficiaries such as women and vulnerable groups?	
• Have you been trained on Security Council resolutions 1325 and 1820?	
• Do you feel like there is a good gender balance in the project team?	
• In your opinion, is the project sufficiently sensitive to gender, conflict and inclusion?	
• In your opinion what has worked and what has not worked in this project?	
• Can you tell me lessons learned and good practices?	

Questionnaire for Land Rights Forum

Introduction	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could you please introduce yourself? • Are you involved in the project and how? • What is your knowledge of the project? Do you feel like have properly been informed about the project? 	
General	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you been invited to participate in any of the activities (workshop, panel, trainings, etc.) organized in the context of this project? • If yes, have you participated in any of these activities yet? • In your opinion, could you participate freely and meaningfully? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you feel like this project is sufficiently gender-sensitive and focuses adequately on women's issues? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you feel like this project has identified from the beginning obstacles that women face in relation to land and property in Nepal? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you feel like this project is representative enough of women and other vulnerable groups in Nepal? • In your opinion does this project benefit women and marginalized group? • If not, how can it be improved? 	
<p>Do you feel like this project remains relevant to the current situation in Nepal?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In your opinion what has worked and what has not worked in this project? • Can you tell me lessons learned and good practices? 	
UNPFN	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you feel like this project can assist in preparing Nepal's leaders to progressively resolve land issues and establish mechanisms and thus strengthening the peace process in Nepal? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent do you believe it is fundamental to focus on women's issues in relation to land to achieve sustainable peace in Nepal? 	

Questionnaire for Local Peace Committees (LPCs)

Introduction	
• Could you please introduce yourself?	
• What is your role in the project?	

Outcome 1	
Nepal's leaders have agreed on a draft national implementation plan for land reform	
• Were you involved in the public panel involving political and civil society leaders?	
• If yes, were you satisfied? Did you feel like the panel was sufficiently participatory?	
• Will you be involved in any panels in the near future?	

UNPFN	
• Do you feel like this project can assist in preparing Nepal's leaders to progressively resolve land issues and establish mechanisms and thus strengthening the peace process in Nepal?	

General	
• Do you feel like this project remains relevant to the current situation in Nepal?	
• Do you see LPCs having an active role in land reform and land related discussions in Nepal?	
• Is the LPC involved in facilitating/resolving cases related to conflict era land and property return?	
• In your opinion what has worked and what has not worked in this project?	
• Can you tell me lessons learned and good practices?	

Questionnaire for MoLRM

Introduction	
• Could you please introduce yourself?	
• What is your role in the project?	

Outcome 2

Central, District, Village Development Committee and Municipality level Land Use Implementation Committees collect and analyze related data and prepare Land Use Plans in their prioritized areas in three districts

• What is your role in the implementation of this outcome?	
• When the participatory land use planning (PLUP) process was organized, how did you ensure the participation aspect of it?	
• Are you aware that outcome 2 of the project was modified?	
• If yes, why?	
• Are you satisfied with the modifications?	
• <u>Output 2.2</u> – You identified pilot areas in 3 project districts. Who selected these and what were the criteria?	
• In your opinion, what was the impact of the November 2013 Constituent Assembly election on the project?	
• How have you ensured that women and vulnerable groups participate in the Land Use Planning?	

Outcome 3

Draft unified land regulatory framework adopted

• Has someone been hired as a legal consultant?	
• If yes, who has been hired?	
• Are you satisfied with this person?	
• Were you satisfied with the half day workshop that took place last December 2013?	
• Did you feel that the workshop sufficiently included women's issues and dispute resolutions?	
• Do you believe that it will be feasible a draft unified land act to be presented to the government by the end of this project?	

Outcome 4

Land information systems in three districts assessed and enhanced

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the last annual report it was reported that this outcome was off track, are you satisfied with the response that was put in place by the project implementers? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two MIS (SOLA and LRMIS) are currently being piloted, why 2 MIS? Do you foresee any problems with this? 	

Outcome 5 Improved capacity to resolve land issues in the three target districts	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have you received the draft assessment report with key recommendations to address identified gaps and loop holes in the existing procedures? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How would you assess your involvement in the development of capacity-building modules? Do you feel like they will help officials to address land issues in a conflict and gender sensitive manner? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of the 1200 officials that you are planning to train, how many do you expect to be women? 	

UNPFN	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What were the reasons for the changes in the result matrix? Do you feel like the new matrix better reflect the strategic peace building impact and outcome and theory of change? 	

General	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How would you assess your collaboration with the various agencies (IOM/UNDP/UN-Habitat) and the project team? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you feel that, to date, all stakeholders are on board to discuss Land Reform issues in Nepal? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you feel like the current partnerships will allow land reforms to be sustainable in the long term? Have you identified any obstacles with regards to the handover in a year? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you feel like this project remains relevant to the current situation in Nepal? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In your opinion what has worked and what has not worked in this project? Can you tell me lessons learned and good practices? 	

Questionnaire for Project Team MoPR

Introduction	
• Could you please introduce yourself?	
• What is your role in the project?	

Outcome 1	
Nepal's leaders have agreed on a draft national implementation plan for land reform	
• How would you assess your role in conducting dialogue and discussions among various political actors and key stakeholders?	
• Were you satisfied with the public panel involving political and civil society leaders? Are any similar panels planned in the near future?	
• How was it ensured that this was participatory?	
• Where do political leaders and key stakeholders stand on the shared terminology and shared agenda on land reform?	
• Do you think it will be possible to achieve by the end of the project?	
• In your opinion, what was the impact of the November 2013 Constituent Assembly election on the project?	
• How is the situation since the recent election?	

Outcome 5	
Improved capacity to resolve land issues in the three target districts	
• How would you assess your involvement in the development of capacity-building modules?	
• Do you feel like they will help officials to address land issues in a conflict and gender sensitive manner?	
• Out of all the officials that the project is planning to train, how many do you expect to be women?	

UNPFN	
• What were the reasons for the changes in the result matrix?	
• Do you feel like the new matrix better reflect the strategic peace building impact and outcome and theory of change?	

General	
• How would you assess your collaboration with	

the various agencies (IOM/UNDP/UN-Habitat) and the project team?	
• Do you feel that, to date, all stakeholders are on board to discuss Land Reform issues in Nepal?	
• Do you feel like the current partnerships will allow land reforms to be sustainable in the long term?	
• Have you identified any obstacles with regards to the handover in a year?	
• Do you feel like this project remains relevant to the current situation in Nepal?	
• In your opinion what has worked and what has not worked in this project?	
• Can you tell me lessons learned and good practices?	

Questionnaire for Land Reform Office, Land Revenue Office, and Land Survey Office (Biratnagar and Belbari)

Introduction	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could you please introduce yourself? What is your role in the project? 	
Outcome 3 Draft unified land regulatory framework adopted	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did you take part in the half day workshop that took place last December 2013? If yes, were you satisfied? Did you feel that the workshop included women's issues and dispute resolutions? 	
Outcome 5 Improved capacity to resolve land issues in the three target districts	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did you find that the questionnaires you completed as part of this project were sufficiently relevant to assess your managerial, technical, financial and institutional capacities? Have you received any feedback on the draft assessment report based on the findings of your district? Do you think the capacity-building training can be helpful to strengthening the institutional knowledge and understanding on how to address land issues in a conflict and gender-sensitive manner? Out of all the officials that the project is planning to train, how many do you expect to be women? 	
UNPFN	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you feel like this project can assist in preparing Nepal's leaders to progressively resolve land issues and establish mechanisms and thus strengthening the peace process in Nepal? 	
General	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you feel like this project remains relevant to the current situation in Nepal? In your opinion what has worked and what has not worked in this project? Can you tell me lessons learned and good practices? 	

Questionnaire for National Land Use Project

Introduction	
• Could you please introduce yourself?	
• How are you involved in the project?	
• What is your knowledge of the project?	
• Do you feel like have properly been informed about the project?	

General	
• Have you been invited to participate in any of the activities (workshop, panel, trainings, etc.) organized in the context of this project?	
• If yes, have you participated in any of these activities yet?	
• How does this project relate to the National Land Use Policy 2012?	
• Do you feel like this project remains relevant to the current situation in Nepal?	
• In your opinion what has worked and what has not worked in this project?	
• Can you tell me lessons learned and good practices?	

UNPFN	
• Do you feel like this project can assist in preparing Nepal's leaders to progressively resolve land issues and establish mechanisms and thus strengthening the peace process in Nepal?	

Questionnaire for UNPFN

Introduction	
• Could you please introduce yourself?	
• As part of UNPFN how are you involved in this project?	
General	
Have you been invited to participate in any of the activities (workshop, panel, trainings, etc.) organized in the context of this project? If yes, have you participated in any of these activities yet?	
Do you feel like this project is sufficiently gender-sensitive and focuses adequately on women's issues? Has this been the case from the beginning or has it changed?	
In your opinion, have women and vulnerable groups been able to participate freely and meaningfully in this project?	
Do you feel like this project remains relevant to the current situation in Nepal?	
In your opinion does this project benefit women and marginalized group? If not, how can it be improved?	
In your opinion, what was the impact of the November 2013 Constituent Assembly election on the project? To your knowledge have implementing agencies put mitigating strategies in place? If yes, were you satisfied?	
In your opinion what has worked and what has not worked in this project? Can you tell me lessons learned and good practices?	
UNPFN	
Do you feel like this project can assist in preparing Nepal's leaders to progressively resolve land issues and establish mechanisms and thus strengthening the peace process in Nepal?	