

***Capacity Building of CBOs
for the Promotion of Transparency and Accountability
in RAIDP***

(a CARTA project)

BY

SKY Samaj Nepal

Project Office: Bagdole, Lalitpur

March 2014

TO

HELVETAS Intercooperation NEPAL

Dhobighat Lalitpur

Acronyms

BoQ	Bills of Quantity
CARTA	Citizens Action for Results, Transparency and Accountability
CBAS	Capacity Building and Advisory Services
CBO	Community Based Organization
CBPM	Community Based Performance Monitoring
CCO	Cluster Coordination Office
CEO	Community Enhancement Officer
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DDC	District Development Committee
DTO	District Technical Office
ESMF	Environmental and Social Management Framework
FGD	Focused Group Discussion
GGTE	Good Governance cum Training Expert
GHC	Grievance Hearing Committee
GoN	Government of Nepal
HDI	Human Development Index
LBT	Labour Based Tool kit
LDO	Local Development Officer
LRUC	Local Roads User Committee
NRDRC	National Resource Development and Research Center
PDE	Planning, Design and Supervision Engineer
PTF	Partnership for Transparency Fund
RAIDP	Rural Access Improvement and Decentralization Project
RIP	Rural Infrastructure Project
RQPE	Road Quality and Procurement Engineer
RTI	Rural Transport Infrastructure Improvement
SDC	Social Development Consultant
ToT	Training of Trainers
VDC	Village Development Committee
VRCC	Village Road Coordination Committee

Table of Contents

1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
2	Background	6
2.1	Description of RAIDP	6
2.2	Governance gaps and accountability issues addressed by the CARTA sub-project	6
2.3	CARTA Objectives	7
2.4	TOR with the implementing agency	7
2.5	CARTA project scope	8
3	Outcomes and Results:.....	9
4	Survey methodology and TPM tools	12
4.1	Baseline: methodology and findings	12
4.2	End survey: methodology and findings	13
4.3	Media	13
5	Project Management	14
5.1	Main problems and challenges encountered and the ways they were addressed	14
5.2	Sub-project sustainability	15
5.3	Dissemination of results and outcomes	15
6	Lessons learned and recommendations.....	16
6.1	Lessons learned	16
6.2	Recommendations	18
7	ANNEXES	20
7.1	Annex 1: Sub-Project Logical Framework.....	20
7.2	Annex 2: Sub-project Terms of Reference (ToR)	22
7.3	Annex 3: Participants of trainings for CEOs and Focal Persons.....	25
7.4	Annex 4: Summary information of district orientations	27
7.5	Annex 5: Baseline information collection format.....	28
7.6	Annex 6: Sub-Project Work Plan	30
7.7	Annex 7: Summary of Selected Road and Number of CBOs.....	31
7.8	Annex 8: Capacity building training schedule/content	32
7.9	Annex 9: Status of CBO Trainings	35
7.10	Annex 10: ToT schedule	36
7.11	Annex 11: Participants in ToT.....	38
7.12	Annex 12: IEC materials developed and distributed to CBOs.....	39
7.13	Annex 13: List of media mobilized in 16 districts	40
7.14	Annex 14: Number of CBOs' receiving LBTs and LBT equipment provided.....	41
7.15	Annex 15: Status of Grievances in Different Roads.....	42
7.16	Annex 16: Types of grievances	44
7.17	Annex 17: Case Studies	46

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the CARTA sub-project¹ was to strengthen the capacity of Community Based Organizations (CBOs) that monitor road construction projects under the World Bank financed “*Rural Access Improvement and Decentralization Project*” (RAIDP). Specifically, this CARTA sub-project focused on the following capacity building activities: increasing CBO knowledge of policy and principles mentioned in the RAIDP Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), explaining the roles and responsibilities of the CBO, building CBO skills to monitor construction work, contracts, and payments, and enabling CBOs to register valid grievances. The CBOs consisted mainly of three community-based, RAIDP committees: the Village Road Coordination Committee (VRCC), the Local Roads User Committee (LRUC), and the Grievance Hearing Committee (GHC). The 105 CBOs monitored 27 road construction projects in 16 of 30 RAIDP districts with results above expectations. The 15-month CARTA sub-project was implemented by SKY Samaj Nepal in coordination with the National Resource Development and Research Center (NRDRC), and 7 Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), along with technical inputs from HELVETAS and the Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF).

The CARTA project was initiated to resolve specific problems, including: the lack of institutionalized community monitoring, inadequate information on the role and responsibility of Village Road Coordination Committee (VRCC) and Local Roads User Committee (LRUC), limited understanding of civil works, a weak complaint mechanism, and the lack of user-friendly documents, particularly the Bill of Quantity (BoQ). The inability of members to understand the technical specification was one of the reasons why CBO members were discouraged from monitoring; consequently, many CBOs were not active. As part of the training, key technical issues were fully explained to CBO members, and a simple toolkit was provided that would enable the members to measure quality. The training also helped members understand quality levels according to the contract as opposed to their own expectations.

The overall results of this capacity-building CARTA sub-project were positive. Two surveys, baseline and completion, provide comparison data showing knowledge and skill levels before and after the training interventions. After the project ended in December 2013, the completion survey in January 2014 showed that 97% of CBO members had knowledge of ESMF, (compared to the baseline: 28%); 92% of CBO members had knowledge on quality of civil work and community monitoring methods, (baseline: 26%); 100% of CBOs had received contract documents, (baseline: 27%); information boards were displayed for 96% of roads (baseline: 60%); and, the responsibility for monitoring civil works was assigned to members in 84% of CBOs (baseline: 0%).

The grievance process also improved: 89% of the registered grievances were now being addressed. Prior to the CARTA sub-project there were only verbal grievances; the DDC had no records of types, quantity or status. As a result of the capacity-building, the number of valid, written grievances increased, which generated more frequent monitoring visits by Local Development Officers (present head of DDC) and District Technical Officer to resolve grievances locally at the request of those CBOs. This increased involvement improved local level coordination among stakeholders, and helped to sort out the grievances in a harmonious manner. By the end of the sub-project, there were 187 grievances registered overall during the sub-project duration, out of which 86 (46%) were related to quality issues in civil works. Only 32 grievances were not resolved at local level, and these have been registered to the DDCs.

¹ *Capacity Building of CBOs for the Promotion of Transparency and Accountability in RAIDP*

² The LBT toolkit includes simple measurement devices to assess the thickness of the roadway surface, camber, distances and the size of the gabion holes.

There were several factors that led to an improvement in an individual member's participation in monitoring. First, monitoring levels appear to depend on members' perceptions of their own self-efficacy, which was based on their enhanced knowledge and skill levels in understanding their roles, and in the use of tools (especially the simple Labour-Based Toolkits² [LTB] introduced to enable CBOs to measure some physical aspects of road works). Increased knowledge and skills enhanced confidence levels, resulting in more participation. Still there were variations in monitoring levels between CBOs, even though all members received the same training, which leads to the premise that there are other factors that contributed to the different levels of monitoring activity. Variations appear to be correlated with three factors: the timing of the capacity-building intervention by the CARTA sub-project, the location of more communities adjacent to the road construction (population density), and the geographic region. In general, CBOs participated at higher levels of monitoring when they received knowledge and skills trainings at the beginning of the road improvement work; when the roads being monitored passed through communities, rather than through unsettled areas; and, when the CBOs were located in the hill regions rather than in the Terai. This last correlation would need more study to determine the underlying reasons. Overall, not surprisingly, it appears that the more the community has informed, timely input in the construction cycle, and the more the road is considered important to more members of the community, the higher the monitoring participation levels.

The program activities included training, material development (manuals) and media events to raise awareness of the need for community involvement. Trainers were trained and they in turn trained CBO members. CBO training consisted of one 7-day training for three members of the CBO, in the use of materials such a training manual, and Labour-Based Tools (LBT). In addition there were periodic field visits by sub-project staff to provide advice and support. There was also a 5-day training for sub-project cluster coordinators (regional program managers), who would provide ongoing technical support. Media events included radio broadcasts and printed materials to build support and raise awareness. Several social-accountability tools were used to inform communities: in addition to radio notices and reports, the sub-project used surveys, posters, and focus-group meetings to improve transparency and raise accountability. An important adjustment relatively early during sub-project implementation was the introduction of LBT kits, which greatly enhanced the members' confidence. Several lessons were learned during this 15-month project:

- ◆ More “refresher” training for CBO members would support knowledge and skill retention. Using adult-learning education principles to train community members improves performance—a manual is insufficient.
- ◆ Stakeholders' early involvement creates commitment, which can be sustained beyond the project.
- ◆ Meaningful community mobilization is the cornerstone of success.
- ◆ There has to be capacity building of community members to ensure contextualized tracking. Low confidence levels were believed to be a cause for low participation. When the sub-project provided LBTs, and oriented CBOs in their use, community monitoring became more regular.
- ◆ Investing in the organizational development of new CBOs enables them to become effective. New CBOs, created by the project, are found to be less self-sufficient, and more dependent on the project.

² The LBT toolkit includes simple measurement devices to assess the thickness of the roadway surface, camber, distances and the size of the gabion holes.

- ♦ The media has a role as “watch-dog” to promote good governance. The media was an important vehicle to set the agenda, to expose malpractices (of government, civil society or private sector), and to counter prejudices, thus contributing to community empowerment.
- ♦ User-friendly, simple documents work well with the CBOs. The inability to understand the technical specifications reduced confidence that led to lower participation.

Based on their analysis of the grievance process, the implementing CSO, SKY Samaj, recommended greater decentralization of authority to District Technical Office (DTO), and to the GHCs, so that they would be empowered to make decisions, and then held accountable for their actions. Their roles should be expanded to enable quicker resolution of issues. Finally, while the LBT tool was a crucial factor in improved monitoring, there are times when technical personnel need to be regularly available on site during peak construction periods to help sort out CBOs’ issues and seek timely solutions.

There is evidence that the project training appears to be sustainable, based on the transfer of the knowledge and skills using the LBT toolkit to communities who would like to monitor their own road projects outside of CARTA. There is also evidence that institutional sustainability is more likely given the linkages among the CBOs, DDC/DTO, and contractors.

To see a visual presentation about this project, SKY Samaj prepared a 30-minute video that describes the program and its results, which can be accessed at their website.

2 Background

2.1 Description of RAIDP

The Rural Access Improvement and Decentralization Project (RAIDP) is a follow-on project to the Rural Infrastructure Project (RIP), aimed at replicating good practices and lessons of RIP. RAIDP has narrowed the gaps between urban and rural lives by contributing toward improved services related to health, education, agriculture and marketing, technology transfer and good governance. The project implementing body for the government of Nepal is the District Development Committee (DDC), which is responsible for all the activities, including planning, construction/rehabilitation and maintenance of the Local Road Network (LRN). Over the project period (2005 to 2013), over 2 million people of Nepal have been able to utilize improved rural transport infrastructures and services, which also enhanced access to economic opportunities.

2.2 Governance gaps and accountability issues addressed by the CARTA sub-project

Ideally, the CBOs would provide additional input to RAIDP implementers on the quality of work done, including; the probity and integrity in contracting local labour; the resolution of complaints; information dissemination; indications of collusive procurement practices; and environmental and social safeguard issues. CBOs were considered an important component in RAIDP, but there were known issues that prevented their functioning. These included:

- ♦ Monitoring was a random process carried without assigning clear monitoring responsibilities to CBO members.
- ♦ Few CBOs’ members had knowledge on ESMF, because none were trained.
- ♦ Grievances were often verbally submitted, but few were resolved.
- ♦ CBO members were not sure of their role in ensuring quality road construction, and had little knowledge of what quality construction consisted of.
- ♦ CBOs did not have standard tools to measure road construction quality, such as the LBT.

The baseline survey and focus group discussions confirmed these initial reports:

- ♦ *Only 28% of CBOs' members have knowledge on ESMF, and none of them are trained.* If the respondents were moderately or highly aware of ESMF guidelines of the RAIDP including on the entitlements provisioned, social and environmental safeguards, environmental management plan, etc. it was assumed that they knew about ESMF. FGDs provided information on formal training on ESMF.
- ♦ *Only 26% of CBOs' members have knowledge of quality of civil work, and method of community monitoring.* The information to this indicator was obtained by analyzing the response of the participants in the survey in relation to their understanding of monitoring mechanisms of civil works. It was further discussed in the FGDs to get a clearer picture and to verify the information obtained from the survey.
- ♦ *None of the CBOs had discussed monitoring of labour contracts and contractors' payment though 27% CBOs have received contract documents.* (During the FGDs with the CBOs, only around 25% of them said that they had received the contract documents of contractors including designs and estimates.) In fact the CBOs did not monitor these contracts or the payments since there were no complaints.
- ♦ *The grievance registration system was primarily verbal only: the DDC had no records as to type, quantity and status of complaints.* The grievance rate was estimated to be 30%: which is the proportion of the grievances listed in the CBO grievance register, compared to the number of grievances orally discussed at CBOs meetings. (Usually, there are a lot of grievances that are discussed in the CBO meetings, but most of those grievances do not get listed for resolution or further process.³)
- ♦ *Information boards are displayed for only 60% of roads.* This information was collected from observation.
- ♦ *None of the CBOs had a tool to measure construction quality, and responsibility for monitoring civil works was not assigned to CBO members.* The FGDs and interactions with the CBOs revealed that they were not aware of a tool, such as LBTs, and monitoring was a random process without clear monitoring responsibilities for CBO members.

3 CARTA Objectives

Based on the assessment of the problems listed in 2.2, the objective of the sub-project was to *strengthen the capacity of CBOs to monitor civil works and contracts process under RAIDP, and to enable access to concerned agencies for their Grievances.* The specific goals were:

- ♦ To support 80 CBOs to understand the policy and principles in ESMF, and their roles and responsibilities;
- ♦ To capacitate CBOs for understanding quality of construction work by providing training based on specific training manual;
- ♦ To capacitate the CBOs for monitoring the labor contract process and payment of the contractors; and,
- ♦ To support the CBOs for easy and productive access to report the grievances, and to assist them in understanding any malpractice.

3.1 TOR with the implementing agency

The World Bank, through the government implementing agency, was also interested in the CBO capacity development, and particular details of the grievance process; specifically, they requested that the CARTA sub-project:

³ This information was obtained from regular meetings of the CBOs and their minutes as well as from the grievances registered in the DDC for GHC to address.

- ♦ Monitor the number of times CSOs or CBOs make representations to the DDC alleging quality deficiencies in civil works supported by the project. Compare the frequency of these representations with experience before the sub-project.
- ♦ Monitor the number of times CBOs report malpractice. Compare the frequency of these reports with experience before the sub-project.
- ♦ Describe improvements in the management and administration of CBOs as a result of support to them under the sub-project
- ♦ Indicate how CBOs supported by the sub-project clearly understand the quality requirements in civil works supported by the project.
- ♦ Indicate how CBOs understand what work has been agreed on, expected cost, time, and procurement procedures.
- ♦ Describe the grievance mechanism established and describe CBOs familiarity with it.
- ♦ Indicate the extent to which CBOs have clear knowledge of the responsibilities and governance of the different groups (VRCCs, LRUGs, Grievance Committee, etc.)

3.2 CARTA project scope

The sub-project was completed in 15 months (September 2012-December 2013), in 16 RAIDP districts, covering 27 road sub-projects, with a budget of less than 150 thousand USD. The CBOs mainly included the *Village Road Coordination Committee (VRCC)*, *Local Roads User Committee (LRUC)*, and *Grievance Hearing Committee (GHC)*⁴. Of 105 CBOs, 63 were VRCCs, 26 were LRUCs, and remaining 16 were GHCs. This capacity building of CBOs and users focused on monitoring the quality of civil works (i.e. construction, rehabilitation, maintenance and upgrading) of road and contracts under the project and on making representations in case of unsatisfactory performance.

The key activities included training CBOs to understand quality in respect to roads by training them in quality inspection so that these CBOs could make representation to the District Development Committee (DDC) responsible for RAIDP in the district level or District Technical Office (DTO) within DDC. Other activities included: developing training materials that the CBOs can use to monitor the roads; and, helping CBOs to monitor the labour contracts and payments; the contractors, or higher authorities. Depending on the needs of individual CBOs, the sub-project was responsible to assist CBOs in their re-formation, functioning, management and administration; setting delegations to DDCs; and helping them understand the policy and principles of the environmental and social safeguard.

Geographical coverage: 16 of 30 RAIDP districts (9 *Terai* and 7 in hilly areas) were selected and clustered into 7 groups based on number and length of road, number of CBOs and geographical location. The selection of districts was based on the requirements set out in the World Bank created TOR for the sub-project:

⁴ *LRUC represents communities across the whole road segment; the VRCC is formed in each village development Committee along the road; and the GHC is formed at district level with 3 members (nominee of District Road Coordination Committee as chairperson, DDC's Planning Officer and Social Development Consultant or Social Mobilization Officer of RAIDP)*

RAIDP clusters and sub-project cluster districts

RAIDP	Districts included in RAIDP	CARTA districts	CBOs
Cluster-I	Kailali, Bardia, Banke, Surkhet, Salyan, Dang, Kanchanpur	Kailali, Banke, Surkhet	18
		Salyan, Dang	11
Cluster-II	Palpa, Gulmi, Aghakhanchi, Pyuthan, Rupandehi, Kapilvastu and Nawalparasi	Gulmi, Nawalparasi	13
		Pyuthan, Kapilvastu	16
Cluster-III	Syangja, Kaski, Tanahu, Nuwakot, Rasuwa, Dhading	Tanahu, Rasuwa,	10
Cluster-IV	Makawanpur, Rautahat, Sarlahi, Mahottari, Dhanusa, Siraha, Udayapur, Saptari, Bara, Parsa	Mahottari, Udayapur	15
		Sarlahi, Bara, Parsa	22
Total		16 districts	105

Of the 27 roads, 8 roads were gravel roads, 6 were *ottaseal*, 8 were earthen, and remaining 5 were a mix of earthen and gravel roads. Each road included from 1 to 8 CBOs. (See Annex 7 for more information on selected road, CBO type and type of intervention.)

4 Outcomes and Results:

Outcome 1: The level of the knowledge on ESMF practices will improve from 28 to 70 %

Result: The end-survey revealed that 97% of the surveyed CBO members could fully explain these ESMF provisions.

The gaps observed in environmental and social safeguards issues during the construction of roads were addressed by this sub-project. Trainings were provided to the CBO members on EMSF, including information on possible impacts to the environment and to society. Other significant issues, related to environmental and social safeguards, were equally discussed in CBO meetings, during interface meetings and during the monitoring of the civil works. IEC materials and media mobilization have also contributed to an enhanced understanding of ESMF provisions.

CBO members now recognize many technical problems, such as how stone quarrying and erosion of hillsides by water runoff can result in landslides; and, how widening of roads, opening of tracks spoil disposal, quarrying and encroachment can result in damage to forest through the loss of vegetation. CBO members also learned methods for water diversion to prevent gully advancement, spoil disposal to prevent water contamination, road alignment in river-bank cutting, sediment deposition to prevent clogging irrigation canals, and the effects of dust and contaminated water on the health and safety of communities. Against these potential impacts, CBO members learned to take mitigation measures like limiting road gradients, constructing drains, using designated spoil disposal sites, using bioengineering approaches, compacting disposal, avoiding borrow pits along river banks, and how to meet the overall environmental requirements. CBO members have used their new knowledge during their monitoring visits to make contractors mitigate potential impacts. CBOs were also able to take specific actions based on this knowledge. Examples include the preparation of action plans by CBOs that consider local social and environmental issues.

This increased understanding by CBOs of environmental and social safeguards, road quality parameters and contracting processes led to an improvement in the quality of civil works, and strengthened citizen capacity to

respond to most issues concerning basic road quality. The improved monitoring by the CBOs led to the identification of construction deficiencies, most of which were addressed.

Outcome 2: The level of knowledge on quality of civil work, and method of community monitoring, will improve from 26% to 60%

The end-survey of the sub-project showed that 92% of CBO members had knowledge of quality of civil work and method of community monitoring. Also, 84% of CBOs have assigned the responsibility among members for monitoring the construction of civil work.

Prior to the training, the CBOs had limited knowledge of quality issues, especially issues related to contracts and the quality levels specified in the contract. The trainings and site inspections increased the understanding of quality issues, and made the contract documents to CBOs. The training manual consisted of fundamental technical knowledge of civil works and community monitoring, while IEC materials also highlighted the significance of Community Based Performance Monitoring (CBPM). It was during orientation on the use of LBTs that CBO members further understood how community monitoring improves the quality of civil work.

Monitoring methods improved significantly after the introduction of the LBT toolkit; the use of LBTs also improved the quality of the road construction. LBTs were not the part of the original plan, but a tool was felt to be important, based on discussions in the Rural Road Monitoring Workshop jointly organized by HELVETAS and Public Affairs Center –India in September 2012⁵. The PTF Advisor for the CARTA RAID sub-project suggested introducing LBTs to RAIDP to help CBOs in their monitoring work. After receiving the toolkits, and being trained in their use, the monitoring of civil work increased among the CBO members. CBOs are now actively measuring the thickness of gravel/earth filling in the road, testing the width of the road, and checking the size of the holes in the gabions. In many places, this monitoring led to changes; the contractor began to use a camber-board in the Gaihat-Fattepur Rural Road Sub-project, which resulted in a commitment by the contractor to fill the borrow pit, such as in Parsa⁶. When specifications and measurements of roads did not match, CBOs were able to report the cases to DDC/DTO.

The CBO administration and management has improved; post-training evaluations have confirmed that CBOs have an enhanced understanding of their roles and responsibilities. As a result, CBO meetings have become more frequent and participatory. Exit meetings with the CBOs have reflected that there has been improved sense of ownership of CBO members on sub-project activities, and, as a result, CBOs are critically analyzing the social and environmental impacts when expecting wider roads. They are also assigning the responsibilities of monitoring among CBO members.

Examples where this new knowledge was demonstrated include:

- ♦ The increased role of CBOs in resuming civil works such as in Rasuwa, where they were stopped due to several problems related to quality of work and unsettled grievances.
- ♦ The improved CBO leadership ensured the reconstruction of a damaged irrigation canal, and made contractors commit to re-establishing the damaged water supply system (such as in Pyuthan).
- ♦ Construction design was changed. For example, a wall was added to protect a settlement from flood (such as in Udayapur).

⁵ This workshop was funded by PTF

⁶ RAIDP's consultant appreciated the commitment to use this tool in the Bara district.

Outcome 3: The provisions of contract management under contract document will be discussed

The end-survey showed that 100% of CBOs have discussed contracts and estimates.

Other important gaps identified by the RAIDP project included probity and integrity while making contracts, and the community being unaware of the contractual documents. The sub-project has addressed these gaps partially by facilitating CBOs to receive contract documents for each road, so that CBOs could review the contracts and act accordingly. It also ensured public information dissemination through information boards. As a result of these initiatives, there has been positive change in terms of contract review and monitoring, and fewer spurious grievances filed. Before the intervention, confusions about the contracts had resulted in filing petitions, but after understanding the provisions in the contract, such cases have been withdrawn (e.g. in Udayapur). Also, BoQs were discussed among CBO members, and because of these discussions, CBOs have better understood the contractor's needs. For example, the CBO even increased the use of materials like gravel (e.g. in Dang) to the contractors, after the members understood the contractor's contractual limitations.

It is noted that, as SKY started the sub-project, construction work was already ongoing with completed labour contracting procedures. As a result, neither SKY nor the CBOs could monitor the process related to creating the labour contracts. The way labour were contracted and the amount labour were paid was also not of significant interest to CBOs because of several reasons: contractors had already negotiated the lowest and appropriate wages in their bid; labour was not locally recruited; labour had no grievances concerning low wages, or delayed payment; and the labour contract and payment processes had no effect on the timeliness and quality of work, or on environmental and social safeguards. CBOs were aware that labour had to be paid appropriately and timely; they discussed potential problems (as evident from their minute books), but due to above mentioned reasons, the sub-project did not focus exclusively on monitoring of the labour contract process and payment to contractors.

An example where this new knowledge of contracts was demonstrated includes at least one decision by a CBO to increase the budget for gravel in Kailali.

Outcome 4: Most of the verbal grievances will be registered, and all reliable grievances will be timely addressed

Based on research from exit meetings, 187 grievances were registered during sub-project duration and 89% of the grievances were addressed.

RAIDP recognized the weak complaints-handling mechanisms at the project sites, with the result that issues raised by communities were not considered. Prior to the sub-project capacity-building activities, there were no recorded grievances at the DDC level in any of the CARTA sites. Although some CBOs claimed during the surveys and FGDs that their grievances were recorded (verbally estimated at about one third of the total grievances) in the DDCs, no evidence of such records could be found and obtained from the DDCs. This was basically due to the absence of a systematic grievance recording and documentation mechanism. The lack of documented grievances made comparisons to the period before the project difficult, because the early requests were verbal, and often not recorded, and during the project grievances were and registered.

The lack of a systematic method was addressed by the sub-project through capacity building on complaint handling. The ESMF training manual consists of social safeguard policies and principles including how a GHC is formed and its responsibilities. The CBOs were oriented in these provisions and encouraged in registering their grievances through a formal process. As a result of the increased number of valid, filed grievances (187 during

the 15 months: see annex 17.16 for details), district government agencies have experienced frequent monitoring visits by Local Development Officer (LDO) and the DTO chief; they have agreed to participate in meetings to resolve grievances at the request of CBOs. Their participation improved local level coordination among stakeholders and helped to sort out the grievances in a harmonious way. Only 32 grievances were not resolved at the local level, and were sent up to the DDT to be resolved.

There were three types of grievances: technical (quality), social safeguard, and environmental safeguards. Examples of technical grievances included: delay in physical works, unavailability of Contract Document/BoQ, low quality of construction material, over sized gravel, lack of required thickness for sub-grade, low querying on structure, changing of location of structure (Hump pipe), etc. Examples of social grievances included: lack of timely assistance, no timely address of grievance, one-sided acquisition of private land, no timely reconstruction of damaged public/private structure, etc. Examples of environmental safeguard grievances included: air pollution, noise pollution, borrow pit at road side in private land, waste disposal on private land, inappropriate quarry site, etc. The analysis of the grievances revealed that most grievances (46%) were related to technical issues, followed by social safeguard (34%), and environmental safeguard issues (20%). The number of grievances registered in each road project varied from as low as 4 for the Tharmare-Chaurjhari road in Salyan to as high of 15 in the Simple-Bhorle-Parsang road in Rasuwa. (See Annex 15 for details on number of grievances for different roads, and Annex 16 for the types of grievances).

There are still some responsibilities for grievance resolution that need clarification. For example, although GHC's recognition has improved, one of the shortfalls is related to authority given to a GHC. The Terms of Reference for a GHC allows them to make decision, but in most cases, a GHC could not be fully trusted to resolve the grievances. As a result, after grievances were registered at the DDC, they were addressed by a LDO instead of a GHC. This system bypass could de-motivate GHC members to proactively investigate the grievances.

5 Survey methodology and TPM tools

The CARTA project was primarily a capacity building project, with some limited monitoring expectations. The project primarily consisted of capacity-building activities for the CBOs, who were then charged with monitoring the road-building work. The primary social accountability tools used included: a media awareness campaign, posters, focus group discussions, and site visits with community members. The project also conducted a baseline and ending survey to determine the effect of the capacity building.

5.1 Baseline: methodology and findings

Baseline information was collected using a survey, supported by focus group discussion (FGD), and observations. The survey included 267 respondents: 3 from each of 89 CBOs—excluding 16 GHCs—while considering gender and inclusion issues in selecting respondents. Two of the three members were key position holders (chairperson, vice-chairperson, secretary, joint secretary or treasurer), while one member represented the general membership of the CBO. At least one of the three had to be a woman.

The baseline provided information against the logframe indicators while also uncovering data on roads and CBOs, the duration of road projects, the understanding level of CBOs about the road quality and environmental standards, and the system and frequency of grievance registration and processing them. A few questions tested the level of knowledge of the CBO members. The surveyor asked for examples to clarify the responses, with

responses at a “moderate” and “high” level rated as “aware,” while responses needing more clarification rated as “not aware.”

5.2 End survey: methodology and findings

An impact study of the CBOs was carried out in January 2014, one month after the project ended. The study consisted of a structured questionnaire, and the data was augmented by FGD, observations, and consultations with CBO members. Though the baseline survey collected information from all 27-road projects, the end-survey narrowed the sample to one road per cluster (for a total of seven road projects), but also included no-CARTA sites as well. The individuals included in the end- survey were mostly the same as those who were included in the baseline survey, because people in the same positions were included. However, in some CBOs, there had been reformation of the members with new member in different position.

For assessing the indicators in CARTA roads, seven districts out of sixteen were selected. The sample selection considered aspects such as ecological zone, performance of district (high, medium and low) and number of sub-projects in the district. To provide some additional comparison, (although this was not done in the baseline) non-CARTA road projects were selected as well. Seven alternative roads in the same districts were also selected. The alternative road sub projects were selected based on a random selection if there is more than one alternative road in the district. (The non-CARTA sites showed knowledge levels similar to the baseline report and are not reported in this document.)

Altogether 21 CBOs from CARTA (14) and non-CARTA (7) road sub-projects were part of the impact study. The CBOs were selected based on the performance in terms of conduction of regular meeting, participation in subproject activities and monitoring of civil works. Three members (2 from the Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, Secretary, Joint Secretary and Treasurer, and also one general member, including one woman) were selected from each CBO. For CARTA CBOs, the same members from the baseline survey were interviewed. Where this was not possible an alternate person in the same position was selected.

Along with the survey, the study also contributed roadside observation and informal interaction with representatives of CBOs, social development consultants, planning and supervision engineer and beneficiaries of the roads. Similarly altogether 14 focus group discussions were conducted. The purpose of interaction and focus group discussion with different stakeholders was to verify the information from the respondent survey.

5.3 Media

Media mobilization raised awareness in the communities. At least one media source (either print or FM radio) was used to cover and broadcast major activities carried out in the district. Media was mobilized in monitoring of the civil works, interacting with the CBOs and contractors, and in trainings, stakeholder orientations and regular interactions. Overall, the media increased awareness of the RAIDP project in general and sub-project in particular. The participation of media personnel in the major activities offered them opportunities to learn how good governance was promoted through the RAIDP project, and how communities have a role in the road construction process.

This project was responsible for the increased significance of infrastructure reporting among the media. As media personnel started interacting with the officials and contractors, these stakeholders were able to demonstrate transparency and were able to fulfill their roles and responsibilities. Similarly, the CBOs were empowered and encouraged as their issues/voices were covered in different media. Likewise, regular

dissemination of project and sub-project information made the VRCC and LRUC more active, and other stakeholders increased their willingness to coordinate. As a result of the publicity there has been increasing demand from other RAIDP project areas for CBO trainings. The reporting on the use of the LBT has also resulted in the increased demand for these tools from non-project areas. Overall, media has played a complementary role in the achievement of the project outcomes.

6 Project Management

The sub-project was funded under the Citizens Action for Results and Transparency and Accountability (CARTA) programme, managed in Nepal by HELVETAS Nepal in partnership with the Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF). SKY-Samaj, in association with National Resource Development and Research Center (NRDRC) implemented the sub project. While NRDRC's expertise on training and capacity building was used, SKY Samaj was responsible for overall project delivery. SKY partnered with 7 local CSOs (one in each cluster) to build capacity of CBOs for community monitoring.

SKY selected 105 CBOs in 27 road sub-projects to carryout community monitoring. Coordination with CBOs and stakeholders was facilitated by the support of Social Development Consultants (SDCs) and Planning, Design and Supervision Engineers (PDEs) of RAIDP. SKY Samaj established a central coordination unit in Kathmandu. The Team Leader, Road Quality and Procurement Engineer (RQPE), Good Governance and Training Expert (GGTE), and Admin-Finance manager provided central support.

The 16 sub-project districts were divided into 7 working clusters based on work volume and access between the districts for smoother implementation. The Cluster Coordination Office (CCO) was set up in each cluster within the office of cluster level Civil Society Organization (CSO). A Community Enhancement Officer (CEO) was hired in each cluster for district level implementation. There were different roles assigned to different stakeholders such as DDC/DTO for coordination and review of sub-project progress; RAIDP consultant for information sharing and mobilization and technical support to CBOs; DRCC for coordination and monitoring; CBOs for participating in the sub-project activities; and contractors to ensure that the grievances are addressed in time. HELVETAS provided technical support including sharing of reporting mechanisms and project modality. DOLIDAR introduced SKY Samaj to DDCs/DTOs. SKY shared reports to PTF through HELVETAS. PTF further provided feedback on reports.

6.1 Main problems and challenges encountered and the ways they were addressed

There were problems during the implementation.

- ♦ Reluctance of some authorities like DDC/DTO to provide contractual agreements and the Bill of Quantity (BoQ) was addressed through regular coordination and interactions,
- ♦ The BoQ was not user-friendly,
- ♦ Information gap with DDC/DTO about CBOs in various road sub-projects had to be sorted out by actually visiting the road catchments. Where governance structures have been weak for a sufficient time, usually, any groups or committees formed for monitoring are treated erroneously as activists⁷.
- ♦ Hesitation of CBO members to speak up and share grievances had to be dealt by creating a conducive and a win-win environment for all stakeholders during interface meetings.

⁷ For example, the CBO for the Janata Road in the Parsa district was considered troublesome. This misconception had to be settled with series of visits and interactions with community members and stakeholders including DDC/DTO.

- ♦ CBOs had to recognize that the quality of the road was determined by the contract, not by their expectations. There were high expectations by CBOs for the quality of civil work, despite the limited cost estimates.
- ♦ CBO members are not paid by the project; a feeling of volunteerism and local ownership had to be built among CBO members since there was a limited operation budget for CBOs,
- ♦ Most of the institutional arrangements including relationships with DDC/DTO, contractors and stakeholders including CBOs worked well but the gaps between the transfer of the existing RAIDP Project Coordinator and appointment of new Project Coordinator created some communication gaps as a result of which CEOs could not make official entry into their respective districts as per the schedule.
- ♦ There was inadequate information on the roles of the VRCC and the LRUC,
- ♦ In some places there was a lack of elected body in the local government,

The use of monitoring tools was instrumental in resolving many of these problems, while clear information dissemination to CBOs and coordination with stakeholders jointly helped resolve these challenges. Equally, capacity building of CBOs was also instrumental to address many problems (See case study 1 and 2 in Annex 16).

6.2 Sub-project sustainability

It is hoped that the sub-project outcomes will be long term. First, it is expected that communities will be engaged in local development projects in order to ensure quality of work, to consider environmental and social safeguard issues, and to monitor the work against agreed estimates and designs or specifications. Second, development work at the local level is likely to be cost-effective and efficient, based on a community's active engagement in monitoring procurement of goods and services. Finally, the authorities and stakeholders are likely to be more accountable to the communities with good practices for information dissemination and effective handling of complaints. Together these benefits provide an incentive to keep the practices past the duration of an individual project.

One particular aspect of this project is being replicated—the use of LBT has been multiplying in other RAIDP road projects. Many other CBOs in non sub-project locations have demanded trainings on ESMF and on use of LBT. CBO member of other road sub-project have visited CARTA sites to interact and learn. IEC materials developed under this sub-project are now being used by CBOs beyond the CARTA sub-project areas. This expansion should be studied further.

6.3 Dissemination of results and outcomes

Achievements, outputs, and outcomes have been shared with communities to encourage them to continue their work beyond the sub-project period. The primary methods were:

- ♦ Good practices and improved results of community monitoring were shared to the CBO members during trainings as well as during the mobilization of trained CBO members.
- There were discussion on the results, particularly improved quality of civil works after CBO's active role and DDC/DTOs increased frequency of monitoring. As a result, during CBO's meetings and during interface meetings, CBOs were motivated to request visits by DDC/DTO.
- Working with media was fundamental in disseminating the sub-projects' success stories, including the public opinion and perceptions. Feedbacks obtained from the CBO members to further improve the quality of civil works such as disseminating technical information in easily understandable form were disseminated from media.

- Lessons learned, and recommendations from the communities, were also shared with stakeholders (mainly HELVETAS, PTF, and the World Bank) by participating in the regular meetings and review workshops.
- A project completion survey has been recently conducted though it was not originally planned. This was shared with stakeholders and communities.
- An exit meeting was organized with CBOs and district stakeholders in each district. During these meetings, good practices were shared.

Feedback from the CBOs and stakeholders (like DDC/DTO, contractors, RAIDP consultants, and staff) has been disseminated with each other. Likewise, SKY has utilized forums and opportunities including regional workshops (three such workshops in Nepalgunj, Pokhara and Bardibas) and meetings with relevant stakeholders (including PTF HELVETAS organized CARTA workshop) to share the sub-project results. SKY also expects HELVETAS and PTF to use the results and impacts for wider dissemination where applicable and possible.

7 Lessons learned and recommendations

7.1 Lessons learned

The role of CBOs was crucial, particularly in resolving grievances, in understanding social issues, and in providing monitoring and coordination. Despite the short duration of the sub-project, many lessons have been documented. Some of the most important lessons are discussed below.

- ♦ **Advanced training plus refreshers will increase retention of knowledge and skills.** Many of the orientations and trainings were one-off events such as training on ESMF. However, during the interface meetings and CBOs meetings, those who were trained showed limited memory of their roles, responsibilities, and understanding of community monitoring. Refresher trainings should have been the part of such sub-projects to ensure better understanding and smoother implementation of the sub-project.
- ♦ **Begin early to build awareness to internalize ownership and sustainability.** SKY's experience reveals that delayed awareness and focus on service delivery results in limited ownership of the project, with high expectations, which are difficult to accomplish. A retrospective approach that avoids understanding the beneficiary's needs limits buy-in. This project therefore ensured early awareness through orientation and consultation with stakeholders on project essentials. This resulted project being internalized and bought-in by them. Thus, a clear message is that stakeholders' early involvement creates commitment, organization, and skills for implementation during the project, which can be sustained beyond the project.
- ♦ **Empowerment efforts must be included in governance.** Instead of separate good governance training, SKY has learned that mainstreaming governance issues with empowerment and awareness focused trainings for CBOs will also be fruitful. The sub-project was able to empower CBOs on the significance of community monitoring to promote: transparency of work by the contractors; accountability of the government institutions; participation of stakeholders; recognition of CBOs' roles; and, the necessity of forming inclusive local CBOs. A clear lesson is that empowerment and a culture of good governance reinforce each other, and monitoring should not be limited to achievement of results and procedures, but it should also address the issue of beneficiary empowerment and promotion of good governance in projects.

- ♦ **Meaningful community mobilization is the cornerstone of success:** Mere community participation is not an integral part of the project implementation, as this simply meets requirements without empowerment. Meaningful participation is an empowerment process that not only involves them, but also helps them think beyond the box. This sub-project ensured broad local involvement at all stages of a project resulting in an increased sense of control over the environment, stimulating local action toward achieving project objectives. Engagement of CBOs in planning, designing and implementation has promoted project sustainability.
- ♦ **Capacity building for monitoring is necessary to ensure contextualized tracking.** One problem, which almost all sorts of CBOs have in common, is the lack of confidence, capacity and efficiency to undertake monitoring a technical project, such as road construction. During this sub-project implementation as well, CBOs were reluctant to get involved in monitoring activities and raise their voice. Such a situation opened up new chances for manipulation as well as misappropriation. Community participation in project monitoring has to be improved by imparting minimal monitoring skills and technical knowledge through training and practice using tools adopted for local situations. When the sub-project provided LBTs, and oriented CBOs on the use, community monitoring became more regular.
- ♦ **Use adult education principles in training programs.** Bringing change in attitudes, practices, ideas and beliefs to promote community monitoring, and to accept such monitoring, is not easy—and it is even more difficult if only traditional lectures are used. CBOs can be better sensitized and coached to promote good governance practices through regular, brief and entertaining ways of using IEC tools. For example, IEC materials that use pictures are understood better than IEC materials with text, which are not understood by illiterate people.
- ♦ **Invest in organizational development for new CBOs.** CBOs that have been functional for a considerable period of time have been found to be less dependent on the project, while new or emerging CBOs are found to be more dependent on the project. Organizational development learning packages for new CBOs can make them more committed, because they are organized and functioning. This means that a nominal CBO training cost is also necessary in sub-projects.
- ♦ **More interactions and coordination with stakeholders, results in less confusions and misunderstanding.** Many of the problems and challenges were resolved through a series of CBO meetings to coordinate with stakeholders. Coordination helped to improve confidence and trust among stakeholders; misunderstandings can be resolved through transparent discussions of issues.
- ♦ **The media has a role as watchdog for good governance.** The role of media in raising awareness, sensitizing people on good governance practices, and motivating all concerned stakeholders including contractors to be transparent and to carry out good quality work is fundamental. Media have proved to be an important vehicle for communication including setting the agenda and exposing malpractices (of government, civil society or private sector). Media can also counter prejudices and thus contribute to community empowerment.
- ♦ **User friendly and simple documents work well with the CBOs.** Many CBO members did not understand technical details in the contracts, BoQ and information boards. The inability to understand the technical specification was one of the reasons why CBO members were discouraged to monitor. To resolve this problem, documents should be developed in a simple and easily understandable language. The BOQ terminology must be user friendly; information in the

information boards should be clearly stated; and, standard specifications need to be oriented to CBO members.

7.2 Recommendations

In order to improve the effectiveness of the RAIDP project, the following recommendations are suggested:

- ♦ The construction projects are dependent on appropriate functioning of DDCs. So, it is essential that in future projects, DDC/DTO should effectively own the project, particularly by making regular supervision of civil works plus capacity building works for CBOs. Adequate authority should be delegated to DTO chiefs so that they can support effective implementation and monitoring of the project. Better still, the monitoring and supervision mechanism used by a DDC/DTO should be developed as an integral part of their job, rather than for meeting a project's requirements.
- ♦ The existing system component of monitoring (bimonthly, District Monitoring Committee-DMC and CBPM) can be improved. For example, the CBPM can follow a systemic process, and the presence of an authorized DDC/DTO, and contractor, can be made mandatory. Indicators of CBPM can be discussed.
- ♦ The DDC/DTO should develop a BoQ in simple language (local language), and such BoQ needs to be given to CBOs to increase CBOs understanding on the specifications and requirements to be monitored.
- ♦ The DDC/DTO should be present in most interface meetings, as much as possible, for proper and regular information dissemination, and to facilitate dialogue among stakeholders. The DTO's presence, which would be useful to explain technical issues in a BoQ, is crucial. During the construction, regular availability of technical personnel at site is recommended for quality control and assurances.
- ♦ The final payment to contractors should be linked to CBPM reports so that payment to local labors, shopkeepers shall be ensured.
- ♦ Since the DRCC does not function in the absence of an elected local body, LRUC has to be intensively mobilized so that absence of a DRCC is not felt.
- ♦ Beneficiaries should be informed with enough information through media mobilization, IEC materials, notice board display, and proper record keeping in district information center.
- ♦ GHC are not functional to the level expected because of their TOR being very general without clear responsibilities, and because they are engaged in other regular official assignments. Even when some clear responsibilities are noted, their decisions do not always become the final ones. So authority should be given to them, so that whatever GHC decides should be the final decision. This will motivate GHC to study the grievances and make decisions on their own.
- ♦ In case of similar projects, exposure visits by CBOs and DDC/DTO officials in places where there are good practices and success stories would be useful.
- ♦ The CBOs in this sub-project were not provided direct logistic and financial resources for holding regular meetings and for other management cost. Due to this reason, CBOs were not fully encouraged for active participation in monitoring of the works being carried out. Therefore, it is recommended to cover minimal organizational costs for CBOs for their effective mobilization and institutional sustainability.
- ♦ The application of good practices provisioned in ESMF need to be enhanced. Information on roles and responsibilities of VRCC/LRUCs, provision of burrow pit plan, quarry site plan, compensatory plantation plan, occupational health and safety guidelines, etc. need to be included.
- ♦ It is suggested to PTF and HELVETAS to come up with ways and purpose of monitoring the laborer contract process and payment to contractors. As noted, the contractor already has negotiated a

minimum wage rate for the laborer before being selected, and therefore it would be difficult to influence the change in wage rate when the construction begins. Moreover, whenever the laborers have no issue and agree to work at a certain wage rate, monitoring may not result in any contribution to the project. In general CBOs are not willing to spend their time in monitoring whether the contractors are paid unless the work stops.

- ♦ According to an external consultant hired to complete the final survey, the sub project goal should not be limited to capacity building of the CBOs; rather the programme should focus on the beneficiary of infrastructure constructed. While the CBOs should be intensively involved to capacitate beneficiaries, the beneficiary monitoring should be done as independent monitoring.

8 ANNEXES

8.1 Annex 1: Sub-Project Logical Framework

	Intervention Logic	Objectively verifiable indicators (OVI)	Baseline Data*	End of the project	Progress t the end of December 2013
Goal	To strengthen the capacity of CBOs for monitoring civil works and contracts process under RAIDP and to make access on concern agencies for their Grievances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of civil works will be improved 	-	-	
Specific Objective/ Outcome	To increase the knowledge of CBOs on the provision of ESMF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of knowledge on ESMF will be improved from 28 to 70 % 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 28 % 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70 % 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 97%
	To capacitate CBOs for understanding the quality of civil work and community monitoring method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of knowledge on quality of civil work and method of community monitoring will be improved from 26 to 60 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 26 % 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60 % 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 92%
	To capacitate the CBOs for monitoring of labor contract process and payment of the contractors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisions of contract management under contract document will be discussed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0% of CBOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80 % 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 84 %
	The access to grievances hearing committee will be simplified and GHCs will address the grievances timely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of the verbal grievances will be registered and all reliable grievance will be addressed timely 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grievance registration percentage is 30 % 23 % registered grievance is addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 90 % registration percentage and 80 % of registered reliable grievance will be addressed timely 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grievance registration percentage is 99 % and 89% of registered grievances are resolved
Expected Results/ Outputs	CBOs and users will be familiar on provision of ESMF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1000 CBO members will receive training on provision of ESMF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No training provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All CBO will be trained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1027 CBO members are trained on ESMF
	CBOs or users will get information about sub project details i.e. what work has been agreed, expected cost, time and procurement procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each CBOs will receive contract document and will discuss on CBO meeting Information board will be displayed in each subproject site with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 27 % CBOs received contract documents Information board is displayed in 60 % road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100 % CBO will receive contract document Information board will be displayed in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CBOs of 100 % road package has received contract document Information board has

		required information	(16 road package)	90 % road	properly displayed in 96 % road packages (26 out of 27)
	To capacitate the CBOs for monitoring civil work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBOs will assign the responsibility among members for monitoring the construction of civil work for major items • Each CBOs will use simple toolkit (LBT) for monitoring of civil work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not assigned • No LBT tool provided to CBOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be assigned • All CBO will receive LBT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 84 % CBOs are assigned responsibility among member • All CBOs has received LBT Kit
	CBOs will be understood provisions of labor contract process and mode of payment to the contractors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All CBO will get Contract document • Provisions of contract management under contract document will be discussed by more than 80 % of CBO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBOs of 7 road out of 27 received contract documents • No any of CBO has discussed about the provision of contract management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBOs of 27 road out of 27 received contract documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBOs of 27 road out of 27 received contract documents • CBO of 24 road packages are discussed
	To facilitate the CBOs for easy and productive access to report the grievances or to notice of malpractice in concern agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grievance will be registered to concern agency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only 61 grievance is registered in 27 roads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 90 % registration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 187 (99 %) grievance is registered
	To facilitate GHC for addressing the registered grievances timely as per their nature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The registered grievance will be addressed timely 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23 % registered grievance is addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80 % of registered reliable grievance will be addressed timely 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 89 % of registered reliable grievance is addressed

8.2 Annex 2: Sub-project Terms of Reference (ToR)

Citizen Action for Results, Transparency and Accountability (CARTA) Programme Rural Access Improvement and Decentralization Project (RAIDP) Sub-project Terms of Reference for Concept Notes

HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation Nepal (HELVETAS Nepal) is inviting qualified Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) to submit Concept Notes proposing how they would carry out the sub-project described below, which is intended to strengthen the implementation of the World Bank-financed RAIDP. This sub-project will be financed by the CARTA programme being managed in Nepal by HELVETAS Nepal in partnership with the Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF). The CARTA programme is described on HELVETAS Nepal website, www.helvetasnepal.org.np, which also indicates the CSO eligibility criteria and provides Terms of Reference along with a template and instructions for submitting Concept Notes. The deadline for HELVETAS Nepal to receive Concept Notes for this sub-project is March 18, 2012.

Once a Civil Society Organization has been chosen for this sub-project, the PTF will assign a Project Advisor who will provide advice to PTF, HELVETAS Nepal and the CSO and help monitor implementation of the sub-project.

THE WORLD BANK-FINANCED PROJECT TO BE SUPPORTED BY THE SUB-PROJECT

<p>1. Project information and components.</p>	<p>Name: Rural Access Improvement and Decentralization Project (RAIDP): IDA Grant No.-171-NEP, 525-NEP & Credit 4664</p> <p>Start/End Date: 2005- 2010 restructuring 2009-end of December 2013</p> <p>Sector: Roads and Highways (100%)</p> <p>Themes: Rural Services and Infrastructure (60%) Decentralization (30%) Other Social Development (10%)</p> <p>Physical Area: 1,165 kms of rural roads and 211 kms of rural tracks in 30 districts</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <p><u>Road transport infrastructure:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Rehabilitation and upgrading of about 1,165 kms of existing dry season rural roads to all season standard b. Upgrading of about 211 kms of rural trails and racks to dry season standard in remote hill districts c. Maintenance of about 4,500 kms of rural roads, covering routine and recurrent maintenance d. Construction of 317 short span trail bridges under Sector wide Approach (SWAP) e. Development of small community infrastructure (market sheds, irrigation channels, rail roads, restoration of community sheds/tap stands, health centre buildings etc. f. Construction of 10 river crossing structures <p><u>Capacity Building and Advisory Services:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Implementation of training related activities b. Provision of technical assistance and advisory services c. Preparation of GIS based master transport plan d. Undertaking a rural transport study e. Provision of project implementation support <p><u>Implementation Status:</u> already underway</p>
--	--

<p>2. For further information about the project and related guidelines</p>	<p>a. www.raidp.gov.np b. www.worldbank.org.np (http://web.worldbank.org) (Home>Countries>South Asia>Nepal>Projects & Programs)</p>
<p>3. Project implementation arrangements.</p>	<p>a. The Department of Local Infrastructure Development and Agricultural Roads (DoLIDAR) has a department wide Institutional Strengthening Action Plan (ISAP) which is financed by both ADB-DRILP, and RAIDP. b. DoLIDAR is the responsible GoN agency for this proposal. c. RAIDP has also appointed a Social Development Consultant (SDC) in each district to support DDCs with regard to social safeguards issues. SDCs are helping Village Road Coordination Committees (VRCCs) and Local Road Users Groups (LRUGs) in discharging their responsibilities. d. Community Based Organizations (CBOs) are recognized in the World Bank’s e. Project Appraisal Document (PAD) as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ “Communities”: groups of population within which the project operates ♦ “NGOs/SMOs”: more formal groupings inter or intra communities for particular tasks ♦ “VRCCs”: Village Road Coordination Committees – set up by social development consultants of DoLIDAR ♦ “LRUGs”: Local Road Users Groups – set up by social development consultants of DoLIDAR ♦ “Grievance Committees”: – set up by DoLIDAR </p>
<p>4. Monitoring measures already included (or will be included) in the project</p>	<p>A very large number of monitoring measures at both technical, social and environmental levels already exist (see project risk worksheet of PAD) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Procurement capacity assessment of road agencies E-bidding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Use of Right to Information (RTI) ♦ Material testing laboratory per district ♦ Quality Assurance Plan with outsourced independent inspector Request for Inspection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Physical monitoring 3 x p.a. by Project Support Consultants ♦ Sample independent technical audit by National Vigilance Centre (NVC) ♦ Blacklisting and prosecution in case of proven corruption ♦ Awareness campaign on corruption ♦ Independent and confidential complaint handling mechanism ♦ Local Communities given responsibility to monitor Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) ♦ Community based performance monitoring of quality work and safeguards by VRCCs and LRUGs Annual social audits by VRCCs</p>
<p>THE SUB-PROJECT DESCRIPTION</p>	

<p>1. Governance gaps in the project's implementation arrangement to be addressed by the sub-project.</p>	<p><u>Quality and Governance issues</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Quality of work done b. Probity and integrity in contracting local labour c. Use of complaints handling mechanism d. Information dissemination of intended/undertaken work e. Procurement and collusion practices f. Environmental and social safeguard issues <p><u>Quality and Governance gaps</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clear understanding of what is quality, and what are the quality requirements with respect to specification b. Clear understanding of what work has been agreed, expected cost, time, and of what quality standards c. Clear understanding in communities of general principles and procedures of procurement to be used, and their role and how complaints should be handled d. Clear understanding of the responsibilities and governance of the different groups (VRCCs, LRUGs, Grievance Committee etc.) e. Clear understanding on the environmental and social safeguard issues applied in the project with respect to Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF) guidelines.
<p>2. Sampling of districts to be included in the sub-project.</p>	<p>Select eight districts to be covered in the sub-project, in accord with the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. At least one district from each cluster is to be selected. b. Districts having on-going road projects are to be prioritized. c. Districts having low HDI are to be prioritized. d. A balance between hill and Terai districts is preferred. <p>The information necessary to select districts is available on the RAIDP website, www.raidp.gov.np.</p>
<p>3. CSO activities intended to address identified gaps</p>	<p>At present, it seems, there are a number of CBOs formed with the help of DDCs which report to the DDC, and which is an important element in the design of the project.</p> <p>These are VRCCs, LRUGs, and Grievance Committees. The job of the CSO is to support and backstop these CBOs.</p> <p>The CSO's priority is to strengthen the capacity of CBOs to monitor civil works (i.e. construction, rehabilitation, maintenance and up-grading) and contracts under the project and make representations when they believe performance is unsatisfactory, by undertaking the following activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Help the CBOs to understand quality in respect of roads by training them in quality inspection so that these CBOs can make representation to the DDC. This will involve developing training materials that the CBOs can use to monitor the roads. b. Help the CBOs to monitor the labour contracts and payments of the contractors. c. Help the CBOs, when there is a case of malpractice that they wish to report, in how to approach the DDC, the contractors, and, if there is no resolution, higher authorities, like DoLIDAR, Ministry of Local Development, National Vigilance Centre, and Commission for the Investigation of Abuse of Authority etc. <p>As appropriate, depending on the needs of individual CBOs, the CSO will also assist them by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Assisting in the formation, management and administration of CBOs. b. Helping CBOs perform their responsibilities, particularly making representations to DDCs. c. Helping CBOs understand the policy and principles of the environmental and social safeguard issues (ESMF) and applied activities in the project. <p>In all respects the CSO should be prepared to act as a backstop and support to the CBOs, which have already been formed or will be formed in the case of new road projects.</p>

	CSO activities will be within the scopes of the existing government rules and regulations (e.g. Local Body Financial Administration Rules, 2007 or LBFAR).
4. Information and analyses to demonstrate and measure impacts of the sub-project on the project.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Monitor the number of times CSOs or CBOs make representations to the DDC alleging quality deficiencies in civil works supported by the project. Compare the frequency of these representations with experience before the sub-project. b. Monitor the number of times CBOs report malpractice. Compare the frequency of these reports with experience before the sub-project. c. Describe improvements in the management and administration of CBOs as a result of support to them under the sub-project d. Indicate how CBOs supported by the sub-project clearly understand the quality requirements in civil works supported by the project. e. Indicate how CBOs understand what work have been agreed, expected cost, time and procurement procedures f. Describe the grievance mechanism established and describe CBOs' familiarity with it. g. Indicate the extent to which CBOs have clear knowledge of the responsibilities and governance of the different groups (VRCCs, LRUGs, Grievance Committee, etc.) h. The CSO should also suggest any other ways in which the effects of sub-project activities on the project's performance can be demonstrated and monitored.
5. Desirable characteristics of CSOs applying for sub-project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The project needs a solidly based well trusted local CSO with local membership which has the ability to communicate well throughout the community, which is seen by its members and by DDC/VDC to be independent, to have integrity, and not likely to strike deals with contractors or DDC. b. It also has to have (or be able to acquire) technical knowledge about quality c. It has to be independent and be able to guide, advice the CBOs to proceed with the issues with right procedure and in effective manner. d. It is to be noted that the CSO's role is not to initiate investigation and push issues through CBOs but to help the CBOs to perform their role in effective manner. e. The CSO chosen will have to understand that they operate within the context of the local bodies' regulations, particularly the LBFAR and be able to explain this to the CBOs

8.3 Annex 3: Participants of trainings for CEOs and Focal Persons

List of CEOs						
SN	Name	Home District	Assigned Cluster	Organization	Contact No.	Email
1	Dhruba Pd Sharma	Parbat	III (Tanahun, Rasuwa)	Sky Samaj Nepal	9841567181	sharmadhruba@gmail.com
2	Sanjit Ale Magar	Kathmandu	V (Kapilvastu, Pyuthan)	Sky Samaj Nepal	9841550493	smothely@gmail.com
3	Japendra Pd Bhandari	Palpa	IV (Gulmi, Nawalparasi)	Sky Samaj Nepal	9841445661	bhandari.jhapendra@yahoo.com
4	Amrita Adhikari	Palpa	VII (Banke, Surkhet, Kailali)	Sky Samaj Nepal	9848038607	aadhikari.skt@yahoo.com
5	Mahesh	Bara	II (Sarlahi,	Sky Samaj	9845038757	

	Raj Sharma		Bara, Parsa)	Nepal		
6	Ambika Poudel	Sarlahi	I (Udayapur, Mahottari)	Sky Samaj Nepal	9841801234	ambika.aashu2009@gmail.com
7	Tika Upreti	Ilam	VI (Dang, Salyan)	Sky Samaj Nepal	9842627848	ilamtika@gmail.com
List of Focal People						
1	Yuv Raj Parajuli	Udayapur		PRDC	9842828150	yrp.prdc@gmail.com
2	Prem Pd Poudel	Tanahun		NIRDC	9846065146	Prem.poudyal@gmail.com
3	Radha Krishna Sharma	Nawalparasi		HIMAWANTI Nepal	9847217639	rksharma_nawalparasi@yahoo.com
4	Mahendra Ghimire	Dang		SEP	9847848828	mgmahendra@yahoo.com
5	Saraswati Poudel	Surkhet		WAM	9848160773	
6	Dilip Karna	Sarlahi		SCDS	9741078646	scdssarlahi@gmail.com
7	Dipak Khanal	Kapilbastu		MESDO	9857029237	

8.4 Annex 4: Summary information of district orientations

S. N.	District	Date	No of Participants	Types of Participants
1	Kailali	14 December 2012	29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Local Development Officer (LDO) ♦ Chief District Engineer (CDE), ♦ Member of District Road Coordination Committee (DRCC) ♦ District Monitoring Committee (DMC) ♦ Representative from district line agency (DADO, DFO, DoR etc.) ♦ RAIDP focal person, RAIDP related personnel (Site Engineer, Site In-charge, Supervisor, Mobilizer) ♦ RAIDP Consultants (SPDE, SSDC, PDE, SDC) ♦ Representation from civil society organization (Journalist, ethnic and disadvantage group, women groups, NGO Federation/ Network), ♦ Representative from CBOs
2	Banke	16 December 2012	32	
3	Surkhet	18 December 2012	26	
4	Nawalparasi	19 December	37	
5	Tanahun	26 December 2012	26	
6	Gulmi	23 December 2012	27	
7	Dang	26 December 2012	35	
8	Salyan	2 January 2013	36	
9	Pyuthan	4 January 2013	33	
10	Rasuwa	4 January 2013	46	
11	Parsa	6 January 2013	37	
12	Bara	8 January 2013	48	
13	Mahottari	17 January 2013	51	
14	Sarlahi	18 January 2013	60	
15	Udayapur	20 January 2013	47	
16	Kapilvastu	22 January 2013	28	
Total 598				

8.5 Annex 5: Baseline information collection format

Capacity Building of CBOs for the Promotion of Transparency and Accountability in RAIDP

Bagdole, Lalitpur

Checklist for collecting Baseline Information

District:

Name of Road:

Surveyor:

Date:

Name of Respondent:

Name of

A. Measuring Understanding Level of CBOs (VRCC/LRUC/GHCs)

1. Do you know about ESMF Guideline of RAIDP?

- i) Yes ii) No

if Yes what is the understanding level

- i) Low* ii) Moderate** iii) High***

2. Do you know about entitlement matrix?

- i) Yes ii) No

if Yes what is the understanding level

- ♦ Low ii) Moderate iii) High

3. Do you know about the provision of Community Infrastructure and VCDP ?

- i) Yes ii) No

4. Do you know about role and responsibility of CBOs ?

- i) Yes ii) No

if yes, what is the level of understanding

- i) Low ii) Moderate iii) High

5. Do you know about starting date and completion date of this road sub project?

- i) Yes ii) No

6. Do you the name of contractor ?, Yes (), No ()

7. What is the cost of this improvement work ?, Yes (), No ()

8. Did you get orientation by project personnel?, Yes (), No ()

9. Do you know about monitoring mechanism of civil work ?, Yes (), No ()

10. What is the major interventions of this improvement work ?, Yes (), No ()

11. Do you know the process to report your grievances ?, Yes (), No ()

B. Information on Grievances

I. Registration of Grievances

S. N	Name of Road	Rate of Grievance Registered	Nature of Grievance (in no.)				
			Quality	Malpractice	Assistance Distribution	Environment	Other

II. Readdress of Grievances

S. N	Name of Road	Rate of Grievance Registered	No of Readdress	Average time taken (Regn-Redress)	Reason for not addressing the remaining grievances

* Knows only one questions out of five questions

**Knows three questions out of five questions

***Knows all questions

8.6 Annex 6: Sub-Project Work Plan

S.N	Activity	Years																Responsibility	Remarks
		2012-Months				2013-Months													
		SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		
1	Inception Phase																		
1.1	Literature Review	■	■															Central Team/CEO	
1.2	Selection of CEO		■	■														CSO/Central Team/Helvetas	
1.3	Orientation Program for CEO/LCSO		■	■														CSO/Central Team/Helvetas	
1.4	Field Mobilization of CEO		■	■														CSO/Central Team	
1.5	Introductory meeting with Concern Stakeholder			■	■													CEO/LCSO	
1.6	Baseline Data Collection				■	■												CEO	
1.7	Review Meeting with Helvetas			■			■		■			■				■		CSO/Central Team/Helvetas	Internal review meeting
2	Implementation Phase																		
2.1	Orientation to District level Stakeholder				■	■												Central Team/ CEO	
2.2	Formation & Reformation of CBOs				■	■	■											LCSO/CEO	
2.3	Mobilization of CBOs				■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	LCSO/CEO	
2.4	Media Campaign and Information dissemination				■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	CSO/Central Team/LCSO/CEO	
2.5	Preparation of Training Manual/IEC Material (Process in Revise)				■	■	■											Central Team/Helvetas	
2.6	Conduction of interaction with stakeholder				■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	CEO/Central team	
2.7	Conduction of ToT to CEO					■	■											Central Team/ CSO/Helvetas	
2.8	Conduction of Training to CBOs					■	■	■										Central Team/ CEO	
2.9	Facilitation for reporting and readdressing of grievances					■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	CEO	
2.10	Conduction of meetings with stakeholder					■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	Central Team/ CEO	
2.11	Preparation of LBT tools					■	■											Central Team/ CSO	
2.12	Facilitation to CBOs for Community Monitoring in Civil Work (Use of LBT/Field Observation/CBPM					■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	Central Team/ CSO/LCSO	
2.13	Stakeholder Review Meeting									■						■		CSO/Central Team/Helvetas	Participation of RAIDP & WB
3	Post Implementation Phase																		
3.1	Conduction of impact survey (Questionnaire survey & CSC)															■	■	CSO/Central Team/CEO & Additional Expert	
3.2	Interface meeting with stakeholder															■	■	Central Team & CEO	
3.3	Conduction of workshop															■	■	CEO/Central Team/ CSO/Helvetas	
3.4	Fina Review Meeting															■	■	CSO/Central Team/Helvetas	Participation of RAIDP & WB
4	Reporting				Inception			Semi-Annual								Annual		Central Team/ CSO/CEO	
																	Completion		

8.7 Annex 7: Summary of Selected Road and Number of CBOs

S N	Cluster No.	Name. of District	Name of Road	CBOs Type/Number				Type of Interventi on	Working Section
				BB	LRU C	GHC **	Total		
1	I	Udayapur	Gaighat-Phattepur Rural Road	3	2	1	6	Gravel	0+000-10+000
		Mahottari	Jaleshwar-Madai-Rauja-Bardibas Rural Road	3	1	1	5	Gravel	0+000-10+000
2	II	Sarlahi	Kaudena -Jankinagar Rural Road	6	1	1	8	Earthen	10+000-18+500
		Bara	Kawahigoth-Bariyarpur Rural Road	3	1	1	5	Gravel	5+500-10+750
		Parsa	Janta Rural Road	3	1	1	5	Gravel	1+300-3+300
3	III	Rasuwa	Simle-Bhorle- Parsang	2	1	1	4	Gravel	0+000-6+300
		Tanahun	Dhorbarahi Rural Road-I	2	1	1	4	Gravel	11+680-17+000
			Dhorbarahi Rural Road-II	1	1		2	Earthen	17+000-22+150
4	IV	Nawalparasi	Sahid-Alok-Chakrapatha Rural Road-I	2	1	1	4	Ottaseal	5+220-7+420
			Sahid-Alok-Chakrapatha Rural Road-II	1	1		2	Ottaseal	0+000-8+500
		Gulmi	Ridhi-Rudrabeni-Wamitaskar Rural Road-I	3	1	1	5	Gravel & Earthen	0+500-16+600
			Ridhi-Rudrabeni-Wamitaskar Rural Road-II	3	1		4	Gravel & Earthen	16+600-30+700
			Ridhi-Rudrabeni-Wamitaskar Rural Road-III	3	1		4	Earthen	30+700+45+500
5	V	Kapilvasthu	Jahidi-Bikuli Rural Road	2	1	1	4	Earthen	0+000-9+600
			Bargadawa-Titirkhi-Purhihawa Rural Road-I	3	1		4	Earthen	0+000-11+200
			Bargadawa-Titirkhi-Purhihawa Rural Road-II	2			2		
		Pyuthan	Khalanga-Gogitar Rural Road	3	1	1	5	Earthen	0+000-13+3

6	VI	Dang	Pawan Nagar – Purandhara Rural Road-I	3	1	1	5	Ottaseal	0+000-12+500
			Pawan Nagar – Purandhara Rural Road – II	1	1		2	Ottaseal	12+500-18+770
		Salyan	Tharmare-Chaurjari Road	2	1	1	4	Earthen	19+000-32+140
7	VII	Banke	Chyama-Samjhanachowk-Khajura-Sadhapur Rural Road-I	2	1	1	4	Gravel & Earthen	7+000-12+600
			Chyama-Samjhanachowk-Khajura-Sadhapur Rural Road-II	1	1		2	Gravel & Earthen	12+600-18+400
			Chyama-Samjhanachowk-Khajura-Sadhapur Rural Road-III	1	1		2	Gravel & Earthen	18+400-24+600
		Surkhet	Ratanangla-Dhanarpokhara Rural Road	1	1	1	3	Ottaseal	0+000-6+200
			Niglapani-Dhanarpokhara Rural Road	1			1	Ottaseal	6+200-12+200
		Kailali	Bahuniya -Joshiapur-Bhajani Rural Road-I	3	1	1	5	Gravel	7+500-12+600
			Bahuniya -Joshiapur-Bhajani Rural Road-II	3	1		4	Gravel	12+600-18+800
Total				63	26	16	105		

** Grievance Hearing Committee (GHC) is one for each district

8.8 Annex 8: Capacity building training schedule/content

Day I

S.N	Topics	Content	Time
1	Introduction of RAIDP and its Local Stakeholders	RAIDP and Its District Partners RAIDP and its Local Partners	11:00-12:00
2	Mechanism and process of LRUC and VRCC formation	LRUC & VRCC formation guidelines and process	12.00-13.00
Tea Time			
4	Objectives, roles and responsibilities of LRUC & VRCC	Objectives of LRUC & VRCC formation Roles and Responsibilities of LRUC & VRCC	13.10-14.10
5	Provision of Good Governance and Accountability (GA)in RAIDP	GAAP Mechanism of GA GHC	14:10-15:10
6	Tiffin Break		

Day II

S.N	Topics	Content	Time
1	Review	Review of first day session	11:00-11:20
3	VCDP provision and practices in RAIDP	VCDP provision and practices in RAIDP	11:20-12:20
4	Social Planning, Operation and Issue of Sustainability of CBOs	Social Planning Operation of social planning Issue of sustainability	12:20-13:20
	Social Safeguards Policy of RAIDP	Principles and policies of social safeguards	13:20-15:00
Tea Break			
5	Group Discussion & Evaluation		15:00-15:30
6	Tiffin Break		

Day III

S.N	Topics	Content	Time
1	Review of day II		11:00-11:20
2	Community monitoring mechanism	Community monitoring mechanism	11:20-13:00
3	Entitlement Matrix of RAIDP	Loss of Structure Loss of Land Loss of Livelihood	13:00-14:00
Tea Break			
4	Provision of Environmental Safeguard Measures in ESMF	Provision of Environmental Safeguard Measures in ESMF	14:00-15:00
5	Group Discussion & Evaluation		15:00-15:30
6	Tiffin Break		

Day IV

S.N	Topics	Content	Time
1	Land Acquisition Laws and Regulations of Nepal	Land Acquisition Act 1977 Regulation 1969	11:00-12:00
2	Field practice	Field Practice	12:00-15:00

Day V

S.N	Topics	Content	Time
1	Review of day III		11:00-11:10
2	Procurement Process	Procurement planning, bidding, pre-bid meeting, bid opening, bid evaluation, contract award	11:10-12:10
3	Quality control issues in civil works of road construction	Monitoring and supervision, Quality control and its objective, Factor affecting quality of works, Quality control system,	12:10-13:50
Tea			
4	Fundamental knowledge on civil works	Road component (Road formation, sub-grade, sub-base, base course, wearing course), retaining structures, side drains	13:50-14:50
5	Group Discussion & Evaluation		14:30-15:30
6	Tiffin Break		

DAY VI

S.N	Topics	Content	Time
1	Review of Day IV		11:00-11:20
2	Contract Administration (Condition of contract, Specification & bill of quantity)	Contract document, General condition of contract, Special condition of contract, Bill of Quantity (BOQ), Technical specification, contract implementation	11:20-12:20
3	Road construction process	Labor based Vs Mechanized technique, Compaction, road construction materials	12:20-13:00
Tea Break			
4	Application of simple toolkit	Labor based technique (LBT) tools for quality control, measuring tape, peg, ranging rod, string, camber board, template	13:00 -14:30
5	Group discussion & Evaluation		14:30-15:00
6	Tiffin Break		

DAY VII

S.N	Topics	Content	Time
1	Review of day V		11:00-11:20
2	Field practice	Field Practice	

8.9 Annex 9: Status of CBO Trainings

District	Road	No. of Road package	Training Status			
			Proposed no. of Training	No. of completed Training	No. of Participants	Status
Udayapur	Gaighat-Phattepur Rural Road	1	2	2	63	Completed
Mahottari	Jaleshwar-Madai-Rauja-Bardibas Rural Road	1	2	2	61	Completed
Sarlahi	Kaudena -Jankinagar Rural Road	1	3	3	92	Completed
Bara	Kawahigoth-Bariyarpur Rural Road	1	1	1	43	Completed
Parsa	Janta Rural Road	1	1	1	39	Completed
Rasuwa	Simle-Bhorle- Parsang Road	1	1	1	53	Completed
Tanahun	Dhorbarahi Rural Road	2	2	2	57	Completed
Nawalparasi	Sahid-Alok-Chakrapatha Rural Road	2	2	2	73	Completed
Gulmi	Ridhi-Rudrabeni-Wamitaskar Rural Road	3	4	3	99	Completed two trainings merged into one
Kapilvasthu	Jahidi-Bikuli Rural Road	1	1	1	28	Completed
	Bargadawa-Titirkhi-Purhihawa Rural Road	2	1	1	36	Completed
Pyuthan	Khalanga-Gogitar Rural Road	1	1	1	39	Completed
Dang	Pawan Nagar –Purandhara Rural Road	2	2	2	76	Completed
Salyan	Tharmare-Badagaun Senipily-Chaurjhari Rural Road	1	1	1	34	Completed
Banke	Chyama-Samjhanachowk-Khajura-Sadhapur Rural Road	3	2	2	95	Completed
Surkhet	Ratanangla-Dhanarpokhara Rural Road	2	2	1	57	Completed Two trainings merged into one
Kailali	Bahuniya -Joshiapur-Bhajani Rural Road	2	2	2	82	Completed
Total		27	30	28	1027	

8.10 Annex 10: ToT schedule

Day I

S.N	Topics	Content	Resource Person	Time	Remark
1	Introduction of RAIDP and its Local Stakeholders	RAIDP and Its District Partners RAIDP and its Local Partners	Mr. Raja Karmacharya Project Coordinator, RAIDP	10:00-11:00	
2	Mechanism and process of LRUC and VRCC Formation	LRUC & VRCC formation guidelines and process	Mr. Sita Ram Kandel	11.00-12.00	
3	Pedagogy, Communication Skills	Pedagogy	Helvetas	12.00-13.00	
		Tea Break		13.00-13.10	
4	Objectives, roles and responsibilities of LRUC & VRCC	Objectives of LRUC & VRCC formation Roles and responsibilities of LRUC & VRCC	Mr. Binod Pant	13.10-14.10	
5	VCDP provision and practices in RAIDP	CIDP and VCDP Role of CBOs in participant selection Practices and achievements	Miss Binita Pant	14.10-15.10	
		Snack Break		15.10-15.40	
6	Provision of Good Governance and Accountability (GA) in RAIDP	GAAP Mechanism of GA GHC	Mr. Prabhakar Pandit	15.40- 17.00	

Day II

S. N	Topics	Content	Resource Person	Time	Remark
1	Review	Review of first day session	Mr. Prabhakar Pandit	10:00-10:30	
2	Communication & Facilitation Skills	Communication & Facilitation Skills	Helvetas	10.30-11.30	
3	Procurement Process	Procurement planning, bidding, pre-bid meeting, bid opening, bid evaluation, contract award	Mr. Baikuntha Aryal	11.30- 12.30	
4	Social Planning, Operation and Issue of Sustainability of CBOs	Social Planning Operation of social planning Issue of sustainability	Mr. Binod Pant	12.30-13.30	
		Tea Break		13.30-13.40	
5	Community monitoring mechanism	Community monitoring mechanism	Mr. Sita Ram Kandel	13.40- 15.30	

		Snack		15.30-16.00	
6	Road construction process	Labor based Vs. Mechanized technique, Compaction, road construction materials	Er. Sudarshan Shrestha	16.00-17.00	

Day III

	Environmental Safeguard Measures in ESMF	Measures in ESMF			
Snack Break				15.30-16.00	
	Application of simple toolkit	Labor based technique (LBT) tools for quality control, measuring tape, peg, ranging rod, string, camber board, template	Er. Shekhar Shrestha	16.00 - 17.00	

Day IV

S.N	Topics	Content	Resource Person	Time	Remark
1	Review	Review of third day session	Central Team	10:00-11:00	
2	Field practice	Field Practice	Central Team/Helvetas	11.00 -17.00	

Day V

S.N	Topics	Content	Resource Person	Time	Remark
1	Review	Review of Field Practice	Mr. Prabhakar Pandit	10:00-10:30	
2	Social Safeguards Policy of RAIDP	Principles and policies of social	Dr. Shambhu Kattel	10.30 -12.20	
3	Land Acquisition Laws and Regulations of Nepal	Land Acquisition Act 1977 Regulation 1969	Dr. Shambhu Kattel	12.20- 13.20	
Tea Break				13.30-13.30	
4	Entitlement Matrix of RAIDP	Loss of Structure Loss of Land Loss of Livelihood	Dr. Shambhu Kattel	13.30-14.30	
5	Contract Administration (Condition of contract, Specification & bill of quantity)	Contract document, General condition of contract, Special condition of contract, Bill of Quantity (BOQ), Technical specification, contract implementation	Er. Shekhar Shrestha	15.00-16.00	

8.11 Annex 11: Participants in ToT

List of CEOs					
Name	Home District	Assigned Cluster	Organization	Contact No.	Email
Dhruba Sharma	Parbat	III (Tanahun, Rasuwa)	Sky Samaj Nepal	9841567181	sharmadhruba@gmail.com
Sanjit Ale Mager	Kathmandu	V (Kapilvastu, Pyuthan)	Sky Samaj Nepal	9841550493	smothely@gmail.com
Jhapendra Bhandari	Palpa	IV (Gulmi, Nawalparasi)	Sky Samaj Nepal	9841445661	bhandari.jhapendra@yahoo.com
Amrita Adhikari	Palpa	VII (Banke, Surkhet, Kailali)	Sky Samaj Nepal	9848038607	aadhikari.skt@yahoo.com
Mahesh Bhatta	Bara	II (Sarlahi, Bara, Parsa)	Sky Samaj Nepal	9845038757	
Ambika Poudyal	Sarlahi	I (Udayapur, Mahottari)	Sky Samaj Nepal	9841801234	ambika.aashu2009@gmail.com
Tika Uprety	Ilam	VI (Dang, Salyan)	Sky Samaj Nepal	9842627848	ilamtika@gmail.com

8.12 Annex 12: IEC materials developed and distributed to CBOs

District	Cluster	IEC material				
		Poster type (No)		Flex Print (No.)		Leaflet on CBPM (No.)
		Role/ Responsibility of CBOs	Entitlement Matrix	Role/ Responsibility of CBOs	Entitlement Matrix	
Udayapur	I	350	350	1	1	600
Mahottari				2	2	
Sarlahi	II	350	350	2	2	900
Bara				1	1	
Parsa				2	2	
Rasuwa	III	350	350	1	1	800
Tanahun				2	2	
Nawalparasi	IV	350	350	2	2	800
Gulmi				4	4	
Kapilvastu	V	350	350	3	3	700
Pyuthan				2	2	
Dang	VI	350	350	3	3	800
Salyan				2	2	
Banke	VII	320	300	4	4	1000
Surkhet				3	3	
Kailali				4	4	
Total-Distributed		2420	2400	38	38	5600
Total Stock for redistribution		80	100	0	0	400
Grand Total		2500	2500	38	38	6000

8.13 Annex 13: List of media mobilized in 16 districts

S.N	Name of District	Name of Radio and Newspaper
1	Udayapur	Radio Udayapur FM
		Baruwa Times
2	Mahottari	Radio Rudraksha FM
3	Sarlahi	Sarlahi Times
4	Bara	Bhojpuri FM
5	Parsa	Bhojpuri FM
6	Rasuwa	Radio Trisuli
		Image Newspaper
7	Tanahun	Lokbani Daily
8	Nawalparasi	Lumbini Daily
9	Gulmi	Radio Resunga
10	Kapilvastu	Lumbini Daily
11	Pyuthan	Samachar Daily
12	Dang	Indreni FM
13	Salyan	Radio Salyan
14	Banke	Banke FM
15	Surkhet	Radio Bheri FM
16	Kailali	Kalilali Fm

8.14 Annex 14: Number of CBOs' receiving LBTs and LBT equipment provided

SN	District	Cluster	No of CBOs receiving different tools (LBT Kit)			
			Tape (No.)		Camber Board (No.)	Dip stick (No.)
			Large (30m)	Steel (5m)		
1	Udayapur	I	13	13	3	13
2	Mahottari				2	
3	Sarlahi	II	18	18	2	18
4	Bara				2	
5	Parsa				3	
6	Rasuwa	III	11	11	2	11
7	Tanahun				2	
8	Nawalparasi	IV	13	13	3	13
9	Gulmi				3	
10	Kapilvastu	V	14	14	3	14
11	Pyuthan				2	
12	Dang	VI	14	14	3	14
13	Salyan				1	
14	Banke	VII	22	22	3	22
15	Surkhet				3	
16	Kailali				3	
Total-Distributed			105	105	40	105
Total Stock for redistribution			0	0	2	0
Grand Total			105	105	42	105

8.15 Annex 15: Status of Grievances in Different Roads

SN	Cluster No.	District	Road	Registered grievances	Redress Status		Addressed at	
					Not addressed	Addressed	Locally	District
1	I	Udayapur	Gaighat-Phattepur Rural Road	6	0	6	5	1
2		Mahottari	Jaleshwar-Madai-Rauja-Bardibas Rural Road	5	1	4	3	1
3	II	Sarlahi	Kaudena -Jankinagar Rural Road	6	1	5	4	1
4		Bara	Kawahigoth-Bariyarpur Rural Road	7	0	7	6	1
5		Parsa	Janta Rural Road	14	0	14	11	3
6	III	Rasuwa	Simle-Bhorle- Parsang	15	2	13	11	2
7		Tanahun	Dhorbarahi Rural Road-I	6	0	6	5	1
8			Dhorbarahi Rural Road-II	8	1	7	6	1
9	IV	Nawalparasi	Sahid-Alok-Chakrapatha Rural Road-I	11	1	10	7	3
10			Sahid-Alok-Chakrapatha Rural Road-II	9	0	9	7	2
11		Gulmi	Ridhi-Rudrabeni-Wamitaskar Rural Road-I	5	1	4	3	1
12			Ridhi-Rudrabeni-Wamitaskar Rural Road-II	7	1	6	5	1
13			Ridhi-Rudrabeni-Wamitaskar Rural Road-III	5	2	3	3	0
14		V	Kapilvasthu	Jahidi-Bikuli Rural Road	6	1	5	4
15	Bargadawa-Titirkhi-Purhihawa Rural Road-I			7	1	6	5	1
16	Bargadawa-Titirkhi-Purhihawa Rural Road-II			6	1	5	4	1
17	Pyuthan		Khalanga-Gogitar Rural Road	5	0	5	4	1
18	VI	Dang	Pawan Nagar – Purandhara Rural Road-I	6	0	6	5	1
19			Pawan Nagar – Purandhara Rural Road-II	5	1	4	4	0
20		Salyan	Tharmare-Chaurjari Road	4	0	4	3	1
21	VII	Banke	Chyama-Samjhanachowk-Khajura-Sadhapur Rural Road-I	5	1	4	3	1
22			Chyama-Samjhanachowk-Khajura-Sadhapur Rural Road-II	7	1	6	5	1
23			Chyama-Samjhanachowk-	6	1	5	4	1

		Khajura-Sadhapur Rural Road-III					
24	Surkhet	Ratanangla-Dhanarpokhara Rural Road-I	6	1	5	4	1
25		Niglapani-Dhanarpokhara Rural Road	5	1	4	4	0
26	Kailali	Bahuniya -Joshiपुर-Bhajani Rural Road	7	1	6	4	2
27		Bahuniya -Joshiपुर-Bhajani Rural Road	8	1	7	5	2
Total			187	21	166	134	32

8.16 Annex 16: Types of grievances

SN	Cluster No.	Name. of District	Name of Road	Registration (number)	Type of Grievance		
					Technical/ quality*	Social Safeguard**	Environmental Safeguard***
1	I	Udayapur	Gaighat-Phatampur Rural Road	6	2	3	1
2		Mahottari	Jaleshwar-Madai-Rauja-Bardibas Rural Road	5	2	2	1
3	II	Sarlahi	Kaudena -Jankinagar Rural Road	6	2	2	2
4		Bara	Kawahigoth-Bariyarpur Rural Road	7	3	2	2
5		Parsa	Janta Rural Road	14	6	5	3
6	III	Rasuwa	Simle-Bhorle- Parsang	15	8	4	3
7		Tanahun	Dhorbarahi Rural Road-I	6	3	2	1
8			Dhorbarahi Rural Road-II	8	3	3	1
9	IV	Nawalparasi	Sahid-Alok-Chakrapatha Rural Road-I	11	5	4	2
10			Sahid-Alok-Chakrapatha Rural Road-II	9	4	4	1
11		Gulmi	Ridhi-Rudrabeni-Wamitaskar Rural Road-I	5	3	2	0
12			Ridhi-Rudrabeni-Wamitaskar Rural Road-II	7	3	3	1
13			Ridhi-Rudrabeni-Wamitaskar Rural Road-III	5	3	1	1
14		V	Kapilvasthu	Jahidi-Bikuli Rural Road	6	2	2
15	Bargadawa-Titirkhi-Purhihawa Rural Road-I			7	2	2	3
16	Bargadawa-Titirkhi-Purhihawa Rural Road-II			6	2	3	2
17	Pyuthan		Khalanga-Gogitar Rural Road	5	2	2	1
18	VI	Dang	Pawan Nagar –Purandhara Rural Road-I	6	3	3	0
19			Pawan Nagar –Purandhara Rural Road-II	5	2	2	1
20		Salyan	Tharmare-Chaurjari Road	4	2	1	1
21	VII	Banke	Chyama-Samjhanachowk-Khajura-Sadhapur Rural Road-I	5	3	1	1
22			Chyama-Samjhanachowk-Khajura-Sadhapur Rural Road-II	7	4	2	1
23			Chyama-Samjhanachowk-Khajura-Sadhapur Rural Road-III	6	3	1	2

24	Surkhet	Ratanangla-Dhanarpokhara Rural Road-I	6	3	2	1
25		Niglapani-Dhanarpokhara Rural Road	5	3	2	0
26	Kailali	Bahuniya -Joshipur-Bhajani Rural Road	7	4	2	1
27		Bahuniya -Joshipur-Bhajani Rural Road	8	4	2	2
Total			187	86	64	37

8.17 Annex 17: Case Studies

Case study 1: Knowledge for social harmony

The Ghaighat-Phattepur road (9.845 Km) in Udayapur district is being improved by RAIDP since May, 2012. Sita Rai, (wife of Amrit Bdr. Rai), inhabitant of the road side had registered writ petition in Appellate Court, Rajbiraj dated October 11, 2012 against the fixing of road width covering more land in her single side of the road at the chainage 0+247. After intervention of CARTA programme, the issue of delay of works due to stay order of the court was discussed in meetings and interactions. As major component of CARTA programme, capacity building training (7 days) was provided to CBOs of the road sup-project to aware them on their roles and responsibilities where Mrs. Rai also participated. The CBOs developed action plan to resolve the land issue (registration of file in the court) along with other concerned issues in the course of the training. Based on their action plan, a series of meetings/interactions were conducted in coordination of SKY. Due to the frequent requests made by the CBOs to the concerned district authorities i.e. DDC/DTO/ RAIDP consultants, the issue was considered resolved so as to continue civil works. Regarding the issue, the authorities and the CBOs made field inspection to examine actual field scenario. As per the regular concern of the CBOs, an interface meeting including Mrs. Rai, DDC/DTO chief, RAIDP consultants and SKY was conducted. Based on the comprehensive discussion on the issue a consensus was made between DDC/DTP and the writ applicant. Based on the agreement, the fixation of the road width was made in such way that she felt justice to her. As a result of consensus of the CBO regarding the issue, Mrs. Rai withdrew her writ from the court.

SN	Activities	Date	Remark
1	Writ petition registration to appellate court	11 October, 2012	
2	Stay order by appellate court	7 November, 2012	
3	Meetings/interactions	Different date	CBOs, SKY
3	Conduction of training	(4-10) March, 2013	SKY
4	CBOs meeting on writ registration	23 March	SKY, DTO/CBOs
5	Meeting minute submission to DTO	1 April	CBOs, SKY
6	Field inspection	(20- 21) April	SKY, CBOs/ RAIDP
7	Interface Meeting	26 April	CBO, SKY, DTO/ RAIDP
8	Letter to DDC from the court	26 May	Legal end of the issue

Case study 2: Impact of capacity building training

Following district level interaction with concerned authorities and 7 day long capacity building training was provided to the representatives of CBOs. Participants were able to learn their roles and responsibilities and also were provided skills for technical assessment.

In Danda Jhalbas road (length 8.5 km; 3 CBOs; contract agreed on 26.07.2012; work accomplished on 25.09.2013), road construction process was going on smoothly at the beginning. Later, gravel work started. It was during this time, there was debate regarding the size of the gravel. In fact, the gravel was oversized despite the fact that BOQ clearly stated the size to be 65mm. There was telephonic sharing of grievance to DTO. Immediately, an interface meeting was conducted. As a result, the contractor agreed to replace the gravel. This was not the single time the issue related to size of the gravel were revealed. Every time, interface meetings had to be organized to resolve the cases.

The result is now for all to see. All those capacity building trainings have built the confidence of the CBO members to raise the issues. The results are that the quality of road has improved a lot and all the CBO members feel that it was because of their active initiation, the road quality has improved.

Chronological Development

- ♦ 7 days training to CBOs from 1st April to 7th April, 2013 on quality issues and ESMF along with field practice visit for application of tools kits and of monitoring mechanisms
- ♦ Observation of oversized gravel
- ♦ Concern of CBOs as the immediate response of 7 days capacity building training
- ♦ Discussion on BoQ and contract documents on 28th May, 2013
- ♦ Registration of grievances regarding oversized gravel on 5th June, 2013
- ♦ Interface meeting on 10th June, 2013 now contractor agreed to change the oversized gravel – participation in meeting-DTO authorities, representation of contractor, CBO members and SKY's CEO

***Capacity Building of CBOs
for the Promotion of Transparency and Accountability
in RAIDP***

(a CARTA project)

Objectives feasibility, finances, & self-evaluation

BY
SKY Samaj Nepal
Project Office: Bagdole, Lalitpur

March 2014

HELVETAS Intercooperation NEPAL
Dhobighat Lalitpur

Table of Contents

1	Assessment of realism of sub-project objectives	50
2	Financial management	50
3	Assessment of Performances	51
4	Annexes	53
4.1	Annex 1:Sub-project Terms of Reference (ToR)	53
4.2	Annex 2: Expenditure per Budget Lines	56

1 Assessment of realism of sub-project objectives

According to the impact study of the sub-project, all the objectives have been found to be realistic as evidenced by the achievements. The outputs and outcomes and expected impacts of the project clearly reveal that these objectives were realistically framed and designed considering the resources available, the capacity of SKY Samaj, and the time available. The capacity assessment of CBOs averaged a 98% achievement rate, in comparison with the baseline average of 50% (including understanding of ESMF provisions). The information on project implementation procedures was known by (on average) 88% of the members of CBOs at the end of the project.

The one objective that was not realistic concerned the monitoring of certain aspects of the labor contracts. When SKY started implementing the project, the labour contract was already completed thus making it difficult to monitor the bidding process. CBOs were not concerned about the wage rates that laborers had received because there was no problem in the timeliness and quality of work due to laborer issues. Further, because the laborers were not locally selected, and the contractor had already put a figure of wage in the bidding process, which CBOs could not influence to change, there was no self-interest for CBOs to monitor how laborers were selected and paid. However, when the payment to contractors was delayed which further stopped the work, then the CBOs lobbied the DDC to make sure that contractors were paid in time.

CBOs did discuss contract issues in their meetings, as evidenced in their minute books. It means that third objective could have been slightly modified: excluding monitoring of laborer contracts and payment procedures but still including discussion of contracts to ensure civil works were going on as agreed.

Increased evidences of CBOs' involvement in monitoring of civil works reflect that all of the project objectives were carefully and holistically designed. In addition, cost-effective activities have increased the potential for replication of similar works in other areas reflecting the realistic design of the objectives.

2 Financial management

Overall, the expenditure variation has not been significant in the sub-project as the expenditures were mostly carried out as originally planned or as agreed. The budget spent was 99.8% of planned budget. The saving from activities and sub-project staff was utilized to address administrative and secretariat issues.

The comparison of planned budget vs. expenditure reveals that the budget was sufficient to carry out the sub-project activities. However, if the LBTs could have been included from the beginning, more of the budget could have been utilized by providing more equipment to the CBOs. Additionally, if the sub-project budget could have included some budget for CBO management and cluster level CSO management, the overall performance could have improved with more CBOs regularly being engaged in the monitoring work as well as CSOs actively participating throughout the sub-project implementation.

However, it is worthwhile mentioning the readjustment of the budget agreed with PTF. The cost originally provisioned for preparation of IEC material was later broken down and allocated for preparation of Labor Based Tool kit, Media Campaign and Preparation of IEC materials as well. Media mobilization was considered effective way of sharing information to the CBOs and other stakeholders while the introduction of LBT is significant for capacitating CBOs for understanding quality of civil works. The possible needs and affects related to such changes were shared with PTF. The revised budget was effective for achieving the outcomes. Following

table reflects the revisions made in the budget as per the suggestion from CARTA RAIDP Advisor to adjust the budget for LBTs from the available and agreed sub-project budget.

Original and revised budget to adjust cost of LBT

Provision in Contract					USD	Revised/Proposed Provision					USD
Title	Sub Title	Q	Rate	Amt (NRs.)		Title	Sub Title	Q	Rate (NRs.)	Amt (NRs.)	
Prep of Training Manual (TM) and IEC Material	Prep of Train Manual (TM)	L S	LS	100000	1123.60	Prep of Training Manual (TM) and Labor-Based Tool (LBT)	Prep of Training Manual (TM)	L S	LS	100000	1123.60
	Prep of IEC Material	L S	LS	500000	5617.98		LBT-Camber board/slope measurement tool	28	4500	126000	1415.73
Media campaign and Info Dissemination	-	16	20000	320000	3595.51		LBT-Other tools	89	1000	89000	1000.00
						Prep of IEC material & Media	IEC Material	L S	LS	125000	1404.49
							Media Campaign	16	30000	480000	5393.26
Total				920000	10337.08	Total				920000	10337.08

LBT consisting of large tape (30m), steel tape (5 m), camber board and deep stick. The unit cost of large tape is 3.80 USD, small tape is 2.00 USD, deep stick is 4.30 USD and camber board is 20.30 USD based on the Exchange rate 1 USD=NRS 95.00.

The expenditure for various activities provides a general basis for cost for similar activities in future. However, it clearly depends on the location of project activities and the inflations rates. SKY has carried out the activities at a minimum possible cost. Please see details of budget expenditure in Annex 17.

The audits of SKY Samaj including that of this sub-project were completed for 2012-13. For this FY 2013-14, the audits will be conducted during July/August.

3 Performance Assessment

CBO's performance:

SKY had carried out an assessment of the performance carried out by various CBOs by mobilizing CEOs. Performance of CBOs was influenced by three distinct factors: geography, type and timeline of the intervention and presence of settlements/communities around the section of the roads. The performance of the CBOs was found to be relatively better in hilly district or CBOs in hilly region of the districts spread over hills and terai (e.g. Rasuwa, Dang, Udayapur) than in the Terai (e.g in Mahottari). Our finding revealed that the high level of participation, empowered community willing to participate in community monitoring, CBO members with ability to coordinate with stakeholders and high level of grievance registration and addressing practices made CBO perform well, particularly in hills or even in few cases, some specific communities of terai (e.g. in Banke

and Kailali). Likewise, performance of CBOs was not found to be relatively better if the capacity building of CBOs did not coincide with civil works for the road improvement. As for example, in the Ridi Rudrabeni road with civil work focused on road widening urgently, 60% of the work was completed when SKY started the sub-project. It was found that when major portion of the work was completed, CBOs members tend to give less priority on new things including following instructions to improve the civil work. Finally, it has also been noted that when there were communities along the section of the road, there was more ownership by CBOs and if the section of the road passed through unsettled area (e.g. barren public land, forest or agriculture land), CBOs were found to be relatively inactive. It meant, presence of communities had generated more interest to participate in community monitoring work.

SKY's administrative relations:

SKY is non-political but during this sub-project implementation, it ensured equidistance with all members of CBOs. Thus, support received from all CBO members representing to different political parties contributed in achieving all the objectives. This is a strong aspect of successful performance as revealed by sub-project staff and CBOs. Likewise, improved coordination and linkage with government during sub-project implementation is strength of SKY.

Mobilization of local CSOs for effective local stakeholders' coordination:

The performance of SKY has been partially contributed with the mobilization of the local CSOs. SKY benefitted from the 7 local CSO mobilization in the district where they were based. However, in 9 districts, these CSOs could not substantially contribute in local level coordination. SKY addressed this gap by mobilizing its own staff more frequently.

SKY's board members' support:

The support of the SKY's board members was instrumental in the success of the sub-project particularly through their support by engaging themselves in monitoring and supervision.

Use of LBTs:

SKY was not aware of the use of LBTs during the sub-proposal development stage. So, provision of support was not initially included in the sub-project proposal and budget. HELVETAS and PTF's suggestion to include LBT added value to the sub-project as CBOs used them in monitoring of the quality of the civil works.

Minimal support for CBOs:

Given that the CBOs are the beneficiaries of the quality civil works in road, they should have self-interest in participating in the monitoring work. However, travelling along up to 20km stretch of road regularly for monitoring meant that CBO members were required to pay on their own (approximately \$2 per monitoring visit-only for travel excluding food and snacks). They were not claiming allowances but costs of basic snacks and travel for regular visits and meetings. Some CBO members during the exit meeting revealed their slight demotivation for having to pay on their own while visiting district headquarter with a grievance for individual. Sometimes, CBO members had to stay in the district headquarter for number of days. Since the sub-project had not planned financial support to CBOs, it was revealed that this has been a limitation of the sub-project. If these CBOs were provided minimal support, it could be expected that their involvement in monitoring would have significantly increased with increased motivation.

Weakness related to CEO's placement and workload:

Since there were 7 CEOs only responsible for supporting CBOs and taking responsibility to carryout sub-project activities, it was found that due to geography, the workload was little higher with considerable time being spent on travel. This weakness in future would have to be addressed by calculating the time requirement of

such staffs across multiple districts as well as access to the districts (time required for travel). HELVETAS, through RAIDP’s efforts, were strong aspects in helping SKY coordinate effectively with the local stakeholders.

4 Annexes

4.1 Annex 1:Sub-project Terms of Reference (ToR)

Citizen Action for Results, Transparency and Accountability (CARTA) Programme
Rural Access Improvement and Decentralization Project (RAIDP)
Sub-project Terms of Reference for Concept Notes

HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation Nepal (HELVETAS Nepal) is inviting qualified Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) to submit Concept Notes proposing how they would carry out the sub-project described below, which is intended to strengthen the implementation of the World Bank-financed RAIDP. This sub-project will be financed by the CARTA programme being managed in Nepal by HELVETAS Nepal in partnership with the Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF). The CARTA programme is described on HELVETAS Nepal website, www.helvetasnepal.org.np, which also indicates the CSO eligibility criteria and provides Terms of Reference along with a template and instructions for submitting Concept Notes. The deadline for HELVETAS Nepal to receive Concept Notes for this sub-project is March 18, 2012.

Once a Civil Society Organization has been chosen for this sub-project, the PTF will assign a Project Advisor who will provide advice to PTF, HELVETAS Nepal and the CSO and help monitor implementation of the sub-project.

THE WORLD BANK-FINANCED PROJECT TO BE SUPPORTED BY THE SUB-PROJECT

1. Project information and components.	<p>Name: Rural Access Improvement and Decentralization Project (RAIDP): IDA Grant No.-171-NEP, 525-NEP & Credit 4664</p> <p>Start/End Date: 2005- 2010 restructuring 2009-end of December 2013</p> <p>Sector: Roads and Highways (100%)</p> <p>Themes: Rural Services and Infrastructure (60%) Decentralization (30%) Other Social Development (10%)</p> <p>Physical Area: 1,165 kms of rural roads and 211 kms of rural tracks in 30 districts</p> <p>Objectives: Road transport infrastructure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Rehabilitation and upgrading of about 1,165 kms of existing dry season rural roads to all season standard b. Upgrading of about 211 kms of rural trails and racks to dry season standard in remote hill districts c. Maintenance of about 4,500 kms of rural roads, covering routine and recurrent maintenance d. Construction of 317 short span trail bridges under Sector wide Approach (SWAP) development of small community infrastructure (market sheds, irrigation channels, rail roads, restoration of community sheds/tap stands, health centre buildings etc. e. Construction of 10 river crossing structures <p>Capacity Building and Advisory Services:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Implementation of training related activities b. Provision of technical assistance and advisory services c. Preparation of GIS based master transport plan d. Undertaking a rural transport study e. Provision of project implementation support <p>Implementation Status: already underway</p>
---	--

<p>2. For further information about the project and related guidelines</p>	<p>a. www.raidp.gov.np b. www.worldbank.org.np (http://web.worldbank.org) (Home>Countries>South Asia>Nepal>Projects & Programs)</p>
<p>3. Project implementation arrangements.</p>	<p>a. The Department of Local Infrastructure Development and Agricultural Roads (DoLIDAR) has a department wide Institutional Strengthening Action Plan (ISAP) which is financed by both ADB-DRILP, and RAIDP. b. DoLIDAR is the responsible GoN agency for this proposal. c. RAIDP has also appointed a Social Development Consultant (SDC) in each district to support DDCs with regard to social safeguards issues. SDCs are helping Village Road Coordination Committees (VRCCs) and Local Road Users Groups (LRUGs) in discharging their responsibilities. d. Community Based Organizations (CBOs) are recognized in the World Bank’s Project Appraisal Document (PAD) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ “Communities”: groups of population within which the project operates ♦ “NGOs/SMOs”: more formal groupings inter or intra communities for particular tasks ♦ “VRCCs”: Village Road Coordination Committees – set up by social development consultants of DoLIDAR ♦ “LRUGs”: Local Road Users Groups – set up by social development consultants of DoLIDAR ♦ “Grievance Committees”: – set up by DoLIDAR
<p>4. Monitoring measures already included (or will be included) in the project</p>	<p>A very large number of monitoring measures at both technical, social and environmental levels already exist (see project risk worksheet of PAD)</p> <p>Procurement capacity assessment of road agencies E-bidding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Use of Right to Information (RTI) ♦ Material testing laboratory per district ♦ Quality Assurance Plan with outsourced independent inspector <p>Request for Inspection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Physical monitoring 3 x p.a. by Project Support Consultants ♦ Sample independent technical audit by National Vigilance Centre (NVC) ♦ Blacklisting and prosecution in case of proven corruption ♦ Awareness campaign on corruption ♦ Independent and confidential complaint handling mechanism ♦ Local Communities given responsibility to monitor Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) <p>Community based performance monitoring of quality work and safeguards by VRCCs and LRUGs Annual social audits by VRCCs</p>
<p>THE SUB-PROJECT DESCRIPTION</p>	
<p>1. Governance gaps in the project’s implementation arrangement to be addressed by the sub-project.</p>	<p>Quality and Governance issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Quality of work done b. Probity and integrity in contracting local labor c. Use of complaints handling mechanism d. Information dissemination of intended/undertaken work e. Procurement and collusion practices f. Environmental and social safeguard issues <p>Quality and Governance gaps</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clear understanding of what is quality, and what are the quality requirements with respect to specification b. Clear understanding of what work has been agreed, expected cost, time, and of what quality standards c. Clear understanding in communities of general principles and procedures of procurement to be used, and their role and how complaints should be handled d. Clear understanding of the responsibilities and governance of the different groups (VRCCs, LRUGs, Grievance Committee etc.) e. Clear understanding on the environmental and social safeguard issues applied in the project with respect to Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF) guidelines.

<p>2. Sampling of districts to be included in the sub-project.</p>	<p>Select eight districts to be covered in the sub-project, in accord with the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> At least one district from each cluster is to be selected. Districts having on-going road projects are to be prioritized. Districts having low HDI are to be prioritized. A balance between hill and Terai districts is preferred. <p>The information necessary to select districts is available on the RAIDP website: www.raidp.gov.np.</p>
<p>3. CSO activities intended to address identified gaps</p>	<p>At present, it seems, there are a number of CBOs formed with the help of DDCs which report to the DDC, and which is an important element in the design of the project. These are VRCCs, LRUGs, and Grievance Committees. The job of the CSO is to support and backstop these CBOs.</p> <p>The CSO's priority is to strengthen the capacity of CBOs to monitor civil works (i.e. construction, rehabilitation, maintenance and up-grading) and contracts under the project and make representations when they believe performance is unsatisfactory, by undertaking the following activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Help the CBOs to understand quality in respect of roads by training them in quality inspection so that these CBOs can make representation to the DDC. This will involve developing training materials that the CBOs can use to monitor the roads. Help the CBOs to monitor the labor contracts and payments of the contractors. Help the CBOs, when there is a case of malpractice that they wish to report, in how to approach the DDC, the contractors, and, if there is no resolution, higher authorities, like DoLIDAR, Ministry of Local Development, National Vigilance Centre, and Commission for the Investigation of Abuse of Authority etc. <p>As appropriate, depending on the needs of individual CBOs, the CSO will also assist them by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Assisting in the formation, management and administration of CBOs. Helping CBOs perform their responsibilities, particularly making representations to DDCs. Helping CBOs understand the policy and principles of the environmental and social safeguard issues (ESMF) and applied activities in the project. <p>In all respects the CSO should be prepared to act as a backstop and support to the CBOs which have already been formed or will be formed in the case of new road projects. CSO activities will be within the scopes of the existing government rules and regulations (e.g. Local Body Financial Administration Rules, 2007 or LBFAR).</p>
<p>4. Information and analyses to demonstrate and measure impacts of the sub-project on the project.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor the number of times CSOs or CBOs make representations to the DDC alleging quality deficiencies in civil works supported by the project. Compare the frequency of these representations with experience before the sub-project. Monitor the number of times CBOs report malpractice. Compare the frequency of these reports with experience before the sub-project. Describe improvements in the management and administration of CBOs as a result of support to them under the sub-project Indicate how CBOs supported by the sub-project clearly understand the quality requirements in civil works supported by the project. Indicate how CBOs understand what work has been agreed on, expected cost time, and procurement procedures. Describe the grievance mechanism established and describe CBOs' familiarity with it. Indicate the extent to which CBOs have clear knowledge of the responsibilities and governance of the different groups (VRCCs, LRUGs, Grievance Committee, etc.) <p>The CSO should also suggest any other ways in which the effects of sub-project activities on the project's performance can be demonstrated and monitored.</p>
<p>5. Desirable characteristics of CSOs applying for sub-project</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The project needs a solidly based well trusted local CSO with local membership, which has the ability to communicate well throughout the community, which is seen by its members and by DDC/VDC to be independent, to have integrity, and not likely to strike deals with contractors or DDC. It also has to have (or be able to acquire) technical knowledge about quality It has to be independent and be able to guide, advice the CBOs to proceed with the issues with right procedure and in effective manner. It is to be noted that the CSO's role is not to initiate investigation and push issues through CBOs but to help the CBOs to perform their role in effective manner. The CSO chosen will have to understand that they operate within the context of the local bodies' regulations, particularly the LBFAR and be able to explain this to the CBOs

4.2 Annex 2: Expenditure per Budget Lines

Budget Category*		Budget (NPR)	Total expenses			
			Sources of Funding Used			
			PTF		CSO Contbn (NRs.)	
			NRs	(USD)		
A	Sub Project Staff		NPR	USD	NPR	
1	Team Leader	975,000	975,000.00	10,919.75	-	
2	Road Quality & Procurement Engineer	280,000	259,000.00	2,972.47	-	
3	Good Governance Training Expert	455,000	455,000.00	5,003.17	-	
4	Admin-Finance Manager	450,000	450,000.00	5,039.93	-	
5	Community Enhancement Officer	2,537,500	2,520,000.00	28,186.09	17,500.00	
	Total A	4,697,500	4,659,000.00	52,121.42	17,500.00	
B	Administration/Secretariat					
1	Office Rent	225,000	-	-	225,000.00	
2	Local Transportation	300,000	5,660.00	65.40	303,500.00	
3	Use of Computer and Printer/Scan	300,000	46,640.00	538.94	257,465.00	
4	Stationary	150,000	3,200.00	36.98	148,080.00	
5	Communication	750,000	6,600.00	76.27	95,010.00	
6	Inter cluster Transportation	240,000	240,000.00	2,707.56	13,725.00	
7	DSA for cluster staff	600,000	577,000.00	6,539.46	20,000.00	
8	Transportation for central level staff	500,000	416,560.00	4,735.14	99,240.00	
9	Cost for additional experts	400,000	370,000.00	4,153.31	30,000.00	
10	DSA for central level staff	800,000	721,000.00	8,095.80	64,000.00	
	Total B	3,590,000	2,386,660.00	26,948.86	1,256,020.00	
C	Activities					
1	Review of Literature					
	Collection Information	10,000	10,000.00	115.55	400.00	
2	Selection of CEO					
	Cost for selection of CEO	70,000	70,000.00	808.87	2,800.00	

3	Orientation to CEO & Local CSO				
	Stationary	35,000	31,600.00	365.15	-
	Tea and Snacks	21,000	24,400.00	281.95	-
	Sub Total	56,000	56,000.00	647.10	-
4	Orientation to Stakeholders				
	Stationary	80,000	72,800.00	841.23	-
	Hall Rent	48,000	42,000.00	485.32	-
	Local Transportation	80,000	88,000.00	1,016.87	-
	Tea and Snacks	80,000	85,200.00	984.52	1,400.00
	Sub Total	288,000	288,000.00	3,327.94	1,400.00
5	Formation and Mobilization of CBOs				
	Local Transportation	20,000	34,000.00	392.88	600.00
	Tea and Snacks	100,000	86,000.00	993.76	-
	Sub Total	120,000	120,000.00	1,386.64	600.00
6	Preparation of Training Manual & IEC Material (Revised)				
	Training Manual	100,000	100,000.00	1,155.54	-
	Use of LBT	215,000	215,000.00	2,484.40	-
	Sub Total	315,000	315,000.00	3,639.94	-
7	Conduction of ToT for CEO				
	Stationary/Training Material	7,500	7,500.00	86.67	900.00
	Tea and Snacks	12,000	12,000.00	138.66	800.00
	Logistic	90,000	90,000.00	1,039.98	-
	Sub Total	109,500	109,500.00	1,265.31	1,700.00
8	Post Implementation	140,000	50,000.00	505.05	52,400.00
9	Conduction of Meeting, Interaction, Training and Workshops				
	Meeting				
	Local Transportation	294,000	274,000.00	3,055.64	-
	Interaction				
	Local Transportation	47,600	45,800.00	513.24	-
	Tea and Snacks	285,600	279,700.00	3,108.70	-
	Sub Total	333,200	325,500.00	3,621.94	-

	Training				
	Stationary	136,000	146,600.00	1,694.01	-
	Hall Rent	238,000	192,140.00	2,220.24	-
	Tea and Snacks	380,800	416,060.00	4,807.72	600.00
	Local Transportation	47,600	47,600.00	550.03	-
	Sub Total	802,400	802,400.00	9,272.01	600.00
	Workshop				
	Stationary	20,000	20,290.00	204.95	-
	Hall Rent	9,000	12,280.00	124.04	-
	Logistic	300,000	319,448.00	3,226.75	2,458.00
	Transportation	100,000	51,792.00	523.15	-
	Tea and Snacks	50,000	75,190.00	759.49	-
	Sub Total	479,000	479,000.00	4,838.38	2,458.00
10	Preparation of IEC Material & Media Mobilization (Revised)				
	Preparation of IEC Material	125,000	125,000.00	1,444.42	3,000.00
	Media Mobilization	480,000	460,100.00	5,124.64	-
	Sub Total	605,000	585,100.00	6,569.06	3,000.00
11	Monitoring Evaluation	960,000	832,200.00	9,191.40	-
12	Reporting, documentation & Presentation				
	Reporting	30,000	12,000.00	138.66	-
	Documentary Preparation	200,000	120,000.00	1,212.12	-
	Sub Total	230,000	132,000.00	1,350.79	-
	Total C	4,812,100	4,448,700.00	49,595.63	65,358.00
	Total (A+B+C)	13,099,600	11,494,360.00	128,665.91	1,338,878.00
D	Additional Expenses				
	Cost for Impact Study	140,000	140,000.00	1,414.14	-
	Cost for Final Report Preparation	100,000	100,000.00	1,010.10	-
	Total D	240,000	240,000.00	2,424.24	-
	Grand Total	13,339,600	11,734,360.00	131,090.15	1,338,878.00