

PROJECT EVALUATION LEARNING BRIEF

[10 December 2019]

This learning brief is a summary of the key findings, conclusions, and recommendations prepared by the [evaluator/evaluation team] for use by [list intended audience, including both type and name e.g. "the donor (Government of Japan)", "IOM project staff and management", etc.] Details on all of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations can be found in the full evaluation report.

Evaluation type: External independent final evaluation

Evaluator Nirmal Kumar Bishwakarma, PhD.
Independent Consultant

Evaluation visit: 21 November to 5 December, 2019

Final report: 10 December 2019

Commissioned by: [OM Mission in Nepal]

Managed by: [Jitendra Bohara, Project Manager]

Evaluation purpose: [To capture and document lessons learned and best practices from a completed set of activities of the project that could be replicated in similar context/projects that envisages of similar objective]

Evaluation criteria: [Relevance, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability"]

Evaluation methodology: [Document review, Consultative meeting, Interview, Focus Group Discussion.]

PROJECT SUMMARY

[This is about the final evaluation of the IOM project funded by USAID/OFDA. The name of the project is being evaluated is 'Technical Support to Government of Nepal to implement Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) Act. It was 15 months project ended in August 2019, with three months no cost extension. This project covers the seven provinces and the 14 selected urban and rural municipalities across the country. Main objective of the project is to contribute to the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act (2017) of establishment of a National Disaster Risk Reduction Nepal, These activities also contribute to the Climate and Management Authority (NDRRMA) following Change Policy (2019), and Local Government the DRRM Act. The project outputs are: 1. Operations act (2017). The project has achieved many Municipal Government have increased capacity for of the targets included in the project log-frame. In implementing DRM and post-disaster recovery, 2. addition, it has generated some intended positive Guidelines and by-laws relating to DRRM Act are effects at policy and regulation formulations, process of developed with wider solicitation and consensus DRRM integration into development sectors, from concerned stakeholders, and 3. Government, institutional arrangement at province and local level civil society, humanitarian actors and communities such as disaster management committee as well as are committed to support and advocate for the some practice level impacts that needs to be sustained implementation of the DRRM Act and NDMA in the future]

[Technical Support to Government of Nepal to implement Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) Act]

Geographical coverage: [Nepal]

Project type: [Disaster Management]

Project code: [720FDA18IO00029 NEPAL]

Project period: [May 2018 to August 2019]

Donor: [e.g., Government of Japan]

PROJECT EVALUATION LEARNING BRIEF

KEY FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS

[Summarize here the key findings and/or conclusions of the evaluation.]

GOOD PRACTICES

[Optional: List any good practices gathered during the evaluation, whether explicitly requested in the TOR or identified by the evaluator in the course of the evaluation.]

LESSONS LEARNED

[Optional: List any lessons learned gathered during the evaluation, whether explicitly requested in the TOR or identified by the evaluator in the course of the evaluation.]

[Continue content here from the left column, if needed. If not, delete this text box and move the recommendations to the top.]

[Note: All key findings/conclusions, good practices, lessons learned, and recommendations must fit on this one page. This is to ensure that only the most significant results are shared based on their relevance for the target audience.]

[If there is space, a photo could be added.]

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

[Summarize here the key recommendations relevant to the target audience. Recommendations can be organized by the audience category (as illustrated below), evaluation criteria, or by any other relevant categorization.]

Recommendations for [e.g., IOM project staff]:

1.XXX

2.XXX

Recommendations for [e.g., IOM senior management at the IOM Mission]:

1.XXX

2.XXX

Recommendations for [e.g., Migrant Assistance Division (MAD) at IOM Headquarters]:

1.XXX

2.XXX

Recommendations for [e.g., MAD thematic specialists]:

1.XXX

2.XXX

[If there is space, a photo could be added.]

