

3 December 2018

Mr. Shreekrishna Nepal
Joint Secretary and Chief
International Economic Cooperation Coordination Division (IECCD)
Ministry of Finance
Singha Durbar, Kathmandu

Subject: Nepal: School Sector Development Program
(Jointly Financed by: ADB Loan NEP (SF) 3452-NEP; EU Grant: ACA/2016/038-030; Finland; GPE Grant: TF0A0843-NEP; TF0A0779-NEP & TF0A0915-NEP; JICA, Norway, UNICEF and the World Bank IDA Credit No. 5971-NEP)

Dear Mr. Nepal,

The joint review meeting (JRM) of the School Sector Development Program was held from 25-29 November 2018, with the joint field visit to Province 4 and 5 (Districts: Kaski, Parbat, Kapilvastu and Rupandehi). We appreciate our meeting with you on 27 November 2018 to discuss JRM findings. The attached Aide-Memoire reflects the discussions and agreements reached during the wrap-up meeting held at the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST) under the chairmanship of the Secretary of MOEST.

We strongly request the government to ensure all agreed actions summarized in paragraph 74 of the AM are met. We would like to underscore that the government (i) accelerates the process of achievement and verification of the year 2 (FY2017-FY2018) Disbursement Linked Indicators (DLIs); (ii) establishes and operationalizes the dedicated team for each DLIs at the Center for Education and Human Resource Development; and (iii) resolves pending audit observation from FY2012-FY2015 of the School Sector Reform Plan.

We look forward to our continued support. The partnership we have been sharing together is well recognized and highly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,


Mukhtor Khamudkhanov
Country Director


ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK
NEPAL RESIDENT MISSION
Metro Park Building, Lazimpat, Ward No. 2
P.O. Box 5017, Kathmandu, Nepal
Tel: +977 1 400 5120 Fax: +977 1 400 5137
adbnrm@adb.org
www.adb.org/nepal

cc: Mr. Khagraj Baral, Secretary, MOEST
Mr. Baikuntha P Aryal, Joint Secretary, MOEST
Mr. Babu Ram Paudel, Director General, CEHRD
Mr. Deepak Sharma, Deputy Director General, CEHRD
Mr. Dhruba R Regmi, Under Secretary, MOEST
Mr. Tek B. Khatri, Under Secretary, MOF
JFP Partners

**Nepal School Sector Development Plan
Joint Review Meeting Aide Memoire
November 2018**

I. JRM Background and proceedings

1. The School Sector Development Plan (SSDP; FY2016/17–FY2022/23) is a long-term strategic plan of the Government of Nepal (GoN), which is jointly supported by eight Joint Financing Partners (JFPs)¹ and several non-joint financing Development Partners (DPs)² using a Sector Wide Approach (SWAp). The SSDP aims to expand the equitable access to quality school education for all children by focusing on strategic interventions and new reform initiatives to improve the efficiency, management and governance, and resilience of the school system. The total program cost is US \$ 6,461 million and the total contribution by JFPs is US \$ 478 million. The executing agency is the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST) and the implementing agency is the Center for Education and Human Resource Development (CEHRD).³

2. In accordance with the provisions in the SSDP Joint Financing Arrangement (JFA), the third Joint Review Meeting (JRM) was organized from 25 November 2018 to 29 November 2018, with a field visit from 19 November 2018 to 22 November 2018.⁴ The summary of the joint field observation is described below in section C.

3. The main objectives of the 2018 JRM were to:

- (i) Assess Year Two (FY 2017/18) SSDP physical and financial progress including the results framework;
- (ii) Assess and confirm the achievement of Year Two (FY 2017/18) Disbursement Linked Indicators (DLIs) for which evidence has been submitted;
- (iii) Agree on timeline and actions to be taken to complete the documentation to fulfil the DLIs requirements for the remaining Year Two (FY 2017/18) DLIs;
- (iv) Review progress and agree on actions against Year Three (FY 2018/19) DLIs;
- (v) Review progress against financial, social and environment safeguards of SSDP including financial monitoring reports and unaudited reports of FY 2017/18 and assess progress made in reconciling audit observations of FY 2015/2016 (last year of SSRP) and FY 2017/2018;
- (vi) Prepare a timeline and required tasks ahead of the mid-term review of SSDP including restructuring of bilateral support to SSDP;
- (vii) Review implementation of actions outlined in the Transitional Roadmap; including progress on accountability mechanisms at each level.

4. The Terms of Reference (ToR) and agenda of the 2018 JRM are attached as Annex 1. The representation of various agencies in the JRM including the full list of participants is

¹ The JFP currently are the ADB, EU, Finland, WB, JICA, Norway, UNICEF and GPE/REACH.

² The non-joint financing Development Partners are USAID, WFP, UNESCO, UNFPA, DFID, and the BC.

³ With the federation of the country into Federal, Provincial and Local Governments, the mandate for school education as per the Constitution of Nepal 2015 is now with the Local Governments. Given the state restructuring the Ministry of Education is renamed as the Ministry of Education Science and Technology. The central line agencies such as the Department of Education, National Center for Education and Development and Non-Formal Education were merged and renamed as CEHRD. The other central line agencies of MOEST are Curriculum Development Center, Education Review Office, and National Examination Board

⁴ The mission interacted with Provincial Governments, Local Governments, Schools, Teachers, District TCOs and EDCUs in Kaski, Parbat, Rupandehi and Kapilvastu districts

attached as Annex 2. All the presentations made during the JRM are in Supplementary Annexes. During the opening of the JRM, the secretary of MOEST Mr. Khaga Raj Baral and the Local Education Development Partner Group (LEDPG)⁵ focal point, Country Director for ADB, Mr. Mukhtor Khamudkhanov both highlighted the progress made in the SSDP in the areas of access, equity, quality and efficiency, emphasized the strong partnership between LEDPGs and GON, and highlighted the key issues that the JRM would address to enhance SSDP implementation. The JRM was informed of the application of the GON to the Global Partnership for Education for additional support to the SSDP, with the appraisal mission from the supervising grant entity – the World Bank – scheduled for 26 November – 4 December 2018. The JRM also welcomed USAID's support to the SSDP as the new JFP, which is at the final stage of approval by the GON.

5. The observations of the JRM and agreements reached with the GON are recorded in this Aide Memoire (AM) and were discussed at the wrap-up chaired by the Secretary, MOEST on 29 November 2018. The understandings recorded in the AM are subject to the approval of the higher authorities. As practiced in the past the AM including all the presentations delivered during the JRM, will be publicly disclosed on the MOEST website.

II. JRM findings

A. Progress Status on Key Performance Indicators

6. The Mission noted the progress made by SSDP in achieving the physical and financial targets for the FY 2017/18. The financial progress was 93.36%. This was the first federal budget since the funds were transferred directly to the Local Governments (LGs) in the form of conditional grants to implement activities of SSDP. In FY 2017/2018 the responsibility of implementing SSDP activities was also shared with the then District Education Offices (DEOs). Around 75% of the SSDP budget for schools was transferred through LGs whereas the remaining 25% was transferred through DEOs. The LGs implemented program activities related to teacher salary, textbooks and scholarships whereas the targeted interventions under SSDP were implemented by DEOs. All DEOs provided information related to progress in both physical and financial areas⁶. However, LGs could not provide information relating to their expenditure due to the absence of a reporting system with the federal government. In such a context, all the transfers made by the Federal Government to LGs for SSDP were considered as expenditure for the draft Status Report.

7. The progress against the SSDP key performance indicators (KPIs) are summarized in Table 1 below. Overall there is a steady improvement in the KPIs related to access and equity. However, the SSDP continues to face challenges in improving student learning outcomes as measured by the National Assessment of Student Achievement (NASA). Further elaboration of the progress in the key performance indicators is described in Section B below.

Table 1: SSDP key performance indicators, targets and achievements

Sub sector/thematic area		Baseline (2015/16)	Target (2016/17)	Achievement (2016/17)	Target (2017/18)	Achievement (2017/18)
Indicators						
1. Early childhood education development/pre-primary education (ECED/PPE)						
1.1	Gross enrolment ratio (GER) in ECED/PPE	81a	82.6	82.9	84.3	84.1
1.2	% of ECED/PPE teachers with required qualification	93.7	94.4	93.8	95	94.2

⁵ LEDPG comprises of JFPs, non-JFPs, AIN and NCE

⁶ District Education Offices were converted to Education Development Coordination Units from April 2018

Sub sector/thematic area		Baseline (2015/16)	Target (2016/17)	Achievement (2016/17)	Target (2017/18)	Achievement (2017/18)
Indicators						
1.3	% of ECED/PPE teachers with one-month training	0		N.A.		4.7
1.4	% of grade 1 new entrants with ECED/PPE experience	62.4	64.4	64.7	66.5	66.3
2. Basic education (grades 1–8)						
2.1	GIR grade 1	136.7	134.7	133.5	132.7	128.6
2.2	NIR grade 1	93.9	100	95.2	100	95.9
2.3	GER basic (grades 1-5)	135.4	134.8	134	130	132.3
2.4	NER basic (grades 1-5)	96.6	96.9	96.9	97.3	97.2
2.5	GER basic (grades 1-8)	120.1	120.1	122	118	120.2
2.6	NER basic (grades 1-8)	89.4	91.0	91.0	92.5	92.3
2.7	GPI in NER basic (grades 1-8)	1	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
2.8	Survival rate for grade 8	76.6	79.5	75.9	82.4	77.4
2.9	Completion rate basic (grade 8)	69.6	72.4	68.4	75.4	70.7
2.1	% of out of school children in basic education	10.6	9.6	9.0	8.6	8.7
2.11.1	Students' reading proficiency (%) in grade 3	12.8*				
2.12.1	Students' learning achievement scores (%) in grade 5	Math: 48	49	49	51	
2.12.2		English: 47	50	47	51.5	
2.12.3		Nepali: 46	48.5	46	50.5	
2.13.1	Students' learning achievement scores (%) in grade 8 (based on NASA)	Math: 35	39**	35		
2.13.2		Nepali: 48	51**	48		
2.13.3		Science: 41	43.5**	41		
3. Secondary education						
3.1	GER in grades 9-12	56.7	61.5	56.9	66.7	60.6
3.2	NER in grades 9-12	37.7	40.3	38.9	43.1	43.9
3.3	Survival rate to grade 10	37.9	41	45.2	45	57.1
3.4	Survival rate to grade 12	11.5	13	NA	15	17.2
3.5	GPI in NER in grades 9-12	0.99	1.00	0.98	1.00	0.99
3.6	Number of model schools	0	240	0	290	196
3.7	Students enrolled in technical subjects in grades 9-12	9,750		15,445		23,415+
4. Non-formal education and lifelong learning						
4.1	Literacy rate 6 years+	78++		78		
4.2	Literacy rate 15-24 years	88.6++				
4.3	Literacy 15+ years	57++				

Sub sector/thematic area		Baseline (2015/16)	Target (2016/17)	Achievement (2016/17)	Target (2017/18)	Achievement (2017/18)
Indicators						
5. Teacher management and professional development						
5.1	% of female teachers in basic level	38.8	40	40.7	41	41.2
6. Sector finance						
6.1	Education sector budget as % of national budget	12.04%***		11.09		9.91

Source: SSDP draft Status Report 2017/18

*This KPI does not have annual targets and progress will be reported against the 2018/19 target of 14.1% and the 2020/21 target of 15.6%

**This KPI does not have 2017/18 targets and progress will be reported against the 2019/20 target of 53.5 (Math), 56 (Nepali), and 52.5 (Science) targets

+Agriculture and Science; 10,700, English; 12,645, and Music Education; 70

++This KPI does not have annual targets and progress will be reported against the 2018/19 target of 85%

++This KPI does not have annual targets and progress will be reported against the 2018/19 target of 92%

++This KPI does not have annual targets and progress will be reported against the 2018/19 target of 70%

***This KPI does not have annual targets and progress will be reviewed against the 2018/19 target of 15%

B. Progress Status on Key SSDP Objectives

8. The progress against the key SSDP objectives as outlined in the program results framework is in Annex 5. The progress against the SSDP outputs and outcome in each of the objectives is summarized below.

9. **Basic Education.** The program continues to make improvement in expanding equitable access to basic education as reflected in NERs of 92.3%. The gender parity in NER has been achieved at this level of education. Gross Enrolment Rate at ECED has reached 84.1%, and the percentage of grade one new entrants with ECED experience has increased to 66.3%. The enrolment of children from disadvantaged groups, including children with disability has also increased. Interventions such as free textbooks, scholarships and the provision of mid-day meals in targeted districts have contributed to enhancing equitable access to education. Further strengthening of targeted interventions is needed to bring the remaining out of school children into school education as per the country's constitutional commitment to free and compulsory basic education. In this regard, the Government's initiation for the development of a strategy to strengthen access, participation and learning of children with disabilities was appreciated.

10. With regards to efficiency, the completion rates for grade eight has increased to 70.7%. However, improvement in quality continues to remain a challenge largely due to delays in implementing interventions aimed at resolving teacher redeployment, improving classroom teaching-learning processes and student evaluation techniques. NASA for grade eight shows a net decrease in average scores in two out of three subjects when compared to the 2013 assessment. While the mean score of students in Nepali increased from 495 to 503, the scores of Science and Mathematics decreased to 498 and 492 from 501 and 507, respectively. The 2014 nationally representative early grade reading assessment (EGRA) demonstrated that 12.8% (14.1% girls, 11.1% boys) of grade three students are reading at MOEST benchmark of 45 cwpm with 80% comprehension. To date, no nationally representative EGRA has been completed to demonstrate progress on reading proficiency. With regards to efficiency, the completion rates for grade eight has increased to 70.7% from a baseline of 69.6 %.

11. **Secondary Education.** Progress was observed in enhancing equitable access to secondary education. NER at the secondary level has increased for both grades 9-10 and grades 9-12. The number of students enrolled in Science subjects in grade 11 in Community Schools has reached 48,029. The cohort survival rate to grade 10 has increased to 57.1% from baseline of 37.9%. Likewise, dropout rates have decreased, and retention and promotion rates have increased. However, as in basic education, improvements in the quality of education at secondary level also continues to remain slow and there is a need to strengthen teacher management and development including classroom teaching and learning processes. This is evidenced in low average Grade Point Average (GPA) in Secondary Education Examination (SEE, grade 10), grade 11 and 12 examinations. Around 60% of students secured scores of less than 40% in Mathematics and Science in SEE exams of last year. This highlights the need to accelerate the implementation of critical reforms in teacher management and development, and examinations planned by the SSDP.

12. **Literacy and Life Long Learning.** The financial progress under Literacy and Life Long Learning (LLLL) component is 84.5%. The major intervention for FY 2017/18 included grant support for operation of Community Learning Centers (CLCs), grants to bring out of school children into school, providing incentives to good performing CLCs and capacity development training of coordinators and mobilizers of CLCs. The initiative of MOEST to incentivize high performing CLCs in enhancing the quality of literacy programs was noted. Still, there is a need to further strengthen access to continuous education and literacy programs. The JRM noted the need to identify remaining illiterate people and devise appropriate strategies to make them literate.

13. **Teacher Professional Development and Management:** In Fiscal Year 2017/18, 4,500 teachers received TPD out of 258,011 total teachers⁷. The percentage of female teachers at Basic and Secondary Levels has increased to 41.2% and 18.7%, respectively, from the baseline of 38.8 % and 15 %. However, further efforts need to be in place to improve number of female teachers and also minority group teachers at the Secondary Level. It is expected that the new recruitment undertaken recently by the Teacher Service Commission may help to increase number of female teachers. The JRM discussed that the implementation of activities aimed at enhancing classroom teaching-learning processes and increasing teachers' time on task remains challenging. It also emphasized the strong need for coordination in delivering and rolling out activity- based kits for Mathematics, Science and English subjects as well as teacher training in the use of such kits to improve the teaching-learning processes in these subjects. The JRM also highlighted the need to provide continuous mentorship and support to teachers.

14. The JRM noted that the high-level committee formed to provide recommendation for rationalization and redeployment of teachers in the changed context has submitted its report to the Office of the Prime Minister. An implementation task force has been constituted under the leadership of Director General of CEHRD to implement the rationalization and redeployment of teachers to meet the shortage of teachers in schools. Budget has also been provisioned in ASIP/AWPB for FY 2018/19 to meet the shortfall of teachers. In particular, the provision of subject teachers for Mathematics, Science and English subjects in schools without permanent teacher positions needs to be prioritized. The JRM emphasized the need to resolve the long-pending issue of teacher deployment and redeployment. Further, the JRM agreed on the need to promulgate the Federal Education Act at the earliest opportunity to clarify the responsibility for recruitment, deployment and promotion of teachers at all levels of governments, and to provide a legal basis for the appointment of separate head teachers in selected schools. It was agreed that the issue related to teacher motivation through development of appropriate incentive mechanisms (financial and non-financial) needs to be taken forward as outlined in the SSDP.

⁷ Rahat, temporary and permanent teachers

15. **Governance and Management:** The key results indicators outlined in the program results framework under governance and management need further updating to align with the federal context. The JRM noted improvements made in the timely delivery of textbooks. The percentage of students receiving textbooks within first two weeks of academic year has increased to 91.3% from a baseline of 86.5%. There are no remaining trimesters IPRs/FMRs, unaudited financial reports(based on disbursement data) and audit report of FY 2016/17 that the GON need to submit to JFPs. But there are outstanding issues related to audit observation, which is separately discussed below (see section E). The fiduciary risk landscape has changed with the devolution of planning, budgeting, budget execution, accounting and internal control/audit to the Provinces and LGs. Given that the mechanism for verifying compliance, disbursement, reconciliation and refunds of the grants to LGs and schools is yet to be fully established in the federal set up, measures such as approval of Appropriation Act, mobilization of FCGO staffs to capture expenditure data at LGs, are being undertaken to receive reporting for FY 2017/2018 to meet the compliance of reporting related to SSDP. It is expected that the system will be operational by the end of the current fiscal year

16. **Disaster Risk Reduction and School Safety:** The Comprehensive School Safety Master Plan and implementation guidelines have been updated to reflect the changed context. Over 40 school blocks were retrofitted in FY2017/18. In addition to the SSDP regular construction program, the Central Level Project Implementation Unit (CLPIU) informed that it is currently committed to reconstruct 6,456 of the 7,509 schools that were affected by the 2015 earthquakes. Of these 6,456 schools, 4,089 have been fully constructed, 1,990 are under construction and 377 have been selected for reconstruction. In addition to the support for reconstructing and retrofitting schools, the CLPIU informed the JRM that it will also be undertaking a Structural Integrity Assessment of 28,000 schools in 63 districts. The Mission took note of the need to come up with a strategy to serve small and remote schools that are yet to receive support, and to ensure that all newly constructed schools comply with the MOEST environment and safety standards.

17. **Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting:** To ensure continued flash reporting from DEOs and LGs during the transition phase, a web-based portal was established to allow schools to directly upload their Education Management Information System (EMIS) data into the central database. Subsequently, the 2018/19 Flash I has been developed based on reporting of the data from more than 90% of all schools into this database⁸. Further Technical Assistance will be mobilized in 2019 to support the Government to develop this into a fully-fledged web-based EMIS system to be established at the LG and provincial levels and include infrastructure and financial data. Based on the current web-based EMIS platform, provincial and local governments can generate flash reports and profiles at provincial, LG and school levels. Moreover, the new federal institutional arrangements require clarity on reporting mechanisms at the provincial and LG levels and the role of the different institutions to ensure that SSDP activities including social, environment, procurement and financial management are effectively and efficiently monitored.

18. **Examination and Accreditation:** The implementation of single subject certification policy at the Secondary Level has increased efficiency of the system as more than 90 percent of students appearing in SEE can now pursue their education at grade 11. However, the majority of students have achieved GPA less than 3.2. The percentage of students receiving less than 3.2 GPA is around 62.64. SSDP also envisages reforms in the quality of examinations in grades eight and 10 by introducing standardized test items at these grades. Budget has already been allocated for FY 2018/19 to initiate standardized grade eight.

⁸ <https://www.iemis.doe.gov.np>

19. **Capacity and Institutional Development:** In line with the common TA framework for the SSDP, it is expected that the program support facility which is in-built into the program and the external technical assistances that are mobilized will undertake capacity assessment to align with the federal context and support capacity development in key program results areas.

C. Joint Field Visits

20. During the joint field visits, the team met with key stakeholders from provincial and local government and schools. The detailed field visit report is in Annex 5. Overall, commitment to education and awareness of SSDP was observed at both local and provincial levels, although further orientation and training was needed to enhance the capacity. Human resources – including the number and capacity of staff – varied across LGs. It was highlighted that as a result administrative tasks were prioritized over technical education support, and the number of Resource Persons was insufficient for the number of schools they needed to serve. Additionally, it was noted that communication and guidelines from the federal level to the local governments could be strengthened regarding reporting requirements and legislation, for example, relating to the Appropriation Act.

21. In terms of challenges at the school level, teacher management and redeployment were identified as the critical issues, calling for urgency in resolving these issues through timely enactment of the Federal Education Act. Local government and schools lacked an understanding of intellectual, physical and multiple disabilities whilst teachers lacked strategies to support learning for children with disabilities. . Additionally, the increasing trend towards using English as medium of instruction in community schools (including from the early grades) to compete with institutional schools for student enrolment indicates a need for a comprehensive strategy to ensure that children can continue to receive quality instruction in a language they can understand. Several initiatives concerning the enrolment of out of school children were appreciated. Whilst the political drive to enroll children in school is good, there is a need to give continuity to this effort considering demographic change, migration of families, low attendance and dropouts. Classroom observations revealed some progress in early grade reading, however, many grades 1-3 students struggled to demonstrate reading proficiency.

D. Progress on the Achievement and Status of Global Covenants and Disbursement Linked Indicator (DLIs)

22. The progress against the global covenants and the DLIs is in **Annex 6**. The global covenants that are due for the JRM have been met. A detailed discussion on the DLIs and results also took place in the joint Thematic Working Groups (TWGs).

23. **Progress on Year 1 DLIs.** The JRM noted that there are no pending DLIs for year 1 and all JFPs have disbursed accordingly.

24. **Progress of Year 2 DLIs.** The JRM noted the submission of DLI Achievement Report (Part One) - Year 2 DLIs on 10 October 2018 for five out of 10 DLIs. The SSDP Program Steering Committee meeting was held on 2 November 2018, which endorsed the Year Two DLI achievement report. Independent Verification Agent (IVA) - the Research Center for Education Innovation and Development (CERID) has been mobilized for the verification of DLIs. The contract of the IVA is for the FY 2018-2019. Given the urgency in completing verification by the IVA it was agreed that the action plan on how they will accomplish the task in a fast track manner will be shared with JFPs by 30 November 2018. The JRM discussed in detail the following areas covered in the DLIs:

1. DLI 1 – Reading proficiencies and habits strengthened in early grades:

25. **Year 2: DLI 1.2 a:** MOEST has achieved the DLI Year Two target. Community Based Early Grade Reading Assessment (CB-EGRA) was carried out in 3,046 community schools, among 72,538 students in 12 districts in grade 2 and 3 in FY 2017-2018. The results of these assessments were shared with parents in a group meeting. Assessments were undertaken as prescribed by the approved CB-EGRA guidelines in presence of teachers and parents' representative.

26. **Year 3: DLI 1.3a:** The minimum package and official reading benchmarks have been approved by MOEST. The approved minimum package includes (i) providing teaching materials, (ii) teacher training and classroom support, (iii) community mobilization, (iv) student assessment, and (v) monitoring and evaluation standards. Orientations on NEGRP and the minimum package have been conducted for provincial and local government officials in all 20 districts. Budget has been provisioned in ASIP/AWPB for FY 2018/19 for rolling out the early grade reading minimum package in 20⁹ fully covered districts reaching all community schools. EGR TWG will discuss on budget provisioned for each component. The funds have been transferred to LGs to be disbursed to schools for the purpose of procuring reading packages. Schools will be responsible for purchase teaching and learning materials as well as all components of the minimum package. A reporting mechanism will be developed for getting information related to the implementation on minimum packages.

2. DLI 2 – Increased teaching-learning processes through the National Curriculum Framework (NCF) revision and access to activity-based Mathematics, Science and English language materials:

27. **Year 2: DLI 2.1a NCF:** MOEST has achieved the DLI Year Two target. The NCF has been approved by the Curriculum and Evaluation Council. The NCF has all aspects of curriculum and textbook revision, teacher preparation, reduction in number of compulsory subjects and implementation arrangement. The integrated curriculum for grades 1-3 will be finalized in coordination with EGR TWG.

28. **Year 2: DLI 2.1b Activity Based Kits:** The Curriculum Development Center (CDC) finalized and approved the package for activity-based kits. The tool kit for each subject comprises of three types of materials: i) list of hands-on materials (for Mathematics and Science) ii) printed materials (workbook, activity books, guides) and iii) e-learning (digital activities, videos, and audio) materials. Regional and international good practices were incorporated in the development of the activity-based kits for these subjects. The achievement report for this indicator was verified by JFPs and found to be satisfactory.

29. **Year 3: DLI 2.2 Activity Based Kits:** The CEHRD has disbursed budget to LGs so that they can release the amount to schools for procuring activity-based kits to be used by students from grades 6 -8. The teachers and students will be able to use activity-based kits from the beginning of academic session in April 2019. Standard templates will be used to get information on the use of activity-based kits by students and teachers across LGs. The JRM emphasized the need to link the distribution of activity- based kits with the schools that have received ICT grants where possible. To date approximately 5,000 schools have received such grants since the start of the SSDP. It was agreed to provide the list of schools by 15 January 2019 so that effective roll out of activity-based kits is made before the next academic session. A mechanism is being developed to configure e-learning materials in the school servers. The collection of e-learning materials can be installed in the digital library servers available in schools. Similarly, the JRM underscored the need to link activity-based kits to the teacher training activity as part of the teacher professional development program of subject teachers outlined in DLI 3 below.

⁹ The roll out of program in 16 districts is supported by USAID

3. DLI 3 - Improved Teacher Management, availability and accountability, including improved deployment trained subject teachers for Mathematics, science and English in basic and secondary schools:

30. **Year 2: DLI 3.2 TST:** The guidelines for Time-Spent-Teaching (TST) have been developed and finalized. Budget was released to 15% of Community Schools for the implementation of TST in FY 2017/18. The implementation of TST in schools is one of the performance grant indicators. Management training was provided to school for implementation of TST. CEHRD is in the process of compiling the implementation status report. The JRM agreed that the MOEST will share the achievement report by **28 February 2019**.

31. **Year 3: DLI 3.3a Subject Teachers:** MOEST shared that it is reviewing the status of schools that were selected for teacher redeployment and rationalization plan last year and committed to share the revised list of selected schools by the **28 February 2019** for the purpose of deploying trained subject teachers to teach Mathematics, Science and English in Basic and Secondary level schools. Standard templates will be used to collect information on schools that have all three subject teachers.

32. **Year 3: DLI 3.3b Subject wise teachers training:** Teacher professional development curriculum has been revised to align with the new curriculum for Mathematics, Science and English teachers, including use of activity-based kits, and the training has been initiated accordingly. The revised TPD package will be shared to JFPs by 15 December 2018. A total of 4,500 teachers have received 15 days of subject based training, and the list of their schools will be shared. The training for remaining 15 days including training on recently revised NCF will be conducted for the same teachers by April 2019.

33. **Year 3: DLI 3.3c Teachers redeployment:** The high level committee formed to recommend the GON for the rationalization and redeployment of teachers has submitted its report to the Office of the Prime Minister and Council of Ministers. An implementation task force has been constituted under the leadership of the Director General of CEHRD to prepare implementation of the recommendations made by the committee to meet the shortage of teachers in deficit schools. The revised teacher rationalization and redeployment plan including implementation action plan will be shared to JFPs by **28 February 2019**. The Government reiterated its commitment to redeploy and rationalize teachers according to the revised plan by the end of the academic year 2018/19.

4. DLI 4 – Assessment and examination system reforms undertaken to improve teaching and learning;

34. **Year 2: DLI 4.2a Single Subject Certification:** The MOEST has achieved the DLI Year Two target relating to the approval of the single subject certification policy for grades 11 and 12.

35. **Year 2: DLI 4.2b: NASA:** The MOEST has achieved the DLI Year Two target. Analysis of results of nationally representative and competency-based NASA for grade eight has been completed. The Action Plan for implementation of recommendations provided by NASA report has also been prepared and budgetary provision has been made in FY 2018/19 ASIP/AWPB to implement the activities outlined in the action plan. It has been agreed that the IVA will fast track this DLI achievement and submit the verification report by 5th December

36. **Year 3: DLI 4.3a Single Subject Certification implementation:** Single subject certification has been implemented for grades 11 and 12 by National Examination Board

(NEB) in line with the decision made by MOEST. The total number of students certified under single subject certification process for grades 11 and 12 is 347,748 and 299,675 respectively for Academic Year 2017/18. The JRM noted that this DLI has been achieved and recommended the MOEST to share the achievement report.

37. **Year 3: DLI 4.3b Standardization of Grade Eight Examination:** In the federal set up, LGs are responsible for conducting grade eight examinations. The indicator therefore will be further discussed during SSDP MTR.

5. DLI-5 Model Schools piloted with comprehensive quality inputs and innovative teaching and learning:

38. **Year 2: DLI 5.2 and Year 3: DLI 5.3a Implementation of Master Plans:** The appraisal process of master plans has been completed for 222 schools and feedback from the CEHRD has been provided to all schools. CEHRD is currently conducting workshops of model schools in clusters across the country to finalize their master plans. Given the DLI is yet to be achieved for year 2, it has been agreed that the government will submit the revised master plans as per the verification protocol by **15 January 2019**.

39. **Year 3: DLI 5.3b:** Once the master plans are finalized and approved, the implementation of the approved master plans needs to be expedited to meet the Year Three DLI target.

6. DLI 6: Reduction in disparities in access, participation and learning outcomes

40. **Year 2: DLI 6.2a Targeted Interventions:** The FY 2017/18 ASIP/AWPB includes provision for targeted interventions at municipality level within the 10 most disadvantaged districts that have been identified based on their Equity Index ranking. The activities included induction on needs-base planning at local level, provision of scholarships, mid-day meal and several rounds of enrollment campaigns, among others. The MOEST will share the achievement report with JFPs by 5 December 2018.

41. **Year 2: DLI 6.2b Reduction of OOSC:** Household census was conducted to collect detailed information on out of school children in all five additional districts (Dolpa, Rolpa, Doti, Humla and Siraha). The achievement report including relevant datasets will be shared by 5 December 2018. It has been agreed that the IVA will accelerate the verification of this DLI achievement and submit the verification report by 30 January 2019.

42. **Year 3: DLI 6.3 Reduction of OOSC:** The MOEST has selected five additional districts based on the Equity Index. Additional budget has been allocated to 15 districts (previous 10 and the five new districts¹⁰). There is a need to adapt the Equity Strategy Implementation Plans (ESIPs) to the LG and provincial planning cycle and process, and to further strengthen the planning and analysis process. Furthermore, the additional allocation formula should be assessed to ensure it enables the schools to retain the enrolled OOSC. The baseline data of OOSC in the additional five districts will be collected by 28 February 2019.

7. DLI 7: Increased access and participation in secondary education

43. **Year 2: DLI 7.2 Pro-Poor Targeted Scholarship (PPTS):** Students from grade 9 and 11 from the identified poorest 25 districts have been selected for the purpose of

¹⁰ Bajhang, Accham, Dhanusha, Jajarkot and Banke

scholarship distribution¹¹. CEHRD is in the process of completing verification of students for both grades 9 and 11. For the verification, 10% of students from grade 11 were randomly selected from the preliminary list of eligible students. The scholarship amount has been disbursed into individual accounts of students except for those whose verification has not been completed. The CEHRD will submit the achievement report by 15 January 2019. The verification report for this DLI needs to be submitted by 28 February 2019. There is also a need to revisit the pro-poor scholarship guidelines to reflect updated reporting arrangements and roles of various levels of government in the federal context.

44. **Year 3: DLI 7.3 Pro-Poor Targeted Scholarship (PPTS):** An arrangement has been made with Student Finance Assistance Fund Development Board (SFAFDB) for the selection of students for FY 2018/19. For selection, students from grade 8, grade 10 and grade 11 have been asked to complete the Proxy Means Testing (PMT) forms. The students selected from grade 11 will receive scholarship in the current Academic Year. The students selected from grade 8 and grade 10 will receive scholarship in the next Academic Year. It is necessary to expedite the entire selection and verification process so that students can receive scholarship amount on time.

8. DLI 8 - Provision of adequate Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) resilient safe school facilities at all levels:

45. **Year 2: DLI 8.2 School Blocks Retrofitted:** The MOEST has achieved the DLI Year Two target. 40 school blocks have been retrofitted in 10 non-earthquake affected districts¹². The verification report by the IVA should be submitted before the end of February 2019.

46. **Year 3: DLI 8.3a School Blocks Retrofitted:** The MOEST is on track to complete the retrofitting of 120 schools in non-earthquake affected districts for FY 2018/19. However, there is a need to strengthen technical supervision and quality assurance.

47. **Year 3: DLI 8.3b Thematic Study:** DRR and school safety will be included as a priority area of research for informing the SSDP MTR in accordance with the verification protocol.

9. DLI 9 - Improved governance and strengthened fiduciary management.

48. **Year 2: DLI 9.1e and DLI 9.2b Procurement and Financial Management Training:** The MOEST has achieved the DLI Year Two target. More than 1,000 secondary level schools from 66 districts have received the training on financial management and procurement according to manuals. The IVA report for the 500 schools that received training on financial management needs to be submitted by 31 December 2018 to make sure the claim against the DLI achievement can be made by 31 January 2019 to ensure reimbursement within the grace period. The achievement report on conduction of procurement training for 1000 schools was verified and endorsed by JFPs.

49. **Year 2: DLI 9.2a Grant Management System (GMS):** In each DEO, GMS was established with a grant management unit headed by Deputy DEO or senior officer

¹¹ The poorest 25 districts were selected as defined by CBS in Small Area Estimates of Poverty, 2011. These are same districts where Ministry of Land Management, Cooperatives and Poverty Alleviation conducted census to identify poor households

¹² The districts where school blocks were retrofitted are Udayapur, Rautahat, Mugu, Achham, Bajura, Lamjung, Tanahun, Dhanusha, Panchthar and Doti.

responsible for GMS. The other staff of the unit included finance, procurement, technical (engineer) officers. The unit ensured compliance of eligibility criteria and utilization of funds. However, the federation of the country has resulted in the change in implementation arrangement from DEOs to local governments. Thus, there is a need to ensure the continuity of the GMS mechanism in the local government. It was agreed that MOEST will provide justification letter to JFPs by 15 December 2018 stating the need for restructuring the DLI. The justification would include the progress report about the established GMS at DEOs in year 2 and the continuity of the GMS at LGs in the change federal context.

50. **Year 2: DLI 9.2d Performance based grants to schools:** A total of 10 areas were identified for the purpose of disbursing performance grant to schools. These areas included time spent teaching, learning achievement of student, internal efficiency of school education among others. The CEHRD is compiling substantiating documents from districts based on which the achievement report will be shared with JFPs by 15 January 2019.

51. **Year 2: DLI 9.2e Program Support Facility (PSF):** The MOEST has achieved the DLI Year Two target. The total amount allocated in ASIP/AWPB of FY 2017/18 for strengthening of PSF is NRs 309,211,000 which is equivalent to US \$3 million. According to the draft Status Report for FY 2017/18, the total expenditure under capacity strengthening is US \$2.5 million which is 84.51% of the allocated amount.

52. **Year 3: DLI 9.3c PSF:** Budgetary provision has been made in ASIP/AWPB for FY 2018/19 for strengthening of PSF. The total amount allocated is NRs 731, 523,000 which is equivalent to US\$ 7 million.

53. **Year 3: DLI 9.3a and DLI 9.3b CGAS and e-GP Implemented:** There is a need to restructure results related to implementation of Computerized Government Accounting System and e-government procurement system of public procurement monitoring office due to the federal context as DEOs have been dissolved and LGs are now responsible for school education.

10. DLI-10- Enhanced reliability and transparency of EMIS data, including school level data:

54. **Year 3: DLI 10.3a Web-based EMIS:** CEHRD has migrated the information collected from schools into the web-based portal. Web-based EMIS induction and training were conducted for all relevant users. The IVA(CERID) will conduct independent verification of data self-reported by schools. The survey for verification of EMIS data need to be fielded by 15 February 2019

55. The table below presents expected disbursement for SSDP Year Two DLIs for which achievement report submitted on 10 October 2018. The total expected disbursement is US \$ 43 million.

Table 2: Expected Disbursement for Year 2 by DLIs for FY 2017/2018

DLI Number	DLI Name	Expected Disbursement
DLI 1.2	Classroom based Early Grade Reading Assessment (CB-EGRA) carried out in 3,000 community schools	US \$ 3 million from GPE and Euro 2 million from EU
DLI 2.1 a	Revised NCF approved	US \$ 8 million from World Bank
DLI 2.1 b	A package of activity based for Mathematics Science and English language developed for	US \$ 6 million from ADB

DLI Number	DLI Name	Expected Disbursement
	grades 6-8	
DLI 4.2 a	Single subject certification policy approved for higher secondary school exams	US \$ 3 million from GPE
DLI 4. 2b	Analysis of results for nationally representative and competency-based NASA grade 8	US \$ 6 million from World Bank and Euro 1 million from Finland
DLI 8.2	40 school blocks retrofitted in non-earthquake affected districts	Euro 2.78 million from EU
DLI 9.1	500 schools receive school-based FM capacity strengthening support	US \$ 2 million from REACH
DLI 9.2 b	Training imparted to 1,000 secondary schools in procurement procedures	US \$ 2million from ADB
DLI 9.2 e	Satisfactory completion of Capacity strengthening AWPB on key Program support facility (PSF) Activities	US \$ 6 million from World Bank

56. The expected disbursement under a program-based approach is presented in Table 3 below. The expected disbursement is based on assessment of performance of SSDP.

Table 3: Expected disbursement under program-based approach for FY 2018/2019

Joint Financing Partners	SSDP Year 2 Target	Expected Disbursement
European Union	€8.03 million ¹³ (US\$9.15million)	€2.42 million as fixed tranche and maximum €5.61 million as DLI
Finland	€3 million (US\$ 3.42 million)	
GPE	US\$ xx million	
JICA	¥ 300 million (US\$ 2.72 million)	US\$ 2.72 million
Norway	NOK 65 million (US\$ 8.3 million)	NOK 65 million (US\$ 8.3 million)
UNICEF	US\$ 0.5 million	US\$ 0.5 million
USAID *	US\$ 0.5 million	US\$ 0.5 million

*conditional on signing agreement

57. Table 4 below presents the commitment from JFPs for FY 2019/20 based on results achieved for SSDP Year Three DLIs and satisfactory performance of SSDP

Table 4: Tentative Commitment from JFPs for FY 2019/20

Joint Financing Partners	Type	SSDP Year 3 commitment
ADB	DLI	\$31 million
European Union	Fixed/DLI	€9.72 million (US\$ 11.08 million)
Finland	Fixed/DLI	€5 million (US\$ 5.7 million)
GPE		US\$ 5.3 million
JICA	Fixed	¥ xx million*

¹³ Exchange rate as of 30 November 2018

Joint Financing Partners	Type	SSDP Year 3 commitment
Norway	Fixed	NOK 64 million (US\$ 7.5 million)
UNICEF	Fixed	US\$ 0.5 million
World Bank	DLI	US \$ 33 million
USAID**	DLI	US \$2 million

* FY 2019/20 commitment is subject to the agreement to be signed.

**conditional on signing agreement

E. Progress against Program Action Plan, Safeguards, and Fiduciary Management

58. **Program Action Plan (PAP):** The JRM was informed on the progress made in the implementation of PAP. Some examples of progress include NASA activities conducted by the Education Review Office in accordance with SSDP program plan. Most of the activities have been initiated and some need restructuring to incorporate federal context. In general there is a need to expedite the process to complete agreed actions. The update on PAP is presented in Annex 7.

59. **Social and Environment Safeguards:** The JRM noted that environmental and social safeguard actions of SSDP: a) revising existing EMF and SMF in line with new federal Structure and disclosure in CEHRD website, b) translation of the executive summary in Nepali and screening checklists, and c) development of activities to be undertaken to strengthen social and environmental safeguards have been delayed. This is primarily due to restructuring of human resources at CEHRD. The draft Status Report (2017/18) showed that a lumpsum budget has been allocated for capacity development (EMF, SMF, procurement and PFM) at the school level. However, clarity on the training itself is not reported. It is also noted that Grievance Redressal Mechanism (GRM) mechanism such as the responsible unit/personnel and how grievances are managed and documented is missing in the status report. A dedicated focal person for Environment and Social safeguard was nominated in CEHRD by DDG. Going forward, safeguard activities will be supported through the TA specialists hired under ADB- EU financing.

60. **Fiduciary Management:** The JRM was informed about the status of SSDP funding till 2017/18, status of progress in implementing Fiduciary Management Action Plan (FMAP), status of unaudited Financial Report for FY 2017/18 and ineligible expenditures for 2015/16 and 2016/17. The detailed discussion on issues related to the Fiduciary Management is summarized below.

61. **Financial Reporting in the changed context.** One of the major issues is the establishment of financial reporting mechanism so that the expenditures made by LGs under SSDP can be captured in federal reporting system. The JRM noted that the MOF including FCGO and OAG are taking necessary measures to resolve issues related to reporting of expenditures for FY 2017/2018 by LGs and are in the process of linking LGs and PGs in federal reporting system by end of the current fiscal year.

62. **Ineligible Expenditures** The ineligible expenditures of the previous program— School Sector Reform Plan needs to be resolved. There has been only partial settlement of works completion reports for FY 2012/13 to FY2015/16, which is also hindering the financial closure of the SSRP. The unsettled outstanding amount is approximately NPR 6 Billion out of which some amount is in the process of being settled given the audit of the SSDP is currently ongoing from the OAG. This issue was also discussed with the Joint Secretary of MOF (see paragraphs 65 and 66). The JRM agreed to hold a follow up meeting with FCGO, CEHRD and World Bank.

63. **Fiduciary Management Action Plan (FMAP):** Status of 33 key activities in the FMAP was presented in the JRM, where 19 activities seem to have been completed and rest are either in process of implementation or not started yet. It was also informed that there are certain activities that are not relevant and although some of the activities listed were completed by now, they may need continuation in the changed context of federal system. It has been discussed and agreed that the FMAP needs complete revision with concrete actions to strengthen internal controls at all levels, streamline reporting mechanism and capacity development. There is a need to revise FMAP in the changed context. FMAP will be revised after the mid-term review of SSDP. It was also realized that there are vital cross cutting issues where MOEST may not have sole responsibilities or control, and there is a need to work closely with the MOF, FCGO and OAG in strengthening fiduciary management in education sector.

64. **Status on agreed actions from BRM 2018:** The program shows progress in implementing agreed actions from BRM 2018. The status of agreed actions from BRM 2018 is attached as **Annex 8**. Some of the actions that are ongoing and not complied with have been carried forward as revised actions for this JRM.

F. Others

65. **Progress update on milestones of Transitional Plan:** The Government presented the progress update on milestones of the transitional road map. The organizational restructuring has been finalized, units have been established and subsequent (re)deployment of staff is in process, with 70% of the staff currently been redeployed. It was agreed that the CEHRD will appoint dedicated focal person for each DLIs by 10 December 2018. As for the enabling policy framework, the Right to Education Act has been approved and the Federal Education Bill is expected to be tabled in the upcoming parliament session. The JRM appreciated the progress reported in providing orientation to PGs and LGs on SSDP.

66. **Mid-Term Review** In terms of the alignment of bilateral agreements of the JFPs for the SSDP, the Government informed the JRM that this should be completed within the current fiscal year (by June 2019). To facilitate this process, a joint team of Government and JFPs (ADB, World Bank, UNICEF, USAID and Finland) has been formed and will develop a detailed timeline and the TOR for the mid-term review will be done by **31 January 2019**. The firm that will undertake the joint mid-term review, which is financed under ADB-EU TA will be mobilized by 15 January 2019. Furthermore, the Local Education Group (LEG) was informed that the Government is applying for Education Sector Program Development Grant (ESPDG) from the GPE for supporting the analysis and restructuring process. UNICEF has been requested to serve as the ESPDG Grant Agent.

67. **Technical Assistance (TA):** The joint TA framework was approved by SSDP Steering Committee. The updated TA matrix is presented in **Annex 9**. The TA framework has been prepared to ensure that all TA activities are coordinated to minimize duplication and enhance efficiency of resources.

68. **Meeting with the Minister of Education, Science and Technology:** The JFP Heads of Mission met with the Minister of Education, Science and Technology to reflect on the proceedings and the priorities and challenges in moving ahead. The main issues that were highlighted were the timely enactment of the Federal Education Act, designated human resources at all levels, return of ineligible expenditure and the Mid Term Review of the SSDP to align with the new Federal Structure. DPs also raised concerns over the low access and participation for children with disabilities, and ad-hoc practice of using English as medium of instruction in contradiction to policy of instructions in mother tongue.

69. The Honorable Minister appreciated the commitment of the DPs in supporting the Government to successfully implement the SSDP, especially given the current transition to federalism. He further updated that to ensure a smooth transition, the approval of the Federal Education Act is expected to be completed by the beginning of 2019. He highlighted the formation of a dedicated team under the leadership of the Deputy Director General of the CEHRD to assess the status of the DLIs and their requirements to remain compliant with the new structure. He assured the Heads of agencies that if there were gaps then a discussion would be held to address this with his team. He emphasized that MOEST is liaising at all levels to have dedicated teams for ensuring the implementation of the SSDP and to safeguard key result areas, including DLIs. Regarding the return of ineligible expenditure, the Minister committed to address this issue with his team.

70. **Meeting with MOF:** The JFP partners met with the Joint Secretary of Ministry of Finance to reflect on the proceedings and the priorities and challenges in moving ahead. The main issues that were highlighted by the JFPs were (i) refund of ineligible expenditures from previous program SSRP, (ii) timely tabling of federal school education act (ii) clarity on reporting mechanism (iii) provision of staffs at all levels including provision of capacity development (iii) delay in achieving SSDP Year Two Results and verification by IVA. The JFPs also highlighted the vital role played by the CSOs. The joining of USAID as a JFP was also highlighted in the meeting.

71. The Joint Secretary emphasized the preferred modality of the government is a Sector Wide Approach and appreciated the new instrument to link resources with results e.g. DLIs. He urged the MOEST to correct the gaps related to achievement of results under DLIs. He reassured the JFP partners that teams are working on the automation system and have approved the template for the reporting of the expenditure and it will be possible to obtain most of the information that is needed from the Local Level. He assured the JFP partners that it might not be an issue from next fiscal year as the systems will be in place. Regarding the ineligible expenditure the Joint Secretary has advised the MOEST to expedite the process and assured of resources that is needed to obtain the work completion certificate and clear the ineligible expenditure of the SSRP by the end of February 2019. The joint Secretary also informed that the Government would respond to WB letter sent to the Government on behalf of the JFPs on ineligible expenses (dated October 31, 2018)

72. **Civil Society Organizations' engagement in the SWAp:** The JRM was informed by presentations from the CSO networks that are part of the LEG. The National Campaign for Education in Nepal (NCE-N) shared the outcomes of the recently held global GCE summit in Kathmandu, during which they were confirmed as GCEE board member. In addition, it also presented the analysis of the 2017/18 education budget from a CSO perspective, highlighting the need to increase domestic financing and efficiency to utilize the resources available. It also highlighted its contributions within the LEG towards the SDG 4 goal and the SSDP in terms of supporting the Government in the consultation and advocacy processes in preparing the Bill for Free and Compulsory Education and the high-level Education Commission report. The Association of INGOs in Nepal (AIN) shared that INGOs Education Working Group members are engaging with 451 Local Governments and reaching 4,168 schools. Some of the opportunities observed by AIN included the welcoming environment at Local Government level, and its willingness for inclusive planning and resource allocation, as well as the support of AIN to the MOEST in the dissemination of SSDP priorities and joint planning process at the local level.

G. Key Issues

73. The following key issues were identified:

- **SSDP Year Two DLIs.** The delayed achievement and verification of year 2 DLIs is hampering the planned disbursement for JFPs. The meeting suggested the MOEST to give serious consideration to complete the work of DLIs that have not been achieved and accelerate the verification process through recently hired IVA for those DLIs that have been achieved.
- **Federal School Education Act:** The meeting suggested timely tabling of federal school education act for providing the necessary legal backing for SSDP implementation. As school education is the responsibility of all three tiers of government, absence of clear demarcation of roles and responsibilities between these governments could result in risk of different interpretation of their authority. The clear demarcation of roles and responsibilities will be possible through timely enactment of the new Federal School Education Act and with the issuance of by-laws and regulations to help all Local Governments in delivering their constitutionally mandated functions.
- **SSDP Program Management.** The federation of country into seven provinces and 753 local governments has changed the delivery mechanism of SSDP. The transitional plan finalized recently has paved the way for credible program implementation arrangements for SSDP, including restructuring of existing system/institutions and establishment of new ones. However, there is a need to form a dedicated team of joint secretaries, under-secretaries and section officers to oversee and account for SSDP implementation and its interventions at all levels of government. Additional efforts need to be made to ensure adequate human resources in place to implement SSDP at local governments.
- **Ineligible expenditures and the refund:** There are pending issues related to ineligible expenditures of past program—School Sector Reform Plan. There has been only partial settlement of works completion reports for FYs 2012/13 to 2015/16, which is also not allowing the closure of the SSRP. The unsettled outstanding amount is approximately NPR 6 Billion. The slow settlement of audit observations continues to be a problem for SSDP as well. Hence, a greater focus should be given to establish a continual process of periodic follow-up audit agreement between the Government and OAG, build capacity of staffs and strengthen internal control and compliance mechanisms.

H. Conclusion and follow up actions

74. Based on the sessions and deliberations, the JRM has agreed on the following actions, the progress in which will be closely monitored by the SSDP TWGs and the LEDPG focal point.

S.N.	Action	Completed by	Responsibility	Reference Paragraph
1	Submission of revised Status Report and Consolidated Report including Flash Reports	16 December 2018	CEHRD	6
2	Review and shared comments on revised Status Report and Consolidated Report including Flash Reports	21 December 2018	LEDPG	6
3.	Finalize Status Report and Consolidated Report including Flash Reports	31 December 2018	CEHRD	6
4	Share action plan for verification of DLIs that have been achieved by IVA	30 November 2018	MOEST	24
5	Appointment of dedicated focal persons for each DLIs at CEHRD	10 December 2018	CEHRD/MOEST	64
6	Draft Joint Mid-term Review Terms of Reference	31 January 2019	JFPs/MOEST	65

S.N.	Action		Completed by	Responsibility	Reference Paragraph
7	Submit progress report on reconciliation of ineligible expenditures related to school construction of the SSRP.		28 February 2019	MOEST/MOF	69
8	Revise and translate EMF and SMF into Nepali		28 February 2019		
9	DLI 1	Provide clarity on sufficient funding and preparations to roll-out the NEGRP minimum package in 4 districts (Rasuwa, Tanahu, Taplejung, and Dhanusa)	31 January 2019	CEHRD	
10		Develop a strategy to collect nationally representative EGR data.	31 March 2019	CEHRD	
11	DLI 2	Provide the list of schools that have received ICT grant	15 January 2019	CEHRD	29
12	DLI 3	Submit achievement report on the implementation of TST for year 2	28 February 2019	CEHRD	30
13		Submit the updated teacher rationalization and redeployment plan	28 February 2019	CEHRD	33
14		Submit the revised list of schools for deploying trained subject teachers for Mathematics, Science and English in Basic and Secondary level schools.	28 February 2019	CEHRD	31
15		Share the revised TPD packages to JFPs	15 December 2018	CEHRD	32
16	DLI 5	Submit revised master plans of model schools	15 January 2019	CEHRD	32
17	DLI 6	Submit Year 2 achievement and verification reports for DLIs 6.2a and 6.2b	5 December 2018 30 January 2018	CEHRD CEHRD	40 and 41 41
19		Complete collection of baseline data of OOSC in additional five districts for year 3	28 February 2019	CEHRD	42
20	DLI 7	Submit achievement report and verification report for PPTS for year 2 DLI	15 January 2019 28 February 2019	CEHRD CEHRD	43 43
21	DLI 8	Submit IVA report for retrofitting of school block in non-earthquake affected districts	28 February 2019	CEHRD	45
22	DLI 9	Submit IVA report on PFM training to schools	28 December 2018	CEHRD	48

S.N.	Action		Completed by	Responsibility	Reference Paragraph
23		Share letter with JFPs stating the need for restructuring DLI related to GMS	15 December 2018	MOEST	49
24		Submit achievement report on performance-based grants for year 2	15 January 2019	CEHRD	50
25	DLI 10	Field survey for independent verification of EMIS data	15 February 2019	CEHRD/CERID	54

Annexes:**Core**

- Annex 1: 2018 JRM ToR**
- Annex 2: List of participants during the 2018 JRM**
- Annex 3: Consolidated comments from LEDPG**
- Annex 4: Status of Program Results Framework**
- Annex 5: Field visit report**
- Annex 6: Progress update on DLI Matrix**
- Annex 7: Status on Program Action Plan**
- Annex 8: Status on BRM Agreed Actions**
- Annex 9: Updated TA Matrix**

Supplementary

- Presentations Day 1**
- Presentations Day 2**
- Presentations Day 3**

Annex 1: 2018 JRM ToR

Terms of Reference Joint Review Meeting School Sector Development Plan 25 – 29 November 2018, Kathmandu, Nepal

I. Introduction

1. The School Sector Development Plan (SSDP; FY2016/17–FY2022/23) is a long-term strategic plan of the Government of Nepal (approved in 2016) aiming to increase participation of all children to a quality school education by focusing on strategic interventions and new reform initiatives to improve the equitable access, quality, efficiency, governance, management and resilience of the education system. The Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST) is the executing agency and the Centre for Education and Human Resource Development (CEHRD) is the implementing agency of the SSDP under the Sector Wide Approach (SWAp).

2. The SWAp is supported by eight Joint Financing Partners (JFPs), which have committed their funding support through a Joint Financing Arrangement (JFA). In addition to this, the SWAp is supported through other Development Partners, including I/NGOs, that are members of the Local Education Development Partner Group (LEDPG). As outlined in the JFA, the MOEST annually conducts two review meetings; one Budget Review Meeting (BRM) and one Joint Review Meeting (JRM). As such, the MOEST is organizing the third JRM from 25-29 November 2018 to review progress in implementation of SSDP, in particular regarding the objectives stated below. The MOEST and the JFPs will jointly be conducting the JRM. As customary and in the interest of upholding good practices of effective coordination, key agencies supporting SSDP outside the JFA framework will also participate in the review process and in the general sessions relating to overall progress review and discussion on key sector issues.

II. Objectives

3. The objectives of the 2018 JRM are as follows:

- (i) Assess Year Two (FY 2017/18) SSDP physical and financial progress including the results framework;
- (ii) Assess and confirm the achievement of Year Two (FY 17/18) DLIs for which evidence has been submitted;
- (iii) Agree on timeline and actions to be taken to complete the documentation to fulfil the Disbursement Linked Indicators (DLIs) requirements for the remaining Year Two (FY 17/18) DLIs;
- (iv) Review progress and agree on actions against Year Three (FY 2018/19) DLIs;
- (v) Review progress against financial, social and environment safeguards of SSDP including financial monitoring reports and unaudited reports of FY2017/18 and assess progress made in reconciling audit observations of FY2015/2016 (last year of SSRP) and FY2017/2018;
- (vi) Prepare a timeline and required tasks ahead of the mid-term review of SSDP including restructuring of bilateral support to SSDP;
- (vii) Review implementation of actions outlined in the Transitional Roadmap; including progress on accountability mechanisms at each level.
- (viii)

III. Representation

4. MOEST will invite the following:

- (i) National Planning Commission, Ministry of Finance (MoF), Financial Comptroller General's Office, Office of the Auditor General, Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration and Ministry of Women, Children and Senior Citizen;
- (ii) Representatives from Central Level Agencies of MOEST
- (iii) Representatives from provincial ministries and local governments that oversee education;
- (iv) Representatives from Association of Local Governments
- (v) Members of the Local Education Group;
- (vi) Representatives from National Natural Resources and Fiscal Commission , the National Language Commission, the National Dalit Commission, National Women Commission, National Federation of Indigenous Nationalities, and Federation of People with Disabilities;
- (vii) Representatives from Confederation of Nepali Teachers, School Management Committees, Nepal National Guardian Association, and Community School National Network;
- (viii) Representatives from academic and research institutions, such as the Kathmandu University and the Research Centre for Education Innovation and Development;
- (ix) Representatives of the Central Level Program Implementation Unit (CLPIU)

IV. Documents to be presented and discussed as outlined in JFA

- (i) SSDP Status Report (FY 2017/18) and Consolidated Report and Flash II Report Academic Year 2017/18;
- (ii) Social and environment safeguard progress reports for FY 2017/18;
- (iii) Year Two DLI achievement and verification report for FY 2017/18 DLIs;
- (iv) Unaudited financial report of FY2017/18.

5. The following documents will be shared for information

- (i) Progress on program action plan
- (ii) Progress on 2018/2019 program and budget implementation including status of year Three DLIs and Flash Report I (AY 2018/19)
- (iii) An updated SSDP transition roadmap, including an update on the overall SSDP implementation arrangement in line with restructuring.
- (iv) Minutes of TWG meetings
- (v) Reports of the joint JRM field trips.

V. Outputs of the JRM

6. The outcomes of the meetings will be recorded in an Aide Memoire which will be drafted by the JFPs in accordance with the JFA and endorsed by the MOF. This will be published on the MOEST website.

VI. Field Visit

7. Two joint field trips will be organized to Province 4 and Province 5 from 19 November 2018 to 22 November 2018, ` week prior to the 2018 JRM. Participants in the field visits will include government and members of the LEDPG.

VII. JRM Agenda

8. Please see the detailed agenda of the 2018 JRM below.

Joint Review Meeting Agenda

5 November 2018	Government to share JRM documents with DPs for input to LEDPG
16 November 2018	DPs to provide consolidated input on JRM documents
19 – 22 November 2018	Joint field visit to Province 4 and Province 5
25 November 2018	Venue: MOEST, Singha Durbar
09:30-10:00	➤ Tea/Coffee and Registration
10:00-11:00	Opening Session
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Introduction of the participants ➤ Welcome by Mr. Baikuntha Aryal, Joint Secretary, Planning and Monitoring Division ➤ Remarks by DP Focal Point, Mr. Mukhtor Khamudkhanov, ADB ➤ Opening Remarks by Mr. Khagaraj Baral, Secretary, MOEST ➤ Adoption of JRM Agenda and announcement of Aide Memoire team
11:00- 11:15	➤ Tea/Coffee
11:15-12:30	Morning Session
11:15-11:45	➤ Overview of SSDP physical and financial implementation progress for FY 2017/18 and FY 2018/19- Mr. Baburam Poudel, Director General and team, CEHRD
11:45-12:15	➤ Presentation of SSDP Key Performance Indicators and Program Results for AY 2017-2018.
12:15-12:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Response to LEDPG comments. ➤ Lunch
12:30:13:3	
13:30-16:00	Afternoon Session
13:30-14:30	➤ Discussion on presentations made on morning session by CEHRD
14:30-14:45	➤ Tea/Coffee
14:45-15:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Review and discussion on actions outlined in the Transitional Roadmap including formation of joint SSDP Mid-Term Review working team. ➤ Update and discussion on SSDP common TA framework including

15:30-16:30 5:15 PM	status of ongoing TA work Joint Reception- Hosted by MOEST & ADB (Garden of Dreams)
26 November 2018	Venue: MOEST, Singha Durbar
9:00 - 9.30	➤ Tea/Coffee and Registration
9.30-12.30	➤ Morning Session
9:30 – 11:00	➤ Detailed review and discussion on progress against Year Two (FY 2017/18) DLIs
11:00-12:00	➤ Detailed discussion on Fiduciary Risk Management including Unaudited Report of FY 2017/18, as well as status of audit/(return) of ineligible expenditures for 2015/16 and FY 2016/17
12:00 – 12:45	➤ Briefing on JRM and outcomes to Minister of Education, Science and Technology and JFPs HoMs/HoAs at Minister's chamber
12:00-13:00	➤ Lunch
13:15-16:30	Afternoon Session
13:15-13:45	➤ Sharing of good practices and observations from joint field visits
13:45-14:15	➤ Review on the implementation of social and environment safeguard requirements
14:15-14:30	➤ Tea/coffee
14:30-15:00	➤ Progress update on school reconstruction by CLPIU
15:00-15:30	➤ Sharing of INGOs-AIN and NCE in the implementation of SSDP
15:30-16:00	➤ Parallel meeting of Aide Memoire Team
27 November 2018	Venue: CEHRD, Sano Thimi
09:00-9:30	➤ Tea/ coffee
9:30-13:00	Morning Session
9:30 -9:45	➤ Opening and welcome by CEHRD Director General
9:45-10:00	➤ Introduction on the modality for TWG breakout sessions
10:00:11:30	➤ Break out session of TWGs to discuss progress and priorities against Year Three (FY 2018/19) DLIs including SSDP PRF in parallel sessions.
11:30 – 12:30	➤ Plenary where the outcomes of the discussion in the parallel sessions on the presented progress against SSDP PRF and DLIs is presented
13:00	➤ Lunch
1400: 15:00	

14:00-15:00	Afternoon Session ➤ Meeting of JFPs with the MoF Joint Secretary
28 November 2018	Preparation and Circulation of Aide Memoire (JFPs Aide Memoire team) by 12:00 PM. Feedback to be received by 5:00 PM.
29 November 2018	
09:00-12:00	➤ Separate AM Discussions and finalization based on comments from both government and LEDPG
14:00-16:00	➤ Closing of JRM
14:00-15:00	➤ Review of the AM jointly
15:00-16:00	➤ Wrap-up at MOEST to be chaired by the Secretary with presentation of Key findings and agreed actions of AM. ➤ Closing remarks by Secretary for MOEST Mr. Khagaraj Baral and DP focal point Mr. Mukhtor Khamudkhanov

Annex 2: List of Participants during the 2018 JRM

S.N.	Name	Position/Designation	Organization
1	Mr. Khagaraj Baral	Secretary	MoEST
2	Mr. Baikuntha Aryal	Joint Secretary	MoEST
3	Ms. Dev Kumari Guragain	Joint Secretary	MoEST
4	Mr. Surendra Subedi	Joint Secretary	MoEST
5	Mr. Bishnu Prasad Mishra	Under Secretary	MoEST
6	Mr. Navin Pokharel	SDE	MoEST
7	Mr. Dhundi Raj Aryal	Under Secretary	MoEST
8	Mr. Khagaral Paudyal	Under Secretary	MoEST
9	Mr. Mukunda Keshari Pokharel	Under Secretary (Finance)	MoEST
10	Mr. Ramesh Prasad Mainali	Under Secretary	MoEST
11	Mr. Megh Nath Sharma	Under Secretary	MoEST
12	Mr. Kul Bahadur Phadera	Under Secretary	MoEST
13	Mr. Dipendra Kafle	Joint Secretary	MoEST
14	Mr. Jaya Prasad Acharya	Under Secretary	MoEST
15	Mr. Yadab Chandra Niraula	Under Secretary	MoEST
16	Mr. Gopal Narayan Shrestha	Section Officer	MoEST
17	Ms. Sulochana Khanal (Parajuli)	Section Officer	MoEST
18	Ms. Mina Regmi Poudel	Section Officer	MoEST
19	Mr. Yadav Prasad Acharya	Section Officer	MoEST
20	Dr. Dhruva Raj Regmi	Under Secretary	MoEST
21	Mr. Shanker Adhikari	Section Officer	MoEST
22	Mr. Uddhav Raj Kattel	Section Officer	MoEST
23			
24	Ms. Sunita Maharjan	Computer Operator	MoEST
25	Mr. Indra Bahadur Kunwar	Under Secretary	MoEST/TASS
26	Ms. Freya Perry	Policy Advisor	MoEST/VSO
27	Mr. Babu Ram Paudel	Director General	CEHRD
28	Mr. Chudamani Poudel	Deputy Director General	CEHRD
29	Mr. Deepak Sharma	Deputy Director General	CEHRD
30	Mr. Ima Narayan Shrestha	Project Director	CLPIU
31	Mr. Boudha Raj Niraula	Director	CEHRD
30	Mr. Khagendra Bahadur Singh	Director	CEHRD
31	Mr. Geha Nath Gautam	Director	CEHRD
32	Mr. Govinda Prasad Sharma	Director	CEHRD
33	Mr. Khagendra Dahal	Under Secretary (Finance)	CEHRD
34	Mr. Ghanshyam Aryal	Director	CEHRD
35	Mr. Shankar Bahadur Thapa	Director	CEHRD

S.N.	Name	Position/Designation	Organization
36	Mr. Nagendra Prasad Regmi	Director	CEHRD
37	Ms. Sunita Khanal	Account Officer	CEHRD
38	Ms. Renuka Pandey	Director	CEHRD
39	Mr. Uttar Parajuli	Director	CEHRD
40	Mr. Purna Bdr. Darji	Director	CEHRD
41	Mr. Padam Bista	Director	CEHRD
42	Ms. Pramila Rijal	Section Officer	CEHRD
43	Mr. Bishwas B.K.	Section Officer	CEHRD
44	Mr. Arjun Dhakal	Section Officer	CEHRD
45	Mr. Chandra Bdr. Shrestha		CEHRD
46	Mr. Nabin Kumar Khadka	Technical Officer	CEHRD
47	Mr. Choodaman Paudel	Deputy Director General	CEHRD
48	Mr. Rajendra Bhattarai	Account Officer	CEHRD
49	Mr. Shiva Raj Pokhrel	Section Officer	CEHRD
50	Dr. Lekh Nath Poudel	Director General	CDC
51	Mr. Ramesh Prasad Ghimire	Curriculum Officer	CDC
52	Mr. Gyanendra Ban	Director	CDC
53	Mr. Krishna Prasad Kapri	Director General	ERO
54	Mr. Prakash Kumar Kharel	Section Officer	ERO
55	Dr. Tulasi Prasad Thapaliya	Admin Chief	TSC
56	Mr. Lal Prasad Pokhrel	Education Specialist	TSC
57	Ms. Jayanti Satyal	Under Secretary	NEB
58	Ms. Dipshikha Gurung	Consultant	ADB
59	Mr. Mukhtor Khamudkhanov	Country Director	ADB
60	Ms. Smita Gyawali	Sr. Project Officer	ADB
61	Mr. Jaya Upadhyaya	Consultant	ADB
62	Mr. Rajan Acharya	Project Analyst	ADB
63	Mr. Janardan Nepal	Consultant	ADB
64	Mr. Dipshikha Gurung	Consultant	ADB
65	Mr. Pramod Bhatta	Consultant	ADB
66	Mr. Rabi Karmacharya	Consultant	ADB
67	Mr. Nanda Sharma	Consultant	ADB
68	Mr. Rabindra Adhikari	Consultant	ADB
69	Mr. Kamal Raj Devkota	Researcher	CERID/TU
70	Mr. Tilak Kunwar	Vice President	CNT
71	Mr. Ian Attfield	Senior Advisor	DFID, UK
71	Mr. Hari Prasad Dahal	Chief	EDCU Bhaktapur
73	Mr. Nanda Lal Paudel	Unit Chief	EDCU, Kathmandu
74	Mr. Guna Raj Pokharel	Unit Chief	EDCU, Lalitpur
75	Mr. Bhakta Bahadur Dhakal	Director	EDD, Karnali Province

S.N.	Name	Position/Designation	Organization
76	Mr. Khem Nath Pokhrel	Under Secretary	EFP
77	Ms. Indra Gurung	Special Advisor	Embassy of Finland
78	Ms. Bandana Thapa	Program Manager	EU
79	Mr. Ovidiu Mic	Head Cooperation	EU
80	Mr. Joan Casanova	Programme Manager	EU
81	Mr. Kehsab Prasad Dahal	Project Director	EVENT-II
82	Mr. Bhim Prasad Kafle	Account Officer	FCGO
83	Mr. Raibat Aryal	Deputy Director	FFEP
84	Ms. Kati Bhowse	HOC/Counsellor	Finland
85	Mr. Krishna Lamsal	Program Manager	JICA
86	Ms. Yukiko Okugawa	Education Specialist	JICA/CEHRD
87	Ms. Usha Lamichhane	Section Officer	Kathmandu Metropolitan Office
88	Mr. Mahendra Bahadur Chhettri	Under Secretary	Lalitpur Metropolitan Office
89	Mr. Churamani Aryal	Section Officer	MoF
90	Mr. Tek Bahadur Khatri	Under Secretary	MoF
91	Ms. Lotta Karlsson	Director	MoFA, Finland
92	Ms. Sanna Takala	Advisor	MoFA, Finland
92	Ms. Anunaya Bastola	Section Officer	MoHA
93	Mr. Ram Gaire	Program Manager	NCE Nepal
94	Mr. Durga Prasad Aryal	Member Secretary	NED
95	Mr. Pradeep L. Bajracharya	Sr. Mon. Officer	NFDIN
96	Mr. Ram Bahadur Karki	Member	NFDN
97	Mr. Shudarson Subedi	National P.	NFON
98	Mr. Grant Qansie	Senior Advisor	NORAO
99	Mr. Bharat Dhamala	Section Officer	NWC
100	Mr. Ram Sharan Sapkota	Controller	OCE/NEB
101	Mr. Khila Pokharel	EPTS	Peace Corps
102	Mr. Narendra Bhattarai	Team Leader	PFM TA Team
103	Mr. Jagadish Bhattarai	Team Member	PFM TA Team
104	Mr. Rm Hackolt	PFM Advisor	PFMSP/USAID
105	Mr. Prem Aryal	Head of Education	Plan/AIN
106	Ms. Kamla Bisht	Sr. Advisor	RNE
107	Ms. Sangita Regmi	Acting Director General	STRO
108	Ms. Juna Basnet	Vice Mayor	Suryavinayak Municipality
109	Ms. Sabita Dangal	Under Secretary	Suryavinayak Municipality
108	Mr. Bhava Nath Dahal	Team Member	TA TEAN
109	Mr. Bhuban Bajracharya	CTA	TASS/MOEST
110	Mr. Subarna M. Amatya	SMC Chair	Trimodar S.S.
111	Mr. Narayan Kafle	Program Policy advison	UFP
112	Mr. Heyeon Ji	M & E Officer	UNESCO
113	Mr. Christian Manhart	Pep	UNESCO
114	Mr. Suraj Silwal	Consultant	UNESCO

S.N.	Name	Position/Designation	Organization
115	Ms. Usha Mishra	Chief/Policy	UNICEF
116	Mr. Jimi Oostrum	Education Specialist	UNICEF
117	Ms. Marilyn Hoar	Chief Ed.	UNICEF
118	Mr. Purushottam Acharya	Education Specialist	UNICEF
119	Ms. Lyndsay Mc Laurin	Education Specialist	UNICEF
120	Ms. Drayana Kulovic	Education in Emergency Officer	UNICEF
121	Ms. Purnima Gurung	Education Officer	UNICEF
122	Mr. Dipu Shakya	Education Specialist	UNICEF
123	Ms. Sabina Joshi	Education Specialist	UNICEF
124	Mr. Shannon Talor	Deputy Director Education	USAID
125	Ms. Jannie Kwok	Ed. Director	USAID
126	Mr. Krishna Pathak	Governance Specialist	USAID
127	Mr. Uddhav Bhandari	Program Manager	USAID
128	Mr. Ananda Paudel	Head of Program	VSO Nepal
129	Mr. Judu Phnong	Education Head	WFP
130	Mr. Ryaw Pittoce	DCD	WFP
131	Mr. Manoj Kumar Sah	Programme Policy Officer	WFP
132	Mr. Narayan Kafle	Literacy Specialist	WFP
133	Ms. Kamal Tara	Consultant	UNFPA
134	Ms. Maya Sherpa	Economist	World Bank
135	Ms. Shwetlena Sabarwal	Sr. Economist	World Bank
136	Mr. Mohan Prasad Aryal	Sr.Edu. Specialist	World Bank
137	Ms. Rashmi KC	Consultant	World Bank
138	Mr. Sambedan Koirala	Consultant	World Education
139	Ms. Helen Sherpa	Country Director	World Education
140	Ms. Seema Acharya		World Education
141	Mr. Bhuban Bajracharya	Chief Technical Advisor	TASS
142	Mr. Rm Hackott	PFM Advisor	LBG
143	Mr. Saroj Raj Gosai	SMC Chair	Basu Secondary School
144	Mr. Keshab Pani	Chairman	CAN
145	Mr. Deepak Dulal	Program Manager	AIN/GNI
146	Mr. Kedar Lama	Program Manager	GNHA

Annex 3: Consolidated comments from LEDPG and Response from the Government

Consolidated comments for 2018 JRM (Status Report)	
Overall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We appreciate MOEST for sharing Status Report on time. We understand that feedbacks received from DPs are to be balanced with feedbacks received from other stakeholders. Last year was the first time implementation of budget in the federal structure. More than 75 percent of SSDP funds were transferred to Local Governments (LGs) to implement activities of SSDP. LGs implemented programs that were of universal in nature for all schools i.e. teacher salary, textbooks and scholarships. The targeted interventions under SSDP were implemented by DEOs. All DEOs (now EDCUs) provided both physical and financial information. However, LGs did not provide information relating to their expenditure as well as physical progress. The transfer made to LGs by Federal Government was considered as expenditure while calculating financial progress. Hence, the overall percentage of physical progress cannot be ascertained. The document has captured very limited information about the lessons learned on Federal- Province-LGs – Schools joint work and future course of joint work based on the experiences and challenges faced. The report could be made more analytical by analysing progress in education input, documenting how input has translated into quality teaching learning process and output. It will be useful to include Program Results Framework as an annex to the report. This will allow for monitoring of SSDP progress against targets. There is no preparation for the SSDP Mid-Term Review. ASIP/AWPB should have at the minimum allocated budget for it. The actual allocation of budget towards education for FY 2018/2019 is decreasing at the federal level (10.23 %). To get in more clear picture on what other funds in the federal/provincial/local level budget is directed at Education is important to understand the level of funding. AWP has not been prepared from bottom-up. To get PGs and LGs ownership to implement the nationwide program it would be good to consult them when prepare the AWP.
<i>Analysis and reflection of presented data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As the financial progress was calculated based on disbursement to LGs, it would be better not to include achievement of physical target in the report. It would be helpful to see the breakdown of 1) percentage of budget by type of conditional grant 2) % of budget by municipality (refers to page VI summary/2.2.1). There is no information on expenditures under the AWPB related to capacity building of Local Governments. The analytical report including also does not elaborate if any of the budget heads capture activities related LGs capacity building. This information is critical for GPE Grant No 0A0779-NP (Non- DLI part) disbursement. On page 38 the report underscores about Capacity development at district, resource centre and school level, but no mention about LGs. Some of the activities such as support to alternative provision of basic education, Teacher rationalization and deployment, and others are being continued since previous years. However, in most of such cases the report provides forward looking commitment such as “will be supported; will be continued etc”. It is recommended that the report also provides some progress updates on these interventions and lessons learned, wherever applicable. This would make the report/ intervention more convincing/ compelling, going forward. While the document recognizes the limited application of knowledge and skill acquired from TPD (page 34), the report is silent about the possibility / source of getting good teacher. The report also does not address the concerns of educationists (referring to the 9th Amendment of Education Act) about GON approach of making the temporary / rahat teachers permanent. They argue that this would be “symbolic exams”, and this would challenge the quality education

	<p>significantly for several years ahead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the rows stills seem blank and inconsistency of data remains as issue to be double checked and clarified • There is no mechanism to include discretionary local government / province expenditure, or to quantify extent of private/community school contributions to provide a broader picture. • Is the evidence and use of Rs 4.4 billion from provincial/LG allocations credible to justify the computed increase in real terms of education expenditure need for DLI assessment?
<i>Structure of the report</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input from Flash II Report 2017, Consolidated Report 2017 and Flash I report 2018 could enhance analysis presented in the report. • It will be good not to present same information multiple times to make the report succinct. • All ASIP strategies were not implemented in the FY 2017/18. Furthermore, there is no link between ASIP strategies and progress made. It is not clear to what extent those planned priorities could be implemented/ adopted. Hence, there is no value addition by keeping ASIP strategies in the report. • The report on page 71 flags the need of enhanced coordination and collaboration among the three level of governments in planning and implementation to minimize possibility of duplication of activities. However, the report is silent about the lessons learned on coordination and challenges faced during the first year of joint implementation of school sector service delivery by the three level of governments. We suggest that these are reflected in the report in forging coordination going forward. • Some of the possible opportunities and emerging challenges or areas of improvement such as availability of additional resources from local government, capacity gaps especially at local level, and lack of clarity on templates, mechanisms and role among different level institutions for reporting are not adequately highlighted. • No chapter or analysis on equity strategy implementation, either in Basic/Sec chapter 2.2.1/2 sections, or in 2.2.4 cross cutting themes.
<i>Overarching comments by Chapters (not covered by themes)</i>	<p>Basic Education (ECED)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The government does not seem to have done parenting education as per target. Was it not spent? What are the MOEST's plan on parenting education? <p>Basic Education (1-8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of disadvantaged children receiving scholarships and targeted interventions' has significantly increased from 117953 in last year to 214712 in current year, was there new group of students included for this incentives from this year? • It is suggested to briefly explain about the verification of OOSC, who were brought to School/LC system. It is also recommended to bring some lesson learned from and best practices of targeted intervention that may have worked to bring the OOSC in the School/LC system. It will be also good to elaborate on what these targeted interventions are. <p>Secondary Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of constraints and challenges fails to cover gender specific issues that emerge as girls become adolescent. Both girls and other marginalized groups require school and community based activities beyond scholarships and inputs to address violence, stigma and specific pedagogic teaching strategies <p>Secondary Education (TVET stream)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In this 'Enhanced capacity' program provided to only two teachers or two schools or two times for number of teachers? It would be better if it is provided to number of teachers, number would have been mentioned. • The teacher turn over seems very high in TVE stream schools. It might be because of differences in terms service between general and TVE stream

	<p>teachers or due to inadequate preparation of teachers for this purpose. It would be better if CEHRD would share teacher management scheme for this purpose. The schools claim that they were given separate lab assistant position in earlier years but it has been changed only to grant. This change has made them difficulty in hiring and retaining appropriately qualified lab assistant. The technical stream though seems to be separate department in the school, the technical school teacher are not treated as the department head of such stream and everything is controlled by the head teacher and administration of the school. They don't seem to have authority to decide in initiating minor innovations in their practical work due to lack of minimum resources. Contents of curriculum for this stream seems overloaded and the practical activities do not seem to be adequately delivered. The 'on the job training' does not seem to be coordinated with the appropriate authorities and agencies. Hence, there is a need to coordinate form central level with concerned ministry/departments for accepting these stream students for 'on the job training'.</p>
	<p>Literacy and Lifelong Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender breakdown in Table 15 and address disparities. Currently no data post baseline, will this become available via HH surveys?
	<p>School Health and Nutrition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 19 - No. of children receiving midday meal is 658077. It's not clear from the footnote if there is an additional 270,000 included in this number or not.
Theme wise Specific comments	
1. Teacher Professional Development and Management	
Reference Page number	Comments
Page 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why teacher pension is still included in the education budget? We had thought that teacher pension is distributed from national treasury and is not part of education budget.
Page 32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is this the newly developed customized training for designated Mathematics, Science and English teachers or is it the on-going trainings which have been delivered in previous years?
Page 33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it mean separate head teacher position other than total approved teacher position or it is one of the positions among the approved teacher positions? The provision of subject teachers is very important to ensure math, science and English teachers in schools. Are these teacher positions provided to schools to hire Mathematics, Science and English teachers which do not have teachers in these subjects? It will also be better if the MOEST would provide the name of schools that received additional number of math, science and English teachers.
Page 33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are these teacher positions provided to schools to hire Mathematics, Science and English teachers which do not have teachers in these subjects?
Page 34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It will be useful to get information on the implementation of Teacher Rationalization and Redeployment Plan? It would be good if government could share main highlights of recommendations and the direction set by the committee in teacher management. It would also be helpful if it would share how the committee constituted on the chairpersonship of DG CEHRD to implement its recommendation in moving towards materializing them.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Teacher Service Commission has published the vacancy of different level teachers, for instance, 1107 secondary, 1635 lower secondary and 9996

	<p>primary teachers in open competition, where 183 secondary and 250 lower secondary for math, 189 secondary and 180 lower secondary science, and 232 secondary and 460 lower secondary English teacher positions are also included. Likewise, there is also vacancy opened in internal competition for temporarily working teachers. We believe that there are subject teachers vacancies in internal competition too. This arrangement also seems major move in teacher management. Hence, it would be helpful if the MOEST could share the possible implication in teacher management after the recommendation of teacher candidates for permanent appointment by TSC. It will be useful to include status on teachers hired through TSC? What is the percentage of females hired?</p>
Pages 32-34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TPD targets and progress data on training and all areas look identical, have these all been achieved, 100% • More broadly the constraints correctly note the need for faster re-deployment and more emphasis on applying new teaching skills in practice, with support from local communities of practice and teacher resource professionals. Between certification and appointment/rationalisation there is a real risk that LG and schools will not be able to offer teacher career management and professional support to improve effective teaching and time on task. • No progress on job induction training for new appointed teachers, and on CAS; reasons for not accomplishing?
2. Curriculum	
Reference Page number	Comments
Pages 20 Annex I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you please provide status on process of revision of NCF? Has a time bound action plan been prepared to implement NCF? • Please provide the final official English translation of the NCF to DPs. • Making revision of National Curriculum Framework to improve curriculum, textbook and materials is mentioned as strategic priorities. • Annex I p9; budget allocation for piloting and feedback collection of learning materials based on integrated curriculum for grades 1-3 exists, but there is no allocation for preparation of materials or training the teachers? it is just 4 months to the end of the current academic year can we safely assume that as this has not yet been shared that it will not be rolled out next academic year
3. Early Childhood and Educational Development	
Reference Page number	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above
4. Early Grade Reading	
Reference Page number	Comments
Pages 17/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 11 – can we have progress against the target set for number of districts in which NEGRP minimum package will be implemented? This can be reflected in this table or in the PRF table. This is important for reporting on DLI 1.
Page 33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TPD certification training on EGRP for teachers of program districts has no baseline. Targets and actuals are for 10 EGRP districts; however, these do not reflect long term targets
5. Equity; Access and Inclusive Education	
Reference Page number	Comments
n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% children dropout before Grade 8. Potential to consider use of WB new HCI data and Quality Adjusted School Years indicator in future.

<i>Pages 15,19 and 21</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 258,000 reported out of school children enrolled, including targeted interventions in 5 districts (DLI-8), much larger than target. What reasons are behind this? • Can equity index use of targeted grants for OOSC be i) target from districts to LGs in the near future, ii) move beyond access and participation to measures of learning of all children, including a younger age cohort?
<i>Page 19</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disabled residential scholarships volume target and progress: 51728, 30495. Raises broader question on the new Inclusive Education policy:- use of residential vs inclusive education in schools and overall approach to inclusive education implementation, that combines scholarship and support with broader changes on school management, teaching and inclusion.
<i>Page 21, Annex 9</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there robust supporting evidence for the 41 LGs self-declared basic education for all?
<i>Page 26</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of constraints and challenges fails to cover gender specific issues that emerge as girls become adolescent. Both girls and other marginalised groups require school and community based activities beyond scholarships and inputs to address violence, stigma and specific pedagogic teaching strategies.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No progress or mention of the equity strategy implementation plan in the new federal context. How LGs are engaged or plan to be engaged on the equity strategy implementation is not clear.
<i>Page 62</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in disparities in access and participation requires IVA.
6. Disaster Recovery, Risk Reduction & School Safety	
Reference Page number	Comments
<i>Page 40-42</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no description on how emergency funds have been utilised or helped effective response during last emergencies. • It's good to mention the actual name/terminology of the guiding or strategic documents under the last bullet of the achievement to maintain consistency. • It would be useful to consider if the emerging policies and guidelines could also include a broader definition of safety to include risks of violence and in particular addressing gender and inclusion best practice. This could be both in terms of emergency response and 'build back better' in terms of ensuring vulnerable children and girls needs are catered for. But also should include mainstreaming gender and inclusive 'do no harm' and protection/ anti-violence and abuse policies and procedures into SMC and SIP and school operations and protocols. • In some of the meetings, issue of operation and maintenance of constructed school facilities and improving access to children with disabilities as constraints and also areas for further improvement were discussed. Such points are not included in the report.
7. Examination, Accreditation and Assessment	
Reference Page number	Comments
<i>Page 45</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the aim of 'all eligible grade 8 students (at least 50.0% girls) sit for standardized and improved annual examination' will be materialized?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government has recognized that establishment of a credible students learning assessment system is critical to inform policy decisions for education quality improvements. ERO and NEB in coordination with sub-national governments would continue administration of the NASA and high-stake examinations involving a wide range of national and intermittent involvement of international experts. As lessons learned from the national/ international practices it is critical that these institutions are strengthened with core technical staff such as psychometricians, statistician, and subject experts, who could coordinate with

	the large pool of experts to efficiently manage the task. The report needs to underscore this bringing some progress made and challenges faced on this front with suggestions for forward looking actions.
Page 45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be appreciable if some update and explanation on status and progress of standardization of examination, single subject certification of grade 11, etc. are briefed.
Page 58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A plan of action is still not translated and shared to DPs?
Page 66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ASIP 4.6.2; "The EGRA results indicate the need for improved teaching methods for the early grades" -> teaching methods or teaching skills?
8. Fiduciary Management	
Reference Page number	Comments
Page 36, Page 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are substantiating documents for implementation of performance grant and time spent teaching?
9. Strengthening Education Management Information System including M & E	
Reference Page number	Comments
Pages 44, 50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are new web portal based EMIS direct school data input operational? What is the plan to integrate information on physical infrastructures of schools gathered with EMIS? It will be useful to know the type of disaggregated information available in EMIS will be shared with DPs.
10. Model Schools	
Reference Page number	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is an urgent need to finalize a realistic 5 year plan for the 222 schools with estimated budget ceiling for the five years, with clear indications of activities to be done in the areas of educational, physical and governance aspects, including the provision of fulltime HTs, full set of subject teachers, adequate classrooms, lab, library and ICT facilities and materials to introduce innovative teaching-learning practices and to enhance student learning. There is an urgent need to provide clear directives to schools to finalize and approve master plans through local governments, share the approved master plans with CEHRD for verification by the JFPs by the end of December 2018. Facilitation and coordination with the local governments also need to be facilitated by MOEST/CEHRD so that LGs ensure full support to the aims and objectives of the model school program. Increase in the number of schools to be transformed into model schools in the future without giving adequate budgetary and technical-professional support to the existing lot of schools may jeopardize the overall aim of the SSDP program to transform selected secondary schools into model secondary schools.
11. Appropriate application of ICT in Education	
Reference Page number	Comments
Page 47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since this telecasting provision is already started, is there any plan to expand this facility to other schools of the country?
Page 22,41, 71	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ASIP: only 12.4 % schools are using computers in teaching activities, 28.3% schools have computer facilities. Interventions proposed to ICT education emphasize strongly building of physical facilities, more interventions on building teachers capacity of using ICT facilities is required.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be useful to know how monitoring of use of ICT, library and science laboratory is organised
Page 101 and Page 104	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It will be useful to know how many schools have received NRs 650,000 under ICT grant to install ICT facilities.
12. EMF and SMF	
Reference page number	Comments
Page 52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is mentioned that the budget allocation for capacity development under EMF, SMF, procurement and PFM is NRs 3, 79, 38,000 and the financial progress is 99 percent. Please explain how much was allocated for safeguard and on what type of capacity building activities.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please indicate how the impacts identified will be mitigated—does the budget include cost for mitigation measures too? The revision of EMF needs to be completed as early as possible (provide the date) to reflecting the changes as activities related to construction has already started in the field.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed ToC (table of contents) needs to be further revised and condensed from environmental perspective.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A safeguard desk needs to be established in CEHRD with a focal person having some knowledge/background/expertise in safeguard.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please separate EMF and SMF when providing the status update of each. Currently it is all mixed up. The status report has mentioned development of IPP/VCDP during MTR of SSDP. However, the tentative timeline for MTR is not provided. It is suggested that the program initiate the process of development of IPP/VCDP soon rather than wait until MTR.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The status report has mentioned development of IPP/VCDP during MTR of SSDP. However, the tentative timeline for MTR is not provided. It is suggested that the program initiate the process of development of IPP/VCDP soon rather than wait until MTR.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More elaboration on 'provision for responsible personnel' for grievance handling is suggested. Please provide specific information regarding which department or unit is responsible for GRM and who is the responsible personnel? Information on how they are managed, documented and reported also needs to be included in the Status report
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity development training on EMF and SMF is yet to be carried out by the CEHRD. Hence it is not clear from the report how 99% of the budget allocated for the purpose is already spent. Also, it is not clear if the allocated budget is for capacity development activity only or also to address any E&S mitigation measures/activities.
13. Institutional Capacity Development	
Reference Page number	Comments
35-37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No information on spreading use or quality of SMCs, SIPs and social audits
38-40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional Capacity Development appears a huge constraint, until more clarity on decentralised roles and responsibilities and appointments
Editorial Comments	
Reference Page number	Comments
Page 50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The progress against all indicators of Key Performance Indicators should be provided.

<i>Page 10 and Page 12</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The financial progress for SSDP districts is different in table 5 and table 7. It will be useful to provide explanation for the difference in same budget head.
<i>Page 50</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On (KPI) footnote to elaborate “X^a, Y^b” etc. missing. It will be good to check figures presented throughout the report.
<i>Page 16</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BE indicator 1.2 % of grade 3 students reading grade level text with fluency and comprehension should be: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Corrected to match the PRF in the final SSDP (page 118), which is 12.8%.
<i>Page 20 and Page 55</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> P.20 table 11 achievements against targets. Indicator: # of schools implementing CB-EGRA in FY 2017/2018 should be corrected to 3,000. The target for 2016/2017 should be 2,600, not 3,000. Also, the figures in this table (3310 schools) do not match with results presented on p. 55 in the DLI 1 table which states that 3,046 community schools implemented CB-EGRA. Please correct this discrepancy.
<i>Page 51</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 30 – 2.11.1 – The numbers of this indicator need to match the SSDP PRF on page 118. The % of grade 3 students reading with fluency and comprehension is 12.8% (baseline 2015/2016). The target for FY 2018/2019 is 14.8% and for 2020/2021 is 15.6%. The numbers in the status report is the average oral reading fluency (correct words per minute), and does not represent the % of grade 3 students reading with proficiency.
<i>Page 66-67</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first paragraph seems to confuse NEGRP and EGRP. It seems the first sentence should be “Early-Grade Reading Program (EGRP) is a five-year program . . . “. And the second sentence should begin “The EGRP primarily supported the government’s NEGRP . . . “. It may be more clear to mention that EGRP is USAID-supported TA program to provide technical support for government’s NEGRP. In the third paragraph, the number of schools supported under EGRP is 4942, not 2600, in 16 districts. In may be more clear to mention that USAID is providing support directly to government for NEGRP (which corresponds to redbook figures), while also providing technical assistance through EGRP. Status report, 3rd paragraph, TA has been provided also to curriculum development, teachers training and student counselling (TASS)
<i>Page 70</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Status report: "lack of teachers" related. It is not only the number of teachers but also about the quality of teaching that has impact on the learning outcomes.
<i>Annex 8 Page 106-7</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The INGO support provided in Annex 8 looks incomplete. For example, World Education’s EGR program has not been included in it, and this therefore overlooks UNICEF as well as USDA-funded and WFP’s support for EGR activities. Furthermore, other INGOs (i.e. Humanity and Inclusion, Restless Development, VSO, etc) supporting early grade reading are not reflected. DPs can work with AIN to ensure partners’ activities are reflected in the AIN Report 2018.
<i>Page 8</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be helpful to define recurrent and capital costs in a footnote 6
<i>Page 48 – Table 29 –</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does this data reflect only the GoN achievement or also includes the U.S. Embassy -U.S. Department of Agriculture / WFP achievements? Please clarify.
<i>Page 67</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food for education data: Does this data reflect only the GoN achievement or also the U.S. Embassy- U.S. Department of Agriculture /WFP allocations? Is the FFE provided off budget, but included here? Clarification would be helpful.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use the correct DLIs nos. in tables and correct figures/data as presented in SSDP ProDoc.
<i>Page 15</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 10 refers equity indicators/targets as DLI 8. Should it be reflected as DLI6?

<i>Page 19</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Material support grants for ECED/PPE based on per- child fund have typo of one additional digit, so please correct.
<i>Pages 20, 55</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Indicator: # of schools implementing CB-EGRA in FY 2017/2018 should be corrected to 3,000. The target for 2016/2017 should be 2,600, not 3,000. Also, the figures in this table (3310 schools) do not match with results presented on p. 55 in the DLI 1 table which states that 3,046 community schools implemented CB-EGRA. Please correct this discrepancy.

Annex 4: Status of Program Results Framework

Vision: Develop self-sustainable, competitive, innovative and value-oriented citizens for socioeconomic transformation of the nation			
Intervention logic	Verifiable indicators	Sources of verification	Assumptions
<p>Goal:</p> <p>To contribute to socioeconomic development and reduce disparities in the country through the continuous development of its human resources capacity.</p> <p>Purpose:</p> <p>To facilitate all citizens to have the opportunity to become functionally literate, numerate, and to develop the basic life skills and knowledge required to enjoy a productive life, taking into account the diversity of context and needs and with regards to the forthcoming federalization of the country</p>	<p>Trends in average, median, maximum and minimum living standards</p> <p>Trends in productivity in economic sub-sectors</p> <p>Trends in unemployment rates</p> <p>Literacy and numeracy rates</p> <p>Average years of education per citizen</p> <p>Disparity of SSDP key performance indicators between provinces</p> <p>Annual work plans and budgets</p>	<p>Population census</p> <p>Sample surveys (NLSS, NDHS)</p> <p>Subject specific studies</p> <p>Economic surveys</p> <p>Education management information system</p> <p>Labour force surveys</p>	<p>Children and adults make use of what they learn to improve their economic activity (productivity) and standard of living</p> <p>Nepal is highly diverse in terms of geography, culture, socioeconomic status, needs and opportunities</p> <p>Federal state restructuring is undertaken in the first two years of SSDP implementation</p>

	reducing disparities in learning outcomes	s.									
No. of children who receive at least one year ECED/PPE learning by age four	T	454,757	473,206	464,233	492,404	478,514	512,381	533,169	554,799		
	B	233,417	242,887	236,949	252,741	243,234	262,994	273,664	284,767		
	G	221,340	230,320	227,284	239,664	235,282	249,387	259,505	270,033		
No. of ECED/PPE centres established		30,448	30,448	36,093	30,948	36,568	31,448	32,000	32,000		
No. of disadvantaged group children receiving scholarships and other targeted interventions	T	194,000	204,094		214,712		225,884	237,636	250,000		
	B	96,806	101,843		107,141		112,716	118,580	124,750		
	G	97,194	102,251		107,571		113,168	119,056	125,250		
No. of districts with targeted scholarship scheme		NA	Targeted scholarship scheme developed	Targeted scholarship scheme developed	Scheme implemented in 15 districts	Scheme implemented in 15 districts	Scheme implemented in 50 districts	Scheme implemented nationwide		DLI 9	
No. of children receiving	T	648,190	653,115		658,077		663,077	668,114	673,190		
	B	323,447	325,904		328,381		330,875	333,389	335,922		

	midday meal	G	324,743	327,210		329696		332201	334,725	337,268	
	No. of integrated schools with resource classes for CwDs		380	380		380		380	380	380	
1.2. Improved quality of basic education	% of grade 1 new entrants with ECED/PPE experience	T	62.4	64.4	64.7	66.5	66.3	68.6	70.8	73.0	
Review and update norms and operation guidelines for ECED/PPE centres		B	62.5	64.5	65.0	66.6	66.6	68.7	70.9	73.2	
		G	62.3	64.3	64.3	66.4	65.9	68.5	70.7	72.9	
Development and distribution of appropriate learning materials for ECED/PPE children	% of grade 3 students reading grade level text with fluency and comprehension.	T	27.2	29.2	81	31.2		33.2	35.2	37.2	
Enhanced parental awareness and engagement in ECED/PPE	Student learning achievement scores (%) in grade 5	T	Maths: 48.0	49.0		51.0		52.0	54.0	56.0	
Provision of minimum enabling conditions in schools			Nepali: 46.0	48.5		50.5		54.0	56.5	59.0	
			English: 47.0	50.0		51.5		53.0	54.5	57.0	
Implementation of EGRP and community-based EGRA	Student learning achievement scores (%) in	T	Maths: 35	39.0			492	48.0	53.5	55.0	
			Nepali: 48	51.0			504	57.0	60.0	62.0	
			Science:	43.5			498	49.0	52.5	55.0	

	Revision of National Curriculum Framework (NCF)				NCF revision prepared	NCF revision prepared	Revised NCF approved		Revised NCF completed	DLI 2	
Secondary Education											
Outcome:	Indicators:		Baseline (2015/16)	Year 1 (2016/17)	Achievement Year 1	Year 2 (2017/18)	Achievement Year 2	Year 3 (2018/19)	Year 4 (2019/20)	Year 5 (2020/21)	Indicator type
2.1. Improved access and equity in secondary education	GER in secondary education (9-12)	T	56.7	61.5	59.6	66.7	60.6	72.3	78.4	85.0	
		B	56.8	61.6	60.0	66.8	61.3	72.4	78.5	85.2	
		G	56.6	61.4	58.9	66.6	60.0	72.2	78.3	84.9	
Increased number of higher value scholarships for poor and marginalized students (residential and non-residential)	NER in secondary education (9-12)	T	37.7	40.3	38.9	43.1	43.9	45.1	49.3	53.0	
		B	37.8	40.4	39.3	43.2	44.1	46.2	49.4	52.9	
		G	37.6	40.2	38.6	43.0	43.7	46.0	49.2	52.6	
Free textbooks (up to grade 12) for targeted students	Survival rate to grade 10 by cohort	T	37.9	41	60.1	45	57.1	50	57	65	
		B	37	41.2	44.3	45.9	56.5	51.1	57	63.5	
		G	38.9	43.3	46.0	48.3	57.6	53.8	59.9	66.7	
Upgrading of secondary schools to secondary schools based on mapping and need	Survival rate to grade 12 by cohort	T	11.5	13	NA	15	17.2	18	21	25	
Provision of at least one secondary	% students	T	3.5	4.3		5.3		6.6	8.1	10.0	

school in each constituency providing science subject at grade 11 Need and criteria - based (based on regular survey of DEO technical personnel) construction of classroom blocks and WASH facilities	enrolled in science subjects in grade 11 in community schools	B	5	6.2		7.6		9.4	11.6	14.3	
		G	2.1								
				2.6		3.2		3.9	4.9	6.0	
2.2. Improved quality of secondary education Upgrading existing community schools to model schools	% of students enrolled in technical subjects in grade 9	T	0.7	1.1		1.7		2.5	3.9	6.0	
		B	0.9	1.4		2.1		3.3	5.0	7.7	
		G	0.5	0.8		1.2		1.8	2.8	4.3	
Reforms in examination and assessment system Strengthened TVE subjects in secondary education	Number of students enrolled in technical subjects in grades 9-12	T									
			9,750					72,540		102,600	
	No of model schools		-	240	223	290	223	340	440	540	DLI
	No. of community schools		240	240		290		340	440	500	

	offering science subjects in grades 11–12									
	No. of schools with access to Science, maths and language kits	-			Science, maths & language learning kits and teacher guides developed for grades 6-8	Science, maths & language learning kits and teacher guides developed for grades 6-8		1,000	1,000	
	No. of schools receiving activity-based kits for mathematics, science and English language for grades 6–8	NA					1,000	2,000	3,000	DLI
	No. schools establishing Internet facilities	NA					1,000	1,000	1,000	

Literacy and Life Long Learning											
Outcome	Indicators		Baseline (2015/16)	Year 1 (2016/17)	Year 2 (2017/18)	Year 3 (2018/19)	Year 4 (2019/20)	Year 5 (2020/21)	Indicator type		
3. Increased functional literacy and reading and learning habits cultivated among youths and adults	Literacy rate 6 years+	T	78d			85		87	KPI		
	Literacy rate 15-24 years	T	88.6e			92		95	KPI		
	Literacy 15+ years	T	57f			70		75	KPI		
Teacher Professional Development											
Outcome	Indicators		Baseline (2015/16)	Year 1 (2016/17)	Year 1 Achievement	Year 2 (2017/18)	Year 2 Achievement	Year 3 (2018/19)	Year 4 (2019/20)	Year 5 (2020/21)	Indicator type
4.1. Increased provision of qualified and trained teachers	% of trained ECED/PPE teachers	T	NA	10	88.4		90	30	50	65	
	% of ECED/PPE teachers with required qualification	T	93.7	94.4		95.0		95.7	96.4	97.0	
		M	92.3	92.9		93.6		94.3	94.9	95.6	
		F	95.1	95.8		96.4		97.1	97.8	98.5	

No of trained subject teachers for maths, science, and English		T	NA					4,500	9,000	13,500	DLI
No. schools with complete set of subject teachers	Basic (gr. 6-8)	T	NA					1,000	2,000	3,000	DLI
	Secondary	T	NA					500	1,000	1,500	
Certification training for basic teachers	Basic	T	NA	Revised certification training modules for subject teachers in grades 6-8 & 9-12 developed		9,500		10,700	10,700	7,400	
		M	NA			6,116		6,888	6,888	4,764	
		F	NA			3,384		2,454	2,454	1,697	
	Secondary	T	NA			1,500		3,000	1,500	1,500	
		M	NA			1,293		2,586	1,293	1,293	
		F	NA			178		357	178	178	
No. of teachers trained in ICT and e-resources	T	NA	0		0		1,000	1,000	1,000		
	M	NA	0		0		770	770	770		
	F	NA	0		0		230	230	230		
% female teachers	Basic		38.8	40	40.7	41	52.6	42	43.5	45	
	Secondary		15.1	16	17.7	17	18.7	18	19	20	

4.2. Strengthened teacher management and accountability	No. of schools with separate fulltime head teacher positions	-	6,165		6,165		6,165	6,165	6,165	
	Teacher rationalization		Rationalization plan for each district & district incentive scheme approved	Rationalization plan for each district & district incentive scheme approved			Teacher rationalization implementation plan completed		All operationally feasible schools have full set of teachers at basic level	
	Number of districts in which teacher performance incentive scheme is rolled out		Teacher incentives scheme approved		20		40	75		
Governance and Management										
Outcome:	Indicators	Baseline (2015/16)	Year 1 (2016/17)	Year 1 Achievement	Year 2 (2017/18)	Year 2 Achievement	Year 3 (2018/19)	Year 4 (2019/20)	Year 5 (2020/21)	Indicator type
5.1. Adequate resources and infrastructure are being efficiently	% of students receiving text books within first two weeks of academic year at basic level	86.5	89.0	88.4	91.0	91.3	94.0	98.0	100	
	Strengthened financial management information systems in line with FCGO system (CLAs,	-	13		30		30	20	29	

used	RED, ETCs, DEOs)									
	Number of days from trimester end within that trimester FMR is submitted		45	45	45	45	45	45	45	DLI
	No. months OAG Annual Audit Report for previous fiscal year submitted is submitted		9	9	9	9	9	9	9	DLI
	Reduction of % of audit observations	5.8%	5.7		5.5		5.3	5.1	5%	DLI
	Implementation of performance based school grant system	Earmarked grants system	Review of existing grants system		Implemented in 25 DEOs		Implemented in all 75 DEOs			DLI
	% community schools with school financing linked to SIP						50	100		
	% head teachers and SMCs that receive capacity development	NA			30		100			
	No. districts with performance-based incentive scheme for head teachers and SMCs				10		40	75		

Disaster risk reduction and school safety										
Outcome:	Indicators:	Baseline (2015/16)	Year 1 (2016/17)	Achievement Year 1	Year 2 (2017/18)	Achievement Year 2	Year 3 (2018/19)	Year 4 (2019/20)	Year 5 (2020/21)	Indicator type
	Number of new classrooms constructed in disaster-affected areas in line with revised technical standards	Need for 4,400 safe schools to be reconstructed in affected areas (PDRF) & 36,540 classrooms to be retrofitted in non-affected areas	17,000	7,717	21,000	8,500	18,000	12,000	8,000	DLI 10
	Number of schools retrofitted in non-affected areas in line with revised technical standards		80	0	80	44	80	80	80	DLI 10
	Number of schools currently meeting DRR criteria for safe learning environments		(I) SDM guidelines approved, (ii) DRR year-wise implementation plan approved, (iii) Comprehensive School Safety Master plan	(I) SDM guidelines approved, (ii) DRR year-wise implementation plan approved, (iii) Comprehensive School Safety Master plan			Thematic study on DRR commissioned as part of SSDP mid-term review	Review of SDM guidelines		DLI 10

			finalized	finalized						
Monitoring, evaluation and assessment										
Outcome:	Indicators	Baseline (2015/16)	Year 1 (2016/17)	Achievement Year 1	Year 2 (2017/18)	Achievement Year 2	Year 3 (2018/19)	Year 4 (2019/20)	Year 5 (2020/21)	Indicator type
	Independent verification of EMIS data	-	First round of sample-based independent verification of EMIS completed	First round of sample-based independent verification of EMIS completed	Verification of data through corrective actions		Second round of sample-based independent verification of EMIS completed	Annual sector performance report prepared with EMIS data and analysis		DLI
	Introduction of school profile cards				District and school profile cards piloted and used in social audits in 25% schools		District & school profile card implemented in all schools by linking with school performance grants	District and school profile cards used in social audits in all schools by linking with school performance grants		
	Implementation of individual student & teacher ID in EMIS	56	65	77	75	77	75	75	75	

Examination and accreditation											
Outcome	Indicators	Baseline (2015/16)	Year 1 (2016/17)	Year 1 Achievement	Year 2 (2017/18)	Year 2 Achievement	Year 3 (2018/19)	Year 3 Achievement	Year 4 (2019/20)	Year 5 (2020/21)	Indicator type
	Implementation of single subject certification in grade 10 exams	Letter grading & single subject certification introduced for grade 10	Implementation of single subject certification in grade 10 exams	Implementation of single subject certification in grade 10 exams	Single subject certification policy approved for secondary school exams	Single subject certification policy approved for secondary school exams	Single subject certification policy implemented for secondary school exams	Single subject certification policy implemented for secondary school exams			DLI
	Institutionalization of NASA	Education Review Office (ERO) to become fully independent	NASA institutionalized at ERO with ERO granted autonomy	NASA institutionalized at ERO with ERO granted autonomy	Implementation of agreed corrective actions based on 2014 grade 5 NASA results		Examinations for grade 8 administered with standardized test items		NASA survey carried out for grades 8 and analysis of results for NASA Grade 5 (carried out in 2018) disseminated	Examinations for grade 8, 10 and 12 implemented with standardized test items	DLI

Annex 5: Field visit report

A. JRM November 2018 Field Trip Report

Province 4, Kaski and Parbat districts & Province 5, Rupandehi and Kapilvastu districts

B. 19 – 22 November 2018

1. Participants:

1. **Gandaki (Province 4) team:** Meghanath Sharma (MOEST), Prahyad Aryal (CEHRD), Narayan Kafle (WFP), Maya Sherpa (World Bank), Shannon Taylor (USAID), Manil Maharjan (USAID), Kati Bhose (Finland), Ambassador Pertti Anttinen (Finland), Yukiko Okugawa (JICA), Deepak Dulal (AIN), Jimi Oostrum (UNICEF), Freya Perry (VSO)

2. **Province 5 team:** Jaya Prasad Acharya (MOEST), Ghanshyam Aryal (CEHRD), Joan Casanova (European Union), Neera Sharma (WFP), Rajan Acharya (ADB), Smita Gyawali (ADB), Kamla Bisht (Norway), Grant Dansie (Norway), Purushottam Acharya (UNICEF), Jannie Kwok (USAID), Indra Gurung (Finland), Krishna Lamshal (JICA), Toshinobu Miki (JICA), Prem Aryal (AIN), Ian Atfield (DFID).

2. Objectives:

3. To strengthen understandings on the on-the-ground context of the transition experienced due to the federal rollout and the implications for decentralized planning, implementation and monitoring of the SSDP.

4. To review anecdotal evidence on progress against common DLI matrix.

3. Methodology and scope of visit:

5. Prior to the undertaking of the November 2018 Joint Review Meeting (JRM) two joint field trips took place 19-22 November, ahead of the main JRM on 26-30 November 2018. One team travelled to Gandaki (Kaski and Parbat) and the other to Province 5 (Rupandehi and Kapilvastu). The field visits included meetings, interactions, observations and interviews with key stakeholders including government representatives at provincial level, municipal level and school level as well as head teachers, SMC and PTA members. The ToR of the JRM field trips and the district profiles have been attached as annex 1 and 2 respectively.

4. Overall observations on the Practice of federal roll out:

a. Status of transition

6. New institutions were in place according to the transitional arrangements but had varying levels of human resources, capacity and comprehension concerning their roles and responsibilities. For example, in Province 5, whilst some EDCUs were overstaffed (having 12 personnel rather than the mandated 9), others were understaffed (with only 4 personnel despite a provision for 8).

7. Although a commitment to education and to SSDP objectives was repeatedly expressed by different stakeholders, several mayors confessed to not knowing the detailed

contents of the SSDP. Whilst cascade SSDP orientation program of training had been delivered to 8 districts so far in Province 5, the orientation program was yet to be organized of FY 2018-19 in Pokhara – although it had been planned and budgeted for. This was apparent in discussions with the urban municipality of Parbat who shared that they are committed to meet the SSDP annual targets but were unsure on what these actual targets were. It was noted that, as a result of understaffing, combined with a lack of technical expertise, administrative tasks are taking precedent over efforts to focus on enhancing the quality of education. Still, it should be noted that there was significant variation across and within provinces regarding capacity, motivation and activities towards SSDP achievement.

8. The lack of clear rules and regulations from the federal level was expressed by both Gandaki and Province 5's Provincial Ministry of Social Development (PMSD). In Province 5, this had resulted in significant time and resources going to courts to overturn inconsistent legislation put in place by local governments. Likewise, the PMSD in Pokhara shared that they were awaiting regulations from federal government before they could legitimately implement the education guidelines they had developed. The lack of availability of guiding federal laws meant that it was challenging to ensure uniformity across local governments who were developing their own different rules, regulations and resources. Accordingly, the direction of the forthcoming Federal Education Act is an urgent requirement.

9. Nevertheless, despite these challenges, PMSDs were making attempts to coordinate and communicate educational targets across their respective provinces. In both Gandaki and Province 5 the constitutional provision for the Provincial Coordination Council was being implemented and this provided a platform for LGs to discuss their challenges and plans. In Province 5, these meetings were informing a Five-Year development plan. Additionally, in Pokhara, interactive meetings had happened with NGO federations at the provincial level, where the PMSD had learnt about various programmes and policies. They shared that they wanted to continue this kind of collaboration with the development sector and this was also echoed by Mayors and Chairs of Municipalities and Rural municipalities. PMSD further noted that it would take a full year cycle to form a comprehensive understanding of implementation, resource and capacity gaps of local governments and to develop a plan that can support them as required. Both PMSD's shared that they had formed research teams to better understand the education needs of their respective provinces.

10. Regarding the role of the Education Development Coordination Unit (EDCU), there was an overall lack of clarity observed by the field visit teams, since major activities formerly within the mandate of DEO has been transferred to the local government. In part, the challenge was a change of mindset from the previous unitary system to the new decentralized system. However, the challenge was also systematic, and provincial authority suggested that EDCUs need to be moved under the line management of PMSDs. Similarly, the Provincial Education Development Directorate's (PEDD) mandate was to facilitate, motivate, coordination and technical support. Despite these aforementioned challenges, PGs and LGs had a general awareness of SSDP and the Program Implementation Manual (PIM) developed by CEHRD was being referred to as a key planning tool, for example, in Pokhara Metropolitan City and Mayadevi Rural Municipality in Kapilvastu.

b. Financial management and grant management system (GMS)

11. In addition to conditional grants, a significant financial contribution to education planning was allocated through equalization grants (e.g. 0.5 million NPR in Modi Rural Municipality, Parbat, 45 lak NPR in Kushmanaupalika, Parbat, an additional 4 million NPRs allocated to education by LG in Pokhara Metropolitan City).

12. Nevertheless, all schools visited in Province 5 and several schools in Gandaki Province had secured additional financial support from a variety of sources including through introducing fee paying, organizing community events and through the support of community forestry committees and NGOs. In particular, they sourced additional money to cover privately hired teacher salaries, teacher training and student needs (uniforms, books) which were not sufficiently covered by scholarships or other grant allocations.

13. There were some differences across the provinces in how LGs were working with DTCOs. In Gandaki Province, LGs were largely unaware of the reporting requirements outlined in the Appropriation Act (2018) in order to receive the second tranche of funding for this year and therefore were not submitting expenditure reports to the DTCO. DTCO explained that capacity development of local level (both on understanding and skills) was needed but this was not included in their TOR or budget. In contrast, municipalities in Province 5 were very clear about PIM and conditional grants; Municipalities would tally receipts and then send these back to DTCO. Still, it was highlighted in both provinces that a mechanism for reporting between DTCO to federal level line Ministries seems to be missing. Whilst DTCO input data via the online system to FCGO this is not shared with MOEST for example (this is a challenge across sectors) and, since the report combines all sectors together, it is very difficult for JFPs to approve as they are unable to see the breakdown of expenditures. Moreover, this led to problems with the fund release letter from FCGO for JFP funds/ pooled funds not being released. The transition status means that budget lines and structures in terms of financial reporting need to be reestablished. DTCO shared that since FCGO have not received confirmation that they will receive their payment from JFPs, they are suspending payment to local levels until they are able to provide evidence of expenditures to donors.

c. Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Accountability

14. As mentioned in the previous section detailing the status of federal transition, there were varying levels of monitoring, evaluation, reporting and accountability. For instance, in Gandaki, the PEDD shared that there had been no communication from the central government on how to proceed ahead in terms of reporting. In contrast, Pokhara Metropolitan City had established a Ward Education Committees which undertook additional verification school visits. Similarly, Mayors in both Province 5 and Gandaki reported that they had become involved in the monitoring of schools across their palikas. Several interviewees noted that this was due to inadequate human resources across PGs and LGs and, in particular, an insufficient number of Resource Persons. Having only one technical education staff member at the municipal level was a major challenge, as this person frequently spent most of their time on administrative issues rather than technical issues. There is a key need for technical education units at the municipal level. The opinion on Mayoral involvement in monitoring was mixed, with some stakeholders believing it increased accountability whilst other head teachers expressed that they felt less independent as a school because politicians were becoming involved in discussions and they already had SMCs and SIPs in place to track progress.

15. Web-based EMIS was in place in many schools. This faced some challenges in rural municipalities due to capacity gaps and also a lack of working computers. However, schools were trying their best to complete data entry. For example, in Kapilvastu the computer officer was trying to help all local schools set up web EMIS (despite the LG being under-resourced for this) and schools in Tilahar municipality were partnering to share computers for the upload.

d. Support to schools

16. An acute shortage of qualified teachers across schools was noted. This was understood to be a major driver of inequitable, poor quality learning environments for children. Local municipalities, however, felt empowered to fill the teacher gap. In Province 5, LGs reported that they were recruiting new teachers (and following national policy / regulations to do so). Ad hoc hiring of teachers, however, comes with risk factors, including increased concerns regarding child protection. Meanwhile, in Gandaki Province municipalities were planning for the merger of schools in order to redistribute teachers accordingly and achieve a better average for student teacher ratios and to ensure teaching qualifications matched subject areas and grade levels.

Many of the schools visited by both groups included model schools. These model schools had good infrastructure, equipment, learning outcomes and all teachers were present. In conversations with the head teachers of these model schools, it appeared that they were also receiving the most financial support. In Parbat, one model school had a projected budget of 80 million NPRs over five years in their Master Plan, with 15 million NPRs allocated for the current year. Such funds seem disproportionately large and there is a risk that this is negatively impacting resourcing for other community schools. Additionally, it was unclear if this school planned to support feeder schools and schools in its locality. At one model school in Butwal, the head teacher gave a presentation to 30 other head teachers on how his school had achieved success. However, this was an exception in the model schools visited across both provinces.

e. DRR and School Safety

17. The majority of schools had included DRR in their SIP. One school in Kaski had worked with the Red Cross to raise awareness, and had developed a school safety plan and booklet (dated 2017) on actions to take in case of various natural disasters, and the school's child club had also been orientated on this. One secondary school in Rupandehi had established a junior red cross circle to raise awareness on DRR and practice different preparedness drills at school. Additionally, some schools had a DRR focal point. Schools also highlighted that due to lack of budget, they were not able to retrofit old buildings. At the LG level in Kaski and Parbat, engineers had been hired to check that the quality of new builds adhered to regulations.

18. Overall, the focus on school safety was heavily geared towards natural disasters (particularly earthquakes) but not other risks like fires, hazards in the school playground (e.g. piles of bricks were seen at the bottom of a slide in one playground) or broader safeguarding of children.

f. Quality education, inclusion and ECED/Early Grade Reading

19. Class sizes varied enormously, ranging from 11 – 121 in Province 5 and 3 – 100 in Gandaki Province. Across both provinces in the visited schools, it was frequently mentioned that parents were favouring boys in institutional schools, leaving more girls in community schools.

20. Schools are rapidly announcing themselves as English medium of instruction schools in order to maintain enrollment rates due to increasing competition with institutional schools. This is further being led and encouraged by LGs and PGs who are concerned about enrollment figures and also understand English medium to be synonymous to 'quality education'. Whilst some community schools recognized that this was not in the best interest for learning outcomes, this understanding was not shared by all schools visited. In the school visits in Parbat, there was evidence of English teaching from early grades and whilst some schools had print-rich learning environments from the early grades, these were a mix of both English and Nepali.

21. As well as English, there was an increasing emphasis on ICT being prioritized. At the same time, many computer labs seemed not properly maintained in some of the visit schools.

22. Feedback on NEGRP was very positive with teachers explaining the programme was effective in improving reading levels within just one or two years. Many schools were dedicating 90 minutes of the school day to reading instruction. Some basic learning materials were present in classrooms (i.e. supplementary readers and alphabet chart) and each child had their own workbook. Still, there were concerns about whether teachers would continue to have access to the learning materials once funding for the programme ended. In some more rural schools, boxes of teaching and learning materials (i.e. picture cards, window cards, and decodable readers) remained unopened. Moreover, there were also reports that funding to schools had been cut due to high performance on EGRA but without these scores being formerly communicated to the school by EDCU (or formerly, DEO). In classroom observations, it was noted that not all the teaching learning materials were being utilized for EGR instruction, suggesting that follow up training and continuous professional development needs to be significantly strengthened. In several schools visited in Province 5, students in grades 1-3 still struggled to read a single word, especially in schools where Nepali was a second language and most grade 1-3 students spoke and understood Awadhi.

23. Students with disabilities were under represented in the schools visited as part of this mission, reflecting overall under representation according to national EMIS data. Of the non-specialist community schools visited, several schools said they had no children with disabilities. Statistically this suggests that teachers are unable to properly identify non-visible impairments (i.e. mental/intellectual/learning impairments). Moreover, where teachers did recognize some students as disabled, they lacked strategies to support these students.

24. Additionally, one specialist school for deaf students was visited in Kaski. All 270 students had received their disability grants but this was not adequate to cover student needs. The school facilities were inadequate, with poor WASH amenities and a lack of textbooks. Moreover, teachers had only received the basic level government training and an NGO provided sign language training. As in other non-specialist schools, teachers were unable to say whether any of the children in the school had multiple disabilities aside from hearing impairments. Further training on identifying, teaching, supporting (e.g. psycho-emotional support) and safeguarding children with intellectual, developmental and physical difficulties therefore needs to be prioritized. This needs to include a systematic screening mechanism, needs based services and policy provisions.

5. Good practices and lessons learned:

25. Teachers in one model school in Modi rural Municipality had agreed to voluntarily increase the number of school days by 15 days each calendar year, showing that teachers were motivated to increase quality of education.

26. Multiple LGs recognized the importance of motivating teachers and had introduced incentives to recognize their efforts. This included a 'top up' of 500 NPRs each month for ECED facilitators in Gandaki Province and top ups for Head Teachers to work on the quality of education in Province 5.

27. LGs also were filling capacity gaps from their municipality budgets, for instance, allocating funding for a further 129 teachers in Bara Bardia municipality (as shared by PED) to address the shortages of teachers. (However, this needs to be addressed strategically nationally).

28. At the same time, LGs were enforcing educational planning via various tactics – including Mayors visiting schools. In turn, provincial governments were encouraging stronger planning of local governments. For example, in Province 5, it was shared that the fund allocation for next year won't automatically be given to municipalities but that they will be required to show education plan.

29. There were several examples of strong leadership by head teachers across the schools visited. One head teacher for example was making an effort to screen children biannually in his own office for visual impairments, whilst another was inviting parents for a meeting to address issues of absenteeism. Moreover, most schools in Province 5 had complaint boxes (possibly due to heavy INGO/NGO contingency) and there was a strong focus on equal gender representation on committees.

6. Challenges:

30. English as a medium of instruction is increasingly a challenge for quality education. There is a need both to (re-)orientate PGs, LGs and schools on best practice (English as a subject and mother-tongue language) and also to develop a comprehensive strategy recognizing the reality of this rapidly growing trend towards English medium. It is recommended from this field visit, as such, that a policy position paper is developed to identify how schools and teachers can deliver higher quality education in English medium. This could also address feedback received from model schools which had adopted private school textbooks over government textbooks because they were more child-friendly with lots of colourful illustrations and more culturally relevant content.

31. The adjustment of SSDP functions to the federal structure remains a challenge. In particular, the sequencing of education acts and regulations at different level government (i.e. Federal > Provincial > local levels) seems challenging. Further discussion and developing a common understanding among the different level governments regarding the most efficient and effective working modality for finalizing such regulatory frameworks and guidelines is crucial.

7. Opportunities:

32. There is a clear political drive to announce Municipality and Rural Municipality as 'Out of School Children free'. The efforts and passion to ensure enrollment is encouraging but this needs to be measured against a more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of what it takes to achieve this. 51 of 96 wards in Kapilvastu had announced that they had full admission and 13 of 33 wards in Pokhara Metropolitan City. For instance, LGs need technical support on disability screening and providing adequate and appropriate education that responds to children's needs, whilst schools still need further support on retention campaigns. Moreover, it should be noted that this must be an ongoing, continuous effort and regions cannot legitimately be called 'OOSC free' since demographics are continuously changing, including from nomadic communities/ migrating families.¹

33. Overall, the new federal structure was viewed with optimism by key stakeholders. Whilst reporting and accountability mechanisms undeniably need to be strengthened, as do capacity of new staff, there was substantial evidence of ambitious visions for sector-wide (and cross-sector) development. This was most apparent in Pokhara Metropolitan City, where the Mayor envisioned to develop Pokhara as an educational hub, in particular

¹ A few schools in Parbat noted that all children in their catchment areas were enrolled, but they made a clear distinction between families native to the area and those, for instance, who had migrated from India. All children need to be in school, including legitimately migrant children from neighbouring countries.

developing TVET and higher education facilities to tackle the issue of Nepal's 'brain drain' among the youth population and encourage international students from the Asia region to study in Nepal. There was also a general awareness of the aims of SSDP and most stakeholders were aware of the contents of the PIM, which is encouraging.

8. **Annex 1: Terms of Reference for Joint field visit, Joint Review Meeting November 2018**

Terms of Reference: Joint Field Visit Joint Review Meeting, 19-22 November 2018

I. Introduction

1. The School Sector Development Plan (SSDP; FY2016/17–FY2022/23) is a long-term strategic plan of the Government of Nepal (approved in 2016) aiming to increase participation of all children to a quality school education by focusing on strategic interventions and new reform initiatives to improve the equitable access, quality, efficiency, governance, management and resilience of the education system. The Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST) is the executing agency and the Centre for Education and Human Resource Development (CEHRD) is the implementing agency of the SSDP under the Sector Wide Approach (SWAp).

2. The SWAp is supported by eight Joint Financing Partners (JFPs), which have committed their funding support through a Joint Financing Arrangement (JFA). In addition to this, the SWAp is supported through other Development Partners, including I/NGOs, that are members of the Local Education Development Partner Group (LEDPG). As outlined in the JFA, the MOEST annually conducts two review meetings; one Budget Review Meeting (BRM) and one Joint Review Meeting (JRM). As such, the MOEST is organizing the third JRM from 25-29 November 2018 to review progress in implementation of SSDP, in particular regarding the objectives stated below. The MOEST and the JFPs will jointly be conducting the JRM. As customary and in the interest of upholding good practices of effective coordination, key agencies supporting SSDP outside the JFA framework will also participate in the review process and in the general sessions relating to overall progress review and discussion on key sector issues. The joint field visit is part of the JRM to inform on the progress of the SSDP implementation at different sub national level.

II. Time and Scope of the visit

3. The joint field visits will take place from 19 to 23 November 2018. During this period, one team will visit the Kaski and Parbat districts of Province Four whereas the other team will visit Rupandehi and Kapilvastu districts of Province Five. The visits will largely focus on: (i) Grant Management System at provincial and local governments; (ii) monitoring, evaluation, reporting and accountability; (iii) school disaster risk reduction and school safety; (iv) Focused Group Discussion with beneficiaries of poverty targeted scholarship; and (v) efforts taken by LGs to reduce out of school children. The detailed schedule of the district visits have been developed jointly by the field trip working team with input from the government, LEDPG, and in consultation with the provincial and local government representatives. **The participants of the field visit is included in Annex 1.**

III. Methodology

4. The joint visit teams will be led by representatives of the MOEST and are to inform the JRM. During the joint field visits, the team will visit and engage with stakeholders in the

selected areas including government representatives at provincial level, municipal level and school level. The observations gathered through the field visit are understood to strengthen the understanding of the issues and topics discussed and reviewed during the JRM sessions as per the scope reflected in the SSDP JFA and are as such understood to be anecdotal and not representative for the performance and progress made under the SSDP. **The suggested questionnaire to be used in the field is in the Annex 2.**

IV. Report

5. A short report will be prepared by each team after the field visit that includes findings and conclusions of the discussion and observations. For this, a rapporteur will be appointed. The conclusions of the field visit will be compiled and shared during the JRM 2018. The report should include background, proceedings, findings and recommendation (compiled report of maximum 5 pages and five slides for presentation).

V. Documents to refer to:

- (i) The School Sector Development Plan and Programme (2016-2023)
- (ii) Draft Annual Strategic Implementation Plan (ASIP/AWPB) 2018/19
- (iii) District/local level work plans
- (iv) SSDP transitional roadmap
- (v) Status Report
- (vi) District Profile
- (vii) Basic statistics on schools to be visited

JRM Field Visit: Province 4 (Kaski and Parbat districts)
19 -22 November 2018

Rapporteur: Freya Perry

Kathmandu to Pokhara by Buddha Air Flight -607: leave 8:45 AM

Pokhara to KTM by Buddha Air Flight -607: leave 9:45 AM

Hotel in Pokhara: Hotel Haven O' Ganga (Dilip Gurung +977-61-467535)

Hotel in Parbat: Hotel Benju Private Limited (Kushma 10, Parbat 067-420500)

Team Leader: MOEST

Airport Transfer charge: NRs

Date	Time	Event/Appointment	Remarks
(Day 1) Monday, November 19			
	09: 10 AM	Arrive in Pokhara	
	9: 45 AM- 11:15 AM	<p><i>Meeting with Social Development Ministry, Province no 4</i></p> <p>Joint Secreary of Education Planning and Research division</p> <p>EDCU: Narayan Prasad Subedi-9856011440</p> <p>Tej Prasad Kafle-9856035333</p> <p>Park vehicles here</p> <p><i>Agenda:</i> Institutional Arrangement of SSDP <i>including program and budget</i></p>	
11:15 AM- 12:45PM	<p><i>Meeting with Provincial Education Development Directorate</i> <i>(shares compound with Ministry of Social Development)</i> <i>BaburamDhungana 9841606480—Head of the Office</i></p> <p><i>Agenda:</i> Institutional Arrangement of SSDP including program and budget</p>		

Date	Time	Event/Appointment	Remarks
	12:45 PM – 1: 45 PM	Lunch (venue to be decided by team leader and Rapporteur)	
	1: 45 PM – 3: 15 PM	Meeting with Pokhara Metropolitan City Mayor /Deputy Mayor Chief Administrative Officer Hem Acharya—9846219433 EDCDU: Narayan Prasad Subedi Agenda: Education planning and budgeting, allocation of funds, PFM, Pro-poor scholarship 9-10, early grade reading and other SSDP areas	
	3: 30 PM – 5: 00 PM	Meeting with an urban school in Kaski Divide into two groups to visit schools (i)Sahara Bal Basic School –Pokhara Bus Park Contact : Head Teacher-Lochana Adhikari - 9856063059 (iii) Sirjana Bahira Secondary School Aarghau Pokhara 33 Contact: Head teacher Anita Sigdel-9846065744 Agenda: Poverty targeted scholarship 9-10, early grade reading and other SSDP key areas	
	7:00 PM-8:30 PM	<i>Debrief among team members and Dinner Time</i>	
(Day 2) Tuesday, November 20	8.00 AM	<i>Departure to Parbat</i>	
	11:30 PM-12:30 PM	Check in at the Hotel Have Lunch at the Hotel	
	1PM – 2: 00 PM	<i>Visit to Rural Municipality-Modi Gaupalika in Parbat</i> Chairman/Vice Chairman Chief Administrative Officer UdimrajPaudel (EDCU)-9847637138 <i>Jhalak Sharma Acharya (education officer)—9857636778</i> Agenda:	

Date	Time	Event/Appointment	Remarks
		Education planning and budgeting, allocation of funds, PFM, Pro-poor scholarship, early grade reading and other SSDP areas	
	2:00: PM-3:30 PM	<p><i>Meeting with schools in Modi Gaupalika, Parbat</i></p> <p><i>Divide into two groups</i> (i)NabaJagritUchha Ma. Vi. and—Dimuwa, Tilahar</p> <p>Contact : Head Teacher -Bishnu Prasad Subedi-9857630523</p> <p>(ii)Dimuwa Primary school—Dimuwa, Tilahar</p> <p>Contact: Head Teacher-Ramchandra Poudel-9847625872</p> <p>Agenda: DRR, poverty targeted scholarship 9-10, early grade reading and other SSDP areas</p>	
	7:00 PM – 9:00 PM	<i>Debrief among team members and Dinner Time</i>	
(Day 3) Wednesday, November 21	10.00 AM-11:00 AM	<p>Meeting with DTCO Parbat</p> <p>Nabaraj Sapkota 9841308120</p> <p>Agenda: fund flow, reporting mechanism, internal audit</p>	
	11:30 AM-1:00 PM	<p>Meeting with Municipality (urban) of Parbat Kushma Nagar Palika</p> <p>Mayor/Deputy Mayor Chief Administrative Officer UdimrajPaudel (EDCU)-9847637138</p> <p>Agenda: Education planning and budgeting, allocation of funds, PFM, Pro-poor scholarship, early grade reading and other SSDP areas</p>	
	1: 00 PM-2:00 PM	Lunch time	
	2:00 PM-3:30 PM	<p>Meeting with schools in Kushma Nagar Palika</p> <p>Rajendra Bahdur Chhetri -9857622377</p> <p>Divide into two groups (i)Himalaya Ma. Vi.-khurkotBalmandirPra.Vi-near CDO office</p>	

Date	Time	Event/Appointment	Remarks
		Head teacher:Madhav Regmi-9857621511 (ii) BalmandirPra. Vi Lok Bahadur Rana-9847626624 Agenda DRR, poverty targeted scholarship 9-10, early grade reading and other SSDP areas	
	3:30 PM	Departure to Pokhara	
	7:00 PM-8:30 PM	<i>Debrief among team members and Dinner Time</i>	
(Day 4) Thursday, November 22	9: 45 AM – 10: 10 AM	Departure from Pokhara by Buddha Air Arrive in Kathmandu	

JRM Field Visit: Province 5 (Rupandehi and Kapilvastudistricts)

19 November 2018 – 22 November 2018

Rapporteur: Grant Dansie

Kathmandu to Bhairawa by Buddha Air Flight -851: leave 8:15 AM

Bhairawa to KTM by Buddha Air Flight -852: leave 9:20 AM

Hotel in Rupandehi: Dreamland Gold Resort

Team Leader: MOEST

Airport Transfer charge:

Date	Time	Event/Appointment	Remarks
(Day 1) Monday, November 19			
	09: 00 AM	Arrival in Bhairawa	
	10: 00 AM-11:00 AM	<i>Meeting with Social DevelopmentMinistry, Province no 5-Butwal</i> Joint Secreatry of Education Planning and Research division	

Date	Time	Event/Appointment	Remarks
		Thaneshwior Gyawali 9857015998 EDCU representative Deewakar Bhandari 9847062184 <i>Agenda:</i> Institutional Arrangement of SSDP, <i>Planning and budgeting</i>	
	11:00 AM-12:30 PM	<i>Meeting with Provincial Education Development Directorate-Butwal Bus Park Jeet Bahadur Shah-9858053408</i> EDCU representative Deewakar Bhandari 9847062184 <i>Agenda:</i> Institutional Arrangement of SSDP	
	12:30 PM – 1:15 PM	Lunch in Butwal	
	1: 30 PM – 3: 00 PM	Meeting with Butwal Municipality (Butwal Hat Bazar 5 minutes from MOSD) Mayor /Deputy Mayor Chief Administrative Officer EDCU representative Deewakar Bhandari 9847062184 Lokraj Panthi--9847520490 <i>Agenda:</i> Education planning and budgeting, allocation of funds, PFM, Pro-poor scholarship, early grade reading, DRR and other SSDP areas	
	3: 00 PM – 4: 30 PM	Meeting with an urban school in Rupandehi (10 minutes from MoSD) Divide into two groups (i) Kalika Manavgyaan Secondary School Head Teacher: Ghanshyam Pathak-9857027754 (ii) Kanti Secondary School	

Date	Time	Event/Appointment	Remarks
		Head Teachert-Govind Gyawali-9857036211 Agenda DRR, poverty targeted scholarship 9-10, early grade reading and other SSDP areas	
	6: 30 PM- 8:00 PM	<i>Debrief among team members and Dinner Time</i>	
(Day 2) Tuesday, November 20	8.00 AM	<i>Departure toKapilvastu</i>	
	10.30PM – 12: 00 PM	<i>Visit to Rural Municipality in Kapilvastu</i> Mayadevi Rural Municipality Chairman/Vice Chairman Chief Administrative Officer EDCU <i>Baburam Bhattarai 9847034572</i> Agenda: Education planning and budgeting, allocation of funds, PFM, Pro-poor scholarship, early grade reading, DRR and other SSDP areas	
	12:00 PM – 1: 30 PM	Lunch time	
	1:30: PM- 3:00 PM	<i>Meeting with a school in Rural Municipality of Kapilvastu (MayadeviGaunpalika)</i> Ramesh Pandey--9857050530 Divide into two groups (i)ChhatrapaliTirthadevi Secondary School- PakadiMayadeviwarda -2 Head Teacher- 9855121212 (ii) MadarshaMisbahulUlumManakhoriya Head Teacher: Baburam Bhattarai- 9857050411 Agenda: DRR, poverty targeted scholarship 9-10, early grade reading and other SSDP areas	
	4:00 PM	Travel back to Butwal	
	7:00PM- 8:30 PM	<i>Debrief among team members and Dinner Time</i>	
(Day 3) Wednesday,			

Date	Time	Event/Appointment	Remarks
November 21	10:00 AM- 11:30 AM	Meeting with Rural Municipality Rupandehi Kanchan Gaupalika (1 hr from Butwal) Chairman/Vice Chairman Chief Administrative Officer EDCU representative Deewakar Bhandari 9847062184 Agenda: Education planning and budgeting, allocation of funds, PFM, Pro-poor scholarship 9-10, early grade reading, DRR and other SSDP areas	
	11:30 AM- 1:00 PM	Meeting with rural school in Rupandehi (Kanchan Gaupalika) Narayan Poudel--9847037447 Divide into two groups (i)GyanodayaAadharbhut School Renuka Thapa- 9806920338 (ii) Pragati Secondary School Gajedi Jib Raj Paudel- 9857042003 Agenda DRR, poverty targeted scholarship 9-10, early grade reading and other SSDP areas	
	1:00 PM – 2:30 PM	Lunch Time Butwal:	
	2:30 PM- 4:00 PM	Meeting with DTCO Rupandehi Mati Prasad Bhusal 9857063892 Agenda: Fund flow, reporting mechanism, internal audit	
	6: 30 PM- 8:30 PM	<i>Debrief among team members and Dinner Time</i>	
	(Day 4) Thursday, November 22	9:20 AM	Departure from Bhairawa by Buddha Air Kathmandu
9:55 AM		Arrive in Kathmandu	

9. Annex 2: Suggested Questionnaire for JRM Field Visit

A. Introduction

1. All meetings are expected to start with an introduction of all the participants, after which the Government participants of the joint teams will introduce the context and the purpose for the visit. Prior to the trip, all participants are expected to have been provided with a Province/ Municipality/ school profile that presents general information and demographics about the province/ municipality and the education status of the Municipality and school against the average performance in the province/municipality to allow all to understand the status.
2. The introduction from the side of the joint team is expected to be followed by a sharing/presentation by that municipality/school that is visited, based on which the questions stated below can be used to guide the discussion that follows.

B. Transition

3. What is the status of federal roll out? What has been your experience regarding decentralisation and restructuring of state structures in terms of fulfilling your responsibilities? What have been the major challenges so far and how have you tried to overcome them?
4. Are you familiar with the SSDP and its objectives and targets? How are major activities under SSDP being implemented? What is the implementation arrangement? What have been the main challenges in education service delivery, and what has been the unit's response?

C. Grant Management System (*ask LGs and DTCOs*)

5. How do you receive the fund? How do you disburse? How do you get reports on the use of funds? How do you report back? Any other reporting mechanisms?
6. Do you use any Financial Management Information System (FMIS) (probe: SuTRA). Is there a system of reconciliation of different accounts? How is financial information consolidated?
7. Do you have internal control unit? What are the responsibilities of the unit?
8. Who audits your book of accounts?

D. Education Planning and Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Accountability (*ask LGs and Social Development Ministry*)

9. Do you have education sector plan? (if yes, the plan is for how many years?) what are the main activities, areas of focus, and targets? How do you define targets (on the basis of SSDP, policy, law and regulations)? Is the plan costed?
10. What are plans and mechanisms in place to ensure quality education for all?
11. What is M&E mechanism in the changed context? What are frameworks and guidelines guiding M & E mechanism? Do you have procedures for measuring program objectives and outputs? How often do you visit the schools of your LG?

12. Do you monitor teaching and learning process in schools? (probe: teachers time on task)? Do teachers translate the training that they have received in classroom processes?

13. Do you receive education progress reports?

E. Support to LGs and schools (ask EDCUs, schools, Education Development Directorate and Social Development Ministry)

14. What are the activities taking place in the areas of capacity development? (any tools being provided?)

15. What are capacity building programs inbuilt for enhancing quality of teaching and learning processes in schools?

16. Have there been any discussions and contestations between your agency and other GON offices? What are key issues and how have they been resolved?

17. Does your LG have sufficient education human resource i.e. Teachers, Education Personnel? If not what is your plan to ensure this?

18. What kinds of support do you provide to LGs and schools so that they can impart quality education? What are the major issues in terms of children's learning? What are your plans to support schools in your region?

F. School Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and School Safety(ask LGs and schools)

19. Do you have DRR and school safety plan? (plan is for how many years, is it costed?)

20. What are plans to assure quality of constructions in schools? (probe: annual technical audit).

21. Who monitors construction activities in schools? (how many engineers do you have?) How often do they visit schools when construction activities are taking place?

22. Do you have DRR focal person? What is the role of DRR focal person? How do DRR focal person help train students and teachers in DRR and school safety areas?

G. Inclusive Education (ask LGs and Schools)

23. What steps are included as part of the planning cycle to ensure enrolment and retention of out of school children? Are there any specific actions taken to support children with disabilities?

24. In Kapilvastu, have you attended a workshop on the use of the Equity Index and the enrolment of out of school children(ask in Kapilvastu only)?

25. What do you think are the reasons for existence of out of school children?

26. What are you plans to retain students in schools?

27. By when will you be able to enrol all school going aged children into schools?
28. How have you managed to generate resources for enrolling and supporting retention of all students in schools? Are these adequate?
29. Are you working with other line ministries (i.e. health, women, children, and senior citizens) to support children with disabilities enrol, stay in school and learn?

H. Poverty Targeted Scholarship (*ask students*)

30. How did you hear about poverty targeted scholarship? How were you selected? Have you received scholarship amount?
31. What is your perception regarding selection of students (are there students who are less well off than you and have not received scholarship? Are there students who are well off and have still received scholarship)
32. What does the amount help to cover? (tuition fee, hostel fee, travel, stationeries)
33. Did anyone visit your house to verify information you had submitted? How do you think CEHRD/EDCUs/LGs should verify the information provided by students?
34. What are your aspirations?

I. Early Grade Reading (*ask LGs and schools*)

35. Have you been informed about the EGRA/CBEGRA results of the schools in your LG and have you considered that for future planning process? (**ask LGs**)
36. In your experience could you please tell us who performs better and who is underperforming in terms of reading i.e the background, socio economic status of the child and why?
37. How supportive is the community for promoting children's reading? How do they support you?
38. Did your school conduct EGRA/CBEGRA and if yes, did you communicate the results with the parents?

10. Annex 3: District EMIS Profiles

EMIS Profile Province 4

Education Profile Province 4								
ECEDs/PPCs								
District/Province	Number of ECD/PPCs	Total students	Total Boys	Total girls	GER Total	GER Boys	GER Girls	Total Teachers
Nepal	36,568							
Province 4								
Kaski	609	24384	13606	10778				
Parbat	352	4697	2577	2120				
Pokhara Municipality	394	21652	12103	9549				
Kushma Municipality	82	1590	897	693				
Modi Rural Municipality	60	587	322	265				
Basic Education (grades 1-8)								
Enrollment in Basic Education								
	Number of total Schools	Total students	Total boys	Total girls	NER Total	NER Boys	NER Girls	Total Teachers
Nepal	35,601							
Kaski	641	867353	46995	40358				
Parbat	362	21068	10803	10265				
Pokhara Municipality	58	76708	41669	35039				
Kushma Municipality	35	6840	3626	3214				
Modi Rural Municipality	36	3085	1601	1484				
Secondary Education(grades 9-12)								
Enrollment in Secondary Education								
Nepal	Total students	Total boys	Total girls	NER Total	NER Boys	NER Girls	Total Teachers	
Province 4								
Kaski	33294	17301	15993					
Parbat	7481	3634	3847					
Pokhara Municipality	30019	15769	14250					
Kushma Municipality	2399	1169	1230					
Modi Rural Municipality	879	435	444					

School Profile Province 4

ECD				
Schools	Total	Total	Total	Total

	students	boys	Girls	Teachers
Sahara Bal Basic School	29	16	13	
Sirjana Bahira Secondary School	0	0	0	
Himalaya Ma. Vi.	52	30	22	
BalmandirPra. Vi	21	14	7	
Naba Jagrit Uchha Ma. Vi	11	4	7	
Dimuwa Primary school	18	11	7	
Basic Education				
Nepal	Total students	Total boys	Total Girls	Total Teachers
Sahara Bal Basic School	225	106	119	
Sirjana Bahira Secondary School	153	84	69	
Himalaya Ma. Vi.	163	81	82	
BalmandirPra. Vi	92	52	40	
Naba Jagrit Uchha Ma. Vi	272	128	144	
Dimuwa Primary school	54	32	22	
Secondary Education				
	Total students	Total boys	Total Girls	Total Teachers
Sahara Bal Basic School				
Sirjana Bahira Secondary School	44	22	22	
Himalaya Ma. Vi.	133	42	91	
BalmandirPra. Vi				
Naba Jagrit Uchha Ma. Vi	184	92	92	
Dimuwa Primary School				

Annex 4: EMIS Profile Province 5

Education Profile Province 5								
ECEDs/PPCs								
District/Province	Number of ECD/PPCs	Total students	Total boys	Total girls	GER Total	GER Boys	GER Girls	Total Teachers
Nepal	36,568							
Province 5		182397	99292	83105				5968
Rupandehi	818	34817	19171	15646				965
Kapilvastu		11971	6195	5776				271
Butwal Municipality	99	8879	5075	3804				222
Mayadevi Rural Municipality	51	1250	662	588				19
Kanchan Rural Municipality	34	1498	870	628				50
Basic Education (grades 1-8)								
Enrollment in Basic Education								
	Number of Total Schools	Total students	Total Boys	Total girls	NER Total	NER Boys	NER Girls	Total Teachers including secondary
Nepal	35601							
Province 5		844020	429710	39723				45252
Rupandehi	730	144793	6276	6584				7380
Kapilvastu	617	92536	30139	45920				2314

Butwal Municipality	27	13899	16913	30812				1873
Mayadevi Rural Municipality	48	8168	4025	4143				167
Kanchan Rural Municipality	43	7581	3969	3612				450
Secondary Education(grades 9-12)								
Enrollment in Secondary Education								
Nepal		Total students	Total boys	Total girls	NER Total	NER Boys	NER Girls	
Province 5		198,739	97,017	101,722				
Rupandehi		44,395	23,514	2,0881				
Kapilvastu		14,346	7,362	6,984				
Butwal Municipality		16476	9229	7247				
Mayadevi Rural Municipality		1196	669	527				
Kanchan Municipality		2501	1161	1340				

School Profile Province 5

ECD				
Schools	Total students	Total boys	Total Girls	Total Teachers
Kalika Manavgyaan Secondary School	185	98	87	
Kanti Secondary School	62	33	29	
Chhatrapali Tirthadevi Secondary School	31	17	14	
Madarsha Misbahul Ulum Manakhoriya	72	36	36	
Gyanodaya Aadharbhut School	30	16	14	
Pragati Secondary School Gajedi	65	33	32	
Basic Education				
Schools	Total students	Total boys	Total Girls	Total Teachers
KalikaManavgyaan Secondary School	2138	1180	958	
Kanti Secondary School	824	414	410	
Chhatrapali Tirthadevi Secondary School	791	427	364	
MadarshaMisbahulUlumManakhoriya	206	84	122	
Gyanodaya Aadharbhut School	200	97	103	
Pragati Secondary School Gajedi	664	360	304	
Secondary Education				
Schools	Total students	Total boys	Total Girls	Total Teachers
Kalika Manavgyaan Secondary School	3326	1830	1496	
Kanti Secondary School	1717	973	744	
Chhatrapali Tirthadevi Secondary School	402	228	174	
Madarsha Misbahul Ulum Manakhoriya	0	0	0	
Gyanodaya Aadharbhut School	0	0	0	
Pragati SecondarySchool Gajedi	455	188	267	

Annex 6: Progress update on DLI Matrix

DLI ref.	JFP Reference	DLI No with Language	Definition of achievement	Achievement and Expected Disbursement	Supporting Documents
G.2a		Trimester FMR submitted within 45 days of trimester end date		Achieved	Achieved Third Trimester FMR has been shared.
G.2b		OAG Annual Audit Report for previous fiscal year submitted within nine months after the end of the fiscal year		Complied.	Audit report of FY 2016/17 has been already shared with JFPs.
G.2c		Budget allocation for education sector compliant with SSDP budget codes and budget allocation consistently increased in real terms compared to previous year		Complied Budget allocation for education sector complaint with SSDP budget codes. The total education budget allocated under conditional grant in FY 2017/18 was NRs 127 billion The total education budget allocated in FY 2018/19 is NRs 134 billion. This represents around 5.8 percent increase. However, the inflation rate is around 6 percent. Hence, the education budget did not increase in real terms for this FY. If we add budget allocation to education sector by province using funds received from the federal government under equalization grant then the education budget will increase in real terms. According to the data provided by provinces (red book), the total education budget allocated by provinces (allocation from equalization grant and special grant) is NRs 4.4 billion. If we include this budget as well then the budget for education represents an increase by 8.97 percent. This represents 2.97 percent budget increase in real terms as the inflation was 6 percent.	Province Red Books Province AWPBs

DLI ref.	JFP Reference	DLI No with Language	Definition of achievement	Achievement and Expected Disbursement	Supporting Documents
DLI 1	Reading proficiencies and habits strengthened in early grades				
1.2 a	EU/GPE DLI 2 Euro 2 /US\$ 3 million	Classroom based Early Grade Reading Assessment(CB-EGRA) carried out in 3,000 community schools	<p>3,000 community schools have undertaken classroom based early grade reading assessments in grade 2 & 3 and the results of these assessments have been shared with parents through individual student report cards or aggregate findings in group meetings with parents.</p> <p>Assessments have been undertaken as prescribed by the approved classroom based early grade reading assessment guidelines and in presence of teachers and parents' representatives.</p> <p>In Years 2 and 3, the Flash report must show the total number of schools where two rounds of assessment + sharing have been completed (one in July-August and second in February-March)</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>CB-EGRA was carried out in 3,046 community schools, among 72,538 students in 12 districts in grade 2 and 3 in FY 2017-2018. The results of these assessments were shared with parents in a group meeting. Assessments were undertaken as prescribed by the approved CB-EGRA guidelines in presence of teachers and parents' representative.</p> <p>The CB-EGRA report was prepared by Education Review Office (ERO) and shared to JFPs. It is disclosed in the ERO website. http://www.ero.gov.np/article/254/cbegra--2017report.html</p> <p>Flash report I 2018 to be shared on 2 November 2018 will have the total number of schools where assessment was completed.</p> <p>Expected Disbursement:</p> <p>US \$ 3 million from GPE and Euro 2 million from EU</p>	<p>CB-EGRA 2018 report</p> <p>Page iii of CB-EGRA report provides information related to conduction of assessment and dissemination.</p> <p>Page 7 provides information on tools and guidelines developed for the purpose of conducting assessment.</p> <p>Annex 1 provides list of participating schools</p> <p>Flash I Report 2017</p> <p>Flash I Report 2018</p>

DLI ref.	JFP Reference	DLI No with Language	Definition of achievement	Achievement and Expected Disbursement	Supporting Documents
DLI 2	Increased teaching-learning processes through National Curriculum Framework (NCF) revision and access to activity-based math, science and English language materials.				
2.1a	WB For WB the DLI number is 3.1 US\$ 8 million	Revised NCF approved	Approved NCF will have all aspects of curriculum and textbook revision, teacher preparation, reduction in number of compulsory subjects and implementation arrangements.	<p>Achieved</p> <p>The National Curriculum Framework (NCF) has been approved by Curriculum and Evaluation Council. The NCF has all aspects of curriculum and textbook revision, teacher preparation, reduction in number of compulsory subjects and implementation arrangement.</p> <p>Curriculum and textbook revision:</p> <p>Curriculum is to be developed based on principles of competencies, holistic child development, inclusiveness, local needs, use of information, communication and technology, flexibility and diversity, and incorporation of Nepali values and beliefs. Integrated curriculum will be developed up to grade 3. (Please refer to part 6, page 68; page 28). NCF is a living document (page 74).</p> <p>Teacher preparation:</p> <p>Aspects of teacher preparation are included in Institutional Capacity (page 26 ,page 27, page 33).</p> <p>Reduction in number of compulsory subjects:</p> <p>The number of compulsory subjects have been reduced to five for grades 9 and 10 (page 57 of NCF).</p> <p>Textbooks and learning materials development, production and distribution</p> <p>-Provision to improve physical quality of textbooks, color printing and use of multi-textbooks.</p> <p>-JEMC and Private Printers will produce textbooks.</p> <p>(page 40 and page 68)</p>	- Approved NCF

DLI ref.	JFP Reference	DLI No with Language	Definition of achievement	Achievement and Expected Disbursement	Supporting Documents
				<p>Implementation arrangement (Part 6, page 68; page 38):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -school is considered as the main entity to implement curriculum -roles of Federal, Provincial and Local governments are defined for the implementation of NCF -Institutional capacity development plan will be developed to implement NCF. <p>Expected disbursement:</p> <p>US \$ 8 million from World Bank</p>	
2.1b	<p>ADB</p> <p>For ADB the DLI number is 3</p> <p>US\$ 6 million</p>	<p>A package of activity based for math science and English language developed for grades 6-8</p>	<p>The package of activity-based kits for mathematics, science and English language is a standardized package of resource materials for grades 6-8, based on the national curriculum, drawing on regional and international good practice.</p> <p>This DLI is achieved when independent verification by JFPs confirms that the package of kits is acceptable, based on a review of the packages on a sample basis.</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>CDC finalized and approved the package for activity-based kits incorporating suggestions provided by stakeholders. The tool kit for each subject comprises of three types of materials: i) list of hands-on materials (for Mathematics and Science) ii) printed materials (workbook, activity books, guides) and iii) e-learning (digital activities, videos, and audio) materials.</p> <p>The workshop was held on June 22 to solicit feedback from larger stakeholders including government, donor partners, school teachers, experts, and representatives from various indigenous groups and associations</p> <p>Regional and international good practices were incorporated in the development of the activity-based kits for these subjects.</p> <p>MOEST and CDC have provided abstracts in English for the resource materials that are in Nepali.</p>	<p>-A list of activity-based learning materials for Mathematics, English and Science approved by CDC</p> <p>-Document summarizing the activity-based kits preparation process and types of materials included.</p> <p>-materials for all three subjects</p>

DLI ref.	JFP Reference	DLI No with Language	Definition of achievement	Achievement and Expected Disbursement	Supporting Documents
				<p>Expected disbursement:</p> <p>US \$ 6 million from ADB</p>	
DLI 4	Assessment and examination system reforms undertaken to improve teaching and learning				
4.2a	GPE DLI 1 US\$ 3 million	Single subject certification policy approved for higher secondary school exams	Government document showing single-subject certification policy has been approved for higher secondary school examinations.	<p>Achieved</p> <p>MOEST has approved the single subject policy for grades 11 and 12.</p> <p>Expected disbursement:</p> <p>US \$ 3 million from GPE</p>	- MOEST letter on approval of single-subject policy.
4.2b	WB DLI 4.1/ US\$ 6/ F Euro 1 million	Analysis of results for nationally representative and competency based NASA grade 8	This DLR is considered achieved when (a) a report on the analysis of NASA findings and implications for different agencies to take necessary action for reform is prepared, (b) information indicated in point (a) above is disseminated in the MOE and ERO websites, and (c) a plan of action for implementation is prepared and resources provided.	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Analysis of results of nationally representative and competency based NASA for grade eight has been completed. The report has been uploaded to ERO website. http://www.ero.gov.np/reports/reports/nasa.html</p> <p>A plan of action for implementation has been prepared.</p> <p>Budgetary provision has been made in ASIP/AWPB for FY 2018/19 to implement activities outlined in action plan.</p> <p>Expected disbursement:</p> <p>US \$ 6 million from World Bank and Euro 1 million from Finland</p>	<p>-NASA Report for grade eight</p> <p>Uploaded to MOEST website and ERO website</p> <p>-NASA Action Plan</p> <p>-ASIP/AWPB for FY 2017/18 and FY 2018/19</p>
DLI 8	Provision of adequate DRR resilient safe school facilities at all levels				

DLI ref.	JFP Reference	DLI No with Language	Definition of achievement	Achievement and Expected Disbursement	Supporting Documents
8.1 a	EU Euro 0.81 million	School guidelines for DRR Standards for school construction, retrofitting and School Disaster Management (SDM) approved	The approval of school guidelines for DRR Standards for school construction, retrofitting and School Disaster Management.	<p>Achieved.</p> <p>This is year one DLI result.</p> <p>School guidelines have been approved by SSDP steering committee.</p> <p>Expected disbursement:</p> <p>Already disbursed last year</p>	-School guidelines for DRR
8.1 b	(EU Euro 0.81 million)	DRR Comprehensive school safety master plan approved	The approval of a plan that includes including phase-wise implementation plan with yearly targets on reconstruction and retrofitting approved, based on the revision and approval of the visionary strategy for increasing disaster resilience schools	<p>Achieved</p> <p>DRR comprehensive school safety master plan has been approved by SSDP steering committee.</p> <p>Minimum package has been approved by MOEST. Communication and dissemination strategy for CSSDRR has been developed by MOEST.</p> <p>Expected disbursement:</p> <p>Already disbursed last year</p>	-DRR comprehensive school safety master plan includes minimum package, implementation guidelines and communication strategy
8.2	EU Euro 2.78 million	40 school blocks retrofitted in non-earthquake affected districts	The number of safe school blocks established through retrofitting, on approved locations equals or succeed the targets that are included in the DRR/CSS implementation plan within the periods defined in the plan for these targets to be met	<p>Achieved</p> <p>40 school blocks have been retrofitted in non-earthquake affected districts.</p> <p>Expected disbursement:</p> <p>Euro 2.78 million from EU</p>	List of schools that were retrofitted in non-earthquake affected districts
DLI 9	Improved governance and strengthened fiduciary management of the school sector.				

DLI ref.	JFP Reference	DLI No with Language	Definition of achievement	Achievement and Expected Disbursement	Supporting Documents
9.1	GPE/REACH DLI 5 US\$ 2 million	500 schools receive school-based FM capacity strengthening support	Postponed from year 1 DLIs as part of restructured timeline of GPE/REACH indicators.	<p>Achieved</p> <p>More than 1,000 secondary level schools from 66 districts have received the training on financial management and procurement.</p> <p>Expected disbursement:</p> <p>US \$ 2 million from GPE/REACH</p>	<p>Dataset of names of schools and personnel who received the training on financial management and procurement according to the manual</p> <p>Copy of FM training manual.</p> <p>Copy of procurement manual</p>
9.2b	ADB DLI 6 US\$ 2 million	Training imparted to 1,000 secondary schools in procurement procedures	This DLI is achieved when the JFPs verify the number of 1,000 secondary schools that have received the training based on the manual as described under 9.1c.	<p>Achieved More than 1,000 schools have received the training on financial management and procurement.</p> <p>Expected disbursement:</p> <p>US \$ 2million from ADB</p>	<p>Dataset of names of schools and personnel who received the training on financial management and procurement according to the manuals.</p> <p>Copy of training manuals</p>
9.2 e	WB DLI 1.3 US\$ 6 million	Satisfactory completion of Capacity strengthening AWPB on key	Critical PSF areas include those supporting the achievement of all 1–6 DLIs. AWPB for PSF means establishment and operationalization of TSU, and at least \$3 million annual allocation.	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Annex IV and v page 124 of ASIP/AWPB for 2017/18 list activities related to capacity strengthening of PSF. The total amount allocated is NRs 309,211,000 which is equivalent to \$3 million.</p> <p>Status Report to be submitted on November 02, 2018 will document the expenditure status of amount allocated under</p>	<p>ASIP/AWPB 2017/18</p> <p>Status Report for FY 2017/18</p>

DLI ref.	JFP Reference	DLI No with Language	Definition of achievement	Achievement and Expected Disbursement	Supporting Documents
		Program support facility (PSF) activities	Satisfactory means the above two plus at least 80% of allocated PSF budget (based on the actual contract value) spent.	capacity strengthening. Expected disbursement: US \$ 6 million from World Bank	

SSDP Year 2 DLI progress of the second year (part two) As of 05 November 2018

DLI ref.	JFP Reference	DLI No with Language	Definition of achievement	Achievement	Supporting Documents
DLI 3	Improved teacher management, availability and accountability, including improved deployment of trained subject teachers for Mathematics, Science and English in basic and secondary schools.				
3.1 a	ADB DLI 2 US\$ 3 million	Teacher Rationalization and Deployment Plan, particularly to ensure the availability of subject teachers in basic and secondary schools approved	Basic school offers grades 1–8, and secondary school offers grades 1–10 or 1–12. Subject teachers for mathematics, science and English have the teacher license and are recruited into approved positions to teach specific subjects. The Teacher Rationalization and Deployment Plan will include: (i) a phased plan for all basic and secondary schools to have at least one mathematics teacher, one science teacher and one English teacher per school to teach both basic (grades 1-8) and secondary (grades 9–12) levels; (ii) a time-bound plan to rationalize excess teacher positions in lower grades and shortage in higher grades; (iii) annual targets for rationalization and deployment; and (iv) annual targets for deployment of additional subject	Achieved in Year 1: Teacher Rationalization and Deployment Plan, particularly to ensure the availability of subject teachers in basic and secondary schools was approved in 2017. The plan had provision to have at least one Science teacher, one Mathematics teacher and English teacher per school, time-bound plan to rationalize excess teacher positions in lower grades and shortage in higher grades, annual targets for rationalization and deployment and annual targets for deployment for additional subject teachers for secondary levels. However, in the changed context, MOEST will update this plan and justify the changes made. The updated plan will document all changes and provide information on what actions will be	-Additional analysis of teacher shortage - Updated list of 5,000 schools

DLI ref.	JFP Reference	DLI No with Language	Definition of achievement	Achievement	Supporting Documents
			<p>teachers for secondary levels. This DLI is achieved when the JFPs and MOE have jointly agreed on the Teacher Rationalization and Deployment Plan and it is approved by the MOE</p>	<p>taken to make results comparable.</p> <p>A high level committee has been formed to recommend GoN for redeployment of teachers. The committee has shared the report with the Prime Minister.</p> <p>The prepared list of 5,000 schools for subject teacher positioning and redeployment will be updated accordingly.</p> <p>MOEST has already released teacher support grants to LGs to hire 1,260 primary level teachers, 1,229 lower secondary level teachers, and 724 secondary level teachers for FY 2017/18 academic year.</p> <p>Budgetary provision has been made for teaching learning support to LGs for FY 2018/19 for the purpose of hiring teachers.</p>	
3.2	WB DLI 6.2 US\$ 9 million	TST enhancing monitoring system operational in 15% of all community schools	<p>TST enhancing monitoring system will be considered operational when the individual community schools will implement the system consistent with the approved Policy and Guidelines (monitoring forms obtained, records kept and information reported to higher authority). This DLR will be considered achieved if TST enhancing monitoring system is operational in at least 15% of all community schools.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The guidelines for Time-Spent-Teaching (TST) have been developed and finalized. - Performance grant has been allocated to schools implementing TST enhancing monitoring system. -Budget was allocated for the implementation of TST at school level FY 2017/18 - Provision was made for conducting 	- Guidelines for TST monitoring.

DLI ref.	JFP Reference	DLI No with Language	Definition of achievement	Achievement	Supporting Documents
				<p>management training to school.</p> <p>-DEOs released budget to schools to implement this activity</p> <p>-Reports from individual schools yet to be received.</p>	
DLI 5	Model schools piloted with comprehensive quality inputs and innovative teaching and learning				
5.2	ADB US\$ 5 million	Implementation of approved school-specific multi-year quality improvement plans in 100 model schools initiated	Approved school-specific multi-year quality improvement plan will include needs assessment and comprehensive planning for upgrade to a model school, including construction or retrofitting of buildings, water and sanitation facilities, science laboratory, library, ICT laboratory, e-resources and playground. The DLI is achieved when MOE submits the school-specific plans, with detailed costs and 5-year implementation plan, and confirms deployment of head teachers (one full-time head teacher per school) and subject teachers (one subject teacher for each of mathematics, science and English subjects to teach both basic and secondary levels), and the JFPs review and agree. Partial achievement of the DLI is by the number of model schools.	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>The appraisal process of master plans has been completed for all 213 schools that submitted plans. School specific comments have been prepared. CEHRD has issued directives to schools to revise costed plans based on the technical reports. Budget has been provided to all model schools for implementation of their master plans. CEHRD has been conducting workshop of model schools in clusters across the country. LGs will also be involved in the workshop.</p> <p>The appraisal process has also provided guidance on deployment of full time head teachers as well as subject teachers (one subject teacher for each of Mathematics, Science and English)</p> <p>It might be difficult to appoint a full time head teacher. This is being discussed with the high level committee formed to look into teacher</p>	<p>-Multi-year quality improvement plan with annexes</p> <p>-Needs assessment conducted</p> <p>-Five year budget for the plan</p> <p>-Model School Framework for Master Plan</p>

DLI ref.	JFP Reference	DLI No with Language	Definition of achievement	Achievement	Supporting Documents
				management.	
DLI 6	Reduction in disparities in access and participation				
6.2 a	GPE DLI 3(ii)/EU/F US\$ 2.2/ Euro 2/ Euro 1 million	20% reduction in the aggregate number of OOSC in the 10 most disadvantaged districts (according to the Equity Index)	A brief summarizing the total number of OOSC brought into basic schooling in each of the 10 selected intervention districts. Former OOSC enrolled either in flexible learning centers or regular schools can be included in this list. A dataset listing the names and profiles of the out of school children brought into basic schooling, including the flexible learning centers or formal schools in which they are enrolled	<p>In progress.</p> <p>Household census was conducted to collect detail information on out of school children in all five additional districts(Dolpa, Rolpa, Doti, Humla and Siraha). Orientation and data was collected by VDCs as per the same format as Year 1.</p> <p>CEHRD has initiated workshops in these five districts. During the workshops, the baseline dataset based on household census was produced to confirm the reduction of the number/ percentage of out of school children in these municipalities for the FY 2017/18. The achievement report will be shared by 30 November 2018.</p>	<p>1. Baseline dataset of OOSC from household census in the additional five districts.</p> <p>2. A list of out of school children brought into basic schooling in academic year 2018/19 including flexible learning centers or formal schools in which they are enrolled.</p>
6.2 b	GPE DLI 3(i) US\$ 0.7 million	Targeted interventions implemented in the 10 most disadvantaged Districts (according to the Equity Index)	Targeted interventions developed through ESIP and reflected in ASIP/AWPB 2017/18 for 10 most disadvantaged districts. Revised intervention plans for bringing OOSC into basic schooling.	<p>Ongoing– Documentation in progress</p> <p>The provision was made in ASIP/AWPB to implement targeted activities in municipalities that are within the previous 10 districts selected based on their ranking against the Equity Index to reduce out of school children. The activities included provision of scholarships, mid-day meal and welcome to school campaign.</p>	<p>ASIP/AWPB for FY 2017/18</p> <p>A letter from CEHRD stating modality and</p> <p>Status with annexes ESIP and orientation workshop overview for local governments</p> <p>The report from districts</p>

DLI ref.	JFP Reference	DLI No with Language	Definition of achievement	Achievement	Supporting Documents
					on activities implemented to bring out of school children into the system.
DLI 7	Integrated, pro-poor scholarship scheme implemented. Increased access and participation of boys and girls in secondary education.				
7.2(i)	WB DLI 2.2/ADB DLI 1 US\$ 6/7 million	PPTS in grades 9 and 11 and PSS in grade 11 implemented in 25 districts	PPTS is considered implemented if (a) the implementation progress report submitted by implementing units specifies the number of beneficiaries by gender and poverty quintile, and total amounts disbursed to students, (b) the program covers at least 90% of all community schools in the selected 25 districts (with regard to application purposes where students in Grades 8 and 10 are eligible to apply for scholarship benefits in the following academic year in Grades 9 and 11), and (c) scholarship is disbursed only to students meeting the following conditions: (i) remain unmarried until finishing school (ii) meet at least 80% attendance rate during the relevant period; and (iii) Achieved at least grade 'C' on average (to be defined) or passed, previous year's final exam.	<p>In Progress</p> <p>Students from grade 9 and 11 in poorest 25 districts were asked to fill up the PMT form for the purpose of scholarship distribution.</p> <p>The poorest 25 districts were selected as defined by CBS in Small Area Estimates of Poverty, 2011. These are same districts where Ministry of Land Management, Cooperatives and Poverty Alleviation conducted census to identify poor households.</p> <p>CEHRD is in the process of completing verification of students. For the purpose of verification, 10 percent of students were randomly selected from the preliminary list of eligible students. CHERD and SFAFDB are following up with districts (RPs) on the status of verification. The scholarship amount has been disbursed into individual accounts of students except for students whose verification has not been completed.</p>	<p>Implementation progress report.</p> <p>Final list of students by gender, school, grade, district, ethnicity and poverty quintiles.</p>
7.2 (ii)		in 15 of these districts with targeted interventions for	The DLI is achieved when JFPs review and agree on the revised pro-poor scheme guidelines. The revised pro-poor scholarship	Similar to 7.2 (i)	Similar to 7.2 (i)

DLI ref.	JFP Reference	DLI No with Language	Definition of achievement	Achievement	Supporting Documents
		increasing girls' participation in science subject in grades 11 and 12	scheme is implemented in 15 districts, targeting the poor, girls and boys, with the objective of increasing retention and completion rates for basic and secondary grades among poor students. This DLI is achieved when the MOE report confirming achievement of the DLI target is verified on a sample basis by an independent, third party recruited by the JFPs. Partial achievement is by the number of districts implementing the pro-poor scholarship scheme and the girls' science scholarship scheme. Total disbursement divided by 15 districts for Year 2 (2017).		
DLI 9	Improved governance and strengthened fiduciary management of the school sector.				
9.2a	WB DLI 1.2 US\$ 6 million	Grant Management System (GMS) operational	GMS will be considered operational when (a) GMU led by a coordinator is established in each DEO office and school focal person is assigned by all eligible schools as per approved grants operation manual, (b) all grants are disbursed based on ACF prepared by GMU, ensuring compliance with eligibility criteria, (c) a system of compliance verification of eligibility criteria and utilization of funds by schools is in place, and (d) a system of disbursement reconciliation and refunds of funds from those schools not meeting the eligibility criteria or utilization guidelines is introduced (this reconciliation is based on administrative data generated from GMS and not from OAG report).	In each DEO, there was a unit headed by Deputy DEO or senior officer responsible for GMS. The other staffs of the unit included finance, procurement, technical (engineer) officer to ensure compliance verification of eligibility criteria and utilization of funds. The federation of country has resulted in the change to the functional GMS as LGs are now responsible for school education. There is a need to redefine GMS in the changed federal context.	

DLI ref.	JFP Reference	DLI No with Language	Definition of achievement	Achievement	Supporting Documents
9.2 c	ADB DLI 6(i) US\$ 2 million	Revised needs and performance based school grant system approved by MoE	<p>The revised needs- and performance-based school grant system will redefine the guidelines, norms and procedures for the flow of grants to schools to better address critical school-specific needs and to strengthen performance of schools. This will be based on the review of the existing school grants system.</p> <p>This DLI is achieved when the JFPs verify, and agree with MOE on the revised needs- and performance-based school grant system, and MOE approves the revised school grant system.</p>	<p>The result was achieved in Year 1.</p> <p>There is a need to revise school grant manual in the changed context.</p> <p>Implementation of performance-based grant depends upon design of new LG conditional grant for school education.</p>	
9.2 d	WB DLI 5.2 US\$ 8 million	Performance based grants for schools meeting minimum accountability requirements implemented in 3,000 schools	This DLR is considered achieved when the implementation progress report generated from GMS (a) shows that the performance grants scheme is implemented in at least 3,000 community schools, and (b) includes disbursement information confirming that 3,000 schools meeting accountability criteria received performance grants.	The budget for performance grant was provisioned in ASIP/AWPB for FY 2017/18. A total of 10 areas have been identified for the purpose of disbursing performance grant to schools. These areas include time spent teaching, learning achievement of student, internal efficiency of school education.	

	Comments from DPs
--	-------------------

DLI ref.	DLI No with language	Definition of achievement	Status	Timeline for achievement	
DLI 1	Reading proficiencies and habits strengthened in early grades				
1.3a	NEGR program minimum package is rolled out in 20 fully covered districts reaching all community schools	All community schools in selected districts (20 districts in 1.3, 29 districts in 1.4 and 38 districts in 1.5) have implemented the full approved early grade reading package in the appropriate grades and frequency, supported by the prescribed number and type of teachers and staff.	<p>The minimum package for early grade reading has been approved.</p> <p>Schools where early grade reading package will be implemented are identified. Budget has been disbursed to local governments who will transfer the amount to schools.</p> <p>Schools will procure reading materials. Standard forms and templates will be developed for the purpose of monitoring of implementation activities of NEGR program.</p>	April 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The elaboration of the minimum package needs to be approved by the NEGRP Steering Committee as soon as possible. It has been finalized but not yet officially endorsed/approved. - What are the plans for orienting new districts on the requirements for implementing the NEGRP minimum package? - What is the status of preparations for procurement and distribution of TLMs and preparations for head teacher/coach and teacher training? - Schools will procure reading materials: Is there any provision made to ensure that the standard EGR materials available with CDC are made available to the local market so that schools can procure them locally?
DLI 2	Increased teaching-learning processes through National Curriculum Framework (NCF) revision and access to activity-based math, science and English language materials.				
2.2	1,000 basic schools provided with activity based kits for	-Basic schools refer to the same schools that benefit from one subject teacher for each of math, science	- Budget has been provided to schools through respective local level governments. Schools will	May 2019	-Did all schools receive the list of package that was supposed to be provided them?

	<p>mathematics, science, and English language (ADB DLI 3 US\$ 3.3 million)</p>	<p>and English as per DLI 3 below. DOE and national resource group will provide detailed specifications for the standardized package of math, science and English language kits to DEOs and schools. DEOs will provide grants to schools and schools will purchase the kits from the market.</p> <p>-This DLI is achieved when an independent, third party verifies, on a sample basis, that the kits are available in the schools. The number of schools is cumulative over the years.</p> <p>Partial achievement of the DLI is by the number of schools and not by students. Total disbursement divided by 1,000 schools in Year 3 (2018). MOE will provide disaggregated data on student beneficiaries in the total number of schools receiving this intervention.</p> <p>-PCS will submit a report that includes the list of schools to which the math, science and English language kits for grades 6–8 have been provided and the number of students (girls and boys) benefiting. Independent, third party verification of the report will be conducted by the JFPs</p>	<p>procure activity based kits.</p> <p>-The package will be rolled out in 2019 academic session.</p> <p>-Standard templates will be used to get information on beneficiary students and schools of activity based kits across LGs.</p>		<p>- Is there any report or information received that any school has purchased such kit? Because the 2018 academic session is starting only after 3 months in mountain districts and in five months in other districts.</p> <p>- Have the standard template been developed? If not, how long it will take, if yes can CEHRD share to the DPs?</p> <p>- While schools can procure the hands-on materials for maths and science activities, the e-learning materials and workbooks has to be distributed by CDC through other means and channels. The collection of e-learning materials can be installed in the digital library servers available in schools.</p>
DLI	Improved teacher management, availability and accountability, including improved deployment of trained subject teachers for Mathematics, Science and English in				

3	basic and secondary schools.				
3.3 a	<p>1,000 basic and 500 secondary schools have full complement of mathematics, science and English subject teachers (ADB DLI 2(i) US\$ 4 million).</p>	<p>Full complement of subject teachers means that a school will have at least one math teacher, one science teacher and one English teacher each. Each of these teachers may teach both the basic and secondary levels in the same school. The 500 secondary schools exclude the model schools .The number of schools is cumulative over the years.</p> <p>This DLI is achieved when the MOE report confirming achievement of the DLI target is verified on a sample basis by an independent, third party recruited by the JFPs. A school will be counted for the DLI only when it has at least one teacher for each of math, science and English subjects.</p> <p>Partial achievement of the DLI is by the number of schools meeting the DLI. Total disbursement divided by 1,500 schools for Year 3 (2018).</p> <p>PSC will submit a report to the JFPs, providing the list of basic schools and secondary schools that have placed the full complement of math, science and English subject teachers. Independent, third party verification of the report will be conducted by the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The total number of approved positions for teachers at the Basic Level of Education is 127,902. - Budget has been provisioned to hire additional subject teachers at both basic and secondary levels for meeting the target. - The reporting mechanism to receive information on number of schools that have full complement of Mathematics, Science and English subject teachers will be developed. 	<p>May 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Has this budget been already distributed to LGs and schools or still to distribute? If distributed, which schools have received such support? If not, what will be the criteria to distribute? Will the upper basic (6-8) and secondary (9-10) schools not having English, Mathematics and Science teachers receive these teachers position? - What type of mechanism is thought out? Can CEHRD share this to DPs

		JFPs. This data will be integrated into EMIS.			
3.3b	4,500 subject teachers for science, mathematics and English trained in new subject-wise training (ADB DLI 2(ii) US\$ 3 million).	<p>Trained subject teachers refer to the math, science and English subject teachers who have received the new one-month, subject-wise training implemented by the NCED. Specific training, which may be certification based, will be developed for each of the subjects (math, science and English) and will cover teachers in grades 6–8, and grades 9–10 or 9–12. The number of trained subject teachers is cumulative over the years.</p> <p>This DLI is achieved when the MOE report confirming achievement of the targets has been reviewed and agreed by the JFPs.</p> <p>Partial achievement of the DLI is by the number of teachers. Total disbursement divided by 4,500 teachers for Year 3 (2018)</p>	<p>- Budget has been allocated for the purpose of training 4,500 subject teachers for Mathematics, Science and English. Provincial level government will conduct the training.</p> <p>-Federal Level will develop training framework.</p> <p>-TPD framework will be revised.</p> <p>-standard tools and processes will be used to get information on number of teachers trained.</p>	July 2019	-Has the training package been developed for all three subjects- math, science and English or still to develop? If not, Is there any timeline set up for developing them?
3.3c	Number of teachers to be redeployed reduced by 25% of the baseline (WB DLI 6.3 US\$ 9 million).	This DLR is achieved when at least 25% (of the baseline) of the excess teachers are redeployed as per the approved guideline.	The high level committee formed to recommend GoN for rationalization and redeployment of teachers has submitted the report. A committee has been formed under co-ordination of Director General of CEHRD to prepare and implement action plan for the propose of redeployment.	April 2019	How long will it take to identify and prepare the list of teachers that will be redeployed?

DLI 4	Assessment and examination system reforms undertaken to improve teaching and learning				
4.3a	Single subject certification policy for Grades 11 and 12 implemented (xx student beneficiaries) (WB DLI 4.2 US\$ 6 million)	This DLR is considered achieved when Implementation Progress report including the number of student beneficiaries, mark sheet copies of Grades 11 and 12 examinations, and summary of results by subject is prepared and disseminated.	Achieved		
4.3b	all eligible grade 8 students (at least 50.0% girls) sit for standardized and improved annual examination (ADB DLI 4/F US\$ 2/ Euro 1.2 million)	<p>Grade 8 examination is conducted at the district level by the DEO and grade 10 examination is conducted at the regional level by the NEB.</p> <p>Students appearing for examinations are those who have registered for the examination and have the required attendance rate to sit for the final examinations.</p> <p>PCS will provide an attestation letter certifying that all eligible students from grades 8 and 10 (disaggregated by gender) have undergone the annual examinations conducted using the standardized and improved test items, together with copies of examination question papers. The JFPs will jointly verify.</p>	-There is a need to restructure this DLI as LGs now have responsibility for conducting examination.		
DLI	Model schools piloted with comprehensive quality inputs and innovative teaching and learning				

5					
5.3a	Implementation of approved school-specific multi-year quality improvement plans in additional 100 model schools initiated (ADB DLI 5 US\$ 5 million).	<p>Approved school-specific multi-year quality improvement plan will include needs assessment and comprehensive planning for upgrade to a model school, including construction or retrofitting of buildings, water and sanitation facilities, science laboratory, library, ICT laboratory, e-resources and playground.</p> <p>The DLI is achieved when MOE submits the school-specific plans, with detailed costs and 5-year implementation plan, and confirms deployment of head teachers (one full-time head teacher per school) and subject teachers (one subject teacher for each of math, science and English subjects to teach both basic and secondary levels), and the JFPs review and agree.</p>	<p>-Budget has been provided to all model schools for implementation of their master plans. CEHRD has been conducting workshop of model schools in clusters across the country. LGs will also be involved in the workshop.</p>	January 2019	- What is the plan for deputing separate head teacher for these model schools? Will the separate subject teacher for math, science and English also be ensured?
5.3b	The 100 schools selected in 2017 provided with science and ICT labs, libraries, e-resources and mathematics, science and English language kits (ADB DLI 5 US\$ 4 million).	The 100 schools selected in 2017 will be provided with ICT laboratories; libraries; e-resources; science laboratories; and math, science and English language kits, in accordance with the specifications in the Guidelines for the establishment and operation of model schools and with the detailed school specific quality improvement plans.	<p>--Budgetary provision has been made for performance contract with head teachers of model schools.</p> <p>- The average amount allocate is around NRs 1.5 crore for each school to implement activities for improving physical infrastructure, teaching learning process, and governance and management in the school.</p> <p>- Standard formats to get information</p>	February 2019	

		<p>This DLI is achieved when the MOE report is submitted and an independent, third party verification confirms those ICT laboratories; libraries; e-resources; science laboratories; and math, science and English language kits have been provided to the 100 schools selected in 2017.</p> <p>Partial achievement of the DLI is by the number of model schools. Total DLI divided by 100 model schools for Year 3 (2018)</p>	<p>on availability of ICT laboratories, libraries, e-resources, science laboratories and Mathematics, Science and English language kits will be developed.</p> <p>- A baseline of the selected 222 schools will be prepared so that progress against the costed master plan can be monitored effectively and verified accordingly .</p>		
DLI 6	Reduction in disparities in access and participation				
6.3	<p>30% reduction in the aggregate number of OOSC in the 15 most disadvantaged districts (according to the Equity Index) (EU/F Euro 2/ Euro 1.2 million).</p>	<p>A brief summarizing the total number of OOSC brought into basic schooling in each of the 15 selected intervention districts. Former OOSC enrolled either in flexible learning centers or regular schools can be included in this list. A dataset listing the names and profiles of the out of school children brought into basic schooling, including the flexible learning centers or formal schools in which they are enrolled.</p>	<p>There is a need to restructure this indicator</p>		
DLI 7	Integrated, pro-poor scholarship scheme implemented. Increased access and participation of boys and girls in secondary education.				

7.3	PPTS in grades 9, 10, 11 and 12 and PSS in grades 11 and 12 implemented in 50 additional districts (WB DLI 2.3 US\$ 6 million)	The PPTS program needs to cover all community schools running Grade 8, for the application process, and Grade 9 and above for scholarship distribution, in additional 50 districts. The same provisions on reporting format, coverage and eligibility conditions stated in Year 2 above are applicable.	-Budgetary provision for poverty targeted scholarship has been made in ASIP/AWPB - A notice has been published for interested students to fill up PMT forms.	March 2019	
DLI 8	Provision of adequate DRR resilient safe school facilities at all levels				
8.3 a	A further 120 schools retrofitted in non-earthquake affected districts (EU Euro 2.53 million)	The number of safe school blocks established through retrofitting, on approved locations equals or succeed the targets that are included in the DRR/CSS implementation plan within the periods defined in the plan for these targets to be met.	In Progress	March 2019	
8.3b	DRR to be included as a priority area and thematic study for informing the SSDP MTR and review of School guidelines for DRR Standards for school construction, retrofitting and SDM, based on SSDP MTR recommendation (EU Euro 0.08 million)	DRR/CSS background study report presented and endorsed during the SSDP MTR and agreed actions based on the report's recommendations reflected in the SSDP MTR Aide Memoire.	In progress	February 2019	
DLI 9	Improved governance and strengthened fiduciary management of the school sector.				

9.3a	Computerized Government Accounting System (CGAS) implemented in all 75 DEOs with training (ADB DLI 6(ii) US\$ 3 million)	<p>CGAS refers to unified web-based computerized accounting system of FCGO.</p> <p>This DLI is achieved when the independent, third party verification confirms that the CGAS has been implemented in all 75 DEOs.</p> <p>PCS will submit report confirming implementation of CGAS with training in all 75 DEOs. Independent verification will be conducted by JFPs</p> <p>PCS will submit report confirming implementation of CGAS with training in all 75 DEOs. Independent verification will be conducted by JFPs</p>	<p>- The federation of country into seven provinces and 753 local level governments reorients the delivery mechanisms for SSDP. This results in substantial changes to DLI results related to governance (improved governance and strengthened fiduciary management).</p> <p>- The DLI needs to be restructured.</p> <p>-CGAS is no more relevant for provincial level and local level governments. SuTRA is being rolled out at these levels of government. However, CGAS is still relevant at the federal level.</p>		
9.3b	e-GP system for national competitive bidding is implemented in at least 35 DEOs with training (ADB DLI 6(i) US\$ 2 million)	<p>e-GP refers to online procurement system of the PPMO.</p> <p>This DLI is achieved when the independent, third party verification confirms that the e-GP with training has been implemented in the DEOs as per the targets of 35 in Year 3 (2018)</p>	<p>-An assessment is needed to ensure as to how many local level governments can implement e-GP system for national competitive bidding. There is a need to restructure this DLI</p>		

		PCS will submit a report confirming implementation of e-GP with training for national competitive bidding in the DEOs as per targets. Independent verification will be conducted by JFPs.			
9.3c	Satisfactory completion of Capacity strengthening AWPB on key Program support facility (PSF) activities (WB DLI 1.5 US\$ 6 million)	Critical PSF areas include those supporting the achievement of all 1–6 DLIs. AWPB for PSF means establishment and operationalization of TSU, and at least \$3 million annual allocation. Satisfactory means the above two plus at least 80% of allocated PSF budget (based on the actual contract value) spent.	In progress -Budget has been allocated.	July 2019	
DLI 10	Enhanced reliability and transparency of EMIS data, including school level data				
10.3a	Web-based EMIS, with disaggregated data for gender and social groups operational in all 75 DEOs and in 30% of all schools (ADB DLI	Web-based EMIS refers to a system in which data entry occurs on web-based user interface at the DEO level. Operational means EMIS data utilizes web based entry of all school level information by all DEOs.	In progress A firm has been hired under the support of UNICEF for strengthening	January 2019	

	7 US 2 million)	This DLI is achieved when JFPs jointly verify that a web-based EMIS is operational.	of EMIS.		
10.3b	4 percentage points improvement in teacher and student data accuracy compared to discrepancy in sample verification survey carried out in year one, or 95% accuracy in the sample verification survey carried out in year three (WB DLI 1.4 US\$ 6 million)	This DLR will be considered achieved if the second round of EMIS sample verification is conducted with a representative sample of all schools in year 3 by an independent agency and discrepancy calculated from verification of self-reported EMIS data is reduced by 4 percentage points relative to first round of verification or 95% accuracy in self-reported data if in case accuracy is equal or higher than 95%. (student enrollment, total, female and dalit; and teachers)	-In progress -Budget has been allocated for the purpose of hiring the firm for the purpose of verification of EMIS data.	July 2019	

Annex 7: Status on Program Action Plan

Actions	Responsible Agency	Time Frame for Implementation	Status
Area 1: Program Technical Aspects			
1.1. Revise education regulations as per approved education act and SSDP plan and program.	MOE	October 2016	SSDP plan and program approved. This will be revised during MTR. Federal education bill will be tabled in the parliament during its winter session.
1.2. Recruit Program Management Support and Technical Team for SSDP implementation (individual and firm as per the need).	MOE	October 2016	ADB is supporting the government in mobilizing the related team through EU co-financing by November 2018. The total expenditure made by government under PSF was US \$ 2.5 million in FY 2017/18.
1.3. Commonly agreed TA framework for externally-funded TA.	Development Partners	October 2016	TA framework will be revised in the changed context.
1.4. Implementation initiated of approved teacher rationalization and redeployment action plan and progress updated on an annual basis.	MOE	December 2016 and November of each year	In progress.
1.5. New 1-month training package including Mathematics, English and Science teacher training and revised training guidelines developed and approved.	NCED	November 2017	In progress
1.6. Effective transfer of Higher Secondary Education Board EMIS data into DOE EMIS data following enactment of education act.	MOE and DOE	April 2017	Achieved
1.7. Generate sex, caste and ethnicity disaggregated teacher related data on (i) subject wise teachers per	DOE	Annually	In progress

Actions	Responsible Agency	Time Frame for Implementation	Status
type of school and level of education; (ii) tenure status; and, (iii) training received through NCED under SSDP.			
1.8. Development of item bank of standardized test items for grade 8 and 10 examinations by NEB.	MOE	2018 and 2019 respectively	Need to revisit for grade 8. Not yet due for grade 10. The work in in progress.
1.9. Strengthen and institutionalize ERO as per Education Act for National Assessment of Student Achievement.	MOE	2016 onwards	In progress
1.10. Ensure timely National Assessment of Student Achievement by ERO in accordance with SSDP program plan.	MOE	2016 onwards	Completed for grade eight in 2017. Ongoing for grade ten.
1.11. A comprehensive package of science, math and English language kits including science laboratory materials defined for distribution for Basic Schools (6–8) and secondary schools ensuring equitable accessibility of girls (50%) and boys.	DOE	July 2017	Ongoing
1.12. List of secondary schools shortlisted for model school to be made available to expanded model school committee under the MOE secretary and list of 100 schools selected to be made public.	DOE	January 2017	Achieved
1.13. External Design and Survey firm hired to prepare costed plan for 200 selected model schools	DOE	March 2017	Achieved
1.14. A national repository of ICT materials for teaching and learning developed and an effective and efficient delivery mechanism at schools for ICT, e-learning resources and other materials established.	CDC and NCED	2018	In Progress
1.15. Develop a package for innovative teaching and learning incorporating activity-based and experimentation, GESI sensitive pedagogy for model schools.	CDC and NCED	2018	In progress
1.16. Necessary service procured (individually or firm) for making web-based EMIS.	DOE	2017	Ongoing through Unicef support. Further work will be taken forward by ADB-EU TA.

Actions	Responsible Agency	Time Frame for Implementation	Status
1.17. Review and revise data collection formats of flash system to meet SSDP data reporting requirements and results framework including disaggregated (sex, caste, ethnicity) student and teacher (as per specialization) data	DOE	2016	Same as above
1.18. Strengthen EMIS section with provision of adequate and trained human resource.	DOE	2016–2017	Same as above
Area 2: Financial Management			
2.1. Implementation of approved joint FMAP initiated, reviewed and updated annually	MOE	October 2016 and annually	Achieved. Due to federation of the country there is a need for significant revision of FMAP.
2.2. Simplified school level accounting and financial reports included during the amendment of Education Regulation.	MOE	October 2016	Will be addressed while preparing Education Regulation for Federal Education Act.
2.3. Improved preparation of the ASIP and AWPB with linkage to program results framework and results based financing	MOE and DOE	From 2017 onwards	In progress. Changes needed due to federalization.
2.4. Annual independent Fiduciary Review (including procurement review on a sample basis)	Development Partners	Annual	AFR has not been initiated due to federalization of the country. This will be undertaken through ADB TA.
Area 3: Procurement			
3.1. Develop supervision manuals for inspection, supervision and quality control for civil works and goods purchased at the school level.	DOE	November 2017	Achieved. However, this is a need to revise these manuals.
3.2. Capacity building of DOE and DEO staff to enhance their procurement, oversight and technical capacity for program implementation and supervision.	DOE	Ongoing starting from 2017	This has changed due to federalization given that functions have

Actions	Responsible Agency	Time Frame for Implementation	Status
			been delegated to local governments.
3.3 Compliance of disclosure procedures of procurement activities at school and DEO as per PPA and PPR procedure. The social and financial audit at school level will record the compliance	SMC and DEO	Ongoing with annual reporting	This indicator needs revision due to the changed context.
3.4 Conduct annual independent Technical Audit for quality assurance of school construction in SSDP. This action shall be included in the joint FMAP.	Development Partners	July 2017 and annual	Need to be discussed
3.5 Preparation of annual procurement plan in line with annual budget and work plan at DOE, DEO and School level following PPA and PPR guidelines	DOE, DEO and SMC	Annually by September	In progress
3.6 Supervision consultants recruited supervision and monitoring of model school construction.	DOE	March 2017	Under discussion
Area 4: Gender and Social Inclusion			
4.1 Revised pro-poor scholarship scheme includes targets for girls enrolled in science subjects in grades 11 and 12, including tracking and monitoring science scholarships for girls.	DOE	2018	Pro-poor scholarship scheme revised. Tracking and monitoring is in progress.
4.2 Timely (within 1 month of start of school academic year) distribution and monitoring of targeted support to all girls enrolled in science stream in secondary education as per defined guidelines. The targeted support includes high value scholarships, text books, and residential facilities (for those who need it).	DOE	Annual after 2018	Sample based monitoring was completed by CEHRD and SFAFDB for FY 2017/18.
4.3 Strictly enforce the Teacher Service Commission reservation quota of 45% reserved seats (33% for women, 27% Janajatis, 9% Dalits, 5% disabled and 4% from remote locations) in the recruitment of teachers in approved vacant positions.	MOE	During new recruitment in approved positions	In Progress
4.4 Increase share of the total female teachers to 20% through TSC reservation.	MOE	Annual reporting through EMIS	Exam was conducted to hire permanent teachers. The

Actions	Responsible Agency	Time Frame for Implementation	Status
			status on this indicator will be provided after the publication of result.
4.5 New subject-wise teacher training program guideline to ensure priority for 30% female teachers and 10% from other social groups. Head teacher training will ensure attention to female head teachers.	NCED and DOE	2017	To be discussed
4.6 Teacher training in new ICT and e-learning resources for classroom teaching benefit 30% female teachers out of the total 2,000 teachers.	DOE	2017–2021	In progress
4.7 Model school guidelines to include provisions for supporting girls, particularly from disadvantaged communities and remote locations for their increased access through availability of residential facilities.	DOE	2017–2021	Guidelines prepared. Implementation will commence from FY 2019/20.
4.8 Ensure social audits comply fully with the revised grant management guideline and corrective measures implemented by the schools.	DEO, SMCs	2018 and annually	In progress. Needs to be aligned with the federal structure
4.9 Include GESI in all the training modules developed by DOE for MOE, DOE, DEOs, SMCs and PTAs.	DOE and GESs	2018	Achieved
4.10 Review TOR of GESs of DOE and incorporate linkages to planning and monitoring division of DOE for effective GESI mainstreaming and coordination in line with SSDP reforms, particularly secondary education. The input of GESI expert consultant could be sought.	MOE, DOE, Development Partners	October 2016	Achieved. This is continuous activity.
Area 5: Social and Environment Safeguards			
5.1 Update, approve and implement social and environment safeguard screening, management, and monitoring tools (EMF, LAF for voluntary and willing seller and buyer procedures, IPF, and ADB's prohibited investment activities list-Appendix 5 of SPS ¹)	MOE, DOE and Development partners	2016–2021	EMF has been approved and disclosed on CEHRD website. IPP is being finalized.
5.2 Designate Planning and Monitoring Division for environment and social safeguard monitoring as per SSDP	MOE and DOE	November 2016	To be discussed

¹ ADB. 2009. *Safeguard Policy Statement*. Manila

	implementation arrangement and assign social and environment safeguard officer at DOE and social and environment safeguards focal person at DEO.			
5.3	Conduct orientation and training for relevant officials at DOE, DEO and school level based on approved EMF, IPF and, LAF for voluntary and willing seller and buyer procedures.	MOE, DOE, DEO and SMC	2016–2021	Achieved for FY 2017/18
5.4	Annual monitoring and reporting of the implementation of social and environment safeguard with progress assessment in the joint annual review by Development Partners.	MOE, DOE and DEO	2016–2021	Achieved for FY 2017/18

ASIP= Annual Strategic Implementation Plan, AWPB= Annual Work Program and Budget, CDC = Curriculum Development Center, DEO = District Education Office, DLI = disbursement-linked indicator, DOE = Department of Education, EMIS = Education Management Information System, EMF= Environment Management Framework, ERO = Education Review Office, FCGO = Financial Comptroller General's Office, FMAP = fiduciary management action plan, GES = Gender Equity Section, GESI = Gender Equity and Social Inclusion, ICT = information and communication technology, IP= Indigenous People, IPF=Indigenous Peoples Framework, LAF= Land Acquisition Framework, MOE = Ministry of Education, NCED =National Center for Educational Development, NEB = National Education Board, OAG = Office of the Auditor General, PSSA= Program Safeguard Systems Assessment, PPA= Public Procurement Act, PPR= Public Procurement Regulation, PTA = Parent Teacher Association, SMC = School Management Committee, SPS= Safeguard Policy Statement, SSDP = School Sector Development Plan, SSRP = School Sector Reform Program, TA = technical assistance, TOR = terms of reference, TSC = Teacher Service Commission.

Annex 8: Status on BRM Agreed Actions

S.no.	Action	Completed by	Current Status
1	Complete the verification process of remaining DLIs for year 1 by IVA and share the DLI achievement report and verification report with the JFPs.	Before June 2018	Verification process has been completed for DLI 6.1a.
2	Finalize transition plan after updating the current draft with the confirmed education sector institutional arrangements and FY 2018/19 budget.	June 10, 2018	Transitional Plan has been finalized and was shared with JFPs on September 23, 2018
3	Convene a meeting between GoN and JFPs after the transitional plan and FY2018/19 education budget has been shared	June 15, 2018	Completed October 02, 2018
4	Upload Aide Memoires from SSDP review meetings and the SMF on the GoN website for public disclosure.	June 20, 2018	SMF needs to be revised in the changed context. AMs have been uploaded
5	Submit the DLI achievement report for DLIs of Year 2 that were due in 2018	July 15, 2018	Part One of the DLI achievement report was shared on October 10, 2018.
6	Convene a meeting between MoEST and the JFPs to initiate the revision in the bilateral agreements and JFA	August 2018	After Mid-term review of SSDP. New date: June 2019
7	Complete the reappraisal of SSDP by GoN and JFPs. Based on this, confirm the restructuring activities and timeline for the SSDP implementation arrangements and JFP agreements.	September, 2018	New date: July 2019
8	Hire the IVA and complete the verification for the remaining year 2 DLIs.	September 30, 2018	Completed
9	Revise formats of annual project financial statements to align with new reporting mechanism and take appropriate steps in settling audit observations for FY2015/16 in consultation with OAG.	November 2018	Discussions are underway to develop reporting mechanism.
10	Prepare work completion documentation of the school construction under the SSRP and submit an audit report on settlement of the outstanding amounts.	November 30, 2018	On going
11.1	DLI 1 Convene EGR TWG members to discuss and agree on EGR components before the minimum package is finalized.	June 15, 2018	completed
1.2	Share the final report on the EGRP minimum package.	July 15, 2018	Completed. Final report on the EGRP minimum

S.no.	Action		Completed by	Current Status
				package has been completed and shared with JFPs
12.1	DLI 2	Conduct a workshop to finalize activity-based kits for grade 6-8 English, Science and Math.	June 15, 2018	Completed
12.2		Approve the kits after incorporating suggestions from stakeholders	June 30, 2018	Completed
12.3		Include the approved kits for grade 6-8 English, Science and Math in the NCED training curricula	August 2018	Will be revised in consultation with ICT specialist.
13.1	DLI 3	Share detailed implementation arrangements with DPs, including steps for implementation of TST.	June 15, 2018	Provisioned in PIM.
13.2		Update the teacher rationalization and redeployment plan.	August 2018	The high level committee formed to recommend GoN for rationalization and redeployment of teachers has shared the report to GoN
14.1	DLI 4	Allocate adequate budget for standardized grade 8 and 10 examination to NEB and relevant agencies.	May 2018	Completed
14.2		Develop a specific time-bound action plan based on NASA grade 8 report for relevant agencies, including activities for specific agencies to improve learning outcomes.	June 15, 2018	Draft action plan has been prepared and shared with JFPs on October 10, 2018
15.1	DLI 5	Share the revised costed master plans of 100 model schools with JFPs.	July 30, 2018	Budget has been provided to all model schools for implementation of their master plans. CEHRD is conducting workshop of model school in clusters across the country. LGs were also involved in the

S.no.	Action		Completed by	Current Status
				workshop. The revised master plans will be shared with JFPs by .
16.1	DLI 6	Share the OOSC baseline report for LGs within the previously identified 5 additional districts with the Equity and Inclusive Education TWG members.	June 30, 2018	
16.2		Prepare a time-bound action plan to complete the verification of achievement for the introduction of LG ESIPs and reduction of OOSC in the LGs within the previously identified 10 districts.	October 2018	Completed
17.1	DLI 7	Establish an arrangement with the SFAFDB for the Year 3 implementation of PPTS and PSS	July 30, 2018	Completed
8.1	DLI 8	Update the approved guidelines to remain relevant in the federal context after the revised CSS Master plan has been finalized.	July 2018	Guidelines have been updated. Need further update based on SSDP implementation arrangement
9.1	DLI 9	Update progress on the implementation of Needs-and performance based school grant system	June 15, 2018	No progress
9.2		Update FMAP	October 2018	TA team has been mobilized to update FMAP
10.1	DLI 10	Complete the system design specification for establishing a web-based EMIS (including hardware platforms and software programming language).	May 31, 2018	Completed.

Annex 9: Updated TA Matrix

S.N.	Support Area	Project Name	Time Frame	Supported by	Major Activities	Total Amount
1	Governance and Management	'Hamro Sikshya'	December 2015 – March 2019	European Union (through SFCG)	Strengthening Civil Society Organisations' role in Governance and Accountability of Nepal's Education Sector	\$600,000
2.	Governance and Management	School Sector Development Plan Technical Assistance Facility	January 2018 - December 2022	EU through ADB	Provide timely, quality, & coordinated TA support to identified capacity and institutional development priorities to design, assess, implement and monitor various policies and strategies of the SSDP	\$ 4.0 million
3.	Governance and Management	Strengthening of Financial Management of Ministry of Education/Education Sector	June 2017 – June 2019	Norway through ADB	On-the job training and capacity building in the areas of Financial Management	\$383,000
4.	Governance and Management	Public Financial Management Strengthening Project	August 2016 - July 2021	USAID	Enhance the transparency and accountability of the PFM systems of GON ministries (MOH, MOE, and NRA). Support capacity building priorities by extensive consultation between USAID, GON, and donor community.	US\$14,049,368
5.	Governance and Management	Education System Strengthening including DRR/CCA and SZOP	July 2017 – December 2022	UNICEF	Equity Strategy, School Profile Cards, Implementation	US\$7,353,730

S.N.	Support Area	Project Name	Time Frame	Supported by	Major Activities	Total Amount
					of Comprehensive Safe Schools, Support for SZOP	
6.	Governance and Management	CapED Programme: Integrating SDG 4: Policy Reviews and Monitoring Frameworks	2016-2018	UNESCO	Capacity development to integrate SDG4 commitments into national education policy and sector management including monitoring of progress towards SDG4	US\$169,305
7.	Teacher Professional Development and Management	KFIT II Fund: Supporting Competency-Based Teacher Training Reform for facilitate ICT-Pedagogy Integration	2013-2017	UNESCO	Supporting Competency-Based Teacher Training Reforms to Facilitate ICT-Pedagogy Integration	US\$6281 (2017)
8.	Teacher Professional Development and Management	UNESCO-HNA Partnership for Girls' and Women's Education	2016 – 2020	UNESCO	Developing national capacity for gender-sensitive teacher policy formulation and building the capacities of teacher trainers and trainees, school leaders and teachers to promote gender-sensitive teaching and learning environments and practices	US\$18,778 (2017)
9.	Teacher Professional Development and Management	Empowering Adolescent Girls and Young Women through the Provision of Comprehensive Sexuality Education and a Safe Learning Environment in Nepal (UNESCO-	January 2017 – December 2020	UNFPA	Capacity building of teachers and head teachers on CSE and IEC. Establishment and strengthening of Adolescent	US\$540,000 (Total)

S.N.	Support Area	Project Name	Time Frame	Supported by	Major Activities	Total Amount
		UNFPA-UN Women Joint Programme)			Friendly Learning spaces in schools.	
10	DRR and School Safety	ADB School Reconstruction	December 2016 – September 2018	USAID	Support the reconstruction of at least 15 schools.	US\$10,000,000
11	DRR and School Safety	Nepal Safer Schools Project	February 2018 – January 2020	DFID (Crown Agent lead contractor)	Strengthening disaster resilience in the School Sector aligned with the three pillars of comprehensive school safety	Up to \$14,900,000 (£12,000,000)
12	Curriculum	Technical Assistance for Competency Based Soft Skills (TASS) Development in School Education in Nepal	May 2016 – April 2019	Finland	Institutional capacity development of the GoN-MoE's CLAs to develop and implement competency based soft skills (CBSS) curriculum including integrated curriculum for grades 1-3, learning support materials development, and student counselling policy development.	\$2,080,000
13	Curriculum	Adolescent literacy and life skills curriculum	July 2017 – December 2022	UNICEF	Decreased numbers of out-of-school children, Equivalency Framework, Life skills curriculum, adolescent participation in SMC	US\$11,100,000
14	Examination and Assessment		March 2018 – July 2019	REACH through World Bank	Strengthening NASA & standardization grade 10 examination	US\$352,000

S.N.	Support Area	Project Name	Time Frame	Supported by	Major Activities	Total Amount
15	Quality Education	Quality basic education	July 2017 – Dec 2022	UNICEF	Implementation of Child Friendly Framework, evidence generation for Language of Instruction (mother tongue) and interventions on moi, improved quality in small schools, and inclusive education for children with disabilities	US\$8,945,000
16	Quality Education	CapED Programme: Strengthening literacy and lifelong learning opportunities in Nepal	2015-2018	UNESCO	Capacity development of country stakeholders in promoting literacy and lifelong learning for all, particularly with the objective to achieve SDG4	US\$816,939
17	Quality Education	Project for Improving the quality of school education in Nepal	Feb 18 - Feb 23	JICA	Improve teaching and learning process of maths education for early grades.	TBC
18.	Equity and Inclusive Education	Enhancing young and adolescents' knowledge on Comprehensive Sexuality Education through formal and non-formal education in Nepal	March 2016 – April 2018	UNFPA	Comprehensive Sexuality Education and enhancing of technical capacity of teachers and service providers to deliver CSE and SRH services	US\$372,000
19.	Equity and Inclusive Education	Reading for All: Disability Inclusive Education	February 2018 – 2021	USAID	Support the GON to improve the reading skills of students with disabilities.	US\$3,500,000

S.N.	Support Area	Project Name	Time Frame	Supported by	Major Activities	Total Amount
20.	Equity and Inclusive Education	UNESCO: Malala Fund for Girls' Education	2017-2018	UNESCO	Capacity development of policy makers, community members and other relevant stakeholders on needs, challenges, concerns and solutions of empowering adolescent girls and young women through formal and non-formal education	US\$272,727
21.	Equity and Inclusive Education	Empowering Adolescent Girls and Young Women through the Provision of Comprehensive Sexuality Education and a Safe Learning Environment in Nepal (UNESCO-UNFPA-UN Women Joint Programme)	01/01/2016 - June 2020	UNESCO	Empowering Adolescent Girls and Young Women through the Provision of Comprehensive Sexuality Education and a Safe Learning Environment in Nepal	US\$4,424,779
22.	Equity and Inclusive Education	Girls Education Challenge	2017 – 2022	DFID (INGO/NGO implemented with LGAs VSO, MercyCorp, StreetChild, PIN)	Ensuring gender sensitive and GBV free learning environment for adolescent girls	£14.25m
23.	Equity and Inclusive Education	ENGAGE	2018 – 2021	DFID (VSO lead, with HI and other NGO partners)	Provision of appropriate learning environment for children with disabilities, focuses on empowering adolescent girls in particular	~£5.6m
24.	Nutrition and Hygiene	WASH in Schools	Jan 2018- Dec 2021	WFP	Support WASH activities in 11 Mid and Far West SMP schools to improve knowledge of	US\$980,000

S.N.	Support Area	Project Name	Time Frame	Supported by	Major Activities	Total Amount
					health, hygiene and dietary practices among school children. Intervention package includes installation of water systems, teacher and school administrator trainings, trainings PTAs and SMCs and raising community awareness.	
25.	Nutrition and Hygiene	School Meals Menu Planner Package	Jan 2018- Dec 2020	WFP	Operational research to support increase the nutritional impact of MoE's cash based school meals programme.	US\$950,964
26.	Nutrition and Hygiene	Improved Safe Food Prep and Storage	Jan 2018 – Dec 2021	WFP	Support SMP schools in Mid and Far West districts with improved safe food preparation and storage infrastructure improvement. Up to 150 schools with installation of energy efficient stoves, up to 60 schools build/rehabilitate kitchen	US\$1,000,000
27.	Early Grade Reading	Early Grade Reading Program (EGRP) - RTI	March 2015 – March 2020	USAID	Capacity building of MOE and CLAs for materials development, training, education systems strengthening, community and	\$ 53,870,553

S.N.	Support Area	Project Name	Time Frame	Supported by	Major Activities	Total Amount
					parent engagement to improve early grade reading skills of public primary school students in Nepal. Test and demonstrate a cost-effective, scalable early grade reading model	
28.	Early Grade Reading	National Early Grade Reading Program (NEGRP) - Redbook	16 July 2014 - 15 July 2019	USAID	Support to MOE, DOE, CDC, NCED, NFEC, and ERO through capacity building, training, orientation to improve early grade reading skills of public primary school students in Nepal	\$ 8,000,000
29.	Early Grade Reading	Early Grade Learning Program:	Jan 2018- Dec 2021	WFP (World Education)	Support 5 School Meals Programme districts schools in Mid and Far West with Early Grade Reading interventions and 8 SMP Programme districts with digital learning interventions to improve literacy of school aged children. Intervention package	\$2,047,525
30.	ECED	PEAK! Partnership for Equity and Access in Kapilbastu.	Dec 2015 - Aug 2019	European Union (through WWO)	Local CSOs promoting Equity and Quality in Early Childhood and Basic Education in Kapilbastu District	\$335,000

S.N.	Support Area	Project Name	Time Frame	Supported by	Major Activities	Total Amount
31.	ECED	Early Childhood Education and development	July 2017 – Dec 2022	UNICEF	Local ECD plans, including standards, parenting education and non-school-based alternatives & ECD evaluation	\$3,850,000
32.	ICT in Education	ICT support	2018 - 2021	USDA / WFP	Digital learning programme development and implementation through OPEN Learning Exchange Nepal	USD 92,9136