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Preface

Background and Objectives of GSEA 2011/Sectoral Series: Monograph 5

Gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) have been recognized by the Government of Nepal and its development partners as critical to equitable development. Particularly following the Second People’s Movement (or Jana Andolan II) of April 2006, the efforts of the government, with the support of development partners, have been aimed at transforming the country into an inclusive and just state, with an eye to restructuring existing power relations to ensure the rights of all citizens, regardless of caste, ethnicity, religion, gender, region, age, or class. The Interim Constitution (2007) guarantees social justice and affirmative action for women, Dalits, Adivasi Janajatis, Muslims, Madhesis, and other excluded or disadvantaged groups. It also proposes the future restructuring of the state to institutionalize an inclusive, democratic and progressive governance system, maximizing people’s participation based on devolution of power, and the equitable distribution of resources.

The Gender and Social Exclusion Assessment (GSEA), which was jointly produced by the World Bank (WB) and the UK Department of International Development (DFID), was delivered to the National Planning Commission (NPC) in June of 2005 and published in summary version in early 2006 as Unequal Citizens: Gender, Caste and Ethnic Exclusion in Nepal.

As a complement to the Gender and Social Exclusion Assessment, DFID, WB and ADB have collaborated to produce a series of monographs with practical guidance on how to mainstream gender equality and social inclusion in seven key service-delivery sectors: agriculture, education, forestry, health, irrigation, rural infrastructure (with an emphasis on roads), and rural and urban water supply and sanitation—to which additional sectors may be added in the future.

The current process of political transition provides a very significant opportunity for greater inclusion and equitable development. The Interim Constitution (2007) and the Three-Year Interim Plan (2008-2010) reflect commitments made for the social, political and economic transformation of Nepal. For the country’s development partners, including DFID, WB and ADB, mainstreaming gender equality and social inclusion in their overall work is mandated by global and national agency directives. For instance, in its country partnership strategy (2010-2014), ADB recognizes the need to “address gender, ethnic, and caste discrimination through policy reform, targeted investments, and the mainstreaming of equal opportunity measures in key sector investments”, and aims to guide and ensure that in all ADB operations and sectoral assistance, gender and social inclusion concerns are adequately addressed (ADB 2009). DFID’s country business plan for Nepal states that, “Gender is at the heart of our work … all our work considers impacts on women and girls.” Efforts to promote gender equality and social inclusion are likewise an integral part of the World Bank’s current interim strategy for
Nepal (World Bank, 2009) and the new strategy being developed.

In Nepal over the last few years there has been a growing practice of developing gender- and inclusion-sensitive interventions, especially in the government’s sector-wide programs supported by multiple donors (e.g., Local Governance and Community Development Program [LGCDP], health, education and rural transport SWAps [sector-wide approach]). Various sectors have also developed their own GESI strategies (e.g., forestry, agriculture, health and local development). This Series attempts to provide coherence to GESI mainstreaming done by the government, donor agencies and other development actors, and to introduce a tool that can be commonly applied across sectors for mainstreaming in policies, programming, budgeting, monitoring, and reporting. The aim of the Series is to help make the Government of Nepal’s goal of universal access to key public services and resources a reality for all Nepali citizens. A major focus has thus been on identifying the specific barriers faced by different groups and the resultant impact of those barriers; assessing policies, program modalities, and project mechanisms that have worked best to overcome these barriers; and identifying the measures that work best to mainstream GESI in sectoral programming.

Process of Developing GSEA 2011/Sectoral Series Monographs

Each of the sectoral assessments consisted of document review, meetings with sector specialists and stakeholders, diversity and budget analysis, some fieldwork, wider consultative workshops, and follow-up meetings. Meetings and interactions were held with more than 100 people from government, civil society, commissions, representative associations/organizations of excluded groups, and projects/programs. Sectoral consultation workshops with approximately 30 participants in each were organized with key stakeholders, namely, government, project/program staff, donor agencies, and representative organizations. Literature review was a major source of information for the development of these monographs; however, some fieldwork was also done by team members in selected districts.

Draft versions prepared by Greg Whiteside (health), Elvira Graner (education), Bijaya Bajracharya (agriculture/forests/irrigation), Jennifer Appave (water supply and sanitation), and Shuva Sharma (rural infrastructure/roads) were used as background information and built upon where possible. As the GESI framework began to emerge as an important way forward, ADB, DFID and the World Bank decided that the sectoral assessments should be structured around this framework so that practitioners using the monographs would become familiar with the approach. Due to its previous experience in the development and application of the GESI framework, the Human Resource Development Centre (HURDEC), a private management consultancy firm of Nepal, was commissioned by WB/DFID to lead the development of the sectoral series. Jennifer Appave was commissioned by ADB to work with the HURDEC team from January to June 2010 to prepare the drafts. The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) provided technical support through two advisers.

The team members who prepared the different sectoral monographs in this series are as follows: 1) agriculture—Jennifer Appave and Chhaya Jha, with inputs from Yadab Chapagain and Yamuna Ghale (SDC); 2) education—Jaya Sharma and Chhaya Jha, with inputs from Yadab Chapagain (HURDEC); 3) forestry—Bimala Rai-Paudyal (SDC) and Chhaya Jha; 4) health—Chhaya Jha; 5) irrigation—Chhaya Jha and Jennifer Appave, with inputs from Pranita Bhushan and Yadab
The Sectoral Series Monograph would not have made it to their current published form without the diligence and creativity of the Himal Books team responsible for the final editorial and design support. Led by Deepak Thapa, the team included Amrita Limbu (editorial assistance) and Chiran Ghimire (layout and design).

The monographs in this series should be considered as learning documents that will allow for sectoral data and analysis to be updated and improved based on sectoral experiences and sharing of good practices. The monographs in this series all have a common introduction and a common final chapter outlining the generic steps in the GESI mainstreaming process which is intended as a handy reference guide for practitioners. The sectoral monographs have been published in alphabetical order, covering agriculture, education, forest, health, irrigation, rural infrastructure (roads), and rural and urban water supply and sanitation. Additional sectors will be included over time.

Notes

1 For the World Bank, the gender-mainstreaming strategy (2001) and operational policy and Bank procedures statement (2003) provide the policy framework for promoting gender issues as part of strategically focused analytical work, policy dialogue and country assistance (World Bank 2006). The policy on gender and development (1998), Strategy 2020, and ADB results framework articulate ADB’s commitment to gender, and require that gender inequalities be addressed in all aspects of ADB work (ADB 2010). The principal elements of DFID’s gender policy and strategy are contained in DFID (2000, 2002). A “twin-track” approach based on mainstreaming of gender issues in all areas and sectors, while maintaining a focus on the empowerment of women as a disadvantaged group, has been adopted (Jensen et al, 2006).

2 The UK government’s program of work to fight poverty in Nepal, 2009-2012.
The purpose of this monograph is twofold. First, it assesses the current situation of gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) in Nepal’s irrigation sector. It identifies the barriers faced by women, the poor and the excluded in accessing irrigation-related benefits and services. It considers the policy, legislative and social barriers, and how the various policies, processes and programs have worked to address them. Second, it provides practical guidance on how to improve existing responses and take further action for more equitable access to irrigation services and benefits for women, the poor and the excluded.

The Agriculture Perspective Plan and government policy documents (such as the Tenth Five-Year Plan, the Three-Year Interim Plan and annual budgets) highlight irrigation as key to raising household income and food security in rural areas. But delays in improved irrigation technology inputs, government focus on big schemes, and removal of subsidies in groundwater irrigation have been major setbacks for the poor, women and other excluded groups. Access to irrigation is defined by issues attached to investment made in system construction, which is available only to those who can invest, and thus excludes women, the poor and the excluded more acutely than others.

There are a number of barriers for women, the poor and the excluded. The landless are directly excluded from accessing irrigation services and benefits because they do not own land in the irrigated command area. Thus, they are never direct beneficiaries of the sector, as the distribution of irrigation water is land based, making irrigation development inherently biased against the landless and land poor. Upstream-downstream inequity is a major issue in access to irrigation. If farmers at the head take all the water they need for water-intensive crops, those towards the middle and tail end are left largely dry. Lack of complete information and inability to comprehend government application forms are also a constraint for time-strapped rural women, the poor and the excluded, who are then dependent on literate members of the community. Despite policy mandates for inclusion in user groups, there is inadequate voice for the excluded. Issues include formalization of user associations with paperwork that gives access only to educated members; the need to participate in water user meetings constrains the poor and women, as does night irrigation; caste and ethnicity-based social restrictions impact maintenance work; and payment of irrigation fees, the politicization of the process in general, and inequitable labor contributions. For the very poor, access to credit for the installation of irrigation systems can be very difficult unless collateral-free loans are available. Traditional practices of not eating food or drinking water touched by Dalits prevent the latter from accessing irrigation water.

Irrigation activities have been understood mostly as technical hardware work, strictly for men, thus making women invisible and affecting their level of involvement in the sector. Although it could somewhat address gender issues, the investment necessary in small-scale schemes...
(drip or groundwater irrigation) at a farmer or small-group level is very low. The overall impact of the adoption of drip irrigation technology has been found to be positive for women in terms of reduction of workload, access to food and income, and bargaining power in intra-household decisions. Irrigation powers, authorities and expertise are mostly vested in men, and successful performance as a water manager is strongly correlated with behavioral characteristics associated more with men than with women.

Recent policies have shifted the sector’s focus from the completely technical to one that recognizes and addresses human, societal and environmental aspects. Issues of remoteness, farmer contributions for rehabilitation or construction of new irrigation systems with government support, and participation of women and other users in water user associations have been addressed. But these policies lack explicit mandates and mechanisms for ensuring inclusion at each stage from program development to evaluation. Various programs are trying to address these. Several small, medium and large irrigation schemes have been developed in different parts of the country, for both surface and groundwater resources, with internal and external funding.

We discuss three key programs: the Community-Managed Irrigated Agriculture Sector Project, the Integrated Water Resource Management Program and the Non-conventional Irrigation Technology Project. The former two focus on activities that are likely to improve the assets and capabilities of members of user groups, including women. The Community-Managed Irrigated Agriculture Sector Project incorporates specific activities to build the capacity of women for improved water management at the water user association level, while the Integrated Water Resource Management Program includes a focus on Dalits and Adivasi Janajatis. But both lack adequate emphasis on addressing the underlying structural issues constraining the empowerment of women, the poor and the excluded. The Non-conventional Irrigation Technology Project, meanwhile, complements the water resources strategy and National Water Plan. Programs on community-managed irrigated agricultural systems, non-conventional irrigation technology, and capacity development of disadvantaged water user associations are based on the principle of social inclusion, regional balance and equitable development seeking the participation of women, the poor and excluded communities.

Efforts have also been made to create a supportive environment for the poor and women. Social mobilization, group formation, and investing in capacity building are some of the interventions that have helped to address structural barriers. However, the discourse in the sector reflects an assumption that the water user association approach will ensure access to services for all group members. Self-exclusion of the extreme poor and often socially excluded groups (like Dalits) occurs due to time constraints and inability to make the financial contributions that are generally required. Further, with minimal GESI-sensitive planning of activities and budget, it is difficult to understand how the sector services will reach difficult-to-reach groups. Project design and implementation thus need to recognize that abilities, interests and needs will almost certainly vary, based on gender/caste/ethnicity/location realities and will subsequently require flexibility in responses.

There are several practical operational steps that need to be put in place, including a revision of different policies to address any exclusionary issues. Also important is a review of sectoral and project budgets, resource availability and allocation decisions, including development of gender- and inclusion-responsive budgeting; and further analysis of monitoring and evaluation systems to include structuring systems that are
disaggregated by sex, caste/ethnicity/regional identity and location. Monitoring and reporting need to capture information and track changes in access to assets and services, improvements in voice and influence, and shifts in policy and legal frameworks and the community-based governance structures. In addition, it is necessary to put in place the mechanisms, tools and organizational and human capacity essential for effective GESI mainstreaming. Unless there are clear linkages between personal reward structures and performance against GESI criteria, it is going to be difficult to institutionalize these practices within the sector. Changing cultures, behaviors and structures requires that some of the longer-term exclusion issues are addressed, such as promoting the conditions for entry to employment in the irrigation sector through investment in scholarships, changes to the content of training courses of government staff, and creating more supportive working environments for women professionals. Finally, the most important issue to be addressed is the positioning of women, the poor and the excluded as key actors in the sector, rather than as passive beneficiaries.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction and Overview
1.1 Introduction
This introduction and overview chapter defines the dimensions of exclusion and presents the framework for gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) mainstreaming that has been used for all the sectoral monographs. It presents an outline of the current situation of gender equality and social inclusion in Nepal, and summarizes the findings of the seven sectoral monographs. It presents the barriers that have been identified for women, the poor and the excluded, and discusses the national, international and sectoral policy mandates for GESI, the institutional structures and mechanisms established by the government for women and excluded groups, the sectoral findings regarding institutional arrangements for GESI, the diversity of civil personnel in the various sectors, and the working environment. It summarizes the findings regarding the existing practice of gender-responsive budgeting (GRB), the results of GESI budgeting that was applied in the seven sectors, and the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system in use. The good practices, lessons learned and way forward for the sectoral monographs are also summarized.

1.2 Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Framework and Defining the Excluded
For the last 60 years, since the 1951 overthrow of the Rana regime, Nepal has been struggling to transform its feudal economic and political system, and to leave behind the ingrained hierarchies of gender and caste. But these deep-seated systems for organizing the world and structuring power relations do not change easily. Despite formal laws that guarantee equal treatment to men and women as well as to Dalits, Tharus and Brahmins, to Madhesis and Paharis, and to Hindus, Muslims and Christians, many of the old habits of thought and daily behavior endure. The vulnerability and dependency of women are persistent in a patriarchal culture where, despite the fact that their labor was critical to the subsistence agricultural economy, women were little valued, did not inherit family land, and could be cast out if the husband favored a younger wife.

Persistent too is the chronic poverty of groups such as the Dalits at the bottom of the caste hierarchy, who, in addition to the humiliation of being considered “impure” and therefore “untouchable,” have faced structural barriers to education and economic opportunities for generations. The Adivasi Janajatis, or indigenous groups in Nepal, most of whom were subdued some 250 years ago during the Gorkha conquests, have also found themselves placed within the Hindu caste hierarchy. Because of their numbers (37% of the population) and their military prowess, Adivasi Janajatis were given a place in the middle of the hierarchy rather than at the bottom, as they were in India. Ironically, even though it was a system imposed on them by outsiders, to preserve their own status in the hierarchy many Janajati groups adopted the same discriminatory behavior towards Dalits as that practiced by the “high-caste” rulers. Similarly, even the caste Hindus in the plains, or Madhes, of Nepal were looked down upon and treated as foreigners when they visited Kathmandu, the capital of their own country.

The list of grievances is long and groups that have been historically excluded are many in Nepal. As development practitioners and sectoral specialists, we need to know at least something of this historical and cultural context, so that we can design sectoral interventions in ways that are sensitive to the dense systems of exclusion that often still prevail in the communities where we hope to deliver services, infrastructure and livelihood opportunities. Our goal in this publication is to show how it is possible to design and implement the interventions we support in
ways that bring equal benefit to men and women from all these groups.

This monograph is concerned with two major dimensions of exclusion: economic and social. As shown in Figure 1.1, when it comes to poverty, or economic exclusion, we are concerned with the poor of all castes, ethnicities, locations and sexes.

The socially excluded groups include women, Dalits, Adivasi Janajatis, Madhesis, Muslims, people with disabilities and people from geographically remote areas. What we also need to keep in mind is that the dimensions of exclusion are cross-cutting and cumulative. Some of our clients suffer some dimensions of exclusion but not others—for example, a poor Brahmin woman from Gorkha Bazaar is privileged in terms of her caste and her fairly well-connected location, but excluded by her poverty and gender. Other clients suffer from exclusion in almost all dimensions: for example, a poor Dalit woman in Jumla must contend with four dimensions—poverty, caste, gender and remoteness—of exclusion. The fact that these dimensions all interact with each other in different ways to frame the life chances of the different individuals we are trying to reach is why we need to look at exclusion in a holistic way. This is particularly true for gender, as prior efforts have taught us that it is far less effective to target gender and social inclusion separately. Further, looking at men’s and women’s realities is not enough—it is also necessary to ask “which women” and “which men.”

As will be elaborated in greater detail throughout this series, it is essential for each sector to define who the excluded in that sector are and the cause of their exclusion. The GESI framework that is used for the sectoral monographs recognizes that both formal institutions (the legal framework, the policies of the sectoral ministry or even the specific procedures and components laid out in the formal project document) and informal institutions (the traditional norms of behavior for women and Dalits or the networks of political patronage) can present barriers to inclusion. Therefore, we keep an eye out for both of these dimensions throughout the GESI process.

The framework follows five key steps required to mainstream GESI in sectoral programming (visualized in Figure 1.2):

i. identifying the excluded and the reason for their exclusion from access to services and opportunities in the sector;

ii. designing policy and/or program-level responses that attempt to address the barriers in the program cycle;

iii. implementation;

iv. monitoring and evaluation to check whether planned resources and actions have reached women, the poor and the excluded; and (if M&E findings show the need)

v. adjustment/redesign and continued M&E.

First step: Identification. This requires mapping the existing status of women, the poor, and the socially excluded in the sector, based on disaggregated qualitative and quantitative data and assessment of the available evidence. Analysis of existing policies (in the sector and beyond since policies in other sectors may also be blocking access), formal institutional structures and processes, and informal institutions (kinship, gender, caste systems and business and party net-
works) is necessary to understand exactly how social inequities based on gender, caste, religion, ethnicity and location have been created and/or maintained. The key actors in these existing structures also need to be critically assessed in terms of their ability (and incentives) to change their behavior and values, and to transform processes and mechanisms.

In addition to assessing the barriers constraining each group from enjoying their rights, we need to map existing policy and program responses (if any), and assess whether these are addressing, reducing or reinforcing these barriers (see Annex 1.2 for details). As we begin the design process, the situation prevailing in the sector—the set of policies and formal and informal institutions in place—will almost certainly be benefiting some individuals and groups more than others. Thus, we need to understand the political economy of the sector or subsector both nationally and locally in the sites where our projects or programs will be implemented.

The stated intention of policies and procedures will always be positive and aimed at delivering services and benefits to all, but how do the policies work out on the ground for different groups? Do they deliver as intended; if not, what is intervening to prevent or change the intended outcomes? Usually, it is merely gaps in the delivery or communications systems that have been set up, or failure to understand the real needs of certain kinds of consumers, or other economic or social constraints that are preventing them from accessing the sector services. Either way, this is the detective work that needs to be done during the first step of the GESI process.

**Second and third steps: Design and implementation.** Once the sociocultural barriers and weaknesses in the policy framework or delivery system are understood, the job is to find ways to address these through interventions. This may require changes in policies, program activities, resource allocations, institutional arrangements and staff incentives as well as in the monitoring and reporting systems. Some things are easier to change than others and a single operation might not be able to make all the changes needed to respond to the diagnosis provided by Step 1. But even the larger, more intractable issues should be fed into the policy dialogue with government and other donors and be part of the longer-term sector strategy. At a minimum, policies need to be put in place that provide for the budget, processes (including stakeholder participation in the design) and systems needed to incorporate GESI mainstreaming into the operation under design. Institutional arrangements must also establish
structures and mechanisms for routine work on gender and inclusion by technically competent individuals; promote diversity in staff composition; and adopt sensitive human resources policies for recruitment, promotion, transfer and performance evaluation.

To design a project or program so that it will be able to deliver real change and lasting progress for women, the poor and the excluded, it is useful to consider the content presented in Figure 1.3, which lays out three domains where change can happen. These are also domains that define exclusion and inclusion, and most projects and programs include activities in one or all of these areas. One important domain is access to assets and services (i.e., health, education, and employment opportunities), which almost all of our interventions seek to increase. What does your intervention need to do to make sure that access is open to excluded groups, and that you can track it?

The second domain has to do with voice and

influence. In Nepal, group-based projects and what the World Bank calls community-driven development approaches place a great deal of emphasis on organizing communities to manage resources, deliver services and construct infrastructure themselves. The way groups are formed, the depth of the social mobilization process and the level of effort to bring in people from excluded groups and give them genuine voice and influence over the group processes constitute another area where good design and careful implementation and monitoring can make a major difference. The final domain where our sector operations can make a difference is through changing policies, institutional structures, and norms (i.e., the “rules of the game”), when intentionally or unintentionally these work against the interests of excluded groups. As noted above, not every operation can do this at the national policy level; but if our analysis has revealed that certain policies are perpetuating the exclusion of certain groups from the benefits our sector operation intends to deliver, then we need to be on the lookout for opportunities to get such policy changes on the agenda, and to push for their adoption. Often, even smaller project-level policies and procedures that are easier to influence can bring about important changes.

Nepal’s weak implementation capacity means that even positive policy provisions are often not implemented effectively. Meanwhile, informal norms, social practices, values and biases of officials and service providers from dominant groups continue to hamper the implementation of measures that seek to transform power relations. Thus, implementation processes need to be designed in such a way as to provide space for service providers, local leaders, men and others
who hold power to reflect on and internalize the need for such shifts. This long-term design-and-implementation commitment to gender equality and inclusion-related activities is an essential element of mainstreaming GESI, and it requires a clear commitment from the management level to this way of doing business.

Final steps: Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting. M&E systems need to be designed to collect disaggregated data on outputs, outcomes and development results, and to be linked into management decision-making in such a way that data on inclusion failures automatically trigger project actions to understand and remedy the situation. At the output level, management should be able to ensure that the planned project resources and actions have reached women, the poor and the excluded. Yet, disaggregated intermediate outcomes also need to be tracked, such as the socioeconomic profile of user groups and executive committees, labor groups, pregnant women receiving antenatal visits, school attendance, new teachers hired, the placement of water taps, etc. Finally, disaggregated data on development results need to be collected and analyzed. This may be done by the project, but in some cases with the right coordination it can also be done by periodic national-level sample surveys such as the National Living Standards Survey (NLSS), the Nepal Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS), or the National Labor Force Survey (NLFS), or through the decennial census. Indicators of results at this level include, for instance, the time required to reach an improved water source or motorable road, primary-school completion rates, child mortality, increase in agricultural-based income, etc. In all of this, reporting formats need to capture disaggregated information about outputs, outcomes and results for different social groups, and the processes that linked them. Refer to Chapter 3 for a checklist for mainstreaming GESI.

1.3 Current Situation of Gender Equality and Social Inclusion in Nepal

Gender issues have been addressed during the past few decades of Nepal’s planned development. Yet, it is only more recently that social inclusion has entered the development discourse, leading to recognition of other dimensions of exclusion in addition to gender.

1.3.1 Sector-wide barriers for women, the poor and the excluded

Each of the sectoral monographs in this series demonstrates that economic, political and sociocultural institutional barriers exist for women, the poor and excluded groups, restricting their access to assets, services and opportunities to exercise their voice and influence. Women’s access to assets and resources has improved considerably through many targeted programs while affirmative action strategies have helped to increase their representation in user groups and committees in all sectors. Forest and water supply and sanitation have been the most commendable sectors in promoting women’s membership and participation, yet the operational space for women to voice their issues and exercise their agency remains strongly restricted by societal rules/norms/beliefs that continue to define how women are valued and what they can or cannot do (World Bank/DFID 2006). The sectoral monographs all show that women’s ability to make decisions and benefit from accessing resources and services (e.g., to take care-seeking decisions when ill, to allocate time for attending community meetings, and to engage in livelihood activities) is often shaped by gendered norms and practices. Thus, along with changing discriminatory formal laws and policies, change must also take place in the home and family sphere in order to effectively address the barriers women face.

Government initiatives to promote an inclusive
public sector through, for example, free education and healthcare services have helped to increase access for the poor. However, the need to meet their daily subsistence needs, low literacy skills, and poor access to information about services and available resources limit the poor from benefiting fully from these programs. Further, self-exclusion of the very poor from group-based community development activities is common due to lack of time to contribute as well as lack of agency to influence decisions. Since so many services and opportunities flow through groups, this self-exclusion further reduces the access to resources and livelihood opportunities of those most in need. Similarly, the high opportunity costs incurred in the initial stages of group formation, with benefits uncertain and only coming later, also restrict the membership and participation of the very poor in user groups and committees.

Geographic location is a key determinant of exclusion across all sectors, influencing the level of access to public services such as schools, health posts, agricultural extension agents and finance institutions. For example, 38% of Janajatis in the hill regions have no access to a health post within an hour’s walk. The lowest life expectancy (44) is found in the mountain district of Mugu, compared to 74 in Kathmandu. Only 32% of households in Nepal can reach the nearest agriculture center within a 30-minute walk, and only 28% can reach the nearest bank in that time. A significant part of the problem is that the government lacks the human resources necessary to deliver services or offer effective outreach to the remotest communities—and the available government staff are often reluctant to serve in remote areas, and thus find informal ways to avoid such postings. This is compounded by the dismissive attitude of many providers towards women, the poor, and the excluded.

Caste-based discrimination and untouchability remain a major barrier for Dalits in accessing services, resources and assets, and in their ability to have voice and influence in decision-making processes. This is particularly so in accessing drinking-water facilities due to the traditional Hindu belief that Dalits are “impure” and will pollute a water source. Similarly, the low development outcomes in education (e.g., the illiteracy rate for Madhesi Dalit women is over 85%) and health (e.g., Madhesi Dalit women also have the lowest health indicators) are a result of a combination of factors, including poverty, lack of awareness and the discriminatory attitudes and behavior of non-Dalits towards Dalits (Bennett, Dahal and Govindasamy 2008).

For Adivasi Janajatis, language and issues around their cultural rights are the most significant barriers to accessing resources and benefiting from services. These are compounded by the low access of the most disadvantaged Adivasi groups to information on available development resources and procedures. Muslims and some Madhesi groups, especially women within these groups, face linguistic and sociocultural barriers that affect their level of mobility and ability to access services and participate in the public sphere. Although there is greater awareness of the needs of people with disabilities, this group continues to face social discrimination with virtually no disability-friendly services and facilities available, especially in rural areas.

1.3.2 Policy and legal framework for GESI

This section discusses the GESI policy framework and mandates at the international, national, and sectoral levels.

National mandates for GESI

Positive provisions in parliamentary declarations, the Interim Constitution (2007), the Three-Year Interim Plan (2008-10), and Nepal’s ratification of various international instruments, including the International Labour Organisation (ILO)
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Convention 169 on Indigenous Peoples, establish the fundamental rights of women, protect the cultural rights of Adivasi Janajatis, declare untouchability a legal offence, protect the rights of children and establish the rights of the poor, people with disabilities, Muslims and Madhesis.

The Local Self-Governance Act, 1999, empowers local bodies and has made them more accountable, particularly for local development activities. It directs local bodies to formulate their plans with the active involvement and participation of local people, focusing on the special needs of the poor, and mandates 20% representation of women on village and ward-level development committees. But these provisions do not address issues of inequity and vulnerability caused by gender, caste or ethnicity. The Local Self-Governance Regulations have provided for the inclusion and prioritization of the poor and the excluded in development activities. At the district development committee (DDC) level, however, the regulations make no distinct provision for the social and economic promotion of the poor and the excluded in the duties, roles and responsibilities of the DDC. However, the DDC can form subcommittees to address the needs of women and the disadvantaged by including members from nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), community-based organizations and civil society, and other experts.

The Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Operational Strategy (2009) of the Local Governance and Community Development Program (LGCDP) of the Ministry of Local Development (MLD) has provisioned for the informed participation of citizens, including women, the poor and the excluded, in local governance processes, and for capacity building of the Ministry’s structures for mainstreaming GESI. It has established mechanisms of ward and village citizens’ forums and GESI implementation committees in DDCs, and identified the roles and responsibilities of the GESI section of MLD. The DDC expanded block-grant guidelines to make a direct 15% budget allocation for women and 15% for people from excluded groups at the district level. The Village Development Committee Grant Operation Manual directs 5% for poor women, 5% for poor children and 10% for other excluded groups in village development committees (VDCs) and municipalities. The manual has also provided for integrated planning committees at the VDC level, with inclusive representation from Dalit, Janajati and women’s organizations, from NGOs working in the VDCs, school management committees, social organizations, political parties, and line agencies. It directs that 33% of members must be women. (This is only a sample of provisions that are positive from a gender and inclusion perspective, as several others exist as well.)

International commitments
Nepal has ratified as many as 16 international human rights instruments, including international conventions and covenants on women (United Nations [UN] Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, Beijing Platform of Action), child rights (UN Convention on the Rights of the Child), indigenous people’s rights (ILO Convention 169), and racial discrimination (UN Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination). It has committed to international agreements on targets (Millennium Development Goals) set for women’s empowerment, education, drinking water and sanitation, health, hunger and poverty. Nepal has also agreed to UN Security Council Resolution 1325 that establishes legal standards governing the protection of women during conflict, their participation in peace and security processes, and their protection against multiple forms of violence.
Sectoral policies: Gender equality and social inclusion policy provisions in the seven sectors

From our review, we find that commitments to GESI and progressive policy mandates have been made across the seven sectors, albeit to varying degrees. Revisions in policies have allowed programs addressing access to services for specific groups to be developed and implemented—for instance, free primary education, scholarships for girls and Dalits, multilingual education, incentive schemes for out-of-school children, universal and targeted free healthcare, safe delivery incentive schemes, quotas for women in community groups established by all the sectors, agriculture-related subsidies for the excluded, subsidies for poor households to build latrines, and so on.

SWAp (sector-wide approach) is increasingly being followed in Nepal, allowing for donor harmonization and more concerted efforts to address gender and inclusion issues. SWAps in health, education, and transportation—the Nepal Health Sector Program-Implementation Plan 2 [NHSP-IP 2] (2010-2015), School Sector Reform Program (SSRP) (2009-2015), and rural transportation infrastructure SWAp, respectively—have directives to address barriers experienced by women, the poor and the excluded. The NHSP-IP 2 includes a specific objective to address sociocultural barriers, a reflection of the government’s shift to recognizing the need to address deeply embedded social norms and practices that affect health outcomes. GESI strategies have been included in the NHSP-IP 2, and strategies have been prepared for the agriculture and forest sectors though these have not yet been implemented.

Policies shifting control from centralized agencies to VDC-level community-based committees (school and health facility management committees) have increased the chances for women and the excluded to participate in decision-making. Yet, there is room for improvement: both of these could contribute more effectively if representatives from excluded groups were to be selected by their own communities, if mechanisms were available for more inclusive representation to influence decisions, and if there were better monitoring by the relevant authorities. Policy provisions for representation of women and the excluded in user groups and committees, with specific guidance for representation in post-holding positions, have also become a well-established practice. The rural water supply and sanitation (WSS) national policy, for instance, has a mandate of 30% of women in user groups and committees, while for Dalits and Janajatis, too, there are provisions for representation (e.g., in health facility operation and management committees, farmer groups, road-building groups, water supply users’ committees, and water users’ associations). The more technical infrastructure sectors, such as WSS, rural roads and irrigation, have recognized the role women have in the operation and management of these sectors and have developed policies that promote their participation, especially in the construction and management phases. But policy development is weaker in ensuring that women, the poor and the excluded have voice and agency in local-level decision-making processes and has not effectively addressed the role that political and elite capture often has in influencing access to and utilization of resources and benefits in these sectors.

Policies for public and social audits adopted by many sectors (health, WSS, rural roads) are to be appreciated as these increase downward accountability of service providers. Implementation of these audits, however, remains problematic as does the risk of their becoming just another donor requirement with no repercussions if they are not properly carried out. Thus, it is important to have the participation of all excluded groups, follow-up to address any query that may arise.
from the audits, and monitoring to ensure that full and correct processes are being implemented. Many policy revisions have focused on improving access to resources and services, but without addressing the structural issues that cause the exclusion of these groups. Thus, for example, the Agriculture Perspective Plan, the overarching policy framework guiding the agriculture sector, ignores key land-specific issues, and instead deals primarily with how to increase immediate production outputs rather than with strategic and structural issues related to resource management, governance and structural agrarian reform. In the forest sector, positive provisions are being increasingly implemented in community forestry, which has become more GESI responsive. But there is no recognition by decision makers that 75% of the national forests are barred to civilians—any use is illegal and punitive action is normal, impacting primarily on women, the poor and the excluded.

Almost all sectors provide specific support to women but efforts to address the structural causes of gender-based discrimination are almost nonexistent. Only very recently has the government developed a national plan of action on gender-based violence, with the health sector recognizing violence against women and girls as a public health issue. But these aspects are not integrated in the policies developed in other sectors—for instance, the seed policy in the agriculture sector is considered liberal, but does not recognize that seed transactions are male dominated, and by men of higher-income groups. Similarly, in the forest and WSS sectors, affirmative action policies are in place to ensure the representation of women on user group committees, but gendered norms and roles of women limit the actual level of participation, voice and influence they have in these forums. Indeed, many gender-focused policies have concentrated primarily on increasing representation of women in community-level bodies and increasing access to sectoral resources, with far less recognition of the structural issues of division of labor, including the implications of gender-specific responsibilities of childcare, breast-feeding and taking care of the ill. There are almost no policies that provide women with sufficient support to manage such responsibilities alongside professional growth.

In no sector have government agencies clearly defined who constitute the “excluded,” and the interchangeable use of terminology denoting the “excluded,” the “disadvantaged” and the “marginalized” creates confusion. There are provisions for women, Dalits and Janajatis (e.g., for scholarships, representation and access to funds), who have thus been recognized as excluded groups, but there is hardly any mention of other excluded groups (e.g., Muslims, other backward classes, or OBCs, and Madhesis) or effort to address the causes of their exclusion. There are only a few sectoral policies mandating sex- and caste/ethnicity/location-disaggregated data and analytical evidence for monitoring. For example, the education and health sectors’ management information systems (MIS) have limited disaggregation though a pilot for reporting caste/ethnicity-disaggregated data is ongoing in health. The forest sector’s recently revised MIS incorporates GESI-sensitive indicators, but these still need to be implemented. However, positive examples and initiatives do exist in several programs—e.g., in the forest sector, the Livelihoods and Forestry Program (LFP) has established livelihoods and social inclusion monitoring, which not only demands disaggregated data but also analysis at outcome levels for different social groups.

The personal commitment of policy-makers to GESI is clearly an important influence on both the quality of the policies and the seriousness with which they are implemented. It is also critical to find and convince other important players in each sector, not only through training, which builds
knowledge, but by other means that build understanding and increase the internalization of equality, inclusion and social justice principles. A major part of this will need to be based on an improved understanding among policy-makers, administrators and sector employees of the specific barriers preventing different social groups from accessing and using services and resources as well as a commitment within the respective sectors to develop, budget, implement and monitor mechanisms and processes to overcome these barriers.

1.3.3 National and institutional mechanisms for gender equality and social inclusion

The government has created various institutional mechanisms and structures over the years to address gender and inclusion issues, from the central to the district and VDC levels.

Central level

The National Planning Commission (NPC) has a Social Development Division responsible for addressing women’s empowerment issues. NPC’s Agriculture and Rural Infrastructure Development Division has the responsibility to work on social inclusion. The Ministry of Women, Children and Social Welfare (MWCSW) has been implementing women-focused programs targeted at reaching disadvantaged and marginalized groups such as children, senior citizens and people with disabilities. Through its Department of Women’s Development, the Ministry has women’s development offices in 75 districts managed by Women’s Development Officers (WDOs). MLD, responsible for social inclusion, has a Dalit and Adivasi Janajati coordination committee under its mandate, while the establishment of the National Dalit Commission, National Women’s Commission and the National Foundation for the Development of Indigenous Nationalities has aimed to increase the participation of women, Dalits and Janajatis in governance through improved protection of their rights. Finally, while gender focal points are included in NPC and all ministries and departments, and mandated to work on gender issues, they have been unable to deliver effectively due to multiple reasons, including their lack of authority, the absence of any institutionalized linkage between their gender mandate and the main work of the ministries as well as having no specific programs or resources for gender-related work.

District level

WDOs are present in each district under the Department of Women’s Development/ MWCSW, where they head the Women’s Development Office and are mandated to mainstream gender and child rights in the districts. DDCs have a social committee with a Social Development Officer, who is also designated as the gender focal point for the DDC as a whole. Various watchdog committees have been formed, such as the Indigenous Ethnic District Coordination Committee and Dalit Class Upliftment District Coordination Committee, with representation from political parties. The Gender Mainstreaming Coordination Committee (GMCC), under the WDO and with representation from line agencies, is tasked with monitoring and coordinating district-level gender work. The GESI Implementation Committee, formed by the GESI strategy of LGCDP/MLD (with the Local Development Officer as chair, the WDO as vice-chair, the social development officer as member-secretary, and representation of GMCC, Dalit and Janajati coordination committees, and district-level NGOs/federations/associations of women and the excluded) is responsible for informing program planning on gender- and inclusion-related issues, auditing all programs and coordinating GESI-related activities in the district.

These institutional mechanisms have been
established at higher levels but most have experienced inadequate resources and weak institutional mechanisms, and thus have not been effective in protecting and furthering the GESI cause. In addition, there are overlaps between MWCSW and the National Women’s Commission and only minimal efforts have been made to coordinate between the different commissions and the representative institutions of women, Dalits and Janajatis for collaborative efforts on gender and social inclusion.

**VDC/municipality level**

While there is no institutional mechanism with specific responsibility for GESI in VDCs or municipalities, the representative Integrated Planning Committees in each VDC are supposed to have members representing the interests of women, Janajatis, Dalits and NGOs, as mandated in the VDC Grant Operation Manual, and also have the general responsibility of ensuring that these issues are addressed. A potentially very effective new structure, established by the VDC Grant Operation Manual and GESI strategy of LGCDP/MLD 2009, are the village and ward citizens’ forums. These create spaces for all citizens, including women, the poor and the excluded, to discuss, negotiate, prioritize and coordinate development efforts, and especially the allocation of block grants in their area, ensuring that they are both inclusive and equitable. A supervisory/monitoring committee has been mandated by the LGCDP/MLD GESI strategy. This mechanism has the responsibility to monitor GESI-related aspects of projects/programs. Finally, there are a number of community groups, women’s federations, rights-based organizations, Dalit NGOs, indigenous people’s organizations and pressure groups at the community level that have gathered experience through years of work, and have the ability to claim rights and influence local decisions.

**Sectoral issues**

Responsibility for GESI in the sectors is currently with the gender focal points, who, as discussed above, have not been able to work effectively. Some sectors (agriculture, education and forest) have institutional structures to address GESI issues specifically—for instance, the Gender Equity and Environment Division within the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC) and the Gender Equity Development Section and Inclusive Education Section within the Department of Education. The Gender Equity and Environment Division has a very narrow focus on gender and, in general, even when their mandate is broader and covers other excluded groups these GESI institutional structures do not have much influence on the policies and programs of their respective ministries. For one, the high turnover in government staff in ministries/departments results in changes in the political will and commitment towards GESI issues. For example, there have been frequent changes of staff charged with the role of coordinating the Gender Equity Working Group which is meant to facilitate the implementation of the GESI strategy in the forest sector. This constant turnover in the leadership has decreased the effectiveness of this group. The Ministry of Health and Population (MOHP) has planned to establish a GESI unit, but this is still in process.

Clearly defined responsibilities for any GESI unit, and routine working procedures linked to the main activities in the sector, are essential for these structures to be useful. Additionally, designated gender focal points, or even the GESI unit in general, need to have the technical expertise required to provide assistance on gender and inclusion in policy and project design, and in monitoring and evaluation. While training of gender focal points is common, practical application skills to integrate gender and inclusion from
planning up to monitoring processes remain limited. Additionally, systems have not been revised to enable them to do their work (e.g., planning and monitoring processes/formats do not demand GESI mainstreaming). Although all sectors include GESI issues in their policies, strategies, and procedures, there are no sanctions for not achieving or improving GESI outcomes in the sector. The broader institutional culture might also not encourage (or, indeed, might actively discourage) GESI issues being raised or taken seriously. In the forest sector, for example, some government staff reported that other staff would simply laugh if they brought up social issues in a meeting. As such, transforming institutional culture clearly requires adopting innovative ways (e.g., appreciative inquiry, peer monitoring) to internalize and institutionalize GESI-sensitive thinking and behavior.

**Workforce diversity**

A diverse workforce enhances the ability of government institutions to represent and respond to the needs of specific identity groups and better serve Nepali citizens, including those who have been historically excluded (Social Inclusion Action Group 2009). Efforts are needed to make staff profiles more inclusive with regard to women and people from excluded groups and to develop human resource policies that are gender and inclusion sensitive. A review of personnel of the government in the seven key sectors finds the following:

**Diversity status.** Altogether there are 41,183 staff members (of whom 6,742 are women, i.e., 16.37%) in the sectors we reviewed. Compared to the national population, there is overrepresentation of Brahmins/Chhetris and Newars (who are primarily in key decision-making positions), almost an equal proportion of OBCs (mostly in non-gazetted technical positions), while all the other groups are underrepresented (Figure 1.4).

There are 4,594 staff at the gazetted level, of whom 7.27% are women. Among the women, Brahmins/Chhetris comprise the majority at 69.22%, and Dalits the fewest at only 0.20%. The highest presence of women is in the third-class non-gazetted positions (a majority of which are in the health sector as assistant nurse midwives and mother-and-child health workers; Figure 1.5).

Across sectors, the highest participation of women is in health, at 28.54%, and the lowest in forestry at 3.25%. Brahmins/Chhetris have the highest representation across all sectors, while Muslim representation is comparatively better in forestry than in the other sectors. OBCs are disproportionately overrepresented in the irriga-
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...government funding for these issues is channeled through targeted programs or integrated into mainstream programs. NPC issues guidelines directing ministries and line agencies in the formulation of their program budgets. In close coordination with the Ministry of Finance (MOF), NPC identifies the ministry-specific and sector-specific budget. The government’s annual budget speech presents three types of analysis of the budget from a gender and inclusion perspective: expenditures in support of “inclusive development and targeted programmes”; the gender-responsive budget (GRB) exercise; and pro-poor expenditures (Annex 8a, 8b, and 8c of the annual budget speech 2009-2010, respectively).

We tried to identify how classifications were made and the process that was followed.

1.3.4 Gender-responsive budgeting and gender equality and social inclusion budgeting

This section analyzes allocations/expenditures of the government and programs’ budget to examine the extent to which resources are being spent on sector activities that are expected in some ways to help women, the poor and the excluded. The objective is to “follow the money” to assess what efforts have been made to address the issues that constrain these groups’ access to sector benefits, analyze how much of the budget has been allocated and spent on such issues, and assess the degree to which government funding for these issues is channeled through targeted programs or integrated into mainstream programs.

NPC issues guidelines directing ministries and line agencies in the formulation of their program budgets. In close coordination with the Ministry of Finance (MOF), NPC identifies the ministry-specific and sector-specific budget. The government’s annual budget speech presents three types of analysis of the budget from a gender and inclusion perspective: expenditures in support of “inclusive development and targeted programmes”; the gender-responsive budget (GRB) exercise; and pro-poor expenditures (Annex 8a, 8b, and 8c of the annual budget speech 2009-2010, respectively).

We tried to identify how classifications were made and the process that was followed.
Indicators are not specified for inclusive development/targeted programs, but there are indicators for GRB and pro-poor budgeting. Our discussions with Ministry and line agency staff, however, indicate that the guidelines are not clear, and that, as noted earlier, it is typically left to the budget officer to categorize and score the various budget lines to the best of his (it is primarily men) understanding. Some of the ministries were not even aware of the inclusive development and targeted program analysis while at the district level none of the line agencies had applied these budgeting processes. The budget speech of Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-2010 categorized high percentages of expenditures in all sectors as pro-poor and gender responsive, but with low expenditures for inclusive development and targeted programming (Table 1.1).

According to the GRB guidelines, each proposed program in the sector has to be scored as per the indicators developed by the Gender-responsive Budgeting Committee, in which five aspects of gender sensitivity (participation, capacity building, benefit sharing, increased access to employment and income-earning opportunities, and reduction in women’s workload) have been allocated 20 potential marks each. For each budget item/activity, the officer doing the analysis had to assess what percentage of the expenditure directly benefits women. Programs scoring 50 points or more are classified as directly responsive to women, those scoring 20 to 50 as indirectly responsive, and those scoring less than 20 as neutral.16

Sector staff categorize all expenditure items in the sectoral budget into these three categories based on the five indicators of gender responsiveness. However, these indicators, which were developed in the context of agriculture, are not necessarily applicable in other sectors. There are no sub-indicators to guide the scoring of budget lines or assess how the activities budgeted contribute to the indicators. Also, GRB indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>FY 2009-2010 budget (in '000 Nepali rupees)</th>
<th>Inclusive development and targeted programs</th>
<th>Gender-responsive budget</th>
<th>Pro-poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Directly supportive</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>7,876,587</td>
<td>333,900</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>2,015,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>46,616,672</td>
<td>18,368,433</td>
<td>39.40</td>
<td>1,300,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>3,449,974</td>
<td>60,453</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>71,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>17,840,466</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,156,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>7,761,390</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural infrastructure</td>
<td>35,693,647</td>
<td>4,280,025</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>12,996,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sanitation</td>
<td>29,500,624</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,806,427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annexes 8a, 8b, and 8c, Annual Budget, Government of Nepal, FY 2009-2010.
tend to be better at capturing expenditures for targeted women’s programs than at picking up expenditures for efforts made in universal programs to mainstream GESI. Finally, of course, the GRB exercise focuses only on gender and does not capture expenditures aimed at increasing outreach to excluded groups.

**Gender equality and social inclusion budget analysis**

While we have assessed the existing GRB practice and indicators used, and identified possible sub-indicators for GRB analysis in the different sectors, we have also developed and applied our own tentative GESI budgeting methodology. This is intended to capture expenditures that reach and support excluded groups and those that support women. Although there is no single rule about how to determine whether public expenditure is discriminatory or equality enhancing, there are some general principles discussed in gender-budgeting literature, which we have adapted.

Our efforts here are intended as a first step to identifying the approximant resource flows to these different purposes; but much more work and wider consultation are needed. We hope that this initial attempt can become the basis for further collective work with MOF, the Gender-responsive Budgeting Committee, sectoral ministries, donor agencies such as UN Women, and NGOs which are interested in tracking budget expenditures.

Again, the GESI budget analysis assesses what activities have been planned/implemented that provide direct, indirect and neutral support to women, the poor and excluded social groups to address the barriers they experience in accessing resources and benefits from the sector. We have followed the GRB practice of using three categories but have not followed the GRB indicators as they have not been very effective in application across the sectors. The GESI budget analysis was carried out at two levels. First, we assessed national-level expenditures in the sector using the above criteria. We reviewed a total of 22 programs and two annual plans (see Annex 1.1 for the list of budgets reviewed). Our analysis resulted in the breakdown shown in Table 1.2.

The next step was to move to the district level, to ground both the national-level GRB budget exercise and our own GESI analysis in two districts, Kavre and Morang. We first worked with the line agency staff to assess the current approach to GRB they were using in each sector. In consultations at the district level, officers shared which indicators were relevant to assess

### Table 1.2: Summary Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Budget Analysis of Seven Sectors (Total of Program Budget), Including Direct and Indirect Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Total Nepali rupees (000)</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Dalits</th>
<th>Janajatis</th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>OBCs</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Youth and adolescents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1,622,500.0</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14,936,192.0</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>14.46</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>3,449,974.0</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Health(^a)</td>
<td>13,254,910.0</td>
<td>18.41</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>2,411,912.9</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>80.04</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rural infrastructure(^b)</td>
<td>14,279,739.0</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>38.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Water and sanitation(^c)</td>
<td>3,371,603.0</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>53,326,830.9</strong></td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

\(^a\) Excluding contribution of 0.34–0.42% to Janajatis, Muslims, Madhesis.

\(^b\) Excluding contribution of 0.01–0.06% to Dalits, Janajati, elderly, disabled.

\(^c\) Excluding contribution of 0.10–0.16% to Dalits, Janajati, adolescents, elderly, disabled.

Source: Based on budget documents of sector ministries, selected programs, FY 2009–2010.
the gender responsiveness of items in the sectoral budgets. They said that they were aware of a number of positive policy provisions in each sector mandating that benefits reach girls/women, the poor and the excluded, but they felt that these automatically ensured that the entire budget would be responsive to women or specific excluded groups. In reality, this has proven to be a problematic assumption.

Next, we worked with the line agency staff to do a GESI analysis of the district-level health budgets, using directly supportive, indirectly supportive and neutral categories. The results are shown in Table 1.3.

Effort has been made by the different ministries/programs to address the barriers for women and poor groups but for other groups the assumption seems to be that benefits will automatically reach them through implemented activities. The directly supportive and indirectly supportive expenditure of the budgets for women and the poor address important needs of women. But almost no activities or funds have been planned to address the barriers of women, the poor and the excluded, as discussed in Section 1.2, or the structural issues that constrain their access. This indicates that a more conscious recognition of the need to address such sociocultural, empowerment and governance issues, along with core technical sector services, is required.

The key issues are the criteria, indicators and process of budget review. Government analysis classifies a majority of activities as directly or indirectly contributing to women, based on government directives regarding services to them. A deeper analysis, however, indicates that no activities are budgeted to address the specific gender-based barriers women experience. These are necessary even within a universal program in order that structural barriers are addressed and a more even playing field created—only then can GESI be considered to have been mainstreamed. This also highlights the need for a more rigorous analysis so that the budget speech’s classification can be more realistic.

At the moment, the discourse reflects an assumption that positive formal policy provisions will ensure that all will benefit and that group membership (where relevant) will ensure access to services for all members. But this fails to

### Table 1.3: Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Budget Analysis of Annual Programs, Kavre and Morang (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Total Nepali rupees (Morang, Kavre)</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Dalits</th>
<th>Janajatis</th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>OBCs</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Youth and adolescents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>63,355,341</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,336,366,884</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>2,874,100</td>
<td>39.65</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>78,720,450</td>
<td>53.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>72,695,000</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rural infrastructure</td>
<td>142,369,146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Water and sanitationc</td>
<td>132,054,576</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,828,435,497</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Excluding contribution of 0.34-0.42% to Janajatis, Muslims, Madhesis.
- All items were found neutral, with the district staff arguing that the infrastructure is for everyone and hence cannot be targeted. It is, of course, true that we cannot build roads for Dalits, for women, etc.
- Excluding contribution of 0.10-0.16% to Dalits, Janajatis, adolescents, elderly, disabled.

Source: Kavre and Morang annual programs, FY 2008-2009.
address the fact that it is mostly the extreme poor and often socially excluded groups such as Dalits who are either excluded or exclude themselves from joining groups. While groups are indeed a powerful mechanism to improve access to services and inputs, relying solely on this model without assessing its suitability for all presents a significant risk that those most in need will not gain access.

Overall, our work on gender and inclusion budgeting indicates that for effective and systematic budgeting, more rigorous work has to be done, in particular with the Gender-responsive Budgeting Committee. There has to be a consensus to take gender and inclusion budgeting together; existing indicators and sub-indicators for GRB need to be revised and sharpened; unique issues of social groups need to be addressed; and the process must be improved, so that it is not left to the understanding of just one desk officer.

1.3.5 Program responses: Gender equality and social inclusion approaches

This section highlights the program responses and efforts across the sectors to promote and mainstream a more inclusive service-delivery approach. We also discuss measures and practices that have been found to be effective and successful in improving access to sector services and livelihood opportunities for women, the poor and excluded groups—increasing their voice and influence and supporting changes in the “rules of the game.”

Increasing access to assets and services

Significant progress has been made in the service-delivery sectors in increasing outreach and access to services, assets and resources for the poor and excluded groups. For instance, key reforms in the education sector, through national programs such as Education for All and the School Sector Reform Program (SSRP), represent significant efforts to improve access and equity, enhance quality and improve efficiency through scholarships and incentives for girls, Dalits and Adivasi Janajatis. Still, remaining challenges include effective implementation of the multilingual education policy, monitoring of scholarship distribution, and ensuring funding to meet the opportunity costs for the poorest and most disadvantaged communities. There is also a need to look more carefully into the selection procedures and internal governance of the school management committees, to ensure that they fulfil their potential for giving parents from all groups a say in the running of their local school.

Likewise, in the health sector, government initiatives of pro-poor targeted free healthcare policies and the Aama (Mother) Program for maternity services have had considerable success in reducing the economic constraints of the poor and the social constraints of women, and generally improving health indicators. The recently developed NHSP-IP 2 has various activities to address the barriers of women, the poor and the excluded, and has made very impressive plans with disaggregated objectives and indicators.

In the infrastructure-related sectors, access to water supply has improved substantially over the past few decades. However, the low priority and resources accorded to sanitation have resulted in uneven coverage, especially for the very poor and in the Tarai, where lack of land poses an additional challenge. The construction of rural roads has improved access to markets, schools, health posts, government offices, and so forth, as well as provided work opportunities for women and the poor in road-building groups. In the irrigation sector, men continue to heavily dominate the management of systems even though women farmers are now increasingly involved. The group-based approach in the forest and agriculture sectors has increased access for women and other traditionally excluded groups to resources as well as ben-
benefits from community forestry management and agricultural extension services and support.

**Building voice and influence of excluded groups**

Across the sectors, social mobilization as a process has been one of the main tools for organizing people for easier and more efficient transfer of assets and services, and also for improving reach and access. Groups (forest users, farmers, mothers, water and sanitation users, etc) are mobilized for their labor and financial contributions to support the implementation, delivery and management of services. Policy directives setting quotas for women and excluded groups have improved their representation in user groups and executive committees, which has been important in creating operational space for the voice and interests of these groups to be addressed.

However, evidence from the sectoral assessments indicates that these groups are, in many cases, still highly exclusionary of the extreme poor and socially disadvantaged groups, often reflecting and even reinforcing existing power structures. In addition, although representation of women is generally high in user groups and executive committees, their active involvement in decision-making processes is not commensurate with their formal presence. While the group-based approach to development has thus increased access to assets and services, there is insufficient understanding of and focus on the barriers faced by excluded groups or on how to build their capacity to influence decision-making processes. In many of these we have found the approach is more transactional than transformational, and only in those efforts where REFLECT-type processes (see Box 1.1) have been adopted has there been effective strengthening of voice (e.g., Participatory Learning Center by GTZ/GIZ, COPE/PLA [Client Oriented Provider Efficient/Participatory Learning and Action] process by Support for Safe Motherhood Program/UN Population Fund and REFLECT by CARE/Nepal Family Health Program).

Some notable networks and federations have been able to advocate successfully on behalf on their members. The Federation of Community Forest Users has become an important political player throughout the country, while the Federation of Water and Sanitation Users Nepal and Nepal Federation of Water Users Association are additional examples of civil society groups organizing and mobilizing members to voice their interests, influence policy and decision makers as well as demand accountability and transparency from service providers. The United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)-supported women’s federations and paralegal committees are a force to be reckoned with in many districts. Still, even in these successful second-tier organizations, important issues remain regarding inclusion and diversity in the membership, decision-making positions and governance as well as in establishing more effective and transparent management.

**Changing the “rules of the game”**

Overarching changes are required to remove the barriers that women, the poor and the excluded

---

**Box 1.1: What is a REFLECT circle?**

REFLECT circle is a forum where the disadvantaged are brought together to identify, analyse and take actions on issues that directly affect them. The main purpose of the circle is the empowerment of the poor and the excluded. The facilitator of the circle helps educate members on their rights and support them to take actions to ensure access to services. It helps build the capacity of members to advocate and lobby for their rights. The circle not only takes issues of the disadvantaged, it also encourages members to fight for the rights of the community as a whole. It empowers the poor to bargain with the richer sections in the community and also takes up issues of the whole community, including that of the rich and the elite, up to the VDC and district levels. In this way, the circle can be effective in ensuring the rights of the disadvantaged as well as garner support of the rich and the elite of the community.

Source: Field notes discussion with Action Aid 2009.
face in accessing assets and services. The forest sector, for instance, has made notable progress in this area by addressing GESI issues in sector programming and operational practice. LFP’s pro-poor and social inclusion strategy has been effective in developing a common understanding of social exclusion issues as well as strategic approaches to deal with them. Similarly, the health and education sectors have been progressive through the previously mentioned NHSP-IP 2, Education for All and SSRP policies. However, the informal “rules of the game”—the sociocultural values, beliefs and attitudes that underlie and shape discriminatory behavior and norms—continue to play a strong and influential role in creating barriers for women, the poor and excluded groups. It is in this area that substantive efforts are needed to overcome deep-seated resistance to changing discriminatory practices, both in the workplace and in community groups. Behavior change without systemic structural change in sector institutions, communities and families will continue to reproduce the current gap between good policies and poor implementation. Unfortunately, however, sufficient and sustained work along these lines was not evident in any sector.

1.3.6 Monitoring and reporting

Ministries, including MLD, report on M&E formats issued by NPC (specifically the Poverty Monitoring Division, which has the key responsibility to work in this area). For effective GESI mainstreaming, integrating gender and social inclusion into M&E systems is crucial. NPC has established a system of gender coding for the 10th Plan/PRSP (Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper) monitoring and demands reporting, with some disaggregation, on intermediate and outcome indicators in the poverty monitoring and analysis system (PMAS). It has also developed (with donor support) a district poverty monitoring analysis system, which has been implemented in 22 districts and could potentially be adapted for poverty monitoring in the new federal units once these are determined. But, at present, neither system is actively used.

To a certain extent, the education and health sectoral information management systems do provide disaggregated information. The education sector has the most well-established system of monitoring and reporting, providing comprehensive, high-quality and disaggregated data by sex and caste/ethnic group on, among other things, student enrolment and numbers, teachers and non-teaching staff, student attendance and scholarship allocation. However, it only disaggregates social groups by Dalit and Janajati without differentiating the subgroups within which some are more disadvantaged than others. Moreover, its categories do not capture groups like the Madhesi other backward classes/OBCs or Muslims—both of which have low education outcomes and need to be tracked. Similarly, the current monitoring mechanisms of the health sector collect sex- and age-disaggregated data, but information on service utilization by the poor and the excluded is not integrated. The sector is piloting caste/ethnicity-disaggregated data but managing such huge amounts of data has been challenging.

The WSS, forest and agriculture sectors maintain disaggregated data on membership and participation of women in the user groups/committees and key decision-making positions while also disaggregating user-group data by caste/ethnicity. The MOFSC also incorporates monitoring indicators sensitive to gender, poverty and social equity in its MIS, but this needs to be implemented more systematically. In the forest sector, LFP and Nepal Swiss Community Forest Project (NSCFP) have established systems for maintaining a disaggregated database, monitoring and reporting against gender, poverty and social equity indicators. However, a review of the log-frames of various programs indicates that there is a general
lack of disaggregated indicators or inclusive objective statements. Only in the recent NHSP-IP 2 (health) is there consistent demand for disaggregated data at the results level, or for measuring any shift in sociocultural behavior. In SSRP (education) there is a gap, with very little demand for disaggregated measurements of progress as the indicators are mostly quantitative and neutral from a GESI perspective. Still, many programs do have indicators for representation by women and excluded communities in various groups and committees. Nepal Water and Health, for instance, has very well-disaggregated indicators, e.g., "At least 90% of completed projects [in which 90% of the beneficiaries are the poor and the excluded] remain fully functional 3 years after the project’s completion.”

The sectoral M&E review indicates that there are efforts at collecting disaggregated data and that sex-disaggregated data are most commonly requested. But consistent disaggregation against all social groups with regional identities (women and men of Hill and Madhesi Dalits, Adivasi Janajatis [except Newars], Newars, Muslims, OBCs, Hill and Madhesi Brahmins/Chhetris) is not followed. There are very few sectors with examples of an information management system that can handle such data (probably only LFP and NSCFP in forestry, and rural WSS). With NPC formats still not demanding such disaggregation nor asking for progress against outcomes in disaggregated forms, monitoring and reporting are a key area for more intense mainstreaming of gender and inclusion.

1.3.7  Good practices and lessons learned
In this section we discuss some practices that have been found effective across sectors to address the structural barriers limiting access to resources, assets and benefits for women, the poor and the excluded, and the common lessons that can be drawn from these efforts.

**Good practices**

*Improved targeting and inclusion through use of well-being ranking and proxy means testing (indicator targeting) provide a powerful baseline for identifying the poor and the excluded for program interventions. Community members usually carry out such rankings themselves, using economic and social indicators to categorize households. In education, this is supplemented by proxy means testing to target secondary and tertiary scholarship and work-study support. Evidence that this combination has worked well is still to come in, but there is consensus among practitioners that it can bring together objective and subjective rankings. This is then used to target resources and services, and ensure more equitable distribution. The forest sector will be testing a combined community-based and proxy means testing approach to identify disadvantaged households, with independent verification to try to standardize approaches and remove existing confusion at the local level.*

*Empowerment and community education. Social mobilization based on individual and collective empowerment through efforts to understand and transform the unjust structures that affect their everyday lives and livelihoods has proved effective in building the voice of the excluded and the poor as well as their capacity to influence decisions. Where communities have been mobilized to reflect on the social norms that perpetuate untouchability, gender-based discrimination or violence against women, there has been an increase in access to services and greater involvement in community-level planning for these groups. The REFLECT-type approaches have been particularly effective because they draw in not only the excluded but the rest of the community as well. The whole community is organized into groups to discuss and learn about different rights-based issues, and respond through collective action.*

*Establishing firm quorums for key meetings. The*
lack of access to information about entitlements, services and procedures to obtain available resources is a major component of the exclusion faced by women, the poor and excluded groups. Knowledge is power and more educated elite groups who have time to network in the district centers and create contacts with local politicians are more likely to know the details of incoming development programs or new government policies—and to use this information to their advantage. Setting quorums for key meetings has been effective in ensuring that all households are adequately represented and informed. If a quorum is not met, project staff members are required to cancel meetings until the required number of households is present.

Building a strong civil society able to represent and advocate for changes in the “rules of the game,” has been a major advance in some of the sectors (e.g., Federation of Community Forest Users, Nepal in the forest sector). However, these organizations and federations also need to address issues of diversity and inclusion within their own structures, where representation of excluded caste and ethnic groups is typically low. Another danger with such NGOs or second-tier groups is that they can be captured by political parties.

Policy directives for representation/participation. Setting quotas for women and excluded groups in user groups/committees, along with creating training opportunities, has ensured their representation and participation in development activities as well as strengthened their access to resources and benefits. Still, further efforts are needed to reach socially excluded groups and promote their representation in key decision-making positions in executive bodies and their ability to influence decisions.

Adoption of a workforce diversity policy is a mechanism to change the structure of organizations and the rules of the game that determine entry. These policies (such as those adopted by NSCFP) have improved inclusiveness in individual organizations and among partners, identified groups to be prioritized, established benchmarks for diverse representation in staff categories, and followed up with affirmative action to recruit people from discriminated groups until their representation in various staff categories, committees and working teams is ensured, reflecting their representation of Nepal’s population.

Changing internal budgeting and monitoring systems to track resource allocation effects on women, the poor and the excluded has been successfully employed by a number of programs. This has positively evolved the way in which these institutions allocate and deliver services and enabled programs to identify the causes of changes in livelihood and social inclusion outcomes. LFP (through its livelihood and social inclusion monitoring) uses the three domains (see Figure 1.3) of change to track change in voice, influence and agency, access to assets and services, and also whether the poor and excluded have been able to change policies and institutions in their favor.

Social accountability mechanisms. Social audits and similar tools have provided increasing opportunities for civil society, including community groups, to press for greater accountability and responsiveness from service providers. These have become accepted tools and processes, but still need to be implemented more effectively, with meaningful participation of the women, the poor and the excluded, and with follow-up actions that demonstrate the value in participation.

Lessons learned

Women, the poor and the excluded face multiple exclusions, many of which cannot be solely tackled through sector-based interventions, as the causes are rooted in deep societal structures that
require coherence of interventions at many levels and across many sectors. For example, simply providing low-quality leasehold land is insufficient to bring people out of poverty when the initial investments to improve productivity are large and require time to deliver benefits. For the extreme poor, this could lead to an increase in livelihood insecurity and vulnerability.

Behavior change is required to overcome deep-seated resistance to changing discriminatory practices in both the workplace and community groups among those who have benefited from these practices. But changes in the behavior of a small number of well-meaning individuals will still leave gaps between well-intentioned policies and actual implementation. Changes in incentives for staff working in the sectors are also needed. Overcoming deep-set informal resistance to social inclusion and changing discriminatory and indifferent attitudes of service providers remain two of the greatest challenges facing all sectors.

Social mobilization and facilitation processes need to focus on empowerment not only on increasing access to assets and services. There is a need to build understanding of the rights and responsibilities of individuals as citizens to have a voice in decisions and a share in benefits. When this approach is used, groups are more sustainable and generally continue functioning after the project or program intervention is over to take up new activities of concern to members.

Sociocultural constraints on women are strong and thus it is necessary to work on shifting gender-based power relations both in the workplace and in communities at large. Compared to men, women of all social groups tend to have high opportunity costs attached to their participation which often involves high levels of benefit.

Dealing with the extreme poor’s self-exclusion from development processes requires special targeted support to ensure that they can access resources and associated benefits. Action should be based on analysis rooted in an understanding of the unequal power relations created by class, caste, ethnicity and gender, which have to be addressed by any support provided.

Policy mandates and affirmative action provisions are necessary for resources to reach women, the poor and the excluded along with the political commitment required for implementation. During the implementation process, all gaps need to be understood and addressed, and the reasons causing the failure need to be understood and acted upon.

Increased formal representation does not automatically lead to increased voice. Although there has been significant representation of women in user groups/committees, they still do not have sufficient voice in these groups. Their attendance is limited at meetings, they rarely speak, and if and when they do, they are often not listened to. The same is often true of Dalits and other excluded groups whose presence is mandated by donor or government funding requirements. For real change, capacity building and advocacy for shifts in discriminatory practices are necessary and need to be directed not only at the excluded but all members of the group/user committee. Also necessary for any effective change of the formal structures such as user groups is political and power-focused analysis to understand how these structures interact with informal structures and systems.

Targeted interventions are important but GESI needs to be integrated into mainstream programs and services. Though equity-related and, to some extent, inclusion issues are captured in some of the sector programs, too often in these programs inclusion has remained a separate component. The issue of social exclusion has not been approached holistically. For example, in the education sector, despite the change in terminology from “special education” to “inclusive educa-
tion,” the focus remains solely on disability and is separated from the gender equality section. This reveals a limited understanding of what it means to mainstream GESI in a sectoral program.

Institutionalizing gender and inclusion in budgeting requires further clarity and capacity. The methodology and process for the government’s gender-responsive budgeting are not clear enough. The current indicators are not adequate for analysis across sectors and it is not clear that the current post-allocation analysis adds value at either the sectoral or MOF level. There also seems to be an implicit bias in the point allocation system towards smaller, targeted, women-only projects and programs rather than genuine integration of women’s needs and constraints into mainstream sector programs. In addition, the approach lacks a wider inclusion dimension that, with very little additional effort, could allow it to track expenditures benefiting other excluded groups using the same basic process. Clear, consistent guidelines on process and analytical categories are urgently needed.

Institutional structures for GESI need to be made functional and integrated into the core products and services provided by the sector. Institutionally, just creating structures is insufficient, as demonstrated by the position of the gender focal points within the sectoral ministries. Rather, for any such position to be influential, it must be integrated into the sector’s core systems and organizational structure. The GESI function should be assigned to the planning and monitoring division of each ministry and ultimately be the responsibility of its chief. The responsibility should be backed with resources to bring in or create the necessary staff capacity to be able to provide technical backstopping necessary to fulfil the GESI mandate.

Increasing access to services for women, the poor and the excluded requires a multi-sectoral approach. For example, in order to improve access to health services, other actions are required in sectors such as education (e.g., building awareness), rural infrastructure (e.g., road and trail networks), modes of transport services (e.g., availability of stretchers, public transport), water and sanitation, and access to finances (e.g., community-level emergency funds).

1.4 Mainstreaming Gender Equality and Social Inclusion: The Way Forward
In Section 1.2 we discussed the steps of GESI mainstreaming and the three domains of change, and explained any questions or queries. In this section, common measures on mainstreaming GESI in the sectors are grouped under our framework of three stages: identifying; design and implementation; and monitoring and reporting (and response to the findings through changes in project implementation). As has been illustrated, gender-, caste-, ethnicity-, and location-based exclusion are complex interlinked issues that cannot be addressed in isolation. To respond to this complexity, multipronged measures are necessary for mainstreaming, as reflected in the suggestions made here.

Step 1: Identifying the barriers
Analyze existing power relations and the formal and informal institutions that enforce and perpetuate social and economic inequalities. Gender inequality and social exclusion in the sectors are linked to the wider sociocultural and politico-economic context. First, identify the key socioeconomic constraints and harmful social and cultural practices that limit access to sector resources and assets for women, the poor and the socially excluded. Often the “barriers” that need to be removed or worked around are part of interconnected formal and informal institutions that structure Nepali society, which allocate privileges and obligations in accordance with different roles or ascribed characteristics. The sector programs
work with these systems and try to improve them so they can deliver services more effectively. Yet, it is generally recognized that changing any of these “rules” upsets some stakeholders, and this is why there always needs to be awareness of the “political economy” of the individual projects/programs. Likewise, the more “informal” institutions, which are deeply embedded in values, beliefs and norms, can also block change, and thus need to be considered. Some—like the gender system or caste hierarchy—are so deeply ingrained that people often follow them without even being aware that they are doing so. On the other hand, not all these traditional values are negative or exclusionary, and many can indeed be a strong source of renewal and positive change.

The GESI framework is a tool to increase the chances that the changes we want to bring can actually happen on the ground. GESI requires us to look at both formal and informal systems. To identify barriers, we need to look in two areas: first, how the formal project systems are likely to work for different groups of people. This will bring us to the second layer, to see how informal systems might be distorting the way the formal systems work for some individuals and groups. So, when we try to “identify barriers,” we are actually uncovering whole systems that keep some individuals and groups from gaining equal access to universal services and benefits that the project/program we are supporting is intended to deliver.

Steps 2 and 3: Design and implementation
GESI mainstreaming requires that project/program plans must consciously recognize and address, at each stage, the constraints experienced by women, the poor and the excluded, and must build on their existing strengths.

Address policy and organizational change issues
The aim here is to focus more on the policy and organizational level and how GESI issues can be better addressed in program/project responses.

Support and strengthen GESI at policy level.
Programs/projects are applying GESI-sensitive policies, but overarching policy guidance from the government is missing. A GESI policy that provides a common framework would ensure that certain principles and a clear definition of exclusion and the excluded are consistently applied by all sector actors, and would direct revision of systems, mechanisms and processes as required.
Promote diversity in service providers. The number of women and people from excluded groups working in the sectors varies but is generally low, highlighting a need for affirmative action. This will require long-term investments through scholarships as well as individual coaching to prepare technically qualified women and people from excluded social groups. Measures to create a supportive working environment, like childcare or flexible timings and safety from sexual harassment, can be very effective in attracting and retaining women professionals. But little thought seems to have been given to how to open the way for other groups like Dalits or Muslims so that they feel comfortable and perform well in the workplace.

Develop skilled service providers to deliver GESI-sensitive services. Support for mainstreaming of GESI issues in tertiary and technical institutions will build the technical capacity of professionals. GESI-sensitive messages also need to be integrated into related training affecting the sector.

GESI in job descriptions and strengthening GESI arrangements. Work needs to be done with the Ministry of General Administration (now called the Ministry of Human Resource Development) for revision of job descriptions of all positions to integrate GESI-related tasks. GESI units and desks are required in the ministries, their departments and district-level divisions/departments to provide technical support for mainstreaming gender and inclusion in the sectors. This is also necessary in programs that have not provided dedicated responsibilities to identified structures. Mechanisms for coordination between these different structures are essential, while the capacity and skills of government and program staff to address GESI need to be strengthened and used.

Capacity building on GESI must be a process rather than a one-off event so that skills are built on to integrate gender and inclusion in everyday work. Gender and social development specialists need to have the relevant technical expertise to respond to and guide technical staff on how to mainstream GESI while technical staff members need to be able to respond to social issues linked to their technical work.

GRB and GESI budgeting. GESI budgeting, as a tool, can identify the kinds of activities budgeted/spent for but the government’s current budgeting criteria and process require revision to be more effective. GESI budget analysis should not be done only after the program has been designed and funds allocated; rather, it must be done simultaneously with program development, to ensure that activities/subprojects to address the barriers constraining access to services for women, the poor and the excluded are identified and an adequate sum allocated in the budget and work plans. Likewise, activity planning and budgeting must be linked to disaggregated data and the information generated from the use of tools such as poverty mapping, social mapping and gender analysis.

Designing program/project responses
Balance targeted and universal action. Targeted activities are necessary to address specific constraints or issues of women, the poor and the excluded, e.g., special initiatives to build capacity of women farmers to become traders/entrepreneurs in agribusiness, or specific financial services to increase access to credit of the poor, or advocacy with men regarding empowerment of women. But these need to contribute to a universal program, addressing structural constraints blocking groups from accessing resources and benefits of the sector equally with other social groups.

Promote and support partnership with civil society to invest in community education for behavior change on both sector-specific and social transformation issues, investigate governance aspects
at each step of the project cycle, and monitor investments in the sector.

**Mechanisms to encourage greater downward accountability** need to be strengthened. Across sectors, state and non-state actors are more accountable upwards than downwards towards the community, and these include NGOs and community-based organizations (i.e., support organizations) that are partnering with government and donors to implement tasks such as social mobilization, needs identification, etc. Their agreements demand reporting to project supervisors and donors with hardly any mechanism to ensure accountability towards the people they are supposed to serve. GESI performance incentives need to be developed and included in the evaluations of support organizations.

**Longer-term investment in the capacity building of women, the poor and excluded members** to enable them to participate more effectively in executive committees and groups is necessary. This requires building the leadership abilities of members of these groups.

**Harmonize working approaches across programs at the local level to minimize beneficiary transaction costs.** The formation of multiple groups by different projects/programs and varied requirements and working approaches adopted by different actors increase the time burden of women, the poor and the excluded, who have to attend multiple group meetings. This could be addressed if VDCs play their coordinating role better and ensure that the neediest receive services, but this would demand a disaggregated database and information about the current situation of women, the poor and the excluded, and their access to services in VDCs.

**Develop localized behavior change communication materials and translate project information into local languages.** To be effective, these materials must be available in local languages and use a range of media to address specific discriminatory beliefs and norms. Likewise, program/project information and documents need to be translated into local languages to ensure that all groups understand the processes, rules and regulations to access services, assets, resources and other benefits.

**Steps 4 and 5: Monitor and Adjust Implementation**

**Monitoring and reporting**

Many sectors are disaggregating data by sex and caste/ethnicity. But the focus is on activities (e.g., number of women trained) and outputs, and the capacity to track GESI outcomes is still lacking. Some potential improvements are listed below.

**Disaggregated monitoring and reporting** to show what each project/program is contributing to assist women, the poor and the excluded, need to be established across the sectors. This is very challenging at the national level as NPC monitoring and reporting formats, which all ministries have to follow, do not demand disaggregated information. Additionally, the “three domains of change” framework is very useful for tracking changes at outcome levels, and could usefully be established as a routine practice by NPC.

**Objectives and indicators need to be disaggregated by sex and caste/ethnicity.** Planning and programming must be based on disaggregated information and evidence. With NGO partners, PRA (Participatory Rural Appraisal) tools (e.g., well-being ranking, labor/access/control profile, resource mapping, etc) must be used as required at the community level to identify the poor and map existing social and power relations. In turn, this information must be used for identifying priorities for programming and guiding implementation practice.

**Uniform MIS and disaggregated data** for all sectors around some basic indicators would help reduce duplication and identify gaps and areas of
acute exclusion. PMAS needs to be revised and its implementation strengthened. Monitoring and reporting formats must be standardized with disaggregation. Sectors and programs will need to monitor their investments, and hence have more detailed indicators and monitoring systems. But they must all contribute to the indicators incorporated in PMAS.

Community monitoring and social accountability mechanisms should be institutionalized within the M&E system. Social and public audits have become accepted tools and processes, and need to be improved in implementation. To ensure this, social mobilization may be necessary until the process of giving this kind of feedback becomes a familiar activity for the excluded. This requires a carefully facilitated process to ensure that all social groups participate, that proper service evaluation occurs, and that useful understanding is developed and acted upon.

Good practices and lessons learned need to be documented and shared by sector actors through donor coordination groups, and perhaps through the Social Inclusion Action Group, a group of practitioner agencies. Enhanced capacity to prepare case studies that document and analyze positive pro-inclusion processes will accelerate the pace of change.

Monitoring and evaluation teams must be inclusive and must have people with technical competence about gender and social inclusion in the sector. The terms of reference of the M&E teams must specifically demand deliverables that have addressed GESI issues.

Adjust implementation
Project/program management needs to view the M&E system as their dashboard for steering the project to achieve its objectives. If the inclusion indicators show that some of the intended outcomes are not emerging as expected or some groups are not getting their share of benefits, project management needs to diagnose why this is so and work with staff and project participants to develop mechanisms to change the situation as soon as possible.

The seven sectors covered in this series have made significant progress in increasing the participation of women, the poor and excluded groups in development efforts, but rather uneven progress in addressing structural causes of gender/caste/ethnicity-based discrimination and issues of social exclusion. However, the current discourse on inclusive development provides an opportune time to learn from sectoral experience and move towards more inclusive practices, as these lessons can be adopted and mainstreamed across the sectors and institutionalized within government and non-government structures alike.

As has been noted, to institutionalize GESI, each sector will need to address the main issues uniquely facing women, the poor and the excluded: the underlying structural causes of their limited participation, voice and very low influence over decision-making processes; the reasons behind ongoing inequitable access to resources and assets; and the need to build responsive processes that address the different needs of specific social groups. At an institutional level, a variety of common issues need to be addressed, including lack of staff diversity; ineffective gender focal points; and limited integration of GESI principles in core sectoral planning, budgeting and monitoring processes, which leads to major gaps between enabling policies and actual implementation.
sectoral perspectives on gender and social inclusion

notes
1 According to the Interim Constitution and Three-Year Interim Plan, excluded groups refer to those who have experienced exclusion historically and have not been mainstreamed in the nation’s development: women, Dalits, Adivasi Janajatis, Madhesis, Muslims, people living with disabilities, and people from geographically remote areas.
2 This framework has been adapted from Naila Kabeer’s social relations analysis framework (Kabeer 1994). It has been informed and refined by the GSEA framework. Field-level experience of professionals has contributed to it. It has been used in Nepal for program design, evaluation studies, and gender equality and social inclusion mainstreaming in the forest sector, LGCDP/MLD, and in various other program/NGO strategies.
3 In a national program, mapping the local political economy of the sector in a sample of the different types of sites where the program would be implemented would provide us with enough to go on.
4 This section draws from the LGCDP/MLD gender equality and social inclusion operational strategy (2009). Refer to Annex 2 of that document for a more detailed analysis of policy and institutional frameworks.
5 This has recently been approved as the GESI policy of MLD.
6 Such as categorization of Janajati groups into endangered, highly marginalized and marginalized, and prioritization of projects accordingly; disaggregated information about users; information to users regarding resources before approval of next installment; 33% women and representation of Dalit, Janajati and deprived groups in user committees; allocation of up to 3% of total project cost estimates for capacity building and overhead costs of user committees; participatory monitoring by users; and registration of complaints at VDCs about the implementation of the project.
7 As has been directed by MLD for the VDC-level integrated planning committees.
8 This publication reviews the workforce diversity profile of 30 international agencies working in Nepal.
9 Records of civil servants maintained by the Department of Civil Personnel Records (Nijamati Kitabkhana) of the Ministry of General Administration were reviewed and disaggregated according to surname and place of permanent residence. Rules applied were those developed by the WB Social Inclusion Index development team, and caste/ethnicity groupings were drawn from the Census. This process can be erroneous to a certain extent, as some surnames are common to different social groups. We appreciate that a participatory process facilitated by the Nijamati Kitabkhana for the self-identification of employees has been initiated.
10 The national population as of Census 2001 was Brahmin and Chhetri 32.5%; Janajati (excluding Newar) 32%; Newar 5.4%; Madhesi 20.4%; Muslim 4.3%, OBCs 14%; and others 1.4%.
11 Gazette is the highest category of officers, appointed through national open competition. Non-gazetted officers are appointed by the head of department to support gazetted officers. Within the gazetted and non-gazetted, there is a hierarchy of special, first-, second-, and third-class officers. The classless officers are support staff.
12 Of the total 72,939 civil personnel in the government as of February 2010, only 12% were women. Of these, 12.9% were gazetted officers, 57.4% were non-gazetted, and 30.4% were without grade (Nijamati Kitabkhana records, February 2010).
13 The three prescribed categories are direct contribution, indirect contribution and neutral. Each sub-activity is assigned a code of 1, 2 or 3, considering the percentage of contribution to women. The formula for coding has five indicators, each valued at 20%: capacity building of women, women’s participation in planning process and implementation, women’s share in benefit-sharing, support for women’s employment and income generation, and qualitative progress in the use of women’s time and reducing women’s workload (eAWPB 1.0 Operating Manual, 2009). In order to measure these categories quantitatively, five qualitative indicators were assigned quantitative values of equal denomination, totaling 100. Direct gender contribution indicates more than 50% of the allocation directly benefiting women, indirect gender contribution indicates 20-50% of the allocation benefiting women, and the neutral category indicates less than 20% of the allocation benefiting women. This is gradually being used by ministries such as the Health Ministry but due to difficulties in the application of the criteria that do not seem relevant to all the sectors, this has not been fully used by all.
14 Indicators for the pro-poor budget are investment in rural sector; income-generation program in rural areas; capacity-enhancement program in rural areas; budget allocated for social mobilization; expenditure focusing on poverty reduction; grant for local bodies; social security programs; and investment in social sector (especially for education, health, etc). See Annex 8c, budget speech 2009-2010. But it is not clear how these are scored and what sub-indicators are used.
15 Refer to the monograph on Rural Infrastructure in this series for more discussion on GRB.
16 Refer to the monograph on Rural Infrastructure in this series for more discussion regarding this.
17 This analytical framework is adapted from GRB frameworks being used, and has been applied in Nepal in different program/project assessments and evaluations and for the GESI strategy development (e.g., MFSC GESI strategy for the forest sector 2006, the International Labor Organization’s GESI strategy for LED [local economic development] in Nepal 2009, and LFP social and geographic audit, 2004).
We are adapting from gender budgeting initiatives that have aimed to assess the impact of government expenditures and revenues, using three-way categorization of gender-specific expenditure, equal opportunity expenditure and general expenditure (the rest), considered in terms of its gendered impact (Budlender and Sharp 1998).

Implemented budgets of districts were reviewed to assess actual expenditure and its effect on addressing the barriers of women, the poor and the excluded. Program budgets of the current year were reviewed to assess allocations.

Directly supportive (i.e., targeted to provide direct support to women, the poor and the excluded); indirectly supportive (contributing to creating an enabling environment, supporting in any manner the access of women and the excluded to services, or addressing the structural difficulties confronting them); and neutral.

CHAPTER 2

Gender Equality and Social Inclusion

Making it Happen in Irrigation
2.1 Introduction
The aim of this chapter is to provide practical guidance on how to operationalize gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) in the irrigation sector. Irrigation is an important input for increased agricultural productivity, which has a direct relation to well-being and economic growth. It benefits the poor through higher production, higher yields, lower risk of crop failure, and higher and year-round farm and non-farm employment. It enables smallholders to adopt more diversified cropping patterns, and switch from low-value subsistence production to high-value market-oriented production; and helps women reduce their workload of fetching water. Of Nepal’s total agricultural area, 67% is irrigable, of which around 70% is irrigated (through surface or groundwater farmers’ management irrigation systems [FMISs]). But irrigation systems are dependent on availability of transit flow at the water source, and therefore only about 40% of the area is reportedly irrigated throughout the year, thus limiting types of crop and productivity (DOI 2007).

The Tenth Plan/Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper and the Agriculture Perspective Plan included land reform packages and improved irrigation facilities in their policy provisions (Jull 2006). But the budget for irrigation was substantially reduced (the Ninth Five-year Plan in 2002 had Rs 25.40 million while the Interim Plan had Rs 13.25 million). Nepal continues to struggle with implementation, with the investment in and benefits of the sector not equitably shared. The majority of large, state-financed irrigation projects have benefited larger-scale farmers (Gurung 2000, quoted in Upadhyay 2004). But community-managed irrigation systems do cater to the needs of smallholders, while non-conventional systems are increasingly able to help rural women, the poor and the excluded meet their practical needs and generate extra income. Yet, despite recent inclusive measures, the sector’s focus has been on irrigation infrastructure, with technical and financial priorities that marginalize issues of inclusion and equity.

This chapter explores the barriers experienced by women, the poor and the excluded in accessing resources and benefits of the irrigation sector. The level of inclusion in policy and programmatic responses, the tools and mechanisms practiced to address GESI issues, governance and social accountability mechanisms, institutional arrangements and the level of skills in the sector are all discussed, while ways to operationalize GESI will be drawn from the good practices and lessons learned of previous experiences of different actors.

2.2 Irrigation in Nepal: Access of Women, the Poor and the Excluded to Resources and Benefits
The Agriculture Perspective Plan and government policy documents (such as the Tenth Five-Year Plan, the Three-Year Interim Plan and annual budgets) highlight irrigation as key to raising household income and food security in rural areas. But delays in improved irrigation technology inputs, government focus on big schemes, and removal of subsidies in groundwater irrigation have been major setbacks for the poor, women and other excluded groups. Access to irrigation is determined largely by the ability to invest in system construction and thus tends to exclude poor households.

2.1.1 Barriers of women, the poor and the excluded in irrigation
There are several broad dimensions of exclusion that women, the poor, excluded groups and remote areas face in accessing and utilizing irrigation resources and benefits.

Access to land. The landless are directly excluded from accessing irrigation services and benefits
because they do not own land in the irrigated command area. Thus, they are never direct beneficiaries of the sector. Although the landless and marginal landholders use water for rearing livestock, and as sharecroppers and tenants (ADB 2009a), the distribution of irrigation water is land based, making irrigation development inherently biased against the landless and the land poor. It is thus unlikely that the landless or land poor, including women and Dalits, would feel any incentive to participate in local water committees such as water user associations (WUAs), an important stakeholder in the sector, since decisions taken there would most likely not concern them. According to a 2009 study, fewer than 10% of rural households possess roughly one third of private land, while more than half of the rural population are functionally landless, i.e., do not possess enough land to cover subsistence needs; further, approximately 10% have no land at all (Wily, Chapagain, and Sharma, quoted in Carter Center 2010). Efforts to address barriers faced by the landless and marginal holders—through leasehold farming, leasing common water catchments for fish farming, or more shares per unit of land for marginal landowners—are increasing but have not yet been upscaled sufficiently for a vast majority of women, the poor and the excluded to benefit.

One notable source of exclusion arises from the fact that nearly all irrigation programs in Nepal put 5-10 ha (5-15 ha for households) as the minimum for their selection criteria in order to increase efficiency of staff and resource use. Yet, doing so not only excludes many schemes but also a majority of existing FMISs that collectively contribute a large percentage of the irrigated area in Nepal. No reliable numbers are available for Nepal as a whole, or for specific regions and districts, but a detailed inventory of FMISs in 51 village development committees (VDCs) of Ilam, Panchthar and Taplejung districts in 1990 revealed that such very small schemes actually form a majority among FMISs. A selection criterion that excludes systems below 10 ha, for instance, would exclude 66% of all existing systems from assistance (ADB/SDC 2010).

Geographic exclusion. Figure 2.1 provides an overview of irrigated area under the Department of Irrigation (DOI) from 1997 to 2006, while the Central Bureau of Statistics provides data on the total irrigated area during that period. When this is correlated with total population, the proportion of the population with access to irrigated area is lower in the Western and Far-Western regions, with the disparity between the Central and Far-Western regions particularly wide. Moreover, the movement of government officers out of conflict-affected rural areas for a decade has led to semi-urban projects becoming the main recipients of government support.

“Tail-enders.” Upstream-downstream inequity is a major issue in access to irrigation. If farmers at the head take all the water they need for water-intensive crops, those towards the middle and tail end are left largely dry. Unless the system ensures that water reaches everywhere equally and in a timely fashion, tail-enders often remain neglected (ADB 2009a).
Access to information. Remoteness of a community due to location, low literacy levels, and social norms (including mobility practices of women) foster exclusion, since information is not well disseminated to these groups. Information is often accessible only to communities that are in close proximity to government line agencies. For example, irrigation projects located in one municipality received government support twice within 10 years; while other irrigation systems located far from the district headquarters have not received grants, as they never applied to the irrigation office due to lack of information and access to the office. At the level of water users, information does not reach individual farmers equally; often, local leaders, especially the male elite, will have the time to visit irrigation offices and are thus kept far more informed about government procedures and programs. Even when communities are informed, they need to make a ‘farmers’ request’ to the government agency for support. Lack of complete information and inability to comprehend government application forms are also constraints for time-strapped rural women, the poor and the excluded, who are then dependent on literate members of the community.

Access to representation and participation. Under the irrigation policy, farmers are requested to form ad hoc committees for water user associations, with 33% women and representation of “Dalit, downtrodden and ethnic population,” and to submit a request for support along with commitment from at least 67% of the users in the command area (Irrigation Regulations, 2003). However, this inclusive representation is often not achieved, even in terms of mere presence on the committee, let alone active participation in decision making. As in other sectors, relatives of local leaders often become members in the name of women’s representation. Those who do manage to get into groups and committees often lack capability to express their voice, due to historical disadvantages of low exposure and socio-cultural values and norms, especially with regard to women and Dalits (Meinzen-Dick and Zwarteveen 1998; Udas and Zwarteveen 2005).

Preparing an association’s constitution and going to a government office are both necessary to register a WUA as well as for future support and government services, all of which are usually challenging for women, the poor and the excluded. The process is also vulnerable to political capture, with the influence of local (male) political leaders typically high given that successful implementation of irrigation systems adds to social status. Still, WUAs are an important stakeholder in this sector, and the National Federation of Irrigation Water Users’ Associations, Nepal (NFIWUAN) has been formed to improve their performance collectively. The aim is to draw from and share the WUAs’ respective strengths and promote participatory irrigation development, user empowerment and partnerships among agencies involved in irrigation development. NFIWUAN’s specific objectives include making users aware of government policies; developing leadership among water users; conducting research, performance evaluation, and user capacity development training; ensuring that women and marginalized communities are mainstreamed in decision-making; and assisting government agencies in planning, formulating and implementing policies on behalf of irrigation beneficiaries.

The irrigation policy clearly anticipates the sustainable management of irrigation systems through the involvement of user organizations and NFIWUAN. The policy visualized WUAs as a democratic entity in which all users could express their views equally, but the composition of these associations and their relations with the user committee typically reflect existing social hierarchies. One of the reasons for the inability to break down social barriers is the
lower number of excluded groups in WUA committees. A review of the membership profile of NFIWUAN’s district committees (Figure 2.2) indicates a clear dominance of Hill Brahmin/Chhetri men: of the 435 members in 40 districts, 25% are women; 65% are Hill Brahmin/Chhetri, 7% Dalits, 10% Hill and Tarai Janajatis, and 9% other backward classes (OBCs).15 Because formal membership of user associations is linked to land ownership (Zwarteveen and Meinzen-Dick 2001), the fact that women, the poor and the excluded hold less land than men and other non-excluded groups has automatically excluded them from WUA membership.16

Ability to influence the design of irrigation projects. Irrigation project design can often be insensitive to women, the poor and the excluded because these groups were not well consulted during the planning process. For instance, in the Bauraha irrigation system in Dang, male members were consulted as they were heads of households, whereas the actual irrigators in the area were women; distributary canals were thus built in unsuitable places, which the women later had to reconstruct according to their needs (Bruins and Heijmans 1993). In the past, the feasibility study for an irrigation system was limited to a cost-benefit analysis and internal rate of return, but the new policy incorporates analysis on economic, social, environmental, technical and sustainability aspects. In practice, however, during screening and prioritization for feasibility, the limited human resources in irrigation division and subdivision offices to work on social aspects of water management leads to a marginalization of such issues. Additionally, those in charge in such offices tend not to believe in the abilities of women, the poor and the excluded to contribute to design and other such aspects.

Access to integrated irrigation and agriculture services. As irrigation is a factor of production, not a product itself, for women, the poor and the excluded to benefit fully from such investment it is essential to integrate it with agriculture-related inputs. Monograph 1 of this series presents details of the issues experienced by the excluded in accessing agricultural services.

Labor contribution as per total irrigated area. This is a complex issue and generally not addressed as WUA committee members typically own large plots of land that would require higher payment for labor. For example, in the general assembly of two irrigation systems, in Tukucha Nala in Kavre and in Bhusune Asare in Udayapur, women users (supported by economically poor men users) raised the issue of labor contribution proportionate to irrigated land (Udas and Zwarteveven [2005], Zwarteveen et al [2010]). But there was no response from members, and the issue was not resolved.

Gender-based exclusion. Irrigation activities have been understood mostly as technical hardware work, strictly for men, thus making women invisible and affecting their level of involvement in the sector. A study conducted on the West Gandak irrigation
system revealed multiple systematic differences between men and women irrigators, including with regards to field-irrigation strategies, attendance at water user meetings, conflicts faced in accessing water, night irrigation, ethnicity-based social restrictions in carrying out maintenance work, and application of the new share system and payment of irrigation fees (van Koppen et al 2001). In vegetable farming, for instance, women spend a total of 328 hours per annum while men spend only 44 hours (Upadhyay 2004).

Although it could somewhat address gender issues, the investment necessary on small-scale schemes (drip or groundwater irrigation) at a farmer or small-group level is very low. The overall impact of the adoption of drip irrigation technology has been found to be positive for women in terms of reduction of workload, access to food and income, and bargaining power in intra-household decisions—reducing the time needed to irrigate a plot of 0.0127 ha by 50% (Upadhyay et al 2005). But rural women have very poor access to new technologies, with the extension and adoption system still largely male-dominated and women receiving little or no information on technological innovations. Also, the number of female-headed households in Nepal ranges from 10% to 20% of the total population, of which most are widows or wives of long-term male migrants, leaving them extremely vulnerable to constraints and limiting their mobility and access to services (ADB 2009a).

Professional water governance bodies—irrigation agencies, water NGOs, farmer and water user associations, water research institutions—tend to consist only of men. Women’s absence becomes even more prominent at the higher management levels. Irrigation powers, authorities and expertise are mostly vested in men, and successful performance as a water manager is strongly correlated with behavioral characteristics associated more with men than with women (Liebrand, quoted in Zwarteveen 2008; Lauries 2005; Lynch 1993).

The user group guidelines mandate 33% women in user committees, but there is no mandatory provision for women’s participation in the construction committee. User contribution is very low in the survey and design phase as well—users are given employment in the construction phase, but there is no mandate for the employment of women. Similarly, no participation of women is sought in the review and monitoring of irrigation projects. There is a provision for social audit of the project, but the guidelines do not require women’s presence in this. While there is a brief orientation regarding the project—operation and maintenance (O&M) requirements, and user committee formation guidelines—for the users prior to construction, there is no specific component for capacity building.

**Caste-based discrimination.** Traditional practices of not eating food or drinking water touched by Dalits prevent the latter from accessing irrigation water. Additionally, high poverty rates, landlessness and economic and social discrimination, along with very low access to policy decision-making levels, are the main barriers behind the continued exclusion and deprivation of Dalit communities in the sector.

**Ethnicity-based discrimination.** Adivasi Janajatis are intrinsically linked with land and its resources, and, in recognition, Nepal has ratified ILO Convention 169 and signed the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, ensuring their rights to land, water and resources. But, according to the National Federation of Indigenous Nationalities (NEFIN), Adivasi Janajati issues remain neglected by the state in terms of access to many agricultural irrigation services, including access to water. This reflects the generally low access of these communities to productive resources and state-delivered goods and services, and the structural barriers they face.
in getting access to national policy- and decision-making levels.

*User fees, maintenance issues.* Water user associations are responsible for system management during the post-construction phase and they set the management fees. To a great extent the level of institutional development of WUAs determines the degree to which they are able to achieve internal equity. Often, user associations in small-scale farmer-managed irrigation systems are found to be inactive after system rehabilitation, at which point management takes place according to customary practices—typically more interested in bringing in financial resources to make the system more permanent, so that surplus water is available in the command area. Being in the WUA of a large irrigation system is an important sign of political power and committee members often have political interests that influence the management of and access to WUA resources.

Finally, it should be noted that over the past six decades of engagement in the sector, the key challenge faced by the government has been cost recovery. Most investments made in the irrigation sectors are on the basis of loan agreements with bilateral and multilateral organizations, which in turn pressures departments to recover these costs.¹⁷

In this context there clearly are a number of barriers for women, the poor and the excluded. Despite the policy mandates for their inclusion in user groups, the excluded do not have real voice or influence in these groups. Formalization of user associations involves complex paperwork that gives access only to educated members; the need to participate in water user meetings constrains the poor and women, as does night irrigation; ethnicity-based social restrictions impact maintenance work; and payment of irrigation fees, the politicization of the process in general, and inequitable labor contributions are also issues. For the very poor, access to credit for the installation of systems can be very difficult, unless collateral-free loans are available.

### 2.3 Policies and Programs: Responses to Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Issues in Irrigation

This section¹⁸ discusses the policy environment and programmatic responses to address barriers faced by women, the poor and the excluded in accessing benefits of the irrigation sector. The first part discusses the mandates for irrigation, while the second focuses on programmatic responses.

#### 2.3.1 Policy framework for irrigation

The major policies guiding the sector include the Water Resources Act 1992, Water Resources Regulation 1993, Irrigation Policy 1992 (amended 2003), Irrigation Regulation 2000 (amended 2003), Water Resources Strategy 2002, National Water Resource Development Policy 2003 and National Water Plan 2004. These have shifted the sector’s focus from the completely technical to one that recognizes and addresses human, societal and environmental aspects. The National Water Plan stipulates that the irrigation sector must collaborate with other line agencies to improve livelihood strategies. It also gives guidance on the process of privatizing irrigation systems when users have not been able to manage them collectively through their WUA. The plan emphasizes that collection of water fees from the users of large systems is to be used for the upliftment of non-beneficiaries. The Irrigation Policy 2003 mandates 33% participation of women and disadvantaged social groups in WUAs and ensures financial concessions and technical support to them for irrigation facilities.

However, these policies lack explicit mandates and mechanisms for ensuring inclusion at each stage from program development to evaluation.
The Water Resources Strategy 2002 emphasizes basic needs fulfillment, capacity building of stakeholders and sustainable water use, but remains silent about GESI issues. The National Water Resource Development Policy 2003 highlights equitable distribution and appropriate management of water resources for irrigation and defines service charges. Emphasis has been given to the construction and maintenance of systems, efficient distribution of water and increased agricultural output, rather than the nature of crops grown, the impact of irrigation on labor markets or the coexistence of productive and consumption water uses.

Policies addressing geographical inequity and contribution from the poor
Variables that impact people of different locations and excluded groups (such as the definition of large, small and medium irrigation systems, depending on geography) were addressed by the Irrigation Policy 1992 (see Table 2.1). The policy considered the remoteness, poor economy and hardship of people living in mountain and hill regions on issues of farmer contributions to rehabilitation or construction of a new irrigation system with government support. However, it did not address issues of poor farmers within a given geographical location. The amendments to the Irrigation Policy and Regulation in 2003 attempted to address these issues by making user contribution proportionate to different landholding size, irrespective of geographical location.

Policies increasing participation of users
The Irrigation Policy 1992 introduced a major policy shift that focused on improving management, farmer participation in all stages of project implementation and O&M, and transfer of irrigation management to WUAs. The intention was to encourage users to take full ownership and responsibility for managing the technical and financial aspects of the lower tiers of irrigation systems. Termed “participatory irrigation management,” the user associations are to contribute a certain amount of project cost, either in cash or labor, according to individual landholding size, while receiving support from the government.

Policies ensuring participation of women and disadvantaged groups in decision-making
Recognizing the lower participation of women in user groups, the Irrigation Policy 1992 stipulated a minimum of 20% participation of women in WUAs. Until the Irrigation Regulation 2000 was promulgated, this clause was not mandatory. Further, it was only in 2003 that the policy addressed the weaker positions of Dalits and the poor in the sector. According to the Irrigation Regulation 2003, “User association shall be composed of at least thirty three percent of the women representation as well as, there shall be represen-
tation of Dalit, downtrodden and backward ethnic communities in such association.” But this was qualified with “if available in such association” (emphasis added), thus reducing it from being a mandatory clause.\footnote{19} In addition, the definition of “downtrodden” is not explained in the policy document (see Annex 6.1 for WUA provisions).

Though reservation is important to ensure representation of women and excluded communities, it is not sufficient, as internal inequities of WUAs are not addressed and empowerment measures are not undertaken. The policy expects a WUA to be a local authority that can manage and address water-related issues of internal inequity, but does not consider the institutional processes and patterns of inclusion and exclusion, nor the dynamic and negotiated nature of institutional evolution (Zwarteveen, Udas, and Delgado 2010). Clause 2.5.2 of the Policy, on transfer of land required for tertiary canals and field channels to users association, mentions suitable compensation in terms of buying land but does not open possibilities of land exchange. No alternatives address the needs of people at subsistence level who do not want to sell land for money, especially in the case of subsistence farming, despite the fact that an alternative such as exchange of land could be a pro-poor policy.

### 2.3.2 Programmatic responses in irrigation

Since the inception of the five-year development plans, several small, medium and large irrigation schemes have been developed in different parts of the country, using both surface and groundwater resources under internal and external funding. The DOI has a number of programs, but in

---

Table 2.2: Programs and Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects, project coverage, donors (budget)</th>
<th>Key measures towards GESI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-Managed Irrigated Agriculture Sector Project (CMIASP), 35 districts in Eastern and Central development regions; 11 Tarai, 18 hills, and 6 mountains, ADB (US$ 38.6 million)</strong></td>
<td>• Partnership with local NGOs for mobilizing beneficiary WUAs is expected to provide stimuli for increased participation of women and disadvantaged ethnic and caste groups, and fairer sharing of irrigation water between head, middle and tail-end users, to foster greater system ownership and sustainability • Specifically engage poor and disadvantaged ethnic and caste groups in targeted training programs and support • Mandate at least 33% women’s participation in all project activities, to secure more equitable distribution of benefits between genders • Specific pro-poor interventions include improved irrigation infrastructure, which will enable poor men and women farmers to have greater access to water during winter and spring for higher value crops. • Bring an additional 8,500 ha under irrigation through improved water distribution, and thus benefit over 270,000 poor men and women • Institutional development support will aim at effective operation of improved participatory irrigation service delivery mechanisms to support inclusive development with due empowerment and livelihood enhancement of the poor, including ethnic minorities and occupational castes (Dalits) (ADB 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irrigation and Water Resources Management Project (IWRMP), 40 districts, World Bank (US$64.91 million)</strong></td>
<td>• Supervision of cross-cutting issues including gender, indigenous people, resettlement and other social and environmental matters • Gender development strategy prepared for project includes measures to help women WUA members to access project benefits at par with men • Mainstreaming gender and Janajati/Dalit development in subprojects from early stages of planning • Provide pre- and post-production support to small farmers and other nonfarming groups (e.g., landless, disadvantaged rural poor, women, etc) in the form of small rural access infrastructure, improved availability of quality inputs, cooperative processing and marketing, strengthening of supply chains, improved storage structures/handling practices, efficient marketing information (World Bank 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-conventional Irrigation Technology Project (NITP), no donor support</strong></td>
<td>• To implement micro-irrigation program for providing effective micro-irrigation service delivery mechanism with high-value crop production support for poverty alleviation • Serve disadvantaged groups • Serve marginal landholders and farmers • Help to achieve poverty reduction goal by promoting farming of high-value crops such as vegetables, herbs, fruits, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Program documents.
this section we discuss just three of the ongoing ones, two of which are supported by donors and one of which is a regular government program (see Table 2.2 and Annexes 2.1 and 2.2 for an overview).

Implementation of the Community-Managed Irrigated Agriculture Sector Project (CMIASP) at the district level is through subproject management committees represented by related district line agencies (district agriculture development office and district irrigation office). The subprojects include feasibility studies and construction, institutional and agriculture development, and livelihood enhancement plans (Box 2.3). The CMIASP aims for participatory irrigated agriculture development in which livelihood needs of the poor are identified and supported. The Irrigation and Water Resources Management Project (IWRMP) intends to benefit Dalits and Adivasi Janajatis through active involvement in project interventions, for which a development strategy for these groups has been prepared. One of the main criteria for approving irrigation management and implementation projects at the district level has been social and environmental planning, including on gender development. Such planning includes activities to reduce negative implications of a project on women and the excluded, and also to address women’s needs on enhancing crop productivity through improved water management. However, the results framework for project monitoring and evaluation gives inadequate attention to specific indicators for gender and social inclusion. Finally, the Non-conventional Irrigation Technology Project (NITP) in the DOI was established in 1993 to promote techniques and technologies other than those under conventional use. Its aim is to provide irrigation facilities to both under-irrigated areas and areas designated as non-irrigable for whatever reason. Poverty alleviation for and empowerment of women and disadvantaged and marginalized groups are the ultimate goals, with the NITP currently promoting and developing micro-irrigation throughout the country.20

Both the CMIASP and the IWRMP focus on activities that are likely to improve the assets and capabilities of members of user groups, including women. The CMIASP has incorporated specific activities to build the capacity of women for improved water management at the WUA level, while the IWRMP has included a focus on Dalits and Adivasi Janajatis. But both lack adequate emphasis on addressing the underlying structural issues constraining the empowerment of women, the poor and the excluded. The NITP, meanwhile, complements the Water Resources Strategy and the National Water Plan. Programs on community-managed irrigated agricultural systems, non-conventional irrigation technology and capacity development of disadvantaged WUAs are based on the principle of social inclusion, regional balance and equitable development seeking the participation of women, the poor and excluded communities.

These three key projects are discussed below, following the project cycle approach of identification; design, construction and implementation; and monitoring and evaluation. Information is drawn from documents and consultations.

Identification phase

Information dissemination. The CMIASP has a campaign to disseminate project information. A circular is issued to all district development committees (DDCs) and VDCs, providing a clear explanation of the project and the process whereby local WUAs/groups can obtain project assistance. NGOs working to update irrigation inventory deliver the circular to the WUA communities, while presenting project information in individual DDCs and VDCs. A similar circular is circulated to local NGOs through the DDCs and to WUAs through NFIWUAN.
Farmers’ request. In the CMIASP, interested WUAs/groups form an ad hoc WUA committee (comprising representatives from head to tail reach, women and ethnic minorities, if any) and request FMIS renovation to a district-level Subproject Management Unit (SMU) with the endorsement of the concerned VDC and DDC chairpersons. The request includes a brief scope of the renovation works proposed, along with necessary agriculture and social development support services.

Screening and identification survey. The CMIASP project team is supposed to visit the area of the proposed subproject to assess the problems and possible solutions covering irrigation, agriculture and social development aspects. The team has to verify the NGO screening report by meeting with both the WUA and affected people (including any voluntary land contribution), particularly with people of different classes both inside and outside the FMIS. Participatory rapid rural appraisals are carried out by the NGO, including a series of public meetings to discuss the subproject concept, as well as independent meetings with individual groups (including women, ethnic minorities, marginal farmers and landless people, and people outside of the subproject area who might be negatively affected).

Feasibility study. The IWRMP has prepared an environmental and social management framework which provides operational guidance for streamlining the assessment and management of potential social and environmental issues. The framework aims to identify potential issues early in the subproject cycle and insure the participation of stakeholders, including affected people. The project has a process of stakeholder consultations in preparing and implementing scheme-level plans and associated mitigation plans and requires that measures be put in place to ensure that these consultations are participatory and inclusive across all social and economic groups. The framework also includes transparent selection criteria and approval processes together with strong WUAs, to help prevent political and other interference. A social assessment is planned for every FMIS, with the results attached to the corresponding feasibility study.

Surprisingly, however, there has been no study under the social component of the project to assess existing inequities with regard to water rights. Even though at the local level it is said that all the people affected by the project will be consulted and encouraged to participate in all decision-making processes (through WUAs, for example), it seems unlikely that poor or landless farmers, or women who find themselves as head of a household, or more generally those who have no water rights or have only restricted access to irrigation water, would feel any incentive to participate in those local committees, since they may feel that decisions taken by the committees will not concern them.

Design phase
During the design phase, the IWRMP holds public consultations to examine the views of beneficiaries and ensure that they are adequately addressed. (Public hearings are also held to disseminate information and inform the participants of their expected involvement during the implementation phase.) This is an important accountability tool, and mechanisms such as quorums must be in place to ensure that women, the poor and excluded groups are invited and participate. The IWRMP’s design and implementation phases promote meaningful participation from the community through NGOs working with the WUAs, to identify the capacity gaps and training needs to be addressed through mobilization efforts, awareness generation, training, etc. The IWRMP recognizes that women are often unable to participate actively, even though they may have a keen interest and can play an active
role in the decision-making processes. The gender development strategy prepared for the project includes measures to help women WUA members to access project benefits on a par with men. At the design level, there is a distinct effort to take gender and social (and environmental) issues into account, but concrete on-site actions remain very vague: for example, it is not said what “measures” in favor of Adivasi Janajatis will be taken to ensure that they benefit equally. The process also does not draw on traditional knowledge and the skills of local women, the poor and the excluded.

The CMIASP runs an information campaign during this phase to identify the beneficiary households in the subproject area. Direct beneficiaries, local leaders and other relevant stakeholders (e.g., landless Dalits) are identified and the ad hoc management committee modified (to become the WUA) to promote appropriate representation of various stakeholders. (The field-channel groups are encouraged to have at least 35% women.) Participatory detailed design processes are carried out with the beneficiaries, but there are no project requirements to ensure that women or the excluded are present during these joint “walk-throughs” of the proposed design. During the implementation phase, WUAs require at least 33% women and are also expected to form groups comprising disadvantaged ethnic minority and “occupational caste” men and women, and give them job opportunities in construction work. The contribution in cash, in kind or in labor is reduced for small-landholding farmers.

In the CMIASP, a community organizer is nominated from among user members by the WUA, and this individual acts as a facilitator to strengthen the WUA with support from an NGO. The organizer mobilizes users for institutional development activities. As far as possible, 50% of the organizers are required to be women, and preferably from an excluded group, though it is unclear as to how closely this policy is followed. The Irrigation Policy 2003 requires at least 33% women’s representation in all registered WUAs and provides an opportunity to increase women’s exposure and access to irrigated agricultural technology. However, there are significant regional and cultural differences in attitudes towards women’s participation in decision-making in the irrigation sector. Content analysis of NITP policy documents shows evidence that, at the planning level, there is an effort to take gender and social (and environmental) issues into account. The CMIASP and IWRMP also both include safeguards in their projects (i.e., resettlement and rehabilitation policies) to protect people who are adversely affected by the project activities.

**Construction/implementation phase**

Both the CMIASP and the IWRMP include strategies to promote implementation processes that are gender and social inclusion sensitive. A gender operational strategy has been developed by the CMIASP for the DOI (Box 2.1), and the project will support the DOI in establishing a gender-sensitive monitoring system, promoting the gender operational strategy, and developing a training model for staff and clients. Yet, despite CMIASP implementation having started in 2006, no progress in gender inclusion has been achieved as no activity under the strategy has been operationalized. Further, the strategy has to include mechanisms to ensure the quality of women’s participation in project interventions, and project staff members need orientation on the gender operational strategy as well as capacity-building training on mechanisms to ensure gender equity in irrigation development.

Similarly, the IWRMP has prepared a vulnerable groups development strategy for indigenous people and disadvantaged groups, which has emphasized providing benefits from project
interventions to Dalits and Adivasi Janajatis (Box 2.2). The project is still in its early stages and yet to operationalize the strategy, but does include specific measures to enhance the accessibility of these groups to project benefits and ensure that they are positively impacted by the project. The process of preparing and implementing this development plan will follow the project cycle at the scheme level; at the output level, however, the only social aspects that seem to have been addressed are resettlement issues and compensation schemes.

Under the CMIASP, a memorandum of agreement can only be signed when certain conditions have been met and confirmed by the monitoring team. Membership enrolment in the WUA must include representation from a minimum of 70% of the direct beneficiary households in each geographical group, representing head, middle and tail reaches of the system, while at least 33% the
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**Box 2.1: Gender Strategy**

The CMIASP gender strategy includes the following specific activities for gender and social inclusion:

- hiring 33% women field staff for program facilitation
- at least 50% of community organizers will be women
- senior staff training on gender sensitization
- workshop to identify national policy and operational interventions for gender in irrigation
- inclusion of Gender and Development (GAD) session in all training activities
- at least 35% of WUA members will be women
- developing one male and one female leader in field-channel groups associated with WUAs
- leadership training to women members of WUAs and group leaders
- at least 33% women participation in construction work
- special programs for women and the excluded in agriculture and water management
- enhance access for at least 35% women in micro-irrigation system.

Source: CMIASP (2007)

---

**Box 2.2: Vulnerable Groups Development Strategy**

The IWRMP strategy includes the following specific activities:

- educate WUA/project staff members on involvement of Adivasi Janajatis and Dalits in the WUA
- training in leadership and organizational development for enhancing involvement
- ensure need-based agricultural extension and support services
- extend support to these groups’ access to institutional credit
- promote functional literacy
- tune agricultural extension programs to the needs of the illiterate
- facilitate intra-social group interactions to lessen the effect of rigid class and caste-based hierarchy.

In this context, vulnerable groups refer to the Adivasi Janajatis and other socially excluded groups such as Dalits and Muslims.

---

**Box 2.3: Livelihood Enhancement Plans**

The CMIASP’s livelihood enhancement plans target the landless, women-headed households, Dalits, and other excluded groups for both agricultural-related (e.g., vegetable farming) and nonagricultural (gaining access to credit and income-generation schemes through local microfinance) activities. The agricultural extension support is meant to include demonstration plots selected from among landless people and marginal and small-scale farmers. From each group, a man and woman are selected as group leaders who are trained to become local extension experts. NGOs support the social mobilization processes and verify beneficiary households by landholding size and socioethnic composition. Some livelihood enhancement plans have been developed, but focus on nonagricultural activities is also required to benefit excluded groups (ADB 2009).
members must also be women. These groups are then engaged to undertake the project construction work.

The NITP is implemented by district-level offices with consistent supervision and coordination from the central NITP division. Since the use of non-conventional technology suggests reaching the poor and vulnerable groups, the NITP is inherently inclusive. For instance, in Vaksindo VDC of Palpa, where water was extremely scarce and women had to walk for four hours to get one bucketful, the NITP managed to lift water from downstream. With four improved pumps, 101 households now have water not only for irrigation but other daily needs as well. This initiative has been extremely successful in economically liberating women through vegetable farming, and so it is not surprising that the project has 100% women participants.

Monitoring phase

In the CMIASP project framework, performance indicators/targets identify the improvement in livelihood for small-scale farmers and poor caste and ethnic groups. The baseline data are meant to be disaggregated by gender and caste/ethnicity. One of the project indicators at the objective level is “WUA functioning effectively to enhance community livelihood, with increased women and caste/ethnic representation.” Another states “DoI prepared, endorsed and implemented policy on gender and development.” Similarly, at the outcome level there are several indicators that include poor farmers and women (see Annex 6.3 for logframe assessment). The CMIASP will also support linking the gender/caste/ethnicity-disaggregated management information system (MIS) from the field to the center.

In the project appraisal document, the IWRMP mentions that relevant social development indicators will be embedded in the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system. However, according to its results framework, none of the indicators is disaggregated or measures changes in access/utilization for women and excluded groups. The project does aim to collect more qualitative information on the quality and effectiveness of implementation processes and project outcomes from the point of view of beneficiaries and relevant stakeholders, through participatory M&E. NGOs working with each of the WUAs in the project are to facilitate the collection of feedback from beneficiaries. At monitoring level, emphasis is given to quantitative indicators to try and assess the projects’ success (improvement of irrigation facilities; service performance and delivery; strengthening of water resource management institutions; and increase in production, productivity and profitability of irrigated agriculture), but little seems to be done to follow up on the projects’ social components. Instead, there seems to be implicit faith in the accuracy of the pre-implementation assessment that the projects would have no negative impact on Adivasi Janajatis and disadvantaged groups.

Thus, while existing programs do make efforts to address GESI issues by improving access to information and technology, these are mostly limited to increasing representation in user groups. On the other hand, the deep-rooted structural issues constraining women, the poor and the excluded from accessing benefits of irrigation (e.g., land issues) are not comprehensively addressed. The sector also lacks specific gender and inclusion strategies on how women’s participation can be enhanced in a patriarchal society where irrigation management is the traditional domain of men. The DOI itself specifically lacks punitive provisions if the required representation of women or people from excluded groups in a WUA is not achieved; nor is there any clarity on how the project will promote participation of these groups throughout the implementation process. However, the DOI’s Irrigation
Development Strategy 2005 has made some improvements in its efforts to provide effective services in response to the needs of diverse stakeholders, including the socially excluded.

2.4 Institutional Capacity
Institutional arrangements, the location of responsibility for GESI and related capacity of staff, institutional culture, and attitude of service providers have a strong influence on service delivery and access to services for women, the poor and the excluded. This section assesses the diversity of civil service personnel working in the irrigation sector. Job descriptions of key decision-makers and implementers are assessed to identify where responsibility for GESI is located.

2.4.1 Location of responsibility for gender equality and social inclusion
The DOI is the leading government agency coordinating, planning and implementing irrigation activities in Nepal. From the beginning, its main objective has been to construct modern irrigation systems, and hence recruited civil engineers. Later, the department also became involved in rehabilitating and modernizing traditional farmer-managed irrigation systems in the hills. Although its current focus is still on construction, the mode of operation has changed over the years. DOI is expected to work with farmers in a participatory manner to meet the water needs of individuals and farming communities in a gender responsive and socially inclusive manner.

The Ministry of Irrigation (MOI) has three divisions and two departments, with no specific responsibilities for GESI. Though there have been efforts in gender mainstreaming with provision of gender focal points, they alone are inadequate for effective mainstreaming. The provision of gender focal persons in the DOI has not contributed significantly to inclusion in the irrigation sector, possibly due to the non-functionality of this position, lack of commitment by senior managers, and low level of awareness among the staff that such a post exists. Apart from a narrow focus on gender (rather than a broader concern for other forms of social exclusion as well) and its lack of staff diversity, the MOI and DOI have experienced a number of challenges. For instance, the appointed gender focal person, even though a joint secretary, has not been able to influence programs and policies, despite the fact that strong leadership was considered key to DOI effectiveness. Related constraints include inadequate importance given to GESI issues within the MOI; lack of authority and resources; inadequate linkages to integrate GESI in the MOI’s overall work; ad hoc capacity development of skills for mainstreaming GESI in the ministry and department; and lack of a GESI-responsive planning, monitoring and evaluation system. Global learning has found that both focused, dedicated technical support and mainstreaming in other people’s responsibilities are necessary to ensure that GESI is not relegated to just one person or unit. But Nepal’s irrigation sector is yet to recognize this.

2.4.2 Level of diversity in sector
A sex and caste/ethnicity disaggregation of 1,932 civil personnel in the irrigation sector reveals that there is an overrepresentation of men, Brahmin/Chhetris and Newars. Women comprise only 6% of the total staff (Figure 2.3). Of the 695 staff at the gazetted level, 3% are women (with none in the special class), 66% are Brahmins/Chhetris, and 18% are Newars. There are 805 staff in non-gazetted positions, of whom 7% are women. In addition, 432 staff have no grade, of whom 8% are women. The highest presence of women is in second class non-gazetted positions (11%), while there is minimal presence of Dalits and Muslims (Figure 2.4).

In line with the continued emphasis on con-
struction, but contrary to the shift towards farmer participation and cost recovery, most DOI staff continue to be male engineers. The recruitment of staff with social science backgrounds started only when a new emphasis on the management and operation of irrigation systems began to emerge. At the DOI central office there are three posts for sociologists and four others in regional offices. Association organizers are placed in division and subdivision offices to facilitate the formation and development of WUAs, yet their numbers are negligible compared to engineering staff: only 1% of the core staff are sociologists or statisticians (Timilsina et al 2008). In addition, the sociologist position is a gazetted third-class officer, without further chances for promotion; only engineers can become gazetted second- and first-class officers. As such, DOI sociologists tend to try to get transferred to other departments. Marking the hierarchical divide, management and organizational issues tend to be termed “software,” contrasted with the “real” work of construction, or “hardware.” By viewing the realm of the social as external to their profession and expertise, engineers continue to define themselves as concerned purely with design and construction (Udas and Zwarteveen 2010).

2.5 Program and Budget Analysis
This section analyzes government and programs’ budget allocation to examine the extent to which resources are being spent on irrigation sector activities that are expected to help women, the poor and the excluded. The objective is to “follow the money” to assess what efforts have been made to address the issues that constrain these groups’ access to sector benefits; analyze how much of the budget has been allocated and spent on such issues; and assess the degree to which government funding for these issues is channeled through targeted programs or integrated into mainstream programs. The government’s annual budget speech presents three different types of analysis of the budget from a gender and inclusion perspective: expenditures in support of “inclusive development and targeted programs,” the gender-responsive budget (GRB) exercise, and pro-poor expenditures (Annex 8a, 8b and 8c of the annual budget speech 2009-2010, respectively). The budget speech allocated Rs 7,761,390,000 for irrigation, of which 81.13%, or Rs 6,839,801,000, was designated as pro-poor, and Rs 7,110,602,000 (0.10% directly and 91.52% indirectly) as gender responsive. However, nothing has been categorized as inclusive development and targeted programs.

We tried to identify how the classifications were made and the process that was followed. Although indicators are not specified for inclusive development/targeted programs, there are indicators for GRB and pro-poor budgeting. Our discussions with ministry and line agency staff indicate, however, that guidelines are not clear, and in the end it is left to the budget officer to categorize and score the various budget lines to the best of his (it is primarily men) understanding. Since the scoring and indicators were not clear for the other two kinds
of budgeting, we have focused on reviewing the government’s GRB indicators, identifying what subindicators are relevant and analyzing whether this approach is effective for tracking GRB expenditures in the irrigation sector.

As noted above, the annual budget speech for FY 2009-2010 identified 0.10% of the irrigation budget as directly supportive to women, and another 91.52% as indirectly supportive; the remainder was considered neutral. Ministry staff categorize all expenditure items in the irrigation budget into these three categories (directly supportive, indirectly supportive and neutral) based on five indicators of gender responsiveness: participation; capacity building; benefit sharing; increased access to employment and income-earning opportunities; and reduction in women’s workload. There are no subindicators to guide the scoring of budget lines or assess how the activities budgeted contribute to the indicators. Also, the GRB indicators tend to be better at capturing expenditures for targeted women’s programs than at picking up expenditures on efforts made through universal programs to mainstream GESI. Finally, of course, the GRB exercise focuses only on gender, and does not capture expenditures aimed at increasing outreach to excluded groups.
**Gender equality and social inclusion budget analysis**

While we have assessed the existing GRB practice and indicators used, and identified possible subindicators for GRB analysis in irrigation, we have also developed and applied our own tentative GESI budgeting methodology, intended to capture expenditures that reach and support excluded groups and those that support women. Although there is no single rule about how to determine whether public expenditure is discriminatory or equality enhancing, there are some general principles discussed in gender budgeting literature, which we have adapted.

Our efforts here are intended as a first step to identify the approximant resource flows to these different purposes; but much more work and wider consultation are needed. We hope this initial attempt can become the basis for further collective work with the Ministry of Finance, the Gender-responsive Budget Committee, sectoral ministries, donor agencies such as UNIFEM, and NGOs interested in tracking budget expenditures.

The GESI budget analysis assesses what activities have been planned/implemented that provide direct support to women, the poor and the excluded (e.g., training, credit, etc), indirect support (e.g., disaggregated evidence of disparities, sensitivity training for extension workers, etc), and what amount is neutral, as it assumes that everyone will benefit equally. We have followed the GRB practice of three categories but not the GRB indicators, as they have not been very effective in application across the sectors. The analysis was carried out at two levels. First we assessed central-level program expenditures in the irrigation sector, using the above criteria. Two donor-supported programs (CMIASP/ADB; IWRMP/World Bank) for FY 2009-2010 came to a total of Rs 2,411,912,900. Our analysis resulted in the breakdown shown in Table 2.3. There were no directly supportive or targeted programs, but the indirectly supportive budget for women amounted to 4.23%, for the poor 80.04%, and for Dalits, Janajatis, disabled and other excluded groups 1.60-3.99%.

The next step was to move to the district level to ground both the national-level GRB budget exercise and our own GESI analysis in two districts, Kavre and Morang. We first worked with the district irrigation office staff to assess the current approach to GRB. In consultations at the district level, officers stated that of the five
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**Table 2.3: Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Budget Analysis of Sectoral Budgets of the Community-Managed Irrigated Agriculture Sector Project and the Integrated Water Resource Management Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted groups</th>
<th>Directly supportive</th>
<th>Indirectly supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of budget</td>
<td>Examples of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dalits, Janajatis, adolescents, elderly, disabled</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.60–3.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FY 2008–2009 budget of CMIASP and IWRMP.
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GRB indicators, participation, capacity building and timesaving were relevant to assess the gender responsiveness of irrigation budget items; support for employment and income-earning opportunities and benefit sharing, on the other hand, were considered irrelevant. They suggested the possible subindicators (see Annex 203). They were aware of a number of positive policy provisions mandating that benefits reach girls/women, the poor and the excluded, but they felt these automatically ensured that the entire budget would be responsive to women or specific excluded groups. Additionally, there is a view that when an irrigation scheme is constructed in a village, the whole population in the command area will benefit. In reality, these have proven to be problematic assumptions.

Next, we worked with the DDC and district technical office staff of Kavre and Morang. From a total budget of Rs 72,695,000, no directly supportive activities were found; minimal indirectly supportive activities were found, and even then only for women. Table 2.4 gives a breakdown.

**Budget of FY 2008-2009, Morang and Kavre.** From a budget of Rs 40,610,000 for Kavre, a minimal amount was identified as indirectly supportive for women, and nothing for the poor or the excluded. In Morang, it was slightly higher for women (3% indirect), but again nothing for the poor and the excluded. None of the irrigation programs is directed towards the excluded, bar a nominal amount, as there is no practice of targeting activities in the budget. We recognize that neutral expenditures could indirectly benefit all groups, but experience has indicated that unless barriers are specifically addressed, women, the poor and the excluded are unable to benefit fully. This also highlights the need for a more rigorous analysis so that the budget speech classification can be more realistic (as discussed above, it categorized 97% of irrigation programs as either directly or indirectly supportive of women).

The picture that emerges from the analysis of district and project budgets is that attention has been paid to creating a supportive environment for women. For other groups, as noted earlier, the assumption is that benefits will automatically reach them. Yet, this does not address the fact that it is mostly the extreme poor and socially excluded groups, such as Dalits, who are either excluded or exclude themselves from joining groups due to time and poverty constraints. While groups are indeed a powerful mechanism to improve access, relying solely on this model without assessing its suitability means that those most in need might not have access.

### 2.6 Monitoring and Reporting

The DOI has a strongly centralized system of evaluation and monitoring, based on a hierarchy of command and control. Work performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted groups</th>
<th>Directly supportive</th>
<th>Indirectly supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of budget</td>
<td>Examples of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavre (total budget Rs 40,610,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>Awareness and capacity-building training, community worker training and fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morang (total budget Rs 32,085,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Institutional development (dealer training, pump modeling), irrigation technology introduction, handover of developed technologies, awareness and capacity-building training, community worker training and fees, other training, etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Irrigation

is evaluated on the basis of marks granted by the supervisor, the reviewer and a review committee, with a direct supervisor holding most influence. For promotions, work performance evaluations are very important, next to seniority, service in a geographical region, educational qualifications and training. Although the evaluation form includes a column to indicate performed activities that were not targeted during the work period, actual work achieved has to be presented as a percentage of planned activities (Form 15/15a, DOI). The supervisor and reviewers use four criteria to arrive at a final performance evaluation: quantity of work performed (planned versus achieved), money spent (planned budget versus expenditure), time spent (planned versus completed), and quality of work (functioning of water system, sometimes related to fee collection among farmers).

As such, there are few formal incentives to carry out non-construction work. Targets are phrased in terms of construction and budget, and include very little scope to evaluate how the work was performed or with and for whom. Whether officers pay attention to organizational and management questions or make an effort to consult with and involve women, does not appear in the evaluation, and therefore will not help. M&E are also highly centralized, with staff being primarily accountable to their superiors and not to the farmers for (and with) whom they work. This also implies that there are no formal mechanisms for female farmers and those from excluded groups to demand that gender policy goals and inclusive provisions are implemented, or express their views on the overall performance of the staff.

Currently, reporting mechanisms do not demand disaggregation by sex/gender, ethnicity, or caste in the outcomes of sector investments. Only sex-disaggregated data of group and committee membership are available, and even these are not systematic. Suggested indicators include social and economic impacts; awareness levels; patterns of use; awareness and adoption of extension messages; changes in workload; maintenance system performance; interaction between WUA, project and women; composition of and women’s role in WUAs and user groups with similar assessments for other excluded social groups; and performance of women functionaries and staff in implementation partner organizations and government.

2.7 Good Practices and Lessons Learned

There are several areas of good practice derived from experience that can be applied across the sector. In this section, we outline some of the tools and methods that have been found effective to address the structural barriers to inclusion identified in the earlier discussion. These are detailed below.

Promotion of micro-irrigation technologies (MITs). Individual household-based kits and equipment (drip irrigation, treadle pump, sprinkler system) are affordable and manageable for smallholders, including marginal farmers. These save labor and time, especially for women. Projects have reported substantial gains among adopters, particularly through vegetable growing (e.g., CMIASP, NITP).

Rehabilitation and improvement of FMISs. In Nepal the FMISs have been sustained for centuries, collectively cultivating rich experience, skills and knowledge. Development efforts to rehabilitate and strengthen these have been effective.

Inter-firm linkages. MIT manufacturers, dealers, agro-vets and technicians are linked and encouraged to collaborate with each other. International Development Enterprises (IDE) and Winrock have set up dealer networks to facilitate linkages between traders and input suppliers, which help to identify appropriate varieties of production technologies. Once tech-
Technologies are identified, IDE/Winrock provide training on cultivation, processing, MIT development, repair and maintenance at the input and production levels, helping to build relationships, increase access to products and product knowledge, and regulate prices.

*Input-level incentives.* IDE motivates manufacturers to construct MITs, which diversifies the product, creates a niche market, and increases profit margins. In turn, dealers can take advantage of this niche market by promoting and selling MITs and other required materials to farmers, increasing their profit. The introduction of new technologies provides further employment to technicians who install and repair the MITs. In the hills, the incentive for agro-vets investing in MITs is diversification of their business and increased profit margins, while another strong incentive for input providers is the accumulation of social capital and status.

*Linking irrigation services with other subsidies.* At one point, people stopped using tubewells because a monthly energy fee was charged regularly, even when wells were not used. The government now supports a meter box (TOT meter) provided with 50% subsidy, which only charges when wells are in use.

*Supplementary economic services.* Based on a business development service approach, IDE/Winrock typically do not give direct subsidies, instead providing economic services through the development of revolving funds and, in some cases, by linking poor farmers to organizations that provide subsidies. The revolving fund is administered by the creation of a cluster of three groups, including women and Dalits, out of which a management committee is elected to administer funds. Based on a priority ranking system, a loan of up to Rs 2,000 is distributed per household. In the vegetable subsector, this money is to be used only for MITs; after one crop harvest (six months), the farmers must repay 50%, and the money is transferred to the next prioritized group. This revolving system puts pressure on each group to succeed, so that the next group receives the loan on a timely basis. Successful groups then register as cooperatives, providing financial services to their communities.

**Sectoral learning**

*The transaction cost for infrastructure maintenance is very high,* especially for women, the poor and the excluded, given that meeting daily subsistence needs takes precedence over attending capacity-building training and meetings.

*Irrigation is a factor of production, not a product itself.* It will create multiplier effects and more productivity if it is integrated with appropriate technology and agriculture inputs, without which irrigation can do little to increase productivity or improve livelihood options.

*Promotion of non-conventional irrigation technologies* caters to the needs of small and marginal farmers in areas that are not feasible for conventional irrigation development.

*Small projects are more beneficial to excluded groups.* Water user groups of small projects are typically just 50-60 households, and hence exclusion of any type is almost impossible. It is important in the earlier stages to build the confidence of women, the poor and the excluded by introducing small projects, enabling them to be fully engaged and build their capacities.

*Implementation through local partners is particularly effective.* Two studies—one in the Tarai undertaken by Support Activities for Poor Producers, with the support of the World Bank, and one in the hills with the International Fund for Agriculture Development—show that models using NGOs or community-based organizations (CBOs) are usually the most efficient and sustainable, due to the continuous involvement of users.
2.8 Mainstreaming Gender Equality and Social Inclusion in the Agriculture Sector: The Way Forward

The measures on mainstreaming GESI in the sector are grouped under our framework of five stages: identification, design and implementation, monitoring, and, where necessary, project adjustment in response. This section discusses ways in which GESI is to be mainstreamed and operationalized in the sector.

Step 1: Identifying barriers

Analyze existing power relations and the formal and informal institutions that enforce and perpetuate social and economic inequalities. Gender inequality and social exclusion in the irrigation sector are linked to the wider socio-cultural and politico-economic contexts. Irrigation infrastructure and other services can open up important new opportunities, but diverse inequalities also prevent women, the poor and the excluded from taking advantage of these. As such, we first need to identify the key socioeconomic constraints and social and cultural practices that limit access to irrigation resources and benefits for women, the poor and the socially excluded. Often, the "barriers" we need to remove or work around are part of interconnected formal and informal institutions that structure Nepali society, allocating differing privileges and obligations. Our projects/programs work with these systems, and try to improve them so that they can deliver irrigation services more effectively. But we all understand that changing any of these "rules" upsets some stakeholders and this is why we always need to be aware of the "political economy" of our projects. Here, we also have to think about the more informal institutions, deeply embedded in values, beliefs and norms, which can likewise block needed change. Although not all are negative, some—like the gender system or caste hierarchy—are so deeply ingrained that people often follow them without even being aware of doing so.

The GESI framework is a system to increase the chances that the changes we want to bring about to increase access can actually happen on the ground. GESI work is different in that it requires us to look at both formal and informal systems. So, when we try to "identify barriers" we are actually uncovering whole systems that keep some individuals and groups from gaining equal access to the universal services and benefits that the project/program we are supporting is intended to deliver. To identify barriers, we need to look in two areas: first, how the formal project systems are likely to work for different groups of people. This will bring us to the second layer: to see how the informal systems might be distorting the way the formal systems work for some individuals and groups.

Towards this end, the irrigation needs and benefits of different groups of people must first be identified. Participatory rural appraisal tools such as social/resource/poverty mapping need to be used to chart out existing irrigation facilities (disaggregated by wards/VDCs/districts) and who has access to them, while well-being ranking and proxy means testing can together identify poor households. Needs assessments can then identify the irrigation tasks (disaggregated by location and gender/caste/ethnicity), the irrigation needs of different levels of poor (disaggregated by gender, caste/ethnicity and disability), and their ability to use different kinds of irrigation. Other tools (such as the Integrated Rural Accessibility Planning, or IRAP, as directed by the Ministry of Local Development) can also provide detailed information, but only if they are accompanied by disaggregated information on issues in addition to geographic exclusion. A labor availability survey, registration of real beneficiaries/users (with socioeconomic background), and registration of road-building
groups in VDCs are also necessary and are being done by almost all projects/programs. Finally, social mobilization for the preparation of irrigation projects through a carefully designed multimedia information campaign and meetings with beneficiaries and stakeholders is required.

**Assess GESI in existing policy, program, budgeting and M&E.** It is important to assess the existing policy mandates that provide space to work on GESI issues and identify the gaps. The broad review of existing small irrigation programs presented in this chapter is a beginning but much more in-depth work is necessary during project design to identify specific potential barriers. It is important to review these from a GESI perspective, and assess how the specific issues of women, the poor and the excluded are being addressed. If existing programs are not addressing these issues, supplementary measures must be identified. A budget review has to identify, from a GESI perspective, the resources allocated for positive policy and programmatic provisions as well as the needs for improvement. In this, it is also important to assess whether the M&E system is capturing disaggregated changes, particularly with regard to issues that are crucial for increasing access of women, the poor and the excluded. On the basis of this assessment and information collected at the VDC level, projects must be identified. Meanwhile, needs that cannot be captured at the district level must be dealt with at the VDC level, so that access to irrigation resources for women, the poor and the excluded is increased and their economic opportunities and empowerment enhanced.

**Steps 2 and 3: Design/plan and implement**

Planning documents/results frameworks must have clear terminology for GESI-targeted (specifying women, Dalits, Janajatis, etc) and mainstreamed (integrated into other aspects) objectives, results and activities. The results framework must be formulated with GESI-sensitive objectives, outputs and indicators integrated into the planning of rural irrigation infrastructure and reflected in the sector’s core documents.

**Planning and budgeting.** As the key planning documents, the MOI and DOI plans have to be very carefully formulated, with disaggregated evidence and participation of people from different social groups, and the scope widened to include social aspects. The disaggregated information identified in Step 1 must be the basis for plan preparation (or review and addition). The planners/designers need to have knowledge of existing irrigation structures as well as an understanding of the public’s priorities (including those of women, the poor and the excluded) and their irrigation-related tasks. At present, there is no effective mechanism for such a process to inform planning. In addition, projects with large budgets spread over many districts will require the design of many sub-projects; but in the effort to reduce non-construction costs and save time, meaningful participation of diverse groups will be minimal and there will be little interaction between users and project staff. Hence, these aspects must be planned for and included in project activities.

The prioritization criteria used for identifying projects must be gender and inclusion sensitive, and should be developed based on inputs of the representative integrated planning committees (IPCs) of the VDCs, NFIWUAN, user groups, ward and village citizens’ forums, and village- and district-level coordination committees. Targeted gender and inclusion activities will be very important. Particularly useful are capacity building for influencing decisions, Reflect-type classes, childcare facilities, and building the technical skills of engineers, contractors, etc. The technical design must involve beneficiaries and stakeholders, including women, the poor and the
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excluded, in surveying, collection of local rates, and availability of local materials. Budget allocations have to be specified, especially for targeted activities. The DDC and VDC Grant Operation Guidelines have cumulative 30% budget provisions for women (15%) and people of other excluded groups (15%), and similar arrangements must be made in the irrigation sector. It is important to keep in mind that WUAs are largely represented by large landholders, thus requiring a proviso of affirmative action in the WUA executive body.

For operation and maintenance, arrangements that enable user groups and committees to repair and maintain irrigation infrastructure with local support have proven successful and need to be promoted. The practice of keeping a certain percentage of budget costs for O&M is well established and has been useful. It is important that women, the poor and excluded groups are trained as maintenance workers, and that contributions for maintenance are equitable and match the level of income and/or benefit from the infrastructure. For the long term, it will be critical to train more women, Dalits and Adivasi Janajatis as irrigation technicians and professionals. Rehabilitation and improvement of FMIS would lead to better management of irrigation infrastructure and benefits to the excluded, building on accumulated indigenous experience, skills and knowledge of managing irrigation infrastructure, and balancing water use. In case of a loss in investment or a decline in irrigation infrastructure, insurance schemes should be developed for poor farmers and user groups. Similarly, for marginalized rural groups living in chronic poverty, financial assistance in terms of collateral-free, low-interest loans or subsidy is needed to meet any required upfront contribution.

The design must assess and identify which irrigation model is most suitable. Micro-irrigation and shallow tubewell irrigation, for which water distribution can be and is normally done more equitably, i.e., by rotation on household rather than land-size basis, is more GESI responsive. Surface irrigation is an inefficient instrument for targeted household-level poverty reduction as, even if the poorest are able to benefit equitably from a surface irrigation subproject, only 9% of the total benefit will reach them. They may be unable to access even this 9% due to other social constraints and lack of land. Thus, initiatives like extra technical and farm management coaching for optimal benefit and assistance in leasing extra land need to be part of the design.

Most poor do not have the education, awareness, skills, tools and finance to benefit optimally from participation, improved irrigation and agricultural support even if they are included, and even if the training is tailored to the needs of marginal farmers. Coaching on how to take a more active part in decision-making and training on how to use irrigation, support to access opportunities for leasing extra land and support from third-party programs, e.g., advocacy, literacy and poverty reduction are necessary. There is a need for mobilization of subgroups from which disadvantaged representatives and trainees will be selected and to which they will report back. Disadvantaged trainees and representatives will further receive short extra training and coaching so that they can participate on a more equal basis with more advantaged persons.

The relative power of leaders from certain areas can lead to neglect of remote and less influential areas or to biased selection of projects. More time and resources must be allocated to ensure work in remote areas with poor and disadvantaged communities even if that increases the proportion of non-construction to construction costs.

In general, a number of key steps need to be ensured during the design and implementation stage for the construction of irrigation facilities
to improve governance, which contributes to improved inclusion. Inclusive user committees need to be formed, with women, the poor and the excluded in decision-making positions and at least one as a check signatory; the registration of inclusive committees, with certification and brief constitution, at DDCs, VDCs and line agencies; an account opened at the nearest bank; and capacity building of committees on project management, record keeping, procurement, technical supervision and reporting, and gender and inclusion issues. Governance aspects must also be strengthened by following standard norms, issuing clear cost breakdowns of labor, materials and machines/equipment; arrangement of a project board, rate board and project book with relevant information in clear and simple language; recordkeeping in the project book with all disaggregated data and daily records; community contracting with provision of management costs; and complementary income-generating and social empowerment activities for labor groups of women, the poor and the excluded. In addition, a transparent and competitive process of procurement needs to take place for tools, goods, safety equipment and construction materials, which should be monitored by representative committees; timely measurement and valuation should take place of work and payments to laborers and vendors; and payments for labor, materials and equipment made according to actual expenditure, not according to contract signed.

Ultimately, to promote micro-irrigation for poverty reduction on a wider scale, four factors have to come together: a national policy for the promotion of micro-irrigation technologies; the identification, adaptation and application of appropriate technologies; financing for the implementation of these technologies; and institutional arrangements for their implementation.

**Step 4: Monitoring and reporting**

Apart from certain donor-funded projects, monitoring and reporting from a GESI perspective are almost nonexistent in this sector, though public audits and social audits are done. Since the National Planning Commission (NPC) monitoring guidelines and formats are not fully disaggregated and do not ask for qualitative information, GESI-sensitive monitoring is difficult. Policy advocacy with the NPC is thus necessary for future revisions: some necessary steps include public and social audits of projects after each installment, and final audit at project end for review of financial, technical and social progress; regular periodic reporting of project progress against targets, with disaggregation; standard formats for disaggregated information; periodic monitoring by technical teams and representatives of coordination committees, including women and representatives of excluded groups; consultations with labor groups, coordination committees and stakeholders, as part of participatory evaluation of progress and for feedback; and DDC database and MIS systems for better reporting on disaggregated information.

All monitoring and reporting formats must have disaggregation by poverty, sex, caste, ethnicity and location. GESI-related issues require monitoring and reporting in three areas/domains of change: assets/services; voice and ability to influence; and both informal and formal policies and behavior. As explained earlier, budget monitoring from a GESI perspective has to be established: how much allocated budget is being spent on directly supportive, indirectly supportive or neutral activities in relation to women and other excluded groups. While these are essential from a GESI perspective, developing, establishing and maintaining such systems and mechanisms needs sustained effort. Some of the more progressive programs need to pilot an M&E system that is
GESI responsive, after which the subsector can work to mainstream such a system.

Finally, monitoring teams must be inclusive, with representation of IPCs and GESI implementation committees (ensuring representation of women and the excluded). Consultations with community members, including those experiencing exclusion, social mobilizers, representative organizations, and ward citizens’ forum (WCF) and IPC members must all be an integral part of monitoring. Monitoring responsibilities must ultimately be with different actors at different levels.

2.9 Conclusion

Agriculture remains the most important source of livelihood for the rural poor in Nepal, and irrigation an extremely important factor to improve agricultural productivity. The government recognizes that irrigation can have a significant impact, and has tried to develop appropriate policies for the sector. National and international policy mandates and sector programs have created a positive environment for gender, but a substantive policy and program mandate for addressing other social barriers to equitable access to irrigation-related assets and services, and ensuring that formal practices and rules are changed to address these, are still lacking. The government needs to put in place a regime of incentives and disincentives to influence informal practices to become more gender and inclusion sensitive so that women, the poor and the excluded can properly benefit from irrigation investments.

Organizational issues of limited human resources, staff diversity, GESI capacity and sensitivity, inadequate budgets, and lack of an effective monitoring mechanisms are also barriers to GESI mainstreaming in the sector. There is an assumption that policy mandates will ensure that services reach the excluded, though this clearly requires a good understanding of and plans to address the barriers they face. Several initiatives being implemented in the sector have somewhat successfully demonstrated the ability to reach these excluded groups. These need to be supported and scaled up. GESI mainstreaming in the irrigation sector requires that both demand- and supply-side barriers be identified and addressed through activities that are adequately funded. It also requires that inputs, outputs and outcomes are routinely monitored with data that are disaggregated by gender and social group. Policy directives for this, along with mechanisms/tools and organizational and human capacity, are all essential for effective GESI mainstreaming.

There are several practical operational steps that need to be put in place. These include a revision of different policies to address any exclusionary issues. Also important is a review of sectoral and project budgets, resource availability and allocation decisions, including development of gender- and inclusion-responsive budgeting, and further analysis of M&E systems to include structuring systems that are disaggregated by sex, caste/ethnic/regional identity and location. Monitoring and reporting need to capture information and track changes in access to assets and services, improvements in voice and influence, and shifts in policy and legal frameworks and community-based governance structures. In addition, it is necessary to put in place the mechanisms, tools and organizational and human capacity essential for effective GESI mainstreaming. Unless there are clear linkages between personal reward structures and performance against GESI criteria, it will be difficult to institutionalize these practices within the sector. Changing cultures, behaviors and structures requires that some of the longer-term exclusion issues are addressed, such as promoting the conditions for entry to employment in the irrigation sector through investment in scholarships, changes in the content of training courses of
government staff, and creating more supportive working environments for women professionals. Finally, the most important issue to be addressed is the positioning of women, the poor and the excluded as key actors in the sector, rather than as passive beneficiaries.
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CHAPTER 3

Checklist for Mainstreaming Gender Equality and Social Inclusion
3.1 Introduction
The first chapter of this monograph presented the gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) mainstreaming framework, summarizing the key findings from the GESI review of the seven sectors with the steps required to move forward. Chapter 2 focused on how to make projects, programs and policies in the irrigation sector more accessible and useful for the poor and the socially excluded. This final chapter is presented mainly as a handy reference guide. It sets out the generic steps necessary for mainstreaming GESI in any sector with a few blank formats that practitioners may find useful in the course of their work. Of course, these need to be contextualized, made sector specific and refined to address the issues of different social groups. We follow the five steps of mainstreaming: 1) identifying; 2) design; 3) implementation; 4) monitoring and evaluation; and, when necessary, 5) responding to the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) findings by revisions in project design or policy framework. Some tools that can be used for the required analysis are also presented and discussed.

3.2 Organizational Prerequisites for Effective Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) Mainstreaming
Even though sector policies have often integrated gender and inclusion concerns, persistent gaps in implementation continue to hinder the achievement of equitable outcomes in different sectors. As discussed in Chapter 1, these gaps occur for multiple reasons, ranging from technical capacity to attitudes and beliefs of stakeholders. Mainstreaming GESI effectively requires some essential organizational prerequisites in the sectoral implementing institutions.

For instance, the senior management’s personal commitment to and support for GESI is essential, as is clarity and understanding by staff at all levels on concepts of gender, empowerment and social inclusion. A core group of selected staff must have analytical skills on gender and inclusion issues in order to provide technical support to others; time has to be created at all management levels to identify issues, design processes and implement activities; and resources need to be identified and consistently made available. A gender/empowerment/inclusion perspective needs to be integrated into all policies, activities and routine functions in the sector, with appropriate management structures in place, followed by M&E methods that are responsive to empowerment efforts/programs. Finally, strong outside technical support from local and external providers is also necessary.

3.3 Core Information Requirements for Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) Mainstreaming
- Key data should be disaggregated by sex, caste, ethnicity, class, location, age and any other relevant variable (e.g., disability or HIV/AIDS status, where required).
- Issues of division of labor, access to resources and decision-making power (who is doing what, who has access to what, who makes the ultimate decisions) have to be assessed for their differential impact on women and men of different social identity groups.
- Key policies, programming and budgeting; institutional arrangements; human resources issues; and M&E systems must be assessed from a GESI perspective by those designing the project/program or policy and then presented and discussed with stakeholders from the government, project staff, partner organizations and community groups.

3.4 Five Steps of GESI Mainstreaming: A Checklist
As discussed in Chapter 1, a five-step framework for GESI mainstreaming has been followed for all sectoral assessments in this series. We present
here the generic steps and some suggestions on how to implement them.

3.4.1 Step 1: Identification phase—Situation analysis

*Objective.* To identify the specific barriers of women, the poor and specific excluded groups in accessing services and opportunities, and the causes of their exclusion; and to understand the political economy of the sector or subsector, both nationally and locally, in the particular sites where the project or program will be implemented. Identifying the excluded groups in a particular sector and understanding their situation involve using available qualitative and quantitative data to answer the question: “Who had access in the past to resources and decision-making, and how are different social groups doing at present?”

To understand the barriers these groups face in gaining access, it is necessary to look at and think through several levels. Table 3.1 shows the levels, what to do and some suggestions on how to do it.

We can thus assess barriers constraining each group from enjoying their rights and areas where additional measures are needed to address the barriers comprehensively or where existing sectoral efforts need improvement.

3.4.2 Steps 2 and 3: Design and implement responses that address exclusion

*Objective.* To address the sociocultural barriers and weaknesses in the policy framework or delivery system by revising/strengthening policies, program activities, resource allocations, institutional arrangements and staff incentives as well as monitoring and reporting systems. Responses must be developed based on the assessment and the design of the interventions must address the specific barriers of the excluded at the different levels discussed above. Key steps are detailed in Table 3.2.

3.4.3 Step 4: Monitoring, evaluation and reporting

*Objective.* To design/strengthen M&E systems to collect and analyze disaggregated data on outputs, outcomes and development results (Table 3.3), and ensure that the system is linked into management decision-making and the feedback loop to changes in implementation is robust.

Note that none of the existing government M&E systems in the sectors reviewed for this series has been able to monitor GESI outcomes effectively. Although some sectors like education have made a good beginning, comprehensive and consistent systems are not in place to collect, analyze and report with disaggregation. Hence, the steps and process outlined below require advocacy as well as technical support. Programs/projects have initiated some good practices but these need to be institutionalized. Major gains could be achieved if the National Planning Commission (NPC) and the Ministry of Finance could reinvigorate the collection and consolidation of sectoral output and outcome data as planned in the poverty monitoring and analysis system (PMAS). A common system for collection and analysis of disaggregated data across the sectors would allow NPC to generate a much more accurate picture of progress and problem areas on the path towards gender equality and social inclusion.

The roles of the different actors and the timing of monitoring are summarized in Table 3.4.

3.4.4 Step 5: Changing policy and project design to respond to M&E findings on inclusion

Where government policy-makers (and politicians) have real incentives to be responsive to all groups in society, and projects are designed to be flexible and respond to what they learn, this step is automatic. But in settings where accountability and willingness to change are less than
perfect, it is important to build in formal policy reviews and project mid-term and periodic evaluations that ask for data-based analysis of which groups are benefiting from the policy or program and require specific follow-on actions to respond to the findings. If this analysis reveals that certain groups are being left out, then the suggestions for responding outlined in Table 3.2 can be used to guide a critical re-thinking of the various processes, criteria and underlying assumptions upon which the policy or program has been designed.

Table 3.1: Analysis of Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Analysis of barriers</th>
<th>How to do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Household & community             | • What practices, beliefs, values and traditions at family and community levels constrain women, the poor and the excluded from accessing sectoral resources, opportunities and services?  
• What are the different rules, practices, divisions of labor, social expectations and differences in vulnerability and mobility for women and men and for different caste/ethnic groups? How have these impacted on women, the poor and the excluded? | • Stakeholder consultation; participatory rural appraisal (PRA) tools like social mapping, labor, access and control profile, mobility maps, etc  
• Anthropological and sociological literature on Nepal                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 2    | Status of women, the poor and the excluded | • Collect disaggregated data and substantive evidence to find out existing status of women, the poor and the excluded, and assess areas and level of disparities—with particular attention to data on their participation and status in sector for which the program or policy is being designed. | • Review Census, Nepal Living Standards Survey, Department of Health Services data, health management information system, Nepal Demographic and Health Survey, education management information system, Nepal Human Development Report, Millennium Development Goals progress reports, etc, project/program-related information                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 3    | Policy                             | • What policies exist, and how have these affected women and men of different social groups?  
• What new policy initiatives are being taken to address sectoral issues, and what are the likely gender/caste/ethnic/identity differentials in access to benefits from such initiatives?  
• What policies have the potential to transform existing relations of inequality, i.e., bring changes in socially prescribed division of labor and access to resources and decision-making power between women and men, and between people of excluded and non-excluded groups? | • Review government policies/Acts/ regulations relevant to the sector (see Annex 3.1 for policy analysis matrix); project/program log frame, operational guidelines/other policy statements; other guidelines, partners’ log frames, project guidelines, etc                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 4    | Formal institutional structures and processes | • What kind of institutional structures/mechanisms/processes are there in the sector, and how responsive are they to the needs and issues of the excluded (e.g., how representative are committees, project offices, other such bodies formed at local, district and national levels)?  
• Is work on GESI specifically mentioned as a responsibility of any of these different institutions or their constituent units?  
• What kinds of structures/mechanisms exist to enable women and the excluded to be part of planning and monitoring processes in the sector?  
• Human resource policies for recruitment, transfer, promotion, staff performance evaluation: how diverse is the staff profile in terms of gender, region, caste/ethnicity and other variables?  
What provisions recognize specific issues/constraints of women, e.g., maternity leave, breastfeeding, flexible hours, security?  
How does the performance evaluation system capture efforts of the staff at addressing gender and inclusion issues?  
• What is the working culture in committees and offices? How supportive is it for women, the poor and the excluded to work comfortably? What is the behavior of the non-excluded towards these groups? Is the language used in the meetings understood well by all? How well does the language proficiency of the project staff reflect the languages spoken in the project area? What time are the meetings held? | • Develop disaggregated staff profiles of project office, partner organizations, local government partner, user groups formed by project (see Annex 3.2 for format)  
• Review job descriptions of departments/divisions and staff such as project manager, planning officer, field facilitator, M&E (and any other relevant staff) and terms of reference of consultants and other teams  
• Facilitate interactions/discussions with staff on situation regarding working environment
### Table 3.2: Sectoral Perspectives on Gender and Social Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Analysis of barriers</th>
<th>How to do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5    | Programming and budgeting      | • What have been the main interventions in the sector? How have these interventions affected women and people from other excluded groups (e.g., how did gender/caste/ethnic differentials support/constrain access to opportunities from interventions)? Did interventions have explicit inclusion goals and outcome indicators? Did they have an M&E system that was sufficiently disaggregated to track differential outcomes for different groups?  
• What is the budget allocation and expenditure on activities to address issues of women, the poor and the excluded? | • Review annual budget (see Annex 3.3 for format) of government agency, program/projects/partner organization; identify how adequately activities addressing GESI issues have been budgeted for; what percentage of the entire project cost has gone for GESI related activities; how transformative are these budgeted activities?  
• Review M&E system and a sample of periodic and special reports and studies from the main interventions in the sector |
| 6    | Informal institutions (kinship, gender and caste systems and business and party networks) | • What are the income levels, social and human development characteristics of groups identified as excluded in the sector that might present barriers to their access?  
• What are the existing employment options in the sector and what barriers exist for women and other excluded groups in terms of skill levels, mobility, social norms, etc?  
• Who has access to control over what resources in the sector?  
• How are political parties active in this sector at different levels? At the national level what are their linkages with the sectoral ministry and other key organizations in the sector? | • Consultation/interaction  
• Political science, economic, sociological and anthropological literature on Nepal |

### Table 3.2: Responses to Exclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Policy                         | • Ensure policies (e.g., government directives at the national level, project criteria/guidelines at community levels, program goals and objectives) explicitly address constraints of women and the excluded, and mandate action to address them  
• Results planned in project plans/log frames must aim to improve assets, capabilities and voice of women, the poor and the excluded; they must address formal and informal practices that are inequitable and discriminatory, and aim to transform existing structural frameworks that disadvantage women and/or the excluded  
• Policies can support a targeted approach or address GESI issues in a non-targeted manner, integrating whatever special measures may be necessary (and economically feasible and sustainable) into mainstream programs to overcome barriers faced by women and excluded groups in accessing services, opportunities and benefits provided by the sector | • Organize participatory workshops/consultations with stakeholders—women and men of different social groups; time, venue, methodology, language and tools should be suitable for women and the poor in particular  
• Phrase objectives, outputs, activities and indicator statements to reflect both technical and social issues  
• Review who will benefit—which women, men, girls, boys (with caste, class, location, ethnicity, age disaggregation): who is likely to have access to benefits from these policies? Who is likely to control them? Who is likely to benefit less from this intervention? Are targeted groups defined in clear terms or are general terms such as “disadvantaged” or “vulnerable” used without a clear definition of who they are? What assumptions are being made on women’s roles, responsibilities, time and access to and control over resources? On the capacity of people from excluded groups?  
• With the above in mind, what procedures, criteria or ways of working can shift these patterns to be more equitable? What incentives for sector staff and recipient community can be built into the interventions and operation of (government and non-government) institutions in the sector? |
| 2    | Formal institutional structures and processes | • There must be desks/units/sections/departments with specific GESI responsibility located within sectoral institutions/organizations from national to community levels, adequately resourced and mandated to provide technical support to address GESI issues  
• Terms of reference/job descriptions of all, including policy-makers and technical staff, must allocate responsibility to work on GESI issues, integrating them into their responsibilities  
• Efforts must be made to achieve an inclusive staff profile, with women and people from excluded groups in positions of responsibility  
• Human resource policies for recruitment, promotion and capacity building must be gender- and inclusion- | • Identify GESI work responsibilities at different levels; review existing mechanisms to assess how they are addressing identified responsibilities—what has worked, why, what has not, why not; identify through a participatory process what existing structures and organizations can take on GESI responsibilities effectively; assess what new skills and approaches are needed and design accordingly  
• Review terms of reference/job descriptions of departments/divisions/key staff to assess the level of GESI responsibilities; revise and add; integrate into technical responsibilities for technical staff  
• Integrate recognition and incentives for staff that are successful in improving GESI outcomes  
• Review human resources policies: for recruitment, identify |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sensitive, and personnel policies must support gender-specific responsibilities • Performance evaluation systems must capture responsibilities for GESI dimensions and efforts made by staff to address gender and inclusion issues</td>
<td>issues constraining applications from women and excluded groups; adopt alternative strategies to publicize vacancies through networks, in local languages; define “merit” to include language skills, understanding of local community cultures, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>• Activities (e.g., sustained dialogue and advocacy) must be developed and implemented to address informal institutions that violate human rights of women, the poor and the excluded; strategies to work with rich, powerful, advantaged men and boys to change values and attitudes, getting buy-in from even the privileged members of the community to change the status quo are necessary and have often been very successful</td>
<td>• Through consultations and review of previous efforts, identify what has blocked implementation; what behavioral issues, values, social norms have been a challenge • Identify measures necessary to work with women, the poor and the excluded and with family decision makers, community leaders, local political leaders and elites, e.g., poverty analysis with leaders, decision makers, sustained dialogue with men on masculinity, advocacy campaigns against social ills like chaupadi, dowry, boksi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>• There must be programmatic activities and budget allocations that specifically address issues experienced by women and people from excluded groups; budget must also be allocated for activities that can create a supportive environment to address gender/caste/ethnicity and other dimensions of exclusion • Activities must ensure that livelihoods and voice of women, the poor and the excluded are enhanced, along with changing inequitable social norms and formal policies; sufficient budget allocations must be made for these activities • Estimate required resources and include human and financial resources for activities on gender and inclusion awareness for women and men and capacity building of women at program and organization level • Include resources required to support childcare responsibilities, field escort for security reasons and other specific constraints/responsibilities faced by women and people of excluded groups • Allocate sufficient resources for gender-balanced staff, training and institutional capacity building; include sufficient budget and time to build linkages and networking to strengthen different interest groups and to make sure that communication materials can be produced in several languages if need be • Those responsible for implementation must be held accountable for ensuring that planned activities are executed and the budget allocated is spent</td>
<td>• Review program activities and budget in detail; assess likely impact of each activity on women, the poor and the excluded • Ask whether activities are addressing barriers identified: will poor and excluded women and men be able to access resources and benefits coming from this activity? What will be their benefits? Will they get these directly? Will these activities help to address structural issues constraining progress of women, the poor and the excluded, e.g., violence against women or untouchability? Or, will they provide immediate benefits by improving livelihoods or welfare? Identify percentage of budget allocated to different activities addressing barriers and assess whether these will enable groups to benefit equally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.3: Monitoring and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>• Revise planning, budgeting, M&amp;E and reporting formats and processes to capture GESI dimensions according to three domains of change: changes in assets/services; changes in voice and ability to influence; changes in informal and formal policies and behavior&lt;br&gt;• Issue directives to all ministries to report disaggregation at output and outcome levels, provide common format for gender and social disaggregation to be used by all sectoral ministries&lt;br&gt;• Review and strengthen PMAS and the District Poverty Monitoring and Analysis System (DPMAS)—or whatever province-level system may be established after the new federal structure is determined</td>
<td>• Review existing formats; identify strengths and areas of improvement; advocate for revision; create pressure for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>• In every program/project at least some objectives, outputs, and indicators must be phrased in a way that captures gender and inclusion issues; these indicators demand collection of disaggregated data&lt;br&gt;• M&amp;E section to be strengthened to monitor according to three domains of change (services, voice, rules) with disaggregation, and guide departments and other key stakeholders to monitor and report with disaggregation and analytical evidence&lt;br&gt;• As revision of NPC formats may take time, the M&amp;E section of the sectoral ministry involved in the project/program must develop operational guidelines that identify what disaggregated information is possible at national and district levels, and document case examples of success and lessons learned on how to ensure services and opportunities to excluded groups</td>
<td>• Log frame/results framework to be developed in a participatory manner with representatives of excluded organizations; log frame development team to have an expert on GESI&lt;br&gt;• Develop M&amp;E and reporting formats requiring disaggregated information to be developed&lt;br&gt;• Information management system to be reviewed and strengthened&lt;br&gt;• M&amp;E officers to be trained on GESI-sensitive M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>• Revise necessary formats, indicators and monitoring guide to collect disaggregated information and evidence&lt;br&gt;• Monitor programs implemented by government and nongovernment actors in the sector&lt;br&gt;• Assess information provided by districts and report accordingly</td>
<td>• In joint consultation with ministry and other stakeholders, identify steps required to make existing M&amp;E system more GESI responsive and revise accordingly&lt;br&gt;• Remember qualitative data and participatory M&amp;E involving the beneficiaries can be an important source of insight about the GESI impact of interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>• District line agencies to monitor whether programs are implemented as planned and expected outputs/outcomes achieved, and report with disaggregation&lt;br&gt;• District Information and Documentation Centers (DIDCs) to be strengthened to maintain disaggregated database showing status of women and people of other excluded groups in district&lt;br&gt;• GESI implementation committee to be formed in district development committees (DDCs) according to approved MLD GESI strategy; collaboration and linkages between these must be established, with clarity in roles&lt;br&gt;• Budget expenditure and planned progress (monthly and quarterly) must be disaggregated, as must reporting&lt;br&gt;• In annual reports, analysis must not be activity based but should be based on data that capture outcomes for women and people of other excluded groups</td>
<td>• To achieve all this, the Ministry of Local Development (MLD) has to give a directive to the local bodies&lt;br&gt;• Local bodies will need technical support to understand GESI-sensitive M&amp;E and to establish database systems that can be maintained to provide disaggregated information about progress and achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>VDC/community</td>
<td>• Establish disaggregated database providing information regarding existing situation of village development committee (VDC) population; this can include “social mapping” that identifies the caste/ethnic identity and other significant features (such as female headship, etc) of each household in the project VDC&lt;br&gt;• Design/implement participatory M&amp;E system</td>
<td>• Initiate participatory self-assessment process which is sensitive to social constraints like mobility, domestic work burden and family support&lt;br&gt;• Use mechanisms that ensure participation of women and men of different social groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.N.</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Work jointly with the Integrated Planning Committee (IPC) in VDCs and Ward Citizens’ Forums (which are to be established in each ward according to MLD VDC Block Grant Operational Manual 2009 of MLD) for monitoring</td>
<td>• Work with government bodies as required, and strengthen government systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop mechanisms and work according to an M&amp;E plan.</td>
<td>• Efforts must be made not to establish a parallel system but rather to identify joint monitoring mechanisms that produce disaggregated data and analysis on outcomes for different social groups by gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish/strengthen systems for use of social accountability tools like public audit, citizens’ scorecard, public hearing, etc, and ensure that these are implemented by disinterested third parties who can be objective about the results</td>
<td>• Reflect in log frame/results framework objectives, outputs and indicators in a consultative process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Project/program</td>
<td>• All of the above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Incorporate GESI dimension in all processes, mechanisms and progress of project/program activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.4: Roles and Timing in Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Ward Citizens’ Forum/ward level</th>
<th>Village Citizens’ Forum, Integrated Planning Committee/VDC</th>
<th>GESI implementation committee/social committee, DDC</th>
<th>GESI section/division/unit of ministry/department</th>
<th>Projects/programs</th>
<th>NPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>• Monitor progress in group participation, access to services, cases of discrimination&lt;br&gt;• Maintain disaggregated data about program implementation as per plan&lt;br&gt;• Self-monitoring</td>
<td>Regular meetings, monitoring of social mobilization and program implementation</td>
<td>• Regular supervision&lt;br&gt;• Assessment of progress as per plans&lt;br&gt;• Basis of monitoring to be three domains of change (services, voice, rules)</td>
<td>• Regular supervision&lt;br&gt;• Assessment of progress as per plans&lt;br&gt;• Basis of monitoring to be three domains of change</td>
<td>Facilitate setting up of GESI-sensitive monitoring and reporting systems</td>
<td>PMAS, DPMAS: GESI aspects in formats, process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly review</td>
<td>Review progress with focus on the three domains of change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-monthly</td>
<td>Public hearing, covering program implementation and social mobilizers’ work&lt;br&gt;• Public hearing&lt;br&gt;• Public audit</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Participation in public hearing and audit&lt;br&gt;• Quarterly report to cover GESI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision and review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Gender and social audit&lt;br&gt;• Gender and social audit</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Participation in public hearing and audit&lt;br&gt;• Annual report to cover GESI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from GESI strategy of LGCDP, MLD, 2009.

**Notes**

1. In a national program, a mapping of the local political economy of the sector in a sample of the different types of sites where the program would be implemented would provide enough to go on.
2. Policy is understood here as a statement of intent, so it can be at the macro, meso or micro level, and it can be formal (government Act or program-level guidelines/criteria) or informal, such as social practices/norms.
3. See SIAG (2009) for suggestions to increase GESI sensitivity in recruitment policies.
Annexes
Annex 1.1: **Definitions of Socially Excluded Groups**

Brief definitions of the *socially excluded groups* (women, Dalits, Adivasi Janajatis, Madhesis, Muslims, people with disabilities and people of geographically remote areas) are provided below.

**Women.** Due to existing gender relations in Nepal and a patriarchal society, women experience unequal power relations, resulting in their social exclusion. Although the depth of gender discrimination varies between social groups in Nepal, all women are excluded. However, women from excluded communities face caste, ethnicity and location-based constraints in addition to the constraints imposed by their gender. Women constitute 51% of Nepal’s population.

**Dalits.** People who have been suffering from caste and untouchability-based practices and religious, social, political and cultural discrimination form 13% of Nepal’s population. Within the Dalit community, there are five sub-caste groups from the hills (Hill Dalits) and 22 sub-caste groups from the Tarai (Madhesi Dalits).

**Adivasi Janajatis.** Peoples or communities with their own mother tongue and traditional social structures and practices, separate cultural identity, and written or unwritten history form 37% of Nepal’s population, with 5.5% Newars and 31.8% Hill and Tarai Janajatis. There are 18, 24, 7, and 10 sub-groups respectively among the Mountain, Hill, Inner Tarai and Tarai Janajati groups.

**Madhesis.** People of plains origin who live mainly in the Tarai and have languages such as Maithili, Bhojpuri, Awadhi, Urdu and Hindi as their mother tongue are considered Madhesis. They include Madhesi Brahmin/Kshatriyas (2% of the population), Madhesi “other” caste groups (13%) and Madhesi Dalits.

**Muslims.** Muslims are a religious group found predominantly in the Tarai and form 4.3% of Nepal’s population.

**People with disabilities.** “Persons with disabilities include those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.” Persons with full disabilities cannot manage daily life without assistance. They include people with total mental, intellectual or sensory impairment such as complete blindness. People with partial disability are persons who have long-term physical and/or mobility impairments, and require regular assistance to manage daily life.

**People of remote geographic regions.** This covers people living in geographic regions which have distinct, difficult terrain for movement, transportation and communication, and difficulties in accessing services (e.g., Karnali has been defined as geographically excluded by the government in the Three-Year Interim Plan). Similarly, in a DDC some locations (VDCs) can experience geographical exclusion due to difficult terrain and remoteness. Within these kinds of geographically excluded regions, people experiencing gender-, caste-, and ethnicity-based discrimination experience further exclusions.
The specific issues of exclusion differ between these groups. For Dalits it is caste-based exclusion; for Adivasi Janajatis it is cultural rights/language-based exclusion; for Madhesis it is identity-based exclusion; for the poor exclusion it is economic-based; while for remote regions it is distance-related. For women, it is gender-based, a characteristic that cross-cuts each of the other dimensions of exclusion.

Notes
1 Gender equality and social inclusion strategy, LGCDP/MLD, 2009.
3 Based on the National Dalit Commission reports.
4 Based on NFDIN descriptions.
5 Based on Social Security Guidelines, MLD/Government of Nepal, 2065 (p. 1).
Annex 1.2: Step 1 Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Framework: Analysis of Policy, Institutional, Program, and Monitoring and Evaluation Barriers

As part of designing responses that are based on the assessment done in Step 1, the analysis of the barriers and responses must be viewed at several levels.

Policy. Analysis at this level assists us to identify which policies are addressing or reinforcing social inequalities, and reducing, maintaining or increasing disparities. This analysis will, in turn, guide us in the design of appropriate strategies for reprioritization or redefining policies. Policies exist at all levels. Some are more formal and official, others more informal and traditional.

Organizational structures. The rules and practices within organizations need to be reviewed to identify ways in which social inequity is created and maintained. The extent to which GESI policy commitments are formulated and effectively implemented depends on the understanding, skills and commitment of the staff in policy-making, planning and implementation roles. Additionally, most organizations have official rules and procedures, but unofficial norms and practices operate informally and influence results. Tools for organizational assessment in projects/NGOs/partner organizations include disaggregated staff profiles showing who has access to what opportunities and types of resources and levels of decision-making power; reviewing the job descriptions and terms of reference for including GESI in objectives, tasks/responsibilities, and key skills/competencies; and human resource policies for recruitment, promotion, capacity building and support for gender-specific responsibilities.

Program and budgeting. The program activities should be reviewed to assess the strengths and identify areas of improvement for addressing the needs and interests of women, the poor and the excluded. The program and budget should be assessed on whether they are specific, supportive or neutral towards these groups. A financial commitment to gender- and inclusion-related activities is an essential element of mainstreaming GESI, reflecting the spending choices the concerned organization has made as per its available resources. When auditing budget and program design to assess their effectiveness in reaching different excluded groups and the poor, it is important to keep a separate eye on expenditures for men and women in these various groups. Otherwise gender-based disparities may not be picked up. Similarly, when conducting a gender audit, it is important to look separately at the expenditures and outcomes for women from different social groups since women from certain social groups may not have been reached.

Monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring and reporting should follow the conceptual frame of the three areas/domains of change: 1) changes in assets/services; 2) changes in voice and ability to influence; and 3) changes in informal and formal policies and behavior. All monitoring and reporting formats must have disaggregation by poverty, sex, caste, ethnicity and location. Monitoring teams must be inclusive, with representation of women and people from excluded communities as members. Monitoring teams must consult with community women and men, including those experiencing exclusion, representative organizations and others. Monitoring must also focus on the process of implementation: what was done and how it was done, and from a GESI perspective, with whom it was done; and on the outcome or results of action.
### Annex 1.3: List of Budgets Reviewed, FY 2009-2010, for Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Budgeting Covering 22 Programs and Annual Plans of Two Ministries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Number of project/program budgets</th>
<th>List of budgets reviewed of FY 2009-2010 for GESI budgeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Agriculture                 | 3                                 | • Commercial Livestock Development Project, ADB  
                                 | • Project for Agriculture Commercialization and Trade, WB  
                                 | • Regular program of MOAC: extension services                                                                                   |
| Education                   | 5                                 | • School Sector Reform Program  
                                 | • School Sector Support Program  
                                 | • Capacity Development Program  
                                 | • Secondary Education Support Program, district level  
                                 | • Education for All, district level                                                                                                                                 |
| Health                      | Annual plan (covering 41 programs) | • Annual budget of FY 2009-2010 of MOHP                                                                                       |
| Forest                      | Annual plan (covering 18 programs) + 2 | • Annual budget of FY 2009-2010 of MOFSC  
                                 | • Annual program budget of Kavre and Morang, FY 2008-2009                                                                     |
| Water supply and sanitation | 6                                 | • Community-based Water Supply and Sanitation Program  
                                 | • Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Fund Development Board  
                                 | • Small Town Water and Sanitation Project  
                                 | • Regular program of district water supply and sanitation                                                                     |
| Irrigation                  | 3                                 | • Community-managed Irrigation and Agriculture Support Program  
                                 | • Integrated Water Resource Management Program  
                                 | • Department of Irrigation  
                                 | • Annual program budget of Kavre and Morang, FY 2008-2009                                                                     |
| Rural infrastructure        | 4                                 | • Rural Access Program  
                                 | • Rural Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Project  
                                 | • Decentralized Rural Infrastructure and Livelihood Improvement Program  
                                 | • District Road Support Program  
                                 | • Rural Access Integrated Development Program  
                                 | • Annual program budget of Kavre and Morang, FY 2008-2009                                                                     |
### Annex 2.1: Overview of Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project, project coverage, donors (budget)</th>
<th>Project goals/purposes/objectives</th>
<th>Project interventions</th>
<th>Key measures towards GESI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-managed Irrigated Agriculture Sector Project, 35 districts in Eastern and Central development regions, 11 Tarai districts, 18 hills, and 6 mountains, ADB (US$ 38.6 million)</td>
<td>Improve agriculture productivity and sustainability of existing FMISs suffering from low productivity and high incidence of poverty, thereby enhancing livelihood of poor men and women in rural Nepal. For this purpose, the project will: • provide improved means for beneficiary participation and empowerment, irrigation and associated infrastructure, agriculture and targeted livelihood enhancement for the poor, and sustainable O&amp;M by WUAs • strengthen policies, plans, and institutions for more responsive service delivery and sustained growth and poverty reduction impacts</td>
<td>• Institutionalize improved service-delivery mechanisms for FMISs, including irrigation and agriculture extension services within the regular setup in DOI and collaborating agencies, e.g., DOA and LGIs • A CPMO for overall project management and technical backstopping will be set up in DOI with staff assigned from DOI and collaborating agencies • Day-to-day implementation is delegated to district-level multidisciplinary SMU set up with staff representing DOI, DOA, and LGIs, under the supervision of an RPSU established in each development region • WUAs will have a major role in the process by monitoring and endorsing outputs such as the subproject plan, design, and quality and quantity of services provided • Regular SMU-WUA review meetings will be organized as major decision-making forums • National Vigilance Center under the Office of Prime Minister and Council of Ministers will undertake external technical audit for selected subprojects using loan proceeds</td>
<td>• Partnership with locally based NGOs for mobilizing beneficiary WUAs is expected to provide the stimuli for increased participation of women and disadvantaged ethnic and caste groups, and fairer sharing of irrigation water between the head, middle and tail-end users, to foster greater system ownership and sustainability • Specifically engage the poor and disadvantaged ethnic and caste groups in targeted training programs and support • Mandate at least 33% women’s participation in project activities to ensure more equitable distribution of benefits between the genders • Specific pro-poor interventions include improved irrigation infrastructure that will enable poor men and women farmers to have greater access to water during winter and spring when higher value crops are planted • Bring an additional 8,500 ha under irrigation through improved water distribution, and thus benefit over 270,000 poor men and women • Institutional development support will aim at effective operation of the improved participatory irrigation service-delivery mechanisms to support inclusive development with due empowerment and livelihood enhancement of the poor, including ethnic minorities and occupational castes (Dalit) (ADB 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation and Water Resources Management Project, 40 districts, World Bank (US$ 64.91 million)</td>
<td>Improve irrigated agriculture productivity and management of selected irrigation schemes, and enhance institutional capacity for integrated water resources management</td>
<td>• Improve irrigation water service delivery in selected schemes in mountain, hill and Tarai areas and expand groundwater irrigation in the Tarai • Improve service performance and service delivery of selected public irrigation schemes in the Tarai through completion and consolidation of management transfer to WUAs • Help provide more effective and streamlined water resources management services at national level and within selected basins through institutional strengthening of relevant institutions, namely, Water and Energy Commission Secretariat and DOI • Increase production, productivity and profitability of agriculture and related production activities in schemes selected under project</td>
<td>• Supervision of cross-cutting issues, including gender, indigenous people, resettlement, and other social and environmental matters • Gender development strategy prepared for project includes measures to help women WUA members to access project benefits at par with men • Mainstreaming gender and Janajatis/Dalits (disadvantaged groups) development in subprojects from early stages of planning • Provision of pre- and post-production support to small farmers and other nonfarming entities (e.g., landless, disadvantaged rural poor, women, etc) in the form of small rural access infrastructure, improved availability of quality inputs, cooperative processing and marketing, strengthening of supply chains, improved storage structures/handling practices, and efficient marketing information (World Bank 2007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: CPMO – Central Project Management Office; LGI – Local Government Institution; RPSU – Regional Project Support Unit; SMU – Subproject Management Unit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project, project coverage, donors (budget)</th>
<th>Project goals/purposes/ objectives</th>
<th>Project interventions</th>
<th>Key measures towards GESI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Non-conventional Irrigation Technology Project, no donor support | **Vision:** To provide non-conventional irrigation technology for poor and disadvantaged people’s nonirrigated land in mountains, hills and Tarai  
**Mission:** To launch an effective micro-irrigation service-delivery mechanism with high-value crop production support for poor and disadvantaged people, implemented as a joint effort of governmental organizations, CBOs, NGOs, and the private sector in the country  
**Goal:** To provide technology, skills and services to poor and disadvantaged people to increase production and productivity of high-value crops by providing micro-irrigation services | • Provide irrigation facility to underirrigated areas and areas designated as nonirrigable due to reasons ranging from high development cost to nonavailability of sufficient quantity of water for conventional irrigation schemes  
• Lessen social discrimination between “haves” and “have-nots”  
• Rescuing poor from vicious cycle of poverty and uplifting women, disadvantaged and marginalized groups of people economically are the ultimate goal | • To implement the micro-irrigation program for providing an effective micro-irrigation service-delivery mechanism with high-value crop production support for poverty alleviation  
• Serve disadvantaged groups  
• Serve marginal land and farmers  
• Help to achieve poverty reduction goal by promoting farming of high-value crops such as vegetable, herbs, fruits, etc. |
| Community Groundwater Irrigation Sector Project, 12 Tarai districts, ADB/CIDA (US$ 10.16 million), completed 1999-2007 | • Increase agricultural productivity on a sustainable basis  
• Improve incomes of small farmers through participatory group shallow tubewell (STW) development  
• Develop capacity of water user groups and associations | • Create an irrigation system owned, managed and run by local communities  
• Provision of credit for 15,000 STW investments  
• Implementation assistance and institutional strengthening through transfer of technology, training and sharing know-how. Emphasis has been placed on training as part of the skill development program  
• 13,500 water user groups and 300 WUAs operating as capable and effective CBOs to manage local resources, including STW irrigation systems and farm-to-market roads  
• Improved irrigated agriculture with the installation of 15,000 STW covering a command area of 60,000 ha, benefiting 657,000 people in 110,000 households  
• Rehabilitation and maintenance of 840 km of road  
• Increased income for small farmers from improved irrigated agriculture  
• Enhanced role for women in water user groups and associations  
• Increased use of improved and environment-friendly agricultural practices | • Some 110,000 small and poor farming households will be main beneficiaries  
• More than 60% of beneficiaries are women  
• WUAs are eventually expected to evolve as self-reliant and financially viable farmers’ associations that would give a voice to poor farmers and increase their bargaining power in the marketplace and with local authorities |

\[1\] Chitwan, Parsa, Boro, Rautahat, Sarlahi, Mahottari and Dhanusha in the Central Development Region, and Siraha, Saptari, Sunsari, Morang and Jhapa in the Eastern Development Region.
Annex 2.2: Logical Framework of Selected Programs/Projects on Irrigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Verifiable indicators</th>
<th>GESI analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Impact:** Promote inclusive economic growth and reduce poverty in rural areas of Central and Eastern Development regions | • Poverty incidence in rural households in subproject areas is reduced by over 15%  
• Farmers having 0.25-0.5 ha of land achieve over 100% food self-sufficiency on average  
• Livelihood of poor ethnic or caste groups improves, demonstrated by better human development indicators  
• Similar interventions are widely replicated, thereby accelerating agriculture growth, confirmed in district-level statistics | • Indicators and impact are specific towards GESI, especially poverty of Central and Eastern Development regions  
• Aims to reduce poverty by over 15% and improve livelihood of poor ethnic or caste groups, resulting in better human development indicators |

| **Outcome:** Enhance agricultural productivity and sustainability of existing FMISs, thereby enhancing the livelihood of poor men and women by: | • Following results achieved in subproject areas by 2015, with individual subproject targets fixed in Sub-Project Implementation Plans (SiPs) and monitored:  
- cropping intensity increases by 40%  
- annual cereal, potato, and cash-crop production increases by at least 51,000 t, 33,000 t and 14,000 t  
- gross margin per farm family increases by 70%  
- permanent employment increases by 3.3 million days  
- annual family income of landless farm laborers increases by over Rs 2,000  
• Following institutional performance achieved:  
- individual outputs for institutional actions (component/output B.1) are operational  
- improved FMIS support system is operational  
- DOI capacity is established to execute 4 FMIS subprojects per district at a time  
- DOA and DDC are capable of providing due services in each FMIS subproject  
- WUAs are functioning effectively to enhance community livelihood, with increased women and ethnic/caste representation  
- DOI prepared, endorsed and implemented policy on gender and development | • Outcome is specific to the poor, including women and disadvantaged groups  
• Indicators are mostly GESI supportive (permanent employment increases by 3.3 million days; DOI prepared, endorsed, and implemented policy on gender and development) with several specific indicators (annual family income of landless farm laborers increases by over Rs 2,000; WUA are functioning effectively to enhance community livelihood, with increased women and ethnic/caste representation) |

**Component A: Irrigated agriculture development for FMISs**

| **Output 1:** Participatory planning and beneficiary mobilization | • Irrigated agriculture development strategy is formulated in each of the 35 districts  
• 210 subprojects are appraised, with concrete SIP with WUA endorsement  
• 210 WUAs strengthened, with achievement of targets:  
  - over 80% farmers enrolled  
  - officially registered, with gender-responsive rules  
  - O&M improved as per SIP  
• 210 implementation MOAs signed  
• 33% women’s representation | • All four outputs of component A are GESI neutral  
• However, indicators are GESI specific (33% women’s representation in WUA; at least 35% women participate in programs; facilities are provided targeting about 1,000 ha of land with 50,000 poor families) and GESI supportive (WUA officially registered, with gender-responsive rules; gender/ethnicity/caste-disaggregated MIS linked from field to center) |

| **Output 2:** Irrigation and associated infrastructure | • WUAs endorse detailed designs in 210 subprojects  
• RPs are implemented  
• WUA completed beneficiary contribution  
• Irrigation and associated infrastructure are completed, with WUA monitoring | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Verifiable indicators</th>
<th>GESI analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Output 3: Agriculture development and livelihood enhancement**                   | • Agriculture extension and livelihood enhancement support services provided as specified in SIPs and targets set up therein achieved  
  • Demonstration of innovative small-scale irrigation provided focusing on poor communities  
  • 210 WUAs achieve specific SIP targets in cropping pattern and intensity, inputs and yield levels  
  • WUAs continue extension with trained members and seed money generated  
  • Targets for livelihood enhancement as set out in 210 SIPs are achieved, in terms of program delivery and income levels of beneficiaries  
  • 20% subprojects successfully brought MFI NGO to start microcredit activities  
  • At least 35% women participate in programs  
  • Facilities are provided targeting about 1,000 ha of land with 50,000 poor families  
  • Income level of beneficiaries increases by over 100% | ![Alternatives](attachment:GESI_neutral.png) |
| **Output 4: Support for sustainable O&M systems becoming operational**              | • WUAs prepare and implement effective O&M plans  
  • WUAs increase emergency maintenance fund as per SIP specification  
  • Completed FMIS database set up and regularly updated  
  • Gender/ethnicity/caste-disaggregated MIS linked from field to center  
  • Regular WUA audit system made functional within DOI  
  • Schemes suffering from major damage rehabilitated  
  • DOI regular budget for rehabilitation established | ![Alternatives](attachment:GESI_neutral.png) |
| **Component B: Institutional strengthening and project management**                 | ![Alternatives](attachment:GESI_neutral.png) |
| **Output 1: Support for national-level institutional strengthening**                | • Advisory support provided to agriculture sector programs  
  • Advisory support provided to promote water resources sector reforms  
  • Advisory support provided to promote Irrigation Policy, plan and institutional strengthening  
  • Review and advice are provided on initiatives supported under second Agricultural Sector Program Loan  
  • IWMI policy, NWP and IWMI institutions are finalized following advice provided  
  • Project progress and completion reports  
  • Consultants’ reports  
  • ADB review missions  
  • Irrigation Policy and long-term investment plan are updated  
  • DOI institutional vision and strategy are finalized and implemented  
  • Action plan for improved human resource management is implemented  
  • Budgetary and financial management is improved  
  • Internal quality control system is reviewed and improved  
  • External technical audit is operational | ![Alternatives](attachment:GESI_neutral.png) |
| **Output 2: Operation of improved FMIS intervention mechanisms**                   | • Improved FMIS guidelines and manuals are operational  
  • Accountability measures for project institutions (regular SMU-WUA meetings, subproject monitoring by WUAs, etc) are operating  
  • WUA management committee represents social and gender mix, and is operational and exercising responsibilities | ![Alternatives](attachment:GESI_neutral.png) |
| **Output 3: Training capacities of project institutions, stakeholders and their representatives strengthened through training** | • CDP is prepared and effectively implemented  
  • Project institutions are fully operational through effective project management support. | ![Alternatives](attachment:GESI_neutral.png) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Verifiable indicators</th>
<th>GESI analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IWRMP results framework and monitoring (World Bank 2007)</td>
<td>Improved irrigated agricultural productivity: &lt;br&gt;- percent increase in productivity of selected crops &lt;br&gt;- percent increase in cropping intensity &lt;br&gt;Improved irrigation scheme management: &lt;br&gt;- percent of WUAs in transferred irrigation schemes whose O&amp;M expenditure is as per agreed asset management plans &lt;br&gt;- percent of water users in rehabilitated irrigation schemes satisfied with WUA O&amp;M &lt;br&gt;Enhanced institutional capacity for IWRM: &lt;br&gt;- integrated national water resources database established</td>
<td>Indicators and impact are neutral to GESI issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Component A: Irrigation infrastructure development and improvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Verifiable indicators</th>
<th>GESI analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved physical performance of selected surface water schemes</td>
<td>Percent of tail-enders reporting improved water availability (relative to baseline)</td>
<td>All outcomes and indicators of component A are quantitative and GESI neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially and institutionally sustainable WUAs</td>
<td>WUAs: percent WUAs formally constituted and holding regular meetings; percent WUAs collecting water charges (in cash, kind and labor) required for adequate O&amp;M; percent WUAs maintaining appropriate accounts and cash registers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced use of groundwater irrigation</td>
<td>Additional area irrigated by groundwater from deep tubewells (DTWs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Component B: Irrigation management transfer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Verifiable indicators</th>
<th>GESI analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved physical performance of selected irrigation systems</td>
<td>Percent of tail-enders reporting improved water availability (relative to baseline)</td>
<td>All outcomes and indicators of component B are GESI neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially and institutionally sustainable WUAs</td>
<td>WUAs: percent WUAs holding regular meetings; percent of WUAs collecting water charges required for adequate O&amp;M; percent of WUAs maintaining appropriate accounts and cash registers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved bulk water service delivery by DOI to WUAs as per agreed plans</td>
<td>Bulk water delivery percent of delivery points receiving proportionate share of water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate O&amp;M expenditures by DOI and WUA according to agreed asset management plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Component C: Institutional and policy support for improved water management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Verifiable indicators</th>
<th>GESI analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water and Energy Commission Secretariat capacity enhanced for planning, monitoring and intersectoral allocation of water resources</td>
<td>Telemetric systems established in targeted basins</td>
<td>Outcome and indicators of component C are GESI neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated river basin water use plans developed for two river basins by relevant river basin organization (RBOs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Component D: Integrated crop and water management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Verifiable indicators</th>
<th>GESI analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers in selected irrigation schemes adopt better agricultural production and water management techniques</td>
<td>Percent of farmers in selected schemes adopting demonstrated techniques</td>
<td>Outcome and indicators of component D are GESI neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant community and productive assets formed through investment support provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 2.3: Gender-responsive Budget Indicators for Divisional Irrigation Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators (score)</th>
<th>Subindicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation (40)</td>
<td>• Representation of women in executive committees of user groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participation of women in survey meetings, including vital posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building (40)</td>
<td>• Participation of women in observation tours (pond, reservoir, sprinkle,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drip irrigation, irrigation system and management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participation of women in water management and irrigation system management training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participation of women in user committee training programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participation of women staff in national and international training and seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time saved and quality use of time (20)</td>
<td>• Increased number of households benefited from construction of new irrigation systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 3.1: Policy Analysis Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy, provision, article No</th>
<th>GESI analysis of policy statements, provisions, criteria, guidelines, etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addresses human condition within existing social hierarchy and division of responsibilities, does not make structural changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishes equal rights and promotes structural transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1…...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2…...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annex 3.2: Format for Disaggregated Diversity Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Dalit</th>
<th>Janajati</th>
<th>Brahmin/Chhetri</th>
<th>Other Madhesi Castes/OBC groups</th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Madhesi</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Madhesi</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Madhesi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annex 3.3: Program and Budget Analysis Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Directly supportive activity (1)</th>
<th>Indirectly supportive activity (2)</th>
<th>Neutral activity (3)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janajati (except Newar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmin/Chhetri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Madhesi Castes/Other Backward Classes (OBC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (rural, remote, Karnali, Tarai, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…….</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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