



RESEARCH PROJECT – LIVELIHOODS AND CASH INTERVENTIONS
IN THE NRCS/BRC EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY PROGRAMME,
KATHMANDU VALLEY, NEPAL

Final report

Prepared by Key Aid Consulting for British Red Cross and Nepal Red
Cross Society

27/02/2019

www.keyaidconsulting.com

KEY
AID
CONSULTING

Table of Contents

VII.	ANNEXES.....	3
VII.1.	DEFINITION OF THE PRIMARY RESEARCH QUESTION	3
VII.2.	RESEARCH MATRIX	5
VII.3.	METHODOLOGY.....	9
VII.3.1.	PHASE 1: DESK REVIEW & INCEPTION PHASE:.....	9
VII.3.2.	PHASE 2: PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION:.....	9
VII.3.3.	PHASE 3: ANALYSIS & REPORT WRITING.....	11
VII.3.4.	LIMITATIONS.....	12
VII.3.5.	DATA PROTECTION	12
VII.4.	RESEARCH TOOLS.....	13
VII.4.1.	KII QUESTIONNAIRE.....	13
VII.4.2.	FGD GUIDE.....	18
VII.5.	CASH FEASIBILITY CRITERIA AND CONSIDERATIONS	22
VII.6.	DESK REVIEW.....	24
Table 4: Methodological steps of the evaluation		9

VII. Annexes

VII.1. Definition of the primary research question

The primary research question is:

To what extent have livelihoods recovery strategies and modalities adopted by BRC helped restore and strengthen the livelihoods of HH assisted post the 2015 earthquake in the Kathmandu Valley?

The key terms are described below:

Livelihoods recovery strategies:

The livelihoods recovery strategies encompass the four activities implemented as part of the Kathmandu Valley livelihoods intervention, and whose objectives are to restore households' assets and strengthen/diversify their food and income generation. These activities are:

- Restoration of livelihoods for 13,570 vulnerable households in agriculture and small enterprises;
- Vocational training for 800 youths;
- Rehabilitation of 23 community infrastructures;
- 385 trainings on financial management and enterprise development for 86 cooperatives/women's groups.

All livelihoods activities, no matter their funding source (e.g. appeal fund, or DEC phases 2a and 2b¹) are included in the scope of the research.

The seeds and tools cash grants,² although considered in the programme documentation as a livelihood activity, are not part of the scope of this research.

Modalities:

Modalities refer to the form of assistance NRCS/BRC' used to deliver the four types of livelihoods activities mentioned above:

- Service delivery: direct training provided to cooperatives and households receiving CCGs;
- Cash transfer (i.e. the provision of assistance in the form of money)³:
 - Restricted and conditional grant to 13,570 households.
 - Conditional cash grants to 1,200 households: condition here was to work to rehabilitate 23 community infrastructures.
 - Restricted and conditional cash grant to 800 youths for them to attend vocational training of their choice.

BRC:

¹ Key Aid Consulting, 'Final Evaluation: Nepal Earthquake Recovery Programme', July 2018.

² BRC distributed cash grants for Seeds and Tools to 5,811 households.

³ CaLP Glossary

BRC provided technical and financial support to NRCS to implement the recovery programme in the Kathmandu Valley's three districts. Therefore, the scope of the research focuses on the joint intervention of BRCS/NRCS.

Considering that none of the other 14 Partner National Society(ies) (PNS) that intervened in Nepal implemented programming in the Kathmandu Valley, there is no anticipated in this region.

Livelihoods:

Livelihoods includes the capabilities, assets and activities required for generating income and securing a means of living.⁴

HH assisted:

The 'households assisted' (and thus included in the scope of this research) are those that benefited from at least one livelihood activity in the **75 communities**⁵ where NRCS/BRC implemented the Earthquake (EQ) Livelihood Recovery Programme.

Post the 2015 earthquake:

The research will only focus on the Recovery period, which started in **November 2015**⁶. The research will cover the span of the available data collection, i.e. **October 2018**.

Kathmandu Valley:

The geographical scope in Nepal is limited to the **75 communities** of the districts of the Valley, namely **Kathmandu, Lalitpur and Bhaktapur**, where NRCS/BRC implemented the integrated recovery programme.⁷

⁴ Definitions are located on p. 15 and Annex 1.

⁵ Source: The Briefing call with Nigel Ede and Manik Saha on September 10, 2018.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ 'Terms of Reference, Research Project – Livelihoods and Cash Interventions in the BRC/NCRS Earthquake Recovery Programme, Kathmandu Valley, Nepal' (The British Red Cross, 2018).

VII.2. Research matrix

To answer the primary research question:

To what extent have livelihoods recovery strategies and modalities adopted by BRC helped restore and strengthen the livelihoods of HH assisted post the 2015 earthquake in Nepal?

The research team will address the following secondary questions and use the below indicators to form judgement.

Secondary research questions	How judgement will be formed	Sources	Pre-conditions
To what extent and how were the different livelihood activities effective in restoring and strengthening the livelihoods of assisted households?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceptions of programme implementers, local actors and beneficiaries on the livelihood activities' ability to restore the latter's livelihoods to the level it was before the earthquake Perceptions of programme implementers, local actors and beneficiaries on the livelihood activities' ability to strengthen the latter's livelihoods Examples of recovery, at household or community level, collected and analysed from the desk review, FGDs, and KII 	<p>Secondary data review.</p> <p>KIIs with in-country BRC and NRCS staff, district and ward level stakeholders, other humanitarian actors who implemented CTP activities in the Kathmandu valley</p> <p>FGDs and paired interviews with beneficiaries.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NRCS/BRC can identify FGD participants who benefitted from more than one livelihood activity to organise the communities Stakeholders are available for interviews and interested in participating
How reasonable was the decision on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organisation procedures and guidance were available and considered useful at the time the decisions were made 	<p>Secondary data review.</p> <p>KIIs with in-country BRC and NRCS staff, district and ward level stakeholders, cluster</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NRCS/BRC can identify FGD participants who benefitted from more than one livelihood

<p>the modality choice,⁸ especially with regards to the location of the intervention and the timing of the decision?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The choice of intervention modality is documented and formalised (specifically in response options analysis) ▪ All main areas of cash feasibility⁹ were checked in an adequate manner considering the context and the timing of the decision ▪ Comparison of the timeframe of the crisis and of the choice of modality ▪ Perception of programme implementers and of the recipients that the choice of the modality was reasonable considering the context and timing of the decision 	<p>members, other humanitarian actors</p> <p>FGDs and paired interviews with beneficiaries.</p>	<p>activity to organise the communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stakeholders are available for interviews and interested in participating
<p>How was the effectiveness of the livelihood intervention influenced by the modality and type of transfer used?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Perceptions of programme implementers on the effectiveness and timeliness of the chosen modality compared to an alternative modality/combination of modalities ▪ Reported time between the official start date of the programme and the disbursement of the first cash instalment versus reported time between official start date and distribution of in-kind service in a similar area. ▪ Self-reported social effect of the transfer for end-users: stigma associated with receiving Cash grants, being enrolled in cash for work or having received an in-kind kit 	<p>Secondary data review.</p> <p>KIIs with in-country BRC and NRCS staff, district and ward level stakeholders, other humanitarian actors</p> <p>FGDs and paired interviews with beneficiaries.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NRCS/BRC can identify FGD participants who benefitted from more than one livelihood activity to organise the communities ▪ Stakeholders are available for interviews and interested in participating ▪ Access to NRCS/BRC budget data

⁸ In this question, as well as in the following research question, the research team will look at how the choice of modalities was designed and implemented to form judgement. This includes conditionality/restriction, the transfer value, the delivery mechanism and the combination of modalities

⁹ Beneficiary needs, community and political acceptance, organisational acceptance and capacity, market functionality and access , Payment Agents

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Barriers/transaction costs to accessing cash from certain groups: beneficiaries report having to pay transaction fees to cash out the money, beneficiaries are not able to work. ▪ Geographical equity: area of operation of chosen financial service providers (FSP) compared to the areas where NRCS operate compare to those areas that have been the most affected by the crisis. ▪ Capacity to scale up or down: Unit cost per increase in number of additional beneficiaries and unit management and operational overhead costs per beneficiary (costs defined as operating platform and administering cash transfers, delivery mechanisms costs, direct and indirect admin overheads). ▪ Perceptions of programme implementers on how the design and implementation (value, duration, conditionality, delivery mechanism, etc.) of the cash grants) influenced the effectiveness of the various livelihoods activities. ▪ Reported benefits and downsides of the chosen modalities by programme implementers and beneficiaries ▪ Beneficiaries (across different groups) express preference for another modality or a combination thereof, after the intervention 		
--	---	--	--

<p>Were appropriate systems in place to manage a livelihood intervention with the chosen assistance modalities in the Kathmandu Valley?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review and KI show appropriate monitoring system, complaint mechanism and anti-corruption and fraud policies, were in place and used to adjust, if needed, the chosen modalities. ▪ Programme implementers' perceptions on the pros and cons of the system in place to manage and monitor the modalities ▪ Desk review and KI underline that appropriate administrative processes (financial, logistic, administrative processes) were in place to support the programme with the chosen modality ▪ Sufficiently trained human resources were in place and well managed to support a programme with the combination of modalities used ▪ Perceptions of beneficiaries, implementers and service providers that the latter were adequately contracted and managed given the chosen modality ▪ The programme implementer had the flexibility to adjust the design, or to change the modality, if case the situation/context required adjustments 	<p>Secondary data review.</p> <p>KIIs with in-country BRC and NRCS staff, district and ward level stakeholders, other humanitarian actors, FSP and other service providers (training, assurance)</p> <p>FGDs and paired interviews with beneficiaries.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NRCS/BRC can identify FGD participants who benefitted from more than one livelihood activity to organise the communities ▪ Stakeholders are available for interviews and interested in participating
---	--	--	---

VII.3. Methodology

The study was conducted through a highly participatory, mixed-methods approach relying on a variety of secondary and primary sources. The study followed a three-stepped approach presented in the figure below:

Table 1: Methodological steps of the evaluation

Phase 1: Desk Review & Inception	Phase 2: In-country data collection	Phase 3: Analysis and report writing
Secondary data review of available documents, including programme documents Skype workshop presenting the research protocol	Field visit in country from 23 rd October to 4 th November 2018 Key informant interviews, FGDs and households visit In-country presentation of preliminary findings (30 th October 2018)	Coding of the secondary & primary data Analysis and presentation of in country trends Draft report writing Comments from the review group

VII.3.1. Phase 1: Desk review & Inception phase:

The review started with an **in-depth briefing** with the consultancy managers mid-September 2018. Beyond fostering a broad and general understanding of the programme background and the study's Terms of Reference (ToR), this briefing was used to refine the list of documents available for the desk review and to define a primary research question.

Following the briefing, the consultant conducted an extensive **structured desk review** of the programme and overall humanitarian response documentation and the monitoring data provided by the consultancy manager. The desk review intended to harness both qualitative and quantitative data (e.g. PDM, etc.).

The lead consultant reviewed 82 documents and databases. The complete list of documents reviewed can be found in [Annex VIII.4](#). The lead consultant added and reviewed additional documents during the primary data collection phase as various key informants shared secondary data. All documents were coded and reviewed in an iterative manner.

The lead consultant defined the secondary research questions via a participatory approach, which consisted of seven interviews conducted with programme staff aiming to probe them on what questions they would like this piece of research to tackle. The lead consultant presented a summary of these interviews to all interviewees in a skype workshop Mid-September 2018, which led to the defining of the secondary research questions.

VII.3.2. Phase 2: Primary Data Collection:

The fieldwork started with a kick-off workshop with BRC and NRCS representatives on October 23rd 2018. This workshop was used to finalise the data collection logistics.

Primary data collection aimed at filling in any gaps from the desk review and expanding on emerging trends by delving into further details. Primary data collection occurred during a field mission to

Nepal. The lead consultant (Clément Charlot) conducted most of the KIIs in Kathmandu city and conducted FGDs in Lalitpur district on October 28th 2018. Two Nepalese consultants (Anish Shresta and Samasti Tandukar) conducted the majority of the FGDs, and paired interviews, with communities as well as some KIIs. In total, data collection covered three districts (Kathmandu, Latipur and Bhaktapur) and 20 communities (Sangla, Goldhunga, Tinpile, Changunarayan, Guddu, Harrisiddhi, Sipadol, Godawari, Lubu, Mahankaal, Jitpur, Thulagaun, Dharmasthali, Chaling, Kharepati, Sangla, Chhetrapati, Lamataar, Bungamati, Chunikhel).

The data collection methods outlined below were used in this study:

VII.3.2.1. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

Semi-structured interviews were conducted in-person during the field visit (or remotely by Skype or phone as needed) from 23rd to 31st October. The key informants' selection was done purposefully by the programme team and the consultants, targeting people thought to be best able to contribute to the study, and complemented through snowball sampling i.e. asking key informants whom we should interview next. These key informants are representative of the key stakeholders, including:

- BRC staff (both in Nepal and HQ), including programme and support staff;
- NRCS staff (both at the district and HQ levels), including programme and support staff;
- Other International Non-Governmental Organisations (INGO) delivering Cash-Based Assistance (CBA) in the Kathmandu Valley;
- District-level stakeholders (District Agricultural Office, District Livestock Office etc.) and Village Development Committee (now ward) level (Ward Representatives, etc.);
- Service providers (e.g. banks, insurance, training providers).¹⁰

The breakdown of interviewees is detailed in the table below:

Table 3: Breakdown of interviewees per category

Key informant type	Number of interviewees
Implementers	15
BRC	4
NRCS	10
IFRC	1
Service provider	9
Bank	3
Training	4
Insurance	2
Other humanitarian organisations	2
Government representatives	1
Committee	8
TOTAL	35

¹⁰ When designing the research protocol, the consultants did not have access to the full list of FSP/Service provider. The consultant would like to meet at least a representative of all FSPs, and the most representative service providers for the vocational training and the CCGs.

As mentioned previously, during data collection phase, the consultants also added to the desk review any additional documents shared by the key informants. Those documents were analysed in an iterative manner and contributed to the body of evidence alongside the documents reviewed during the inception phase.

VII.3.2.2. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) & Paired Interviews

The consultants also conducted FGDs and Paired Interviews with livelihood activity beneficiaries during the fieldtrip. In total 54 FGDs were conducted with 328 participants, in three districts (Kathmandu, Latipur and Bhaktapur). As agreed in the research protocol, FGDs were segregated by:

- **Gender:** 17 FGDs were conducted with males, 21 with females and 16 were mixed;
- **Livelihood activities:** Beneficiaries receiving CCGs, vocational training and participating in Cash-for-work activities were interviewed together. Nonetheless, as the youth who benefitted from the vocational training may not have felt comfortable providing input in front of a wider audience, the consultants conducted 30-minute paired interviews with the vocational training participants after the FGD. Beneficiaries involved in the cooperative management training were interviewed in separate FGD. In total, 219 participants benefitted from CCGs, 36 from VTR, 80 from CfW and 22 were involved in the cooperative management training.
- Consultants ensured all three **districts** where BRC is present were covered. As such, 20 FGDs were conducted in Kathmandu District, 19 in Latipur and 15 in Bhaktapur.

These FGDs were used to gather feedback directly from the programme's beneficiaries on the livelihood activities and modalities. They were conducted in accordance with humanitarian standards to ensure the safety and security of these populations. They sought to collect feedback on the perceived effectiveness of the livelihood interventions and modalities. They also aimed to gather information to inform recommendations on how assistance could be better provided in the future.

FGDs typically included around 6-10 participants. In one village (Godawari), one FGD included 16 participants because extra participants expressed an interest to attend the discussion, and in the consultant in charge of the data collection chose to let extra participants in, in order to be inclusive.

FGDs also aimed to be representatives of various age groups (including youth and older persons), people living with disabilities as well as communities living urban, rural and peri-urban environments.

In order to avoid survey fatigue, the consultants did not target communities that had been previously interviewed during the BRC's final evaluation.¹¹

VII.3.3. Phase 3: Analysis & report writing

Qualitative data was recorded and coded to analyse emerging trends. The analysis was done iteratively so as to be able to adjust the data collection tools and explore some of the trends in more depth. Data will be triangulated to ensure a rigorous analysis process.

Secondary quantitative data were stored in excel, cleaned and then analysed using computing descriptive statistics for each of the variables (e.g. location, gender, etc.).

At the end of the fieldwork, the consultants led a workshop with BRC and NRCS to present the preliminary findings, assess their consistency and discuss recommendations. The presentation was

¹¹ Communities visited during the final evaluation were 1) Kathmandu District: Kathmandu Metro Ward No. 27, Tarkeshwor Wards No. 2, 3, 8, 14. 2) Bhaktapur District: Changunarayan Wards No. 4, 5, 6, Suryavinayak Ward No. 4, Mahanjushree Ward No. 11, Anatalingeswor Ward No. 10. 3) Lalitpur District: Godawori Wards No. 1, 2, Karyabinayak Ward No. 10, Lalitpur Ward No. 22, Nallu Ward No. 3.

also an opportunity to identify the data that needed further triangulation and to organise the four remaining days of field work in a participatory manner with NRCS.

The team then produced a first draft of the research report. Upon receiving feedback both remotely and during the workshop, the consultants will produce the final version of the report and a PowerPoint presentation to highlight key findings, lessons learnt, and best practices.

VII.3.4. Limitations

When reading this report, the reader should have the following two limitations in mind:

1. The research team did not have access to a comprehensive beneficiary database, i.e. a database which included all beneficiaries for all four activities and all locations.¹² Furthermore, as the number of days for the research limited, the research team and consultancy manager decided not to opt for random sampling, and instead to rely on NRCS field staff field knowledge, to make the data collection more efficient. As a result, NRCS selected communities and FGD participants based on the criteria provided by the research team in the research protocol. The criteria included: the livelihood activity, the gender and setting (urban/rural). Considering that the research team interviewed more than 238 participants (FGD, paired interviews), which suffice to ensure data saturation and to minimise a potential sampling bias. However, the research may not be representative of all settings in all three districts.
2. As activities were just coming to an end, or were still ongoing, the research team could not fully investigate the effectiveness of all livelihoods activities with all beneficiaries interviewed. It was particularly the case with vocational trainees interviewed, whom, for the most part, did not complete their training at the time of the data collection. It was also the case for about a fourth of CCG FGD participants. Furthermore, the consultant could not access the Post-Distribution Monitoring data for the four livelihood activities implemented,¹³ which was being collected at the time of writing.

VII.3.5. Data protection

The consultants are complying with the E.U. General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), enforced on May 25th 2018. This directive sets out individuals' rights regarding the processing, handling, treatment and storage of their personal data. In being a company registered in the European Union, Key Aid Consulting strictly abides by the GDPR for all its programmes.

For the data collected, the consultants have:

- Presented the objective of the programme to potential interviewees.
- Obtained consent from each key informant before participating in the interview with Key Aid Consulting. This can take the form of a written email or a form either administered using an online solution for remote interviews and/or paper-based for the interviews taking place in-country. It ensures that potential interviewees have been informed about the study, about their privacy and that they agree on their data being used for this report. Depending on their answers, the consultants will either conduct the interview or not, and/or integrate or exclude the data/ part of the data.

¹² The research team had access to the personal data of 7290 CCGs recipients out of 13,570. It did not have access to the personal data CfW participants and cooperatives. Regarding the locations, the research team has a database with the names of the Wards included in the project, but it did not have the location of intervention areas, or their settings (urban, rural, semi-rural).

¹³ The research team only had access to the PDM of CCGs activities only for the 7290 recipients included in the baseline

- Stored interviewee's data (audio recordings, transcripts, database) on a secured and password-protected online server, only accessible by Key Aid Consulting.
- Not shared any raw data collected (audio recordings, transcripts, interview database) from interviewees with the client, unless the client especially asks for it. In this case, only anonymised data will be given, i.e. the interviewee's name, organisation as well as any descriptive information that could breach data protection (age, location, etc.) will be omitted.
- Did not quote individuals or refer to interviewees by name in the final report.
- Only referred to specific job titles or organisations in the study if the interviewee has expressly agreed to it. In the case where interviewees within the same organisation disagree on the use of their organisation name, the most restrictive choice will prevail, and the consultants will not refer to the organisation in the report.

VII.4. Research tools

VII.4.1. KII questionnaire

Brief Background

Following the earthquakes in the spring of 2015, the British Red Cross (BRC) in partnership with the Nepal Red Cross Society (NRCS) launched a large-scale multi-sectoral intervention comprising health, food livelihoods, shelter and WASH. This recovery programme also included a capacity building component for the NRCS as well as Community Engagement and Accountability (CEA). It was implemented in the three districts of Kathmandu, Lalitpur and Bhaktapur, across 75 urban, peri-urban and rural communities.

BRC has commissioned Key Aid Consulting to conduct a piece of research on NRCS/BRC' livelihoods and cash interventions in the NRCS/BRC earthquake recovery programme in the Kathmandu Valley. The primary research question for this piece of research is:

To what extent have livelihoods recovery strategies and modalities adopted by BRC helped restore and strengthen the livelihoods of HH assisted post the 2015 earthquake in the Kathmandu Valley?

More specifically, the research will look at:

- The effectiveness of the different livelihood activities in restoring and strengthening the livelihoods of beneficiaries;
- How the modality chosen influenced the effectiveness of the intervention;
- The decision-making process and subsequent management of the modality.

The piece of research will aim to be published in a humanitarian-related journal. The piece of research will also be useful to NRCS/BRC to generate learning for future emergency intervention in-country and in similar contexts.

The interview will last about 45 to 60 minutes. Everything we say will be used to inform the study, but nobody will be quoted individually.

Personal data collected will be used by Key Aid Consulting only, for the sole purpose of the review and will not be forwarded to third parties.

Ask for interviewee's consent.

Tell interviewee if and how he/she will see the results of this consultation (share the final report or share findings orally through consultation based on group).

Instructions

This structured interview guide provides an overview of all the topics and corresponding questions; however, each interview will be tailored to focus on the set of questions that are most directly relevant to the interviewee's expertise and interest.

General information

Name:

Position:

Organisation:

Email address:

VII.4.1.1. Programme implementers (BRC and NRCS staff)

Introductory questions

1. What has been your involvement with the NRCS/BRC recovery programme? And over what time period?
2. What are your expectations of this piece of research?

Effectiveness of the livelihood intervention

1. What is the current status of the livelihood activities? Are there any that will not be achieved by the end of the programme? If yes, why?
2. In your opinion, to what extent were livelihoods activities successful in replacing the assets and restarting the livelihoods of households and communities affected by the earthquake in NRCS/BRC intervention areas? How? Can you provide examples?
3. In your opinion, to what extent and how were livelihoods activities successful in restoring and developing income-generating activities and building new skills of the households and communities supported by the earthquake? Can you provide examples?
4. Have the livelihood activities been able to reach different groups, i.e. women, youth, older people, people living with disabilities and from different castes/ethnic groups?
5. If yes to the question above, what has been the effect(s) on these groups? Can you provide examples?
6. Have certain livelihood activities been better at reaching these groups than others? What about in different geographic locations?
7. In your opinion, were some livelihood activities more effective in restoring and strengthening the livelihoods in the target communities? Why? How?

Effectiveness of the modality

8. In your opinion, to what extent has the modality had an impact on the effectiveness of the livelihood activities? Do you think another modality or a combination of different modalities would have led to higher effectiveness? How, why?
9. Reflecting on the livelihood activities that were implemented, do you feel that the choice of the modality was appropriate and effective? Why or why not?
10. What did the modality enable people to do that they might not otherwise have been able to do? What changes occurred as a result of the transfer?
11. Were there any delays related to the choice of modality?
12. Was the specific delivery mechanism (e.g. bank transfer, AC payee cheque, bearer cheque) successful in delivering the transfer to recipients? Were any major challenges encountered?
13. Did the type of transfer affect the targeting process or targeting outcomes? If yes, how?

14. In your opinion, what are the main benefits of the modality and the type of transfer chosen?
15. In your opinion, what are the main flaws of the modality and the type of transfer chosen?

Decision-making for the modality

16. How did you determine when/where to use conditional/unconditional cash grants? Did you do a cash feasibility assessment? (political/beneficiary acceptance, FSP, etc.)?
17. What decision-making guidance, if any, was used to inform the decision?
18. What sources of information were used to inform the decision (e.g. market assessments, needs assessments, previous evaluations, previous experience)? Which stakeholders were consulted (e.g. partners, donors, government, traders)?
19. Did decision-makers consider the different types of transfers? Was the option to combine different transfer types considered?
20. If you could propose a change to how the modality was designed implemented, what change would you propose? (Prompt: frequency, transfer value, Financial service provider)

Management of the modality

21. Were appropriate business processes, administrative and financial systems in place (or developed) to support a programme with the transfer used?
22. Were appropriate human resources in place and was staffing well managed to support a programme with the transfer used?
23. How did NRCS/BRC monitor the livelihoods activities? Were there some specific monitoring systems put in place as a result of the choice of the modalities?
24. In your opinion, to what extent was the monitoring system put in place was appropriate for the activities and the modalities?
25. Were there systems in place for the beneficiaries to share feedbacks or complaints? How were the feedback/complaint handled? How did they inform the design and the implementation? To what extent was NRC/BRC complaint mechanism adapted to the context, type of activity
26. How did you contract, supervise and monitor service providers (i.e. FSP and training providers)? In retrospect, is there anything you would have done differently?
27. What is the registration process for a recipient to benefit from the cash transfer from the chosen FSP? What information do you need/what type of documents do you require from the recipient?
28. To what extent was the programme and the modality were adjusted to reflect a change in the context and situation analysis? E.g. If the market prices increase, did you monitoring its impact on beneficiaries, and consider adjusting the transfer value accordingly?
29. If other grounds used in decision-making proved not to be accurate, were these identified? If so, was the programme adjusted?

Wrap up questions

30. If you were to start the programme all over again, what would you do differently?
31. Is there anything that we did not discuss that you feel is important to highlight?

VII.4.1.2. District-level stakeholders and ward-level stakeholders

Introductory questions

1. What has been your involvement with the NRCS/BRC recovery programme? And more specifically the livelihood activities (CCGs, CFW, vocational training and cooperatives training)?

Effectiveness of the livelihood intervention

2. In your opinion, what have been the major effects of the livelihoods assistance provided? In other words, what has changed since people started to receive assistance?
3. In your opinion, to what extent were livelihoods activities successful in replacing the assets of households and communities affected by the earthquake in NRCS/BRC intervention areas? How? Can you provide examples?
4. In your opinion, to what extent and how were livelihoods activities successful in strengthening the livelihoods of the households and communities supported by the earthquake
5. Has the livelihood activities been able to reach different types of groups, i.e. women, youth, older people, people living with disabilities and please from different castes/ethnic groups?
6. If yes to the question above, what has been the effect(s) on these groups? Can you provide examples?
7. Have certain livelihood activities been better at reaching these groups? What about in different geographic locations?
8. In your opinion, were some livelihood activities more effective in restoring and strengthening the livelihoods in the target communities? Why? How?
9. What do you think would be the current situation of the targeted communities if they had not received assistance from the Red Cross?

Effectiveness of the modality

10. How effective was the modality chosen, i.e. cash, to deliver assistance compared to in-kind assistance?
11. Were there any delays related to the choice of modality that you were aware of?
12. Was the modality more appropriate and effective for some specific activities than for others? Why?
13. Were there any unforeseen effects of the programme as a result of the modalities? If yes, can you provide some examples?
14. If you could propose a change to how the modality was designed implemented, what change would you propose? (Prompt: frequency, transfer value, Financial service provider)

Decision-making for the modality

15. Were you consulted on the choice of modality? Do you think you should have been consulted?
16. What factors should organisations like NRCS/BRC take into account when choosing an appropriate modality for emergency response?
17. In your opinion, to what extent did NRCS/BRC taken these factors into consideration when choosing the modality/combination of modality?

Wrap up questions

18. If you were to start the livelihood activities all over again, what would you recommend to NRCS/BRC?
19. Is there anything that we did not discuss that you feel is important to highlight?

VII.4.1.3. Service providers

Introductory questions

1. What has been your involvement with the NRCS/BRC recovery programme? And more specifically the livelihood activities?

Effectiveness of the livelihood intervention

2. What has been the programme's effect(s) on the recipients? Can you provide examples?
3. What about the communities where NRCS/BRC intervened? Can you provide examples?

Effectiveness of the modality

4. **[For training provider only]** What has been the effects on BRC giving cash to beneficiaries instead of directly contracting you?

Adapt the phrase if its CCGs or vocation training

5. **[For training provider only]** Do you feel that the choice of the modality was appropriate and effective for training? Why or why not? *Adapt the phrase if its CCGs or vocation training*
6. **[For FSP only]** Was the specific delivery mechanism (e.g. bank transfer, AC payee cheque, bearer cheque) successful in delivering the transfer to recipients? Were any major challenges encountered?
7. In your opinion, what are the main benefits of the modality and the type of transfer chosen?
8. In your opinion, what are the main flaws of the modality and the type of transfer chosen?

Decision-making for the modality

9. **[For FSP only]** How and when did NRCS/BRC approach you to become a service provider and deliver CTP?
10. Have you ever collaborated with a relief organisation before for an emergency response? If so with whom, for how many HH and during what period of time?
11. **[For FSP only]** Where do you operate? (i.e. from where can we send money to you and where do you distribute money to?)
12. If so, what have been the lessons learned from this collaboration? Have you adjusted the cash distribution mechanism accordingly?
13. Would you be interested in collaborating [again] with humanitarian organisations?

Management of the modality

14. Were appropriate business processes, administrative and financial systems in place (or developed) to support a programme with the transfer used?
15. Were appropriate human resources in place and was staffing well managed to support a programme with the transfer used?
16. Were appropriate systems in place or developed in order to provide the transfer in an accountable manner? To what extent was NRC/BRC complaint mechanism adapted to the context, type of activity?
17. How did NRCS/BRC contract and supervise your organisation (i.e. FSP and training providers)? In retrospect, is there anything you think you have been done differently?
18. How did NRCS/BRC monitor your organisation (i.e. FSP and training providers)? In retrospect, is there anything you think you have been done differently?
19. **[For FSP only]** In what areas of the Kathmandu valley do you currently operate?
20. **[For FSP only]** What is the registration process for a person to benefit from your services? What information do you need/what type of documents do you require from the recipient?

21. [For FSP only] How do you make sure the money arrives in the hand of the person the humanitarian organisation wants to send money to?

Wrap up questions

22. If NRCS/BRC were to start the livelihood activities all over again, what would you recommend for them to do differently?
23. Is there anything that we did not discuss that you feel is important to highlight?

VII.4.2. FGD Guide

VII.4.2.1. Beneficiaries from CCGs, Vocational training and CFW

Instructions

NB: Background and general information are the same as for the KII questionnaire.

When conducting the FGDs be conscious of gender, minority groups, and of the time you are going to ask people to contribute (each FGD should be a maximum of 1 hour and 15 minutes). Be well prepared, know your questionnaire well and try to keep your group to a manageable size.

General Information

Data collection date			
Community District			
Interviewer(s)	1. 2.		
Interviewee(s)	Name 1. 2. 3.	Role (Head of HH, etc.)	Telephone

Introduction Questions

1. Are you familiar with the Red Cross' livelihood activities in your community? Can one/two of you please describe the activities implemented?

Please note if participants/a portion of participants were not aware of specific livelihood activities?

2. What assistance have you received through this programme?

Utilise the Participatory Learning for Action (PLA) technique proportional piling

Area	Number of people benefitting from assistance or having at
------	---

	least one household member benefitting from the assistance
CCG (including the training received)	
Vocational training	
Infrastructure rehabilitation (CfW)	
Cooperative training	

Effectiveness

3. What do you think would be the current state of your community if it had not received assistance from the Red Cross?
4. Compared to what it used to be before the earthquake, to what extent has NRCS/BRC programme restore your livelihoods? What about your community?
5. Compared to what it used to be before the earthquake, to what extent has NRCS/BRC programme strengthened your livelihoods? What about your community?
6. In your opinion, did all livelihoods activities equally play a role in restoring and strengthening the livelihoods of the community? Why or why not?
7. Did the assistance arrive quickly enough to help alleviate your need? Why or why not?
8. If yes, do you think the assistance has helped the various groups in the community (e.g. PLWD, elderly, youth, etc.)? Why or why not?

Effectiveness of the modality

9. If you were to receive livelihood support again, would you rather receive in-kind, a cash grant or a voucher? Why?

When you facilitate this question, first explain the different modalities. You can decide to use proportional piling (especially if the group is large).

Area	Preference for assistance	Comments
CCG (including the training received)		
Vocational training		
Infrastructure rehabilitation (CfW)		
Cooperative training		

10. For the livelihood activities you benefitted from, do you feel that another form of assistance would have led to the same effects on your household? Why?

Management of the modality

11. If you had a question about the livelihood assistance you received, who would you ask about it? How would you go about doing so? (In other words, are they aware of how to give feedback?)
12. Have you done so? What was the feedback about? If yes, what happened? Did you receive a response?
13. How satisfied are you with how your voice has been heard? (if there are multiple respondents have them vote – satisfied, not satisfied, or neutral). Are you confident in the response?

Wrap up questions

14. If the Red Cross were to start the programme all over again, what would you like them to do differently?
15. Is there anything that we did not discuss that you feel is important to address?

VII.4.2.2. Cooperatives

Instructions

NB: Background and general information are the same as for the KII questionnaire.

When conducting the FGDs be conscious of gender, minority groups, and of the time you are going to ask people to contribute (each FGD should be a maximum of 1 hour and 15 minutes). Be well prepared, know your questionnaire well and try to keep your group to a manageable size.

General Information

Data collection date			
Community District			
Interviewer(s)	1. 2.		
Interviewee(s)	Name 1. 2. 3.	Role (Head of HH, etc.)	Telephone

Introduction Questions

1. Are you familiar with the Red Cross' livelihood activities in your community? Can one/two of you please describe the activities implemented?

Please note if participants/a portion of participants were not aware of specific livelihood activities?

2. What assistance have you received through this programme?

Area	Number of people benefitting from assistance or having at least one household member benefitting from the assistance
CCG (including the training received)	
Vocational training	
Infrastructure rehabilitation (CfW)	
Cooperative training	

3.

Effectiveness

- 4. Can you describe what has been the training’s effects on your cooperative? Can you give some examples?
- 5. In your opinion, what have been the effects of the cooperative training activity on your community? Why?
- 6. Compared to before the earthquake, to what extent has NRCS/BRC programme restored your livelihoods? What about your community? What role did the cooperative training play in restoring the livelihoods of community?
- 7. In your opinion, did all livelihoods activities equally play a role in restoring and strengthening the livelihoods of the community? Why?

If

- 8. Did the assistance arrive quickly enough to help alleviate your need? Why or why not?
- 9. If yes, do you think the assistance has helped the various groups of the community (e.g. PLWD, elderly, youth etc.)? Why or why not?

Effectiveness of the modality

- 10. If you were to receive support again, would you rather receive in-kind, a cash grant or a voucher? Why?

When you facilitate this question, first explain the different modalities. you can decide to use proportional piling (especially if the group is large).

Area	Preference for assistance	Comments
CCG (including the training received)		
Vocational training		
Infrastructure rehabilitation (CfW)		
Cooperative training		

- 11. For the activities you benefitted from, do you feel that another form of assistance would have led to the same effects on your household? Why or why not?

Management of the modality

- 12. If you had a question about the assistance you receive, who would you ask about it? How would you go about doing so? (In other words, are they aware of how to give feedback?)
- 13. Have you done so? What was the feedback about? If yes, what happened? Did you receive a response?
- 14. How satisfied are you with how your voice has been heard? (if there are multiple respondents have them vote – satisfied, not satisfied, or neutral). Are you confident in the response?

Wrap up questions

- 15. If the Red Cross were to start the programme all over again, what would you like them to do differently?
- 16. Is there anything that we did not discuss that you feel is important to discuss?

VII.5. Cash feasibility criteria and considerations

Criteria	Considerations for cash feasibility
Community acceptance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prior to the recovery phase, the RCM provided cash to all earthquake-affected households (using blanket targeting) in the Kathmandu Valley. Post-distribution monitoring found that beneficiaries were generally pro-cash, for instance 63% of the respondents said to preferred cash as relief as it allowed them to choose what to buy to meet their immediate needs.¹⁴ ▪ Cash & Seeds Cash grants in November 2015 whose PDM demonstrated that beneficiaries were in favour of using cash (57% agreeing that the best modality was cash, and 42% somewhat agreeing, n=708).¹⁵ ▪ From July to September 2015, the NRCS and BRC undertook a scoping exercise to design the general livelihoods strategy for the Kathmandu Valley, using a consultative and needs-based approach.¹⁶ It found for instance that CCGs were shop owner’s preferred modality.¹⁷ However, the market scoping sample size was relatively limited, as it only included 10 in-depth interviews with microenterprises. The modality was also discussed with community members, ward secretaries and local government. ▪ 98.5% of CCGs participants interviewed in the baseline were in favour of cash, due to it allowing flexibility, freedom of choice, and its ability to foster empowerment and ownership of their activity when compared to in-kind. ▪ While cash was generally accepted by the communities, the specific delivery mechanism appears to have been less well accepted. According to some interviewees, during the FGD consultations with community members to design the programme, the acceptance of the delivery mechanism was reportedly discussed. The participants were reportedly all in favour of bank transfers when NRCS suggested the option.¹⁸ However, the addition of new delivery mechanisms (AC Payee cheque and bearer cheque) in some districts/communities later in the programme suggests that this topic, i.e. acceptance/feasibility of delivery mechanism, was not sufficiently discussed, and/or that it did not include a sufficient sample.
Political acceptance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The GoN was in favour of cash during the emergency phase, as they supported and implemented a blanket cash distribution for households affected by the earthquake.¹⁹ For instance, the Ministry of Home Affairs provided a 150 (USD) grant to 523,000 households in June 2015. ▪ During the recovery phase, the National Reconstruction Authority (NRA)²⁰ promoted the use of cash transfers: “Cash transfers to earthquake-affected people will be a central part of the recovery and reconstruction effort. Such transfers are critical for housing and other interventions related to livelihoods and the revival of small businesses.”²¹ After a meeting with the Red Cross delegation in the first quarter of 2016, NRA agreed to the use of cash grants for

¹⁴ IFRC & NRCS, ‘Post Distribution Monitoring Report Nepal Earthquake Operation 2015’.

¹⁵ ‘Kathmandu Valley Integrated Urban Recovery Programme Post Distribution Monitoring and Exit Survey Report Cash Grants for Seeds and Tools’ (British Red Cross and Nepal Red Cross Society, n.d.).

¹⁶ British Red Cross, ‘Livelihoods Recovery Assessment Kathmandu Valley’.

¹⁷ British Red Cross.

¹⁸ The research team did not have access to the FGD transcripts and/or analysis. Therefore, it couldn’t check the information.

¹⁹ Willitts-King and Bryant, ‘Scaling up Humanitarian Cash Transfers in Nepal’.

²⁰ The government body formed to supervise the recovery phase.

²¹ Government of Nepal, ‘Nepal Earthquake 2015 Post Disaster Recovery Framework 2016-2020’.

	<p>livelihood activities as long as the targeting criteria were clearly defined, and discussed/approved by the district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Red Cross got approval not only from the NRA, but also from each district (Chief District Officer, and Disaster Management Committee) to provide CCG.
<p>Organisational acceptance & capacity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Before the earthquake, NRCS did not have the experience nor capacity to implement a large-scale CBA programme. NRCS training in cash was first done in mid 2013 supported by the IFRC regional office (then called AP Zone). IFRC also conducted cash advocacy workshop for NRCS leadership. At the time the first earthquake stroke, there was one expert in-country, who had only had time to conduct one training before the earthquake. ▪ At the GoN's urging, NRCS, like many other NGOs, implemented CBA in the initial relief phase: "The Red Cross has provided shelter materials, food and non-food relief items to affected households. The relief phase finished on 31 August 2015 and cash distribution reached 90% of the total 40,000 households targeted."²² ▪ While the relief phase undeniably began to build NRCS' capacity, its capacity gaps were still considered to be a critical point of improvement/attention.²³ Yet, this gap was considered to be easier to overcome than implementing a livelihood programme based on in-kind assistance and service delivery. NRCS had no emergency (fast track) purchase procedures and did not have the resources to procure rapidly, as was already acknowledged during the emergency phase.²⁴ ▪ In terms of organisational acceptance, there was reported an initial reluctance at NRCS to implement CCG for the livelihood activities, due to concerns of misusing the transfers.²⁵ However, the complexity of the procurement procedures tipped the scales towards CBA: "The capacity of NRCS to implement CTP has increased to a scale which was not the norm prior to the earthquake, generating a more positive attitude to using cash within its management structure given the numerous benefits this programme has demonstrated."²⁶
<p>Market functionality</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The literature review on the earthquake emergency/recovery intervention systematically points to markets being functional by the end of 2015: "Nepal offered an appropriate place to do this as functioning markets existed in the majority of affected areas."²⁷ This was also supported by discussions/data from the cash working group on market functionality. ▪ According to NRCS recovery framework,²⁸ NRCS carried out a contextualised analysis. Their analytical framework included three criteria to help choose the modalities: altitude bands (below 1500, from 1500 to 3000, above 3000), situation (urban, rural), and access to markets (good market access, moderate market access, very remote settlements).²⁹ NRCS based the categorisation of

²² British Red Cross, 'Disaster Programme Response Phase 2a Plan'.

²³ FRC & NRCS, 'Post Distribution Monitoring Report Nepal Earthquake Operation 2015'.

²⁴ IFRC & NRCS, 'Post Distribution Monitoring Report Nepal Earthquake Operation 2015'.

²⁵ "Cash assistance leads to an inappropriate or different use of funds." This requires to "Ensure clarity on the purpose of the cash grant, supported by strong monitoring of activities, Regular activity monitoring and support to beneficiaries through volunteers and community mobilisers." ERO, 'Standard Operating Procedure for Cash Transfer Programming Recovery'.

²⁶ British Red Cross, 'Disaster Programme - End of Programme Report'.

²⁷ Willitts-King and Bryant, 'Scaling up Humanitarian Cash Transfers in Nepal'.

²⁸ Nepal Red Cross Society, 'Draft Recovery Framework'.

²⁹ Nepal Red Cross Society.

	<p>the communities in the Kathmandu Valley on the assumption that markets were fully functional, and the extra demand generated by the livelihood support would not impact the market, in terms of price increase or inflation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NRCS/BRC also conducted a light-touch market assessment to bridge the information gap for specific market systems, e.g. on the labour market³⁰ and on winter garments, seeds and pesticide, fertilizer and farm tools.³¹ ▪ First-hand experience during the emergency response demonstrated that recipients could access markets and spend cash grants, with limited reported shortages from both beneficiaries and World Food Programme/GoN price monitoring data. ▪ NRCS/BRC data did not show any access problems for the population.³² For instance, according to the PDM, during the cash and seeds restricted cash grant that was provided in 2015-2016, beneficiaries could access the markets, even if a minority faced some difficulties.
Financial Service Providers (FSP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prior to earthquake (April 2015), NRCS conducted a mapping of the CBA actors in Nepal, which included a rapid FSP assessment.³³ However, the research team could not ascertain whether the document was used as part of the cash feasibility assessment. ▪ After the earthquake, NRCS/BRC did not formally assess FSPs as part of its cash feasibility study, because the NRA in the Post-Disaster Recovery Framework,³⁴ stated that bank transfers were mandatory to use for cash transfers.³⁵ As a result, NRCS/BRC chose bank transfers and did not question their feasibility. The NRCS/BRC believed that the bank coverage was dense in the Kathmandu valley and KYC Regulations³⁶ easily allowed NRCS to deliver cash transfers. There was an assumption among NRCS (according to interviewees) that banks were sufficient to choose bank transfers as a main delivery mechanism, and recipients would all be willing to go to banks and open bank accounts.
Cost effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The cost effectiveness, especially the considerations of effectiveness and efficiency, appear to have been the main criteria for choosing cash transfers. According to all programme implementers interviewed, In-kind assistance would have negatively impacted the quality and the timeliness of the programme.

VII.6. Desk Review

British Red Cross. 'DEC Disaster Response - End of Programme Report', May 2018.

———. 'Disaster Programme - End of Programme Report', n.d.

———. 'Disaster Programme Response Phase 2a Plan', August 2015.

³⁰ Key Aid Consulting, 'Final Evaluation: Nepal Earthquake Recovery Programme', July 2018.

³¹ Nepal Red Cross Society, 'Rapid Market Assessment (Kathmandu, Lalitpur and Bhaktapur Districts)'.

³² Nepal Red Cross Society, 'Livelihood Planning Workshop'.

³³ Nepal Red Cross Society, 'Rapid Market Assessment (Kathmandu, Lalitpur and Bhaktapur Districts)'.

³⁴ Government of Nepal, 'Nepal Earthquake 2015 Post Disaster Recovery Framework 2016-2020'.

³⁵ "The NRA will operationalise cash transfers through arrangements with Nepal Rashtira Bank and commercial banks. It will be mandatory for all the programme households to open bank accounts, for which a special information campaign will be implemented. The NRA will work with private sector banks to establish simplified mechanisms and standards for accessing personal banking accounts."

³⁶ Know Your Customer Regulation required that Nepalese provide either a citizenship card, Voter's card or Red Card. Even recipients who lost their ID in the earthquake can get a certificate from the Ward allowing them to benefit from the FSP services.

- . 'Grant Value Analysis', November 2016.
- . 'Kathmandu Valley - LLHs Update till August 2018', August 2018.
- . 'Kathmandu Valley - LLHs Update until November 2018', November 2018.
- . 'Livelihoods Recovery Assessment Kathmandu Valley', April 2016.
- . 'Nepal Earthquake Recovery Programme Assessment', September 2015.
- . 'Response Options Analysis Workshop: 26-27 April 2016, Kathmandu, Nepal', April 2016.
- . 'Terms of Reference, Research Project – Livelihoods and Cash Interventions in the BRC/NCRS Earthquake Recovery Programme, Kathmandu Valley, Nepal'. The British Red Cross, 2018.
- Dobbai, Anna, and Kafle Shesh Kanta. 'Mid Term Review of Nepal Earthquake Recovery Operation', 2017.
- Earthquake Response Operation, and Monthly Report. 'Earthquake Response Operation Monthly Report - Bhaktapur', July 2017.
- Ede, Nigel. 'Nepal EQ Livelihoods Recovery and SURE Urban Resilience Technical Support Visit'. British Red Cross, August 2018.
- . 'Nepal EQ Recovery Programme - Livelihoods Technical Support Visit'. British Red Cross, n.d.
- ERO. 'ERO Assessment Kathmandu Valley: Preliminary Livelihoods Analysis Presentation', n.d.
- . 'ERO Livelihoods Assessment', n.d.
- . 'Standard Operating Procedure for Cash Transfer Programming Recovery', 2017.
- ERO, Kathmandu Valley. 'Process of CCG Flowchat', n.d.
- Ferrie, Gerard, and Basant Raj Gautam. 'Cash Preparedness in Nepal - Lessons from the 2015 Earthquake', March 2017.
- Government of Nepal. 'Cash for Work for Early Recovery - Operational Guidelines', May 2015.
- . 'Nepal Earthquake 2015 Post Disaster Recovery Framework 2016-2020', May 2016.
- IFRC. 'IFRC Guidelines for Livelihoods Programming'. International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 2010.
- IFRC & NRCS. 'Post Distribution Monitoring Report Nepal Earthquake Operation 2015', November 2015.
- IIED. 'Cash Transfers during Urban Crises: Lessons for Women's Economic Empowerment'. IIED Briefing, July 2017.
- Industrial Enterprise Development Institute (IEDI). 'A TRAINING REPORT on Start and Improve Your Business (SIYB Level 1) Trainer's Training', July 2016.
- Juillard, Helene. 'Minimum Standard for Market Analysis (MiSMA)'. Humanitarian Standard Partnerships, n.d.
- 'Kathmandu Valley Integrated Urban Recovery Programme Post Distribution Monitoring and Exit Survey Report Cash Grants for Seeds and Tools'. British Red Cross and Nepal Red Cross Society, n.d.
- Key Aid Consulting. 'Final Evaluation: Integrated Recovery and Resilience Programme in Kavre District, Nepal', August 2018.
- . 'Final Evaluation: Nepal Earthquake Recovery Programme', July 2018.
- Levine, Simon, and Sarah Bailey. 'Cash, Vouchers or in-Kind? Guidance on Evaluation How Transfers Are Made in Emergency Programming', February 2015.
- Nepal Red Cross Society. 'Authorisation to Bank for Redistributing Cash Grants', n.d.
- . 'Bhaktapur Cash Grant PDM Database', September 2018.
- . 'Bhaktapur- Monitoring Data', n.d.
- . 'Bhaktapur Vocational Training Participants Details', September 2018.
- . 'Bhaktapur_feedback Box Report', n.d.
- . 'Cash Transfer Actors in Nepal – NRCS Mapping Exercise', March 2015.
- . 'CCG Baseline Data Cleaned', September 2018.
- . 'CCG Post Distribution Monitoring Data Cleaned', November 2018.
- . 'District Secretary Meeting at Lalitpur District', November 2015.

- . 'Draft Recovery Framework', June 2015.
- . 'Earthquake Response Operation Logical Framework: Livelihood', December 2015.
- . 'FAQ - Conditional Livelihood Cash Grants', November 2016.
- . 'Final Ward Selection', September 2015.
- . 'Guideline Community Infrastructure Project', October 2017.
- . 'Guideline for Vocational Training- Version One', December 2018.
- . 'Guidelines - Cash Transfer Mechanisms', November 2016.
- . 'Inputs Cost Analysis- Agriculture', August 2016.
- . 'Inputs Cost Analysis- Cattle', August 2016.
- . 'Inputs Cost Analysis- Female Goat', August 2016.
- . 'Inputs Cost Analysis- Grocery Shop', August 2016.
- . 'Inputs Cost Analysis- Male Goat', August 2016.
- . 'Inputs Cost Analysis- Tailor', August 2016.
- . 'Inputs Cost Analysis- Tea Shop', August 2016.
- . 'Katmandu Monitoring of 1st Instalment', n.d.
- . 'Lalitpur Cash Grant PDM', n.d.
- . 'Lalitpur District- Monitoring Data Sheet (CCG-till April)', August 2018.
- . 'Lalitpur Vocational Training Database', September 2018.
- . 'Lalitpur_Feedback Record Sheet', October 2018.
- . 'Livelihood Baseline Cleaned and Coded', September 2018.
- . 'Livelihood Beneficiary Detail_questionnaire', September 2018.
- . 'Livelihood Planning Workshop', August 2016.
- . 'Livelihoods Cash Grants – Latest Update', December 2016.
- . 'Livelihoods DEC Programme Overview', n.d.
- . 'Minutes, Livelihoods Programme Meeting', December 2016.
- . 'Monthly Livelihood Progress Report', April 2017.
- . 'Nepal Red Cross Society Livelihoods Programme - Technical Standards for Livelihoods Interventions', December 2015.
- . 'NRCS and BRC Cash Grant PDM Updated_25Oct2018', October 2018.
- . 'Nurturing Livelihoods Recovery - A Best Practice from Kathmandu Chapter', December 2016.
- . 'Progress Note -Community Sensitization around High-Value Agriculture and Vegetable Production', 2016.
- . 'Rapid Market Assessment (Kathmandu, Lalitpur and Bhaktapur Districts)', November 2015.
- . 'Risks and Mitigation Measures - Livelihood Cash Grants in KTM Valley', January 2017.
- . 'Secondary Exit Survey Report', June 2018.
- . 'Total Incoming Call of 2017', n.d.
- . 'Revised Concept Note on Cash Grant for Vocational Training', n.d.
- Sanderson, David, and Ben Ramalingan. 'NEPAL EARTHQUAKE RESPONSE: Lessons for Operational Agencies', n.d.
- 'Strategic Framework for Resilient Livelihoods in Earthquake-Affected Areas of Nepal'. ICIMOD, June 2015.
- suggestion box report Kathmandu. 'Suggestion Box Report Kathmandu', n.d.
- Thapa, Dilip. 'Effectiveness of Technical Training of ERO/NRCS Beneficiaries in Kathmandu Valley (KV)', August 2018.
- Ward visit Report. 'Lalitpur Ward Visit Report', September 2015.
- WFP. 'Market Watch 78', October 2018.
- . 'Market Watch 89', October 2018.
- Willitts-King, Barnaby, and John Bryant. 'Scaling up Humanitarian Cash Transfers in Nepal'. ODI, January 2017.

KEY
AID
CONSULTING