

NEPAL RISK REDUCTION CONSORTIUM

FLAGSHIP 4: INTEGRATED COMMUNITY
BASED DISASTER RISK REDUCTION



REPORT ON

**DISTRICT CONSULTATION ON FLAGSHIP AREA 4: INTEGRATED COMMUNITY BASED
DISASTER RISK REDUCTION**

Ilam

4th March, 2012

Jointly Organized by:

Nepal Red Cross Society, Taplejung (NRCS, Ilam)

District Development Committee, Ilam

Disaster Preparedness Network-Nepal

Supported by:

International Federation of Red Cross Society (IFRC)



Acronym

APF	Armed Police Force
CPN UML	Communist Party Nepal UML
DADO	District Development Office
DAO	District Administration Office
DDC,	District Development Committee
	District Disaster Management
DDMC	Committee
DEO	District Education Office
DFCC,	District Forest Coordination Committee
DFO	District Forest Office
DHO	District Health Office
DMC	Disaster Management Committee
	Federation of Community Forest Users
FECOFUN	Nepal
FNJ	Federation of Nepali Journalists
MDI Nepal	Manahari Development Institute-Nepal
NFN Federation	NGO Federation Nepal
RPP Party	Rastriya Prajatantra Party Nepal
UCPN Moist	United Communist Party Moist



Flagship 4 District Consultations

Event Report

1. Introduction

Flagship-4 program that focuses to the integrated disaster risk reduction is one of the five priority programs of Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium. The program has been designed and planned for next five years with the wider ranged consultation among disaster stakeholders at central level since 2009. The aims, structure, modality and implementation schedule were fixed based on the needs and context of the country. The national level stakeholders are quite aware about the program however the district and local level stakeholders are not much familiar about the program as these bodies are implementing bodies. Hence, with the aim of introducing the Flagship 4 program at district level, the district consultation program was organized with the joint collaboration of concerned stakeholders on 4th March 2012 at headquarters of Ilam district. The program was jointly organized by Nepal Red Cross Society, Ilam, District Development Committee, Ilam and Disaster Preparedness Network- Nepal with the support of International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

The planned consultation program intended to provide the credited values of flagship program to the district level partners particularly in the top priority districts on vulnerability ranking. The district level consultation program intended to capitalize on the Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction (CBDRR) activities and experience which has already accumulated to create more systematic and harmonized approach to CBDRR which will be conducted at VDC level. The main objective of the program was to increase interest and awareness about NRRC and Flagship 4. It also intended to increase the number of local partners involved in Flagship 4 and promote the Flagship 4 Information Platform.

The Flagship 4 District Consultation program was prepared with the series of meeting between DPNet-Nepal, Ministry of Local Development and IFRC. The Ministry of Local Development drafted the official letter to the concerned DDCs of program districts in order to invite the participants identified as the district stakeholders in Flagship 4



program. DpNet-Nepal has coordinated and corresponded with DDC, DAO and local partners to achieve the expected outcomes.

The district consultation was organized at the DDC hall of Ilam district. It was organized targeting to the participants from diverse organizations particularly the NGOs working in DRR sector and humanitarian assistance. The presence in the program seemed to be satisfactory that included representatives from different sector. A total of 50 participants from 43 organizations attended the workshop, this included representatives from 14 Government agencies, 2 INGOs, 2 from time bound governmental projects, 6 NGOs, 3 CBOs, 9 political leaders, 4 civil society workers, 5 Media, 2 Academic institutions and 2 free lancer individuals. The focal persons of the concerned organization were participating in the program, however, the participation of the from the NGOs working in the community based disaster sector is expectedly low.

2. Consultation Summary

The workshop was composed with three sessions. The opening session that aimed to introduce the agendas, objectives and participants of the workshop was formal session and the technical session started immediate after the opening session focused to the overall technical parts of the consultation. The opening session of the workshop was chaired by Mr. Mr. Suman Ghimire, Local Development Officer, Ilam and was adorned with the guests from district level security forces, senior level governmental officials and Mr. Eak Narayan Sharma from MoLD. The workshop began formally with the welcoming remarks of Mr. Indra Fuyal. Mr. Fuyal expressed his gratitude to the senior level district officials and Local Development Officer for their keen interest and invaluable participation to the workshop. With his welcome remarks, Mr. Fuyal highlighted the main aims of the program and its importance.

As a guest of the opening session of program, Mr. Eak Narayan Sharma, Section Officer, MoLD highlighted the objectives of the program and also explained how Nepal government has been taking the initiation for the program at national level. He shortly described the national disaster scenario and how the governmental focal points are working for disaster risk reduction in Nepal. Providing the brief information on DpNet-Nepal, Mr. Sharma highlighted on the objectives of the workshop and gave a brief explanation of the Flagship 4 program.



Mr. Inda Fuyal, NRCS Ilam made his presentation on the District Disaster Profile of Ilam District. Mr. Fuyal highlighted that Ilam district is highly vulnerable in earthquake, flood and landslide. The upper part is at high risk of avalanches and Himalayan typhoon and the lower part is from flood. Flood, landslide, thunderbolt, fire and epidemics are the main types of disaster in Ilam district.

Mr. Yogendra Prasad Dulal, Chief District Officer of Ilam made his remarks as chief guest in the program. He delivered his speech that those program which can capacitate the local level stakeholders in risk reduction activities are essential to undertake regularly. His remarks was indicating the importance of the program particularly. Mr. Dulal said that Nepal is one of the 20 most disaster-prone countries in the world and it is at high risk of climate change. Nepal ranks at 11th in terms of risk from earthquake and 30th in terms of flood risk in the world. He also informed that Nepal is being more vulnerable country in terms of climate change and particularly Ilam, an agricultural district may face more difficulty from the recent trend of global climate change.

Mr. Rajan Ghimire, Local Development Officer, Ilam and chair of the program delivered his gratitude to the DpNet-Nepal, IFRC and NRCS for supporting and organizing such a significant workshop in the district. He said that this type of program should be done regularly at district level. The workshop was attended from a cross section of Local Government agencies, Local NGOs, Academic Institutions, Media and Civil Society has demonstrated that the more engagement of community based organizations with Flagship 4.

The list of participating organisations is provided below: The workshop was attended from a cross section of Local Government agencies, Local NGOs, Academic Institutions, Media and Civil Society has demonstrated that the more engagement of community based organizations with Flagship 4.

3. Assessment of Sessions

Session 1:

The first technical session was started with the paper presentation on introduction to NRRC. The presentation for 20 minutes was made on the topic by Mr. Lubha Raj



Neupane. Mr. Neupane briefly talked about Flagship program and its areas of consideration with progress made in the mean time for NRRC. The presentation also described about the current trend of disaster management in Nepal, National Strategy for Disaster Risk Management, National Earthquake Safety Day and Local Disaster Risk Management Plan (LDRMP) Guideline. He also provided a brief explanation on NRRC, its objectives, Flagship Areas, partners and progress of NRRC to date. A full copy of presentation is available on:

[http://www.dpnet.org.np/index.php?pageName=presentation.](http://www.dpnet.org.np/index.php?pageName=presentation)

After the paper presentation on NRRC, a short question answer session was started for the response of the queries raised about the presentation. Responding to the issues on the presentation, the flip chart was given to the participants and they were asked to discuss on the key challenges and possible measures in the coordination at the district level and present the points they have noted. The participants noted the points in the flip chart and presented afterwards. The key challenges and possible measures in the coordination at the district level presented by the participants are as follow:

Current Situation of Coordination at Local Level, challenges and Measures

Challenges	Measures
Group 1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of coordination between the stakeholders for preparedness activities. - Absence of local level NGOs working for DRR - Less responsive political parties for the DRR issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Activate the existence of DDRC at district level - Orientation of district level governing bodies towards DRR activities - Coordination between the humanitarian bodies and media people for response and relief information sharing
Group 2	



FLAGSHIP 4: INTEGRATED COMMUNITY BASED DISASTER RISK REDUCTION

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of identification of the stakeholders of disaster - Lack of accessibility to the information regarding economic and humanitarian support - Lack of identification of vulnerable areas and the accessibility of information of the vulnerable land - Lack of clear cut authority of DRM at local level - Lack of proper coordination among the governmental authority at district level - No inclusion of disaster management program in the annual and periodic plans of district and local level. - Disregards to the current plans, policies and directives and minimum characteristics and laws in DRR sectors. - Lack of skilled man power and technical training facility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DDRC should focus to the preparedness work rather focusing to disaster response work only. - Need to identify the local risks and bring to the district level consultation - Listing the most vulnerable areas and stratification - Formation and activation of local level disaster management committees - Regular coordination meetings should be held quarterly or monthly - Integration of DRR programs in the annual and periodic development plan - Establishment of emergency fund and its regulation - Regular flow of inclusive information - Focus to the present laws and its implementation - Capacity building trainings and awareness activities for skilled manpower
<p>Group 3</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of coordinating, accountable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establishment of Local Level



<p>and responsible bodies at district level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Problem and lack of coordination for the dissemination of information of DRR in pre and post disaster phases - Problems of resources, funds , and budget at district level for effective disaster management activities - Lack of skilled and trained manpower at local level - Problem of coordination and real time information sharing for DRR due to geographical difficulties - Lack of proper legislation and policy provision for the effective coordination 	<p>Disaster Management Committees and regulation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establishment of Resource centre and local level fund for the program - Development of skilled human resources and trained manpower - Awareness Raising activities - Effective monitoring and evaluation activities
---	---

Session 2:

Mr. Lubha Raj Neupane presented the paper on Flagship 4: Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction highlighting on the objectives and its overall implementation mechanism at the beginning of the second session. Mr. Neupane shared the expected outcomes and key challenges of the Flagship program. He said that the main objective of the Flagship 4 program is to bringing different stakeholders together to discuss a common approach to CBDRR and strengthening the linkage with government/administrative structures in Nepal to ensure sustainability from local to national level. He also provided the detail information about the initiatives made in bringing up the program and briefed on the coordination mechanism of NRRC. He also explained on the five year target of Flagship 4 program and joint Flagship 4 outcomes. The paper revolved round on the key challenges



and possible outcomes of the program with the comparative analysis of the local aspiration of district level stakeholders. The paper was concluded with the highlighting on the key challenges of Flagship 4. A full copy of presentation can be reached to PNet-Nepal website:

<http://www.dpnet.org.np/index.php?pageName=presentation>

The second half of the session focused to the introduction of minimum characteristics of flagship 4 program. The presenter highlighted on why the minimum characteristics have been designed and how these characteristics will work for maintaining the common standards of the program. Base on the prepared presentation, Mr. Neupane highlighted that the minimum characteristics were designed with the country context having broader ranged discussion at three times with all concerned stakeholders in Kathmandu. The characteristics were developed based the project duration for next five years and needs of the country. With the detail introduction of the minimum characteristics, a group discussion focusing to the application of characteristics was conducted. He informed that minimum characteristics of a disaster resilient community were developed throughout a series of workshops conducted in 2010 and 2011 involving the Nepal Government, UN, INGOs, NGOs, Donors and the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement. He also explained that these 9 minimum characteristics act as a guide for CBDRR projects and set the standard for what CBDRR projects should encompass. Highlighting on the 9 minimum characteristics, he informed that this is not intended to be a comprehensive list of characteristics, as many agencies may have additional characteristics they wish to achieve as part of their CBDRR projects. A full copy of presentation can be found on DPNepal website:

<http://www.dpnet.org.np/index.php?pageName=presentation>

After the presentation of minimum characteristics and in-depth discussion, the participants were asked to discuss on how they could fit these characteristics into their projects (past or present). Total three groups were separated to discuss on the 9 minimum characteristics developing the discussion framework. Each group was asked separating 3 characteristics about what the function could be for each characteristic in the context of their district and how could the assistance be achieved.



The consolidation of the outcomes of the three groups with mix-features has been presented as follows.

Minimum Characteristics

Character istics	Functions	Necessary Assistance
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information flow to the local level - Participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to assistance provided by VDCs
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establishment of VDC level information centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of district level guidelines and follow up of the guidelines - Technical assistance from district level and VDC level
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PVCA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tool kit and training should be provided by the district level agencies
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training and awareness activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support should be provided by the upper level or district or VDC level
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DRM Planning and and plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By stakeholders assistance - Should be managed by VDC
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of emergency fund 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of seed money at local level - Management and utilization of



		local resources for seed money
7	- Development of Roster and Distribution of the relief and response materials based on the roster	- Use of VDC and Municipality level resources and manpower
8	- Awareness Raising , Policy formation, SOP development and sustainable development	- Support from Local Authority - Support from Local and district and national level stakeholders
9	- Management of Siren, Linking with FM Radios, Use of local information sharing techniques	- Local and upper level information linkage development by the district level stakeholders - Resources available at local level should be used

Session 3:

After a short discussion among the participants on 9 minimum characteristics of disaster resilient community, Mr. Lubha Raj Neupane provided the information on project database form. The project database forms were distributed to the participants intending to record all of the CBDRR projects going on at Ilam district. The project database forms were distributed to the participants intending to record all of the CBDRR projects going on at Ilam district. The majority participant argued that the project database forms were difficult to fill up instantly due to the lack of proper institutional information from their organization. Hence, the project database forms were left for their complete workout as per the request of participants; and right now the information on CBDRR projects is being collected with the objectives of mapping CBDRR projects within the district.



Session 4:

The fourth session followed immediately after the third session was about Information Platform on Flagship 4. However, the LDRMP prepared just before by Nepal government was briefly presented by Eak Narayan Sharma, Section Officer of MoLD. He further explained that the implementation of LDRMP will be the base for flagship program. It is necessary to apply all the characteristics while designing and implementing the program which is a sought of LDRMP. The participants were well introduced about the LDRMP and immediate planning of Ministry of Local Development on how the DRM issues will be integrated in the local level development plan.

After the discussion on recent approved LDRMP, the main facilitator provided a brief explanation on information platform made for whole NRRC program and especially for flagship-4 program. The session introduced that how the information platform provides the detail information on flagship program and how it can be accessed for the local benefits. The facilitator instructed the participants how to visit the information platform website, what they can find and how they can upload their information regarding CBDRR project information and materials into the website. The participants were found very interesting on the information platform and responded it was a wonderful work for information dissemination. The facilitator also informed that they can like the face-book page of NRRC.

Session 5:

The fifth and final session was for Action Plan of the district level partners on flagship 4. The main aim of the session was to develop an inclusive action plan to implement the flagship-4 program effectively and consolidated way. The agendas of the action plan were floored to the participants and they were asked to come up with an action plan. The action plan was prepared with the common discussion and understanding of participants which has been provided in the annex:

Action Plan

Q. What areas do you think Flagship 4 can assist in coordinating and raising the profile of CBDRR in your community?

A. *It can be used for the infrastructure development for safer communities in Ilam*



<p><i>district.</i></p>
<p>Q. How best do you think Flagship 4 can ensure ongoing engagement with CBDRR organizations at a district level?</p> <p>A. <i>It is a full document in term of theory and if we bring it in to practice, it can contribute significantly.</i></p>
<p>Q. Are there other Flagships that you would also like to be involved in?</p> <p>A. <i>Flagship- 1,2,4 and 5</i></p>
<p>Q. How many of the 9 minimum characteristics does your current project/s incorporate?</p> <p>A. <i>In NRCS's point of view they have used 6 characteristics in their program. NRCS is only one agency for the CBDRR programs.</i></p>
<p>Q. How do you think you can incorporate the 9 minimum characteristics into your future projects?</p> <p>A. <i>We can develop the programs for future based on the characteristics and will be implemented.</i></p>
<p>Q. Which characteristics do you think will be challenging to incorporate?</p> <p>A. <i>Emergency fund and Multi hazards risk assessment</i></p>
<p>Q. How would you and your organization like to interact with Flagship 4 Coordinator and the consultation group?</p> <p>A. <i>Email, Internet – Information Platform, Phone, Fax, Mail</i></p>
<p>Q. What project documentation would you like to share with Flagship 4 and other CBDRR organizations</p> <p>Ans: a. <i>Hazard map / vulnerability and assessment map</i></p> <p>b. <i>Photos</i></p>



<i>c. Evaluations documents</i>
<p>Q. Who would be an appropriate focal person for the district that Flagship 4 can liaise with?</p> <p><i>A. DDC and NRCS/DDRC</i></p>
<p>Q. How do participants plan to disseminate information discussed at today's workshop?</p> <p><i>A. Through local level consultation at VDC and Municipality.</i></p>

4. Consultation Outcomes

The consultation outcomes were observed with the consultation of participants collecting their views about the results of the program. In addition, the program was analysed by the local level stakeholders such as NRCS and DDC. According to their view the program got success to achieve the significant result. The outcomes are analysed though the following structure.

Expected Outcomes	Result	Justification
1.Increased awareness and knowledge on CBDRR	Achieved	Wider participation by the representatives of different district level organizations provided the feedbacks on workshop before officially concluding the program that the program was successful for creating local level awareness. Most of the participants mentioned that the program was much effective in sharing the information regarding the flagship program. They have learned much information on NRRC, flagship program, 9 minimum characteristics of Disaster Resilient Community, F4 information platform and LDRMP guideline.
2.Increased number of	Achieved	The wide participation from a cross



local partners involved in Flagship 4		sectional agencies- the governmental bodies, local NGOs, academic institutions, media and civil society organizations was obtained in the consultation.
3.Introduction to Flagship 4's Information Platform	Achieved	All the participants expressed their keen interest on the Flagship 4 Information Platform and they said that they would upload the information and materials related to the CBDRR Projects.
4.Collection of CBDRR projects for Project database	Partially Achieved	The number of organizations working on the CBDRR Projects is very low the district. They were not bringing the CBDRR project materials to the workshop but they expressed their commitment that they would fill up the form and upload the materials on F4 information platform or send to F4 coordinator.

5. Challenges and Lessons Learnt

Challenges

The hectic schedule for whole day program:

The program was planned for full day that was not more effective to the audiences. Allocation of time for full day for the participants especially based on their business is very difficult in the consultation. The result finally made that the fluctuation of participation during the program was observed in whole day.

Workshop was the less priority of concerned Local Government Authorities:

The consultation workshop was scheduled in February and March when almost all districts were attempting the district assembly. The program appealed the full preparatory and operation time from the local level authorities in one side and in another side the scheduled time is fully packed for these authorities due to their



own business. Hence, the concerned government authorities were not contributing effectively for the workshop.

Collection of CBDRR information:

The number of Local Non-Government Organization working in CBDRR projects is very low in the district. The organization representatives participating in the workshop were not well informed on their project details. Hence, the participation in database form seemed very low.

Difficult in Human Resource Management:

Only one resource person was involved in a consultation which was technically difficult for the management of whole day delivery. Hence, the quality delivery from the technical person was questionable. The participants also felt monotonous from for a whole day delivery of a single person in the workshop.

Lessons Learnt

The Event Time should be made suitable:

Before planning of workshop and fixation of its duration, a wide ranged consultation with the local level authorities should be done. Until the local hosting body is encouraged and understand the integrity of the program, the program will remain less effective and the implementation of the program will face difficulty.

The participants should be encouraged to engage for the whole workshop

The critical participants are important to make the program more effective and achieve the objective. Hence, the focal persons from each organizations should actively aware engaged for the whole workshop. Attending the program by the non related participants will obviously disturb to achieve the objectives of the program.

Need to be aware to avoid the duplication of events on the day in the district

The district stakeholders participating in the events organized in the districts are almost same. If there are more events organized in the districts, the government officials are expected to participate in every events, so the organizer should be aware to avoid the collide of the events on same day.

Recommendations

Assign two facilitators for each consultation

Facilitating a whole day workshop by a single facilitator is not an easy task. To make the workshop more effective and ease the facilitation it would be better to assign at least two facilitators in each consultation workshop.

Engage more participants from community level

The participants in the district consultation were the representatives of district level organizations. If the participants invited from the community the information can be shared in the local level. The expected participants could be the representatives of School Teacher, VDC Secretaries, Local Women Group, Youth Group and Youth Clubs.

Link with the Local Level Annual Planning Mechanism:

The implementation of flagship 4, Integrated Community based DRR program should be tied up with the local level governing bodies. While developing the district annual and periodic plan, the local level bodies should incorporate the DRR program focusing to the CBDRM approach. For the effective implementation of minimum characteristics, MoLD should tie up this program in their MCPW mechanism.

Conclusion

The district consultation program organized in Ilam with the aim of increasing the engagement of community based organizations with Flagship-4 and other CBDRR initiatives was able to involve the wide ranged people at district level. The one day consultation program also aimed to promote the Flagship 4's Information Platform and collection of CBDRR projects for project database. The wide participation from a cross section of Local Government agencies, Local NGOs, Academic Institutions, Media and Civil Society has demonstrated that the more engagement of community based organizations with Flagship-4. Before concluding the workshop, the participants were asked to give their comment and feedback on the workshop. Most of the participants mentioned that the program was much effective in sharing the information regarding



the Flagship program. They also expressed that the information platform is very interesting and useful for all those organizations working on CBDRR projects. They said that they have learned about NRRC, Flagship 4 Program and Flagship 4's Information Platform.

**Annex 1: List of Participated organizations:**

N.S	Name	Organization	Designation
1	Yogendra Pd Dulal	DAO	CDO
2	Suman Ghimire	DDC	LDO
3	Indra Phuyal	NRCSS	Chairman
4	Rajeev K.C	NRCSS	PC
5	Enkas Chau	IFRC	
6	Rajendra Sharma	N.C	
7	Mahendra Paudyal	DEO	DEO
8	Hari Subedi	Repre, D.A.O	Repr..
9	Sajan Neupane	N.C.D.C	Env. Officer
10	Ram Rimal	ICC, Ilam	Dis. Cprdi
11	Rajendra Kumar malla	DADO	SADO
12	Rabindra Nath Dev	WSSO, Ilam	
13	Padam Ral	DL.SO Ilam	President
14	Darm Nembor	R.P.R.N	
15	Som Nath.....	Chair Man	
16	Hari Bd. D.C	Chair Man	
17	Shiwa P. Gautam	NRCS	
18	Hira Lal Karmacharya	NRCS	
19	Purna Bdr. Rci	H.S.S.D. R.P	
20	Tika Paudel(Bharadwaj)	A. Bar , Ilam	
21	Suren Karki	Fikkal Radio	S. Manager
22	Bijaya ShekharBhattarai	Nepalbani FM	S. Manager Chief Editor
23	Puspa.....	Mahila Kalyan Samaz	President
24	Umesh Gurung	F.N.J Ilam	President
25	Babita Subba	NRCC, Ex.ecutive committee	Member
26	Basauli Ghatani	NRCC, Ex.ecutive committee	Member
27	Tikaraj Rai	RRN	Sub Engineer
28	Surat Ld Chaudhary	DSCC	
29	Rom Nath Acharya	NRCS	Senior Branch Officer
30	Basauta Timilsina	NRCS	A/C
31	Vikas Subedi	NRCS	Office Asst



32	Kanehha Laotee	UCPN (mabist)	
33	Kiran Kumar Dhungana	A.P.F	D.S.P
34	Minsu Limbu	F.L.S.C	S.S
35	Lubha Raj Neupane	OPNEP	P.C
36	Eak Narayan	MOLD	
37	Anjit Gautam	DDC Ilam	Energy Env. Officer
38	Rabindra Pd. Shrestha	NRCS Ilam	Secretary
39	Bhumi Dhungana	NCP	
40	Bijaya Karki	NRCS Ilam	
41	Tek Pd.	ICCI	Secretary
42	Ratan Kumar.....	NRCS Ilam	Member
43	Ganish Adhikari	EDRO	Section Officer
44	Uttam Paudel	NRCS Ilam	Member
45	Loken Thebe	Ilam Express	Reporter
46	Badri Nath Bhattarai	I.D.A	President
47	Sharada Nepal	WDO	
48	Yubaraj Timilsina	A.P.F	
49	Bishnu Kumar karki	A.P.F	
50	Lubha Raj Neupane	DPNet-Nepal	Program Coordinator