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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

Over the course of 2015, and as a result the April 25th Nepal earthquake, the Conscious Connections Foundation (CCF) collected $180,120 in donations to its Earthquake Relief Projects (ERPs). As this was the largest financial and logistical undertaking in the history of CCF, an evaluation into these ERPs was called for in order to insure transparency, reliability, and accountability to donors and beneficiaries alike. In addition, this research will provide a testimonial of confidence to any individuals interested in supporting CCF in the future.

As of March 2016, the Foundation’s ERPs were valued at approximately $78,400. This report covers projects completed and those in progress. The future reconstruction of the Deurali Community Service Center will be the largest single expenditure of CCF resources and has been allocated a budget of $60,000. Remaining funds will be allocated as continuing projects evolve and future projects are identified.

This report evaluates the implementation and impact of the Foundation’s assistance and assesses individual projects in order to determine what worked well, what can be improved and how CCF projects can provide the greatest future value for donors, partners and beneficiaries. Report methodologies included field surveys, meetings with implementing partners, and extensive interviews with beneficiaries. Surveying identified several key needs common to a majority of earthquake victims which should be considered by CCF in any future ERPs: warmth, shelter, community infrastructure, food, and emergency communications.

Results

Areas of Success

CCF aid was distributed to some of the most severely damaged and remote communities in Nepal, often during the crucial first weeks after the disaster. Emergency relief projects implemented directly after the earthquake, and subsequent recovery efforts were found to address the major needs of recipients. Beneficiaries reported that aid was provided equitably and effectively to affected communities. The following factors were identified as key to these successes:

- **Effective utilization of key relationships and local knowledge**: Relationships cultivated over 30+ years of working in Nepal allowed the Foundation to immediately contact affected communities, determine need, and source and deliver aid through trusted conduits in a timely and economical manner.
- **Rapid distribution of aid**: By reaching villages in the critical few weeks directly after the first earthquake and before many other aid organizations had arrived, CCF was able to provide desperately needed supplies to those most at risk.
- **Appropriate transition from immediate relief to long term recovery**: The leadership of CCF judiciously and effectively applied incoming funds to fit the constantly evolving
needs of those they sought to help, and ensured that immediate aid gave way to long term reconstruction and recovery when appropriate.

- **Support of local, trusted organizations**: CCF’s support of trusted local NGOs through the transfer of donated funds proved to expand CCF’s impact beyond its original horizons, and spread effective humanitarian assistance to an even larger demographic. The local NGO’s capacity to expand the scope and range of CCF assistance may be a valuable resource for future Foundation projects.

- **Continuing and long term assistance**: The commitment of CCF to long-term assistance distinguishes it from many other humanitarian aid organizations, encourages capacity building within communities, and ultimately makes its ERPs more effective and sustainable.

- **Selection of beneficiary communities**: Many of the communities to which CCF provided aid were chosen with meticulous effort so as to best utilize all resources at hand, including relationships and finance based resources, in order to ensure an appropriate choice of responsible development partners.

Through the evaluation of CCF’s completed projects, it was determined that the organization’s earthquake relief was efficient, fair and relevant to the needs of the affected population.

**Areas for Improvement**

In addition to CCF’s success in many areas, the evaluation also found some arenas in which CCF can aim to improve effectiveness:

- **Cultivating ownership of projects within communities**: Although CCF has attempted to cultivate community ownership in its ERP’s, the degree of success has been inconsistent.

- **Cooperation with other NGOs/INGOs**: Although CCF was largely able to avoid duplicating the aid delivered through other organizations (by communicating with community leaders and other local contacts) there was a general lack of understanding by CCF of its role in the overall earthquake relief effort in Nepal.

- **Allocation of appropriate time for consideration and production of projects**: Although rapid design and implementation of immediate assistance projects was a natural response to the devastation wrought by the earthquake, some projects were implemented before due thought was given to overall impact and potentially negative consequences.

- **Incomplete selection data for choice of beneficiary communities**: On several occasions CCF attempted to implement projects without the necessary local knowledge or prior relationships, required to make assistance most effective.

**Recommendations**

This report concludes with recommendations on what and how CCF could improve its performance in the future:
• As a new assistance organization, become more familiar with international guidelines, standards, and inter-organization coordination through such programs as the UN Cluster System
• Better utilize committees and standardize the proposal process
• Better understand the dynamics present within a community and how CCF can work in accordance with them.
• Cultivate current relationships with key individuals and partner communities
• Search for key individuals within beneficiary communities with whom CCF can work directly and build relationships
• Identify aid organizations with whom CCF can work directly, build relationships and coordinate assistance
• Broaden and foster the channels of communication between CCF, aid recipients, and CCF representatives within the community
• Seek the assistance of outside experts in order to build the capacity of the organization and maximize potential.

Specific to Nepal and relative to ongoing assistance:

• **Reassess and update Earthquake Relief Goals:** As CCF continues with current and future recovery projects, it is important for the organization to reassess and update its earthquake project goals, so as to ensure that those projects which are pursued embody the intention of the organization, its stakeholders, its representatives, and its mission.
• **Follow up and long term assistance:** As CCF continues with current and future recovery projects, it’s important for the organization to reassess and update its project goals. Projects must be consistent with goals of the organization, its stakeholders, representatives, and mission.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Conscious Connections Foundation

The Conscious Connections Foundation (CCF) is a 501(c)3 public charity organization founded in September of 2014. CCF came about as earlier relief projects that had been carried out under the non-profit umbrella of the Fabric of Life Foundation grew and necessitated the establishment of a separate non-profit. CCF’s programs have been in effect in Nepal since 2010, and they draw on the experience and connections built by CCF Chairwoman Denise Attwood and Board Member Ric Conner over their 30+ years of working in Nepal as owners of Ganesh Himal Trading (GHT), a Fair Trade import company. In part, CCF was founded to continue the work of GHT outside of the business arena. As such, many of the earthquake relief projects which are evaluated in this report were a direct result of the relationships made with individuals and communities through the work of GHT over 30+ years.

The Conscious Connections Foundation was established to promote and develop the education of young girls through the “Power of 5” program and to provide primary health care to the remote village of Baseri and its neighbors through the Baseri Clinic Project (a.k.a the Deurali Community Service Center). Additionally, in the aftermath of the April 25th earthquake in Nepal, CCF utilized its preexisting connections and resources to launch several Earthquake Relief Projects (ERPs).

These ERPs were based on the following goals established by the CCF Board of Directors:

- **Emergency Earthquake Relief** (short-term)
  - Save lives by providing shelter and food
  - Save lives by providing medical aid
  - Distribute relief resources rapidly through trusted channels
  - Provide a trusted conduit for donors to give and be involved in earthquake relief in a responsible and effective manner

- **Future Rebuilding** (long-term)
  - Reconstruct the Deurali Community Service Center, home to the Baseri Clinic
  - Restore people's ability to generate income and make a living
  - Reduce the affected communities’ future vulnerability to similar disasters

Following the immediate relief phase of the earthquake, a team of CCF representatives traveled to Nepal, at their own expense, to perform an evaluation of CCF's relief work, as well as to survey for future areas of recovery where CCF could be effective.

1.2 Emergent Strategy

Going into a place such as Nepal to provide humanitarian aid or to perform an evaluation of humanitarian aid presents many challenges. Between high political corruption and instability,
lack of infrastructure, fuel shortages, remote locations, and myriad other obstacles that have been heightened by the earthquake, it is clear that anyone aiming to work in this country will have to constantly adapt and reassess their methods. A single, cookie-cutter strategy of providing aid or getting anything done will simply not be effective.

Therefore, CCF and this evaluation team have tried to operate under the theory of what has been coined as “emergent strategy.” Rather than maintaining a rigid approach, emergent strategies deal with complex issues by being flexible and changing with the situation to produce more effective, realistic results. Parts of the original (intended) strategy are discarded (unrealized) and new (emergent) ideas are integrated to produce a realized strategy to pursue. Organizations which employ emergent strategies learn and formulate their process as they go so as to best produce the most relevant and effective results.

The decision by CCF to conduct this research according to an emergent theory is based on several key factors that will be inherent to this study. Preeminent in this decision was the fact that CCF and its Board of Directors had never dealt with humanitarian aid in the aftermath of a natural disaster. As such, despite the most admirable intentions and best laid plans, CCF recognized the necessity of an ever adapting approach to their work, so as to best avoid the issues which are inherent with such lack of experience. Apart from this immediate concern of inexperience, an emergent approach to research will be desirable as the research necessary to address this proposal will take place in an environment that is, itself, constantly subject to change. With aftershocks continuing months after the initial quake, and ranging in geographic location along a several hundred mile expanse, circumstances for those which CCF is attempting to aid can change literally within minutes. To address these issues, a strategy which will combine initial intentions with a changing reality seems entirely necessary.

1.3 Evaluation Framework

The purpose of this evaluation was to better understand the effectiveness of the disaster aid provided by CCF in Nepal. To address this purpose, this evaluation was designed to be both accountability- and learning-oriented. With an accountability-oriented evaluation, CCF aims to provide more transparency to donors, partners, and the public by making more information available about the organization’s projects and practices. With a learning-oriented evaluation, CCF wants to see what lessons can be learned from this earthquake relief process. By evaluating what went right and what didn’t in CCF’s projects, effectiveness and efficiency can be improved as the recovery from this disaster continues and in future disaster situations. The evaluation questions and methodology are designed to fulfill both of these types of evaluation.

1.4 Main Guiding Questions

This evaluation was designed to answer the following main guiding questions.

- Did CCF’s earthquake response achieve its short-term purpose?
- Where was CCF’s short-term earthquake response effective and where was it not?
- How and where can CCF most effectively provide relief to achieve its long-term goals?
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- Where do CCF and other similar small-scale aid organizations belong in the overall context and community of humanitarian aid?

1.5 Methodology

This evaluation was conducted using four primary methods of data collection:

- Interviews with Key Informants
- Surveys
- Desk Review
- Field Observations

Interviews with Key Informants

In-depth discussions guided by prearranged and interview specific questions to be held with Key Informants. Each interview was aimed to address a key point of view which may represent the particular perspective of a larger group, organization, community, etc. Key informant interviews alternatively allowed for a more detailed evaluation of CCF’s past aid and future proposals through a comprehensive discussion with those individuals who have extensive knowledge pertaining to a particular issue.

*See Annex A for a list of Key Informants interviewed.*

*See Annex C for a Draft Interview Outline.*

Surveys

Originally in this evaluation, surveys were going to be used to collect both qualitative and quantitative data from the people of Nepal on the earthquake relief process and their current status. However, considering the amount of time the evaluation team was able to spend in each village, it was determined that attempting a statistically representative, quantitative survey was unrealistic. The number of surveys that would have been needed to draw any significant quantitative conclusions would have greatly limited the time and depth of conversation with each surveyed person. In response to this new insight, the survey questions were modified to promote open, unconstrained discussions with aid recipients about relief they received and their needs and concerns now. Due to small sample size, these surveys are not statistically representative of an entire community or demographic, but an effort was made to survey individuals of varying age, gender, and social status whenever possible. Additionally, survey responses were compared with other sources of data to triangulate the reality of the situation in each village as much and as accurately as possible.

As most communities will have received aid from other organizations as well as CCF, most responses from this survey will not be directly attributable to CCF’s work. Therefore, these surveys will be conducted with the intent of gathering general data from the affected population to inform CCF’s next steps.
SECTION 1: BACKGROUND

See Annex D for a Draft Survey

Desk Review

Desk review focuses on the analysis of books, international journals, magazines, newspapers, and other documents concerning either the humanitarian action taken in Nepal, the culture and history of Nepal, and/or methods of conducting evaluations on humanitarian aid. This information is used to gain a clearer understanding of the environment this research will be conducted in and to build expertise necessary to more credibly and professionally conduct this research. As new information arose during the course of this evaluation, new sources were continually added.

See Annex C for a list of Key Reference Documents and Materials used during Desk Review.

Field Observations

Field Observations were conducted in each village that CCF representatives visited, regardless of whether or not they had received aid from CCF. During their stay in a village, CCF representatives noted key observations regarding food, shelter, medical supplies, and other resources that appeared indicative of the aid received and the current condition of a village. These observations provide a point of reference on the reality of the situation in Nepal that can be compared against interview and survey answers to see if they support the same conclusions. Moreover, they serve to identify the most pressing needs in particular areas so that these may be compared to how others were able to solve these problems.

See Annex E for a Draft Field Observations Form

1.6 Limitations

- Time and Geographical Constraints: The villages and communities which CCF provided earthquake relief to are spread across the Himalayas in locations that often take considerable time and effort to reach. The evaluation team was only able to reach some of CCF’s ERPs, and in some cases had limited time to evaluate certain projects. As such, the results of this evaluation are not necessarily representative of CCF’s work in its entirety or of the views and opinions of entire communities and populations.

- Retrospective Earthquake Relief Goals: Because of the rapid pace at which CCF acted after the earthquake, the Board of Directors had to retrospectively decide upon short- and long-term earthquake relief goals several months after the fact. These goals and standards were established to reflect as accurately as possible the initial intentions behind the ERPs, yet it is important to concede that they may or may not be different than what would originally have been conceived.

- India Blockade and Petrol Shortage: On September 23rd, 2015, India began an economic blockade against Nepal, cutting off many important imports including Nepal’s fuel
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supply. The blockade lasted over five months and was highly disruptive to everyday life in Nepal and the actions of humanitarian aid organizations, including CCF. There has been a drastic rise in the cost of transportation, building materials, and almost all aspects of Nepali life, making evaluation and ongoing CCF projects much more difficult to complete.

- Limited CCF Name Recognition: The purposeful anonymity of CCF made it so many individuals were unaware of which aid came from CCF and what came from other organizations. Therefore, direct attribution of coverage and efficiency to CCF was impossible in most cases.

- Difficulty of Assessing the Perspectives of Women: Often, women simply did not know the details of what aid they had received and had to ask their spouse for assistance. Alternatively, a male family member would be present and naturally begin answering the questions.

2. THE NEED

2.1 Earthquake Background

On Saturday, April 25th at approximately 11:45 am, a magnitude 7.8 earthquake shook Nepal to its core. Following that, another devastating earthquake of magnitude 7.3 hit on May 12th. The country has experienced more than 200 aftershocks, which ranged between magnitudes 4.5 and 6.6.

As of September 2015, the latest records of the Nepali Government indicate that 8,969 people have died, 602,592 homes have been destroyed, and approximately 2.8 million are in need of humanitarian assistance due to this earthquake and its aftershocks. Damage costs are estimated to be around $5 billion, which is 25% of Nepal’s annual GDP. In total, it is estimated that over eight million people have been affected. Many of the most severe losses occurred in the more remote villages of Nepal which are scattered among the Himalayas, and thus isolated from Kathmandu. As such, many of the deaths recorded are either a direct result of the earthquake and subsequent landslides or due to lack of necessary resources such as food, shelter and medicine.

2.2 Emergency Needs

In the aftermath of the earthquake CCF immediately got in contact with trusted friends and partners in Nepal to determine how the organization could best help victims of the disaster. CCF used the knowledge and recommendations from these contacts in forming ERPs to address the most pressing needs at that moment. These immediate, emergency needs include shelter, warmth, food, and medicine.
3. THE RESPONSE

3.1 Immediate Relief

The ERPs undertaken by CCF have been the largest project to date for the organization, both in number of resources expended and lives impacted. At the inception of this final report, CCF had raised over $155,000 for earthquake relief alone, and by the end of the year this number reached $180,120. During the initial “emergency relief phase” CCF distributed close to $30,000. This money went towards providing over 6,000 people immediately with food for one month, and approximately 1,200 people with shelter. An additional $10,300 has been provided to the Association for Craft Producers (ACP) as a portion of CCF’s Artisan Relief Project. This money was sent immediately and has been set aside for the reconstruction of the homes of ACP artisans which were either destroyed or damaged during the Earthquakes.

3.2 Evaluation

In light of all that transpired in the aftermath of the April 25th earthquake, the CCF Board of Directors, in conjunction with contacts on the ground, agreed that it was vital to understand the impact of the aid provided by CCF and to set an effective course for the future. To this end, in October of 2015, four representatives of CFF, Chair Women Denise Attwood, Vice President Ric Conner, Research Associate Grant Gallaher, and Vice President Cameron Conner, traveled to Nepal.

Predominantly, the purpose of this evaluation is to determine what aspects of CCF’s earthquake relief projects worked, what was missed, and how CCF’s involvement can effectively transition from providing immediate and emergency assistance, to supporting various groups and communities in their process of rebuilding. With this information, CCF will have a greater ability to cultivate long-term solutions for recovery. Secondarily, this report analyzes the effectiveness of past aid provided by CCF in realizing the needs of Nepali earthquake victims, so as to determine the organization's accountability to those who financed its work, those it seeks to aid, and other humanitarian actors.
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4. AREAS OF EVALUATION

The scope of this evaluation covered multiple projects and aid recipients within the three main ERPs that CCF pursued:

**General Relief** - CCF partnered with many Nepali organizations and individuals to distribute relief supplies beyond what CCF could achieve alone.

**Baseri Relief** - Immediate aid was provided to the villages of Baseri and Budhatum in the district of Dhading within weeks of the initial earthquake in the form of food, medicine, and durable temporary shelters.

**Artisan Relief** - Mostly initiated by Ganesh Himal Trading but now transitioned into the domain of CCF, these projects concentrate on producers known by CCF and Ganesh Himal Trading to have lost their homes and/or means of livelihood. Artisan Relief focuses on helping these already marginalized individuals get back to work and/or on providing grants so that they can obtain the necessary supplies and materials to survive and begin rebuilding.

4.1 General Relief

**Phulikharka/Kattike Relief Project**

On the 12 of May, 17 days after the initial earthquake, trekking guides and CCF volunteers Ram Karki and Pradeep Karki delivered one month’s worth of food and durable tarps to 43 families in the village of Kattike, Dhading District, all of whom had lost their homes in the earthquake. Out of the 44 homes originally standing in Kattike, 43 were entirely destroyed or rendered uninhabitable. Thankfully, there were no deaths, and only two individuals were injured. Those families that have lost their homes are now living in temporary shelters constructed of wood and CGI sheeting. Though these shelters do protect from rain and snow, they are poorly insulated and are often overcrowded, with a family which used to occupy a two- or three-story home now residing in a one-story space with a drastically reduced footprint. Apart from the aid delivered by CCF, Kattike received assistance in the form of food and CGI sheeting from six other NGOs or INGOs as well as a combined total of 22,000NRs ($220) per household from the Nepali Government.

**Evaluation**

In total, 12 families located throughout Kattike were surveyed. The age of those surveyed ranged from 18-77 years old, with both males and females included in the selection. Each individual surveyed acknowledged having received CCF’s aid, and none - either inside the selected group
of those surveyed or beyond - complained of having been missed or excluded. Though some organizations did later provide additional food, tin sheets, and other necessary supplies, CCF was the first organization to reach the villagers of Kattike in the crucial weeks after the earthquake. The appreciation of the villagers and importance of this aid to them could be clearly seen in their many thanks to Pradeep and Ram, the warm welcome they gave the small party of CCF representatives, and continued utilization of CCF tarps.

The largest concerns expressed by the villagers were: shelter, food scarcity, and water availability. Though it is widely recognized that the newly constructed tin huts can only serve as a temporary solution to the shelter issue, and all desire to rebuild as soon as possible, very few have the financial ability to rebuild any sort of permanent home, and those that do are reluctant to rebuild in the old style out of the fear that another earthquake will strike. Moreover, as most food crops are stored in the upper stories of a home after harvest, these too were lost when homes collapsed. This, in conjunction with a poor growing season, means that food stores for the coming year will be severely lacking and made the supplies delivered by CCF that much more valuable. Together with these concerns is the additional consideration of new irrigation challenges due to an altered course of the local river, meaning that villagers have to entirely recreate their community pump system. Likely due to a combination of these concerns and residual shock, no individuals interviewed had a concrete plan for their future.

Conclusion

As the rice, lentils, and tarps that CCF distributed in Kattike were delivered just weeks after April 25th, it served a vital purpose in that it gave villagers sufficient protection from the elements and food to survive until individuals were able to build more durable shelters. Many families were living under these tarps for several months after the earthquake as it was the only safe, reliable, and durable shelter at hand during the continuous aftershocks. Furthermore, many of the tarps CCF provided have been incorporated into the more permanent tin huts that are now serving as shelter.

Solar Light Distribution Project

Through Dr. Allison Thompson, founder and director of the organization Third Wave Volunteers, CCF directed the distribution of 750 SolarPuff Lanterns from SoLight Design to villages and individuals in need. SolarPuff Lanterns are fully waterproof and shatterproof, with a built-in rechargeable battery, all-in-one SolarPuff lanterns hold a charge for up to 12 hours and stay bright all night. The small solar panel is viable for 10 years and the LED lights last two to three years. Furthermore, these lights can be easily compressed to a thickness of less than one inch, making them easy to transport in bulk over long distances. 500 of these lights were delivered by Dr. Thompson and volunteers directly to the villagers of Dadagaun, Baseri where
each household received one. The remaining 220 were handed over to CCF representatives Denise Attwood, Ric Conner, Cameron Conner, and Grant Gallaher in Nepal. Out of these, 20 were delivered to TEAM Nepal for use in their children's orphanage, 25 were taken to Baseri for use in the clinic, 15 were given to the knitters of Stupa Trading, and 74 were given to producers in the Association of Craft Producers (a Fair Trade organization operating in the Kathmandu Valley). Out of the remaining lights, 49 were distributed throughout the village of Kattike, and the rest were handed out to individuals along the survey trek in late October to persons in need.

Evaluation

As Baseri was the only village visited by CCF representatives that had received Solar Puffs in advance, it was the only coherent community in which this aid could be evaluated. Their effect, however, was apparent. When interviewed about their thoughts on the SolarPuffs, beneficiaries would immediately express a shining enthusiasm for these small, pocket-sized bubbles of light, attesting to their influence in expanding the hours possible to work throughout the day, as well as providing a small, but vital, feeling of comfort and security. This effect was not limited only to the villages, but was expressed in the city as well, where there is often under ten hours of electricity per day, depending on the season. As such, students in Kathmandu were able to use these same lights during the long fall and winter nights, when there was no other source of light to study by. Knitters, weavers, and other artisans have also expressed with gratitude the surprising impact these little lights have had on their lives since the earthquake, making it possible for them to work from home, as they generally do, and continue to support their families.

In both those villages which had lost their electrical grid due to the earthquake, and those that never had electricity to begin with, these lights proved to have a huge effect on those individuals that received them. Without a cheap, sustainable, and readily available source of light, sunrise and sunset often determine the parameters of the working day. In such circumstances, venturing out on one's own in the night can be extremely dangerous, particularly for women and children. Moreover, those few lights which are available in disaster areas are often kerosene lamps, which are dangerous, toxic, and expensive.

Conclusion

The SolarPuffs distributed by CCF and Dr. Thompson replaced harmful alternative light sources, served as nocturnal security, and perhaps most importantly of all, provided a much needed source of hope, solace, and refuge to individuals living out on the edge of survival. Testimonials to the practically limitless application of these small investments came from nearly every individual interviewed. Due to the endorsement of these donations by the beneficiaries themselves, along with the SolarPuff’s versatility, durability, and low cost, these lights proved to
be an extremely effective project for CCF and should be considered for future projects as well.

**TEAM Nepal**

From the 17th of May to the 16th of June, CCF made three direct grants, totaling $12,500, to TEAM Nepal for several of their earthquake relief projects. TEAM Nepal is a Nepali NGO that strives “to help Nepali people with the focus areas of Child rights, Education, Environment and Health awareness” through community specific development. Though not facilitated by CCF representatives, it was thanks to the great efforts of those at TEAM Nepal that donations to CCF were able to go far beyond their original potential. CCF funds were used by TEAM Nepal for three projects:

1. **Bhotenamlang VDC Relief Support**: Funded entirely by CCF funds, this project delivered 7,500 Kgs of rice, 480 Kgs of lentils, and 500 Kgs of salt to 665 households in wards 1-5 of Bhotenamlang VDC in mid June. (Cost: approximately $3,800)

2. **Urjeni V.D.C Relief Support**: Funded entirely by CCF, this project delivered 3,330 Kgs of rice, 111 Kgs of lentils, 111 Kgs of salt, and 111 Kgs of cooking oil, along with 14 mattresses to those who had lost their family, to 111 households in ward 1 of Urjeni VDC (Cost: approximately $1,600)

3. **Toilet Tent Project**: Partially funded by CCF, this program distributed 840 toilet tents in wards 1-9 of Talamarang VDC to help avert any sanitary and health issues that might have resulted from the destruction of preexisting toilets. (Total Cost: approximately $25,000, of which CCF contributed $6,600)

**Evaluation**

The evaluation of this aid consisted mainly of interviewing the facilitators of these projects, such as TEAM Nepal President Neel Shahi, and reviewing the documentation of these projects provided by TEAM Nepal. As CCF representatives were unable to personally reach the beneficiaries of this aid and/or an unbiased third party, it should be taken into account that organizational bias may have affected the resultant conclusions.

**Conclusion**

According to the accounts given by those interviewed, individuals who CCF board members Denise Attwood and Ric Conner have known for several decades, the money that CCF granted to TEAM Nepal was well spent. Not only did these grants allow for the money of CCF to be distributed beyond CCF’s previous horizons to new remote communities that were likewise in desperate need, but they also continued this aid through the same emphasis on relationships.
which CCF holds at the core of its mission. The villages to which TEAM Nepal delivered aid after the earthquake were those villages with which they had developed long-term relationships prior the disaster. As such, similar to CCF projects in Kattike, Baseri, and others, TEAM Nepal also had the relationships necessary to intervene in these communities with a local understanding of the problems faced and needs that were thus present. This relationship based aid, in conjunction with a well established foundation of supporters, and history of reliable, effective humanitarian work has, in terms of this research, shown TEAM Nepal to be an appropriate and trustworthy conduit for CCF donations. In conclusion, and due to the above considerations, this research recommends that CCF continue pursuing a continued partnership with TEAM Nepal as a potential avenue for undertaking effective earthquake recovery.

4.2 Baseri Relief

**Dadagaun (Baseri) Relief Project**

Out of the initial 110 homes in Dadagaun, none managed to withstand the earthquake without suffering severe damage, although some did remain partially habitable. To assist with this crisis CCF purchased 100 durable canvas tents for $4,000 from Delhi, India, arranged for their transportation on top of a local bus to Baseri, and began distributing them in the village just one week after April 25th. These tents provided crucial short-term shelter to an estimated 400 individuals with no alternative available, serving as their home during the three-month monsoon season and often beyond. Along with these tents, CCF also distributed 100 bags of rice (28kg each), and corresponding amounts of lentils, sugar, tea, salt and cooking oil, enough to last a family of three to five members for close to one month. The collection of these supplies, their transportation, and final distribution was facilitated by high altitude trekking guide, treasurer of the Baseri Clinic, and Baseri local, Dhane Gurung.

**Evaluation**

While in Baseri, CCF representatives interviewed 12 individuals of all ages and social statuses, both male and female, about their experience since the earthquake, their attitude towards the immediate aid provided by CCF, the reconstruction of the Deurali Community Service Center, and their plans for the future. All had positive things to say about CCF’s assistance, though they did not associate the aid directly with CCF, but instead with Dhane. Evidence of this aid was also apparent around the village and noted in Field Observations, several canvas tents were still in use as an alternative source of shelter, some had been repurposed for storage, and still others included into other temporary homes.
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Conclusion

Though individuals were still in a state of need, it was apparent that they sincerely appreciated the aid delivered by CCF, and that of other organizations as well. Moreover, as additional aid provided by other organizations including the Red Cross, Aasaman Nepal, the Non-resident Nepal Association of Australia and the Nepali Government, arrived weeks after that delivered by Dhane, CCF’s aid again played a crucial role in helping individuals survive the traumatizing, desperate weeks following the earthquake. The ability to reach this community was again due to the fact that CCF has relationships of 30+ years at its disposal. The anonymity with which CCF representatives were able to conduct interviews and surveys due to the lack of CCF recognition also played a large role in the validity of this process, as it allowed interviewers to appear as an appropriately objective third party and allowed villagers to express answers that might otherwise might not have been as genuine.

One interesting aspect that was noted particularly in Dadagaun concerns the unforeseen effect of the earthquake on family structures. In those households which had previously held a large number of family members, many fractionated into smaller units after the earthquake. Any shelters that remained after the disaster were not big enough for everyone, and as such, many smaller family units were forced to relocate to different areas of the village. To put this effect in context: there used to be approximately 110 households in Dadagaun alone, there are now approximately 161, all of which are in need of shelter. This effect in particular is important to note in the aid distribution process, as we ran into several families which had not received aid from larger organizations because their former head of the family received it instead. Should CCF be called upon to provide disaster relief in the future, this issue should be taken into consideration on the off chance that there will be more recipients in need than accounted for.

4.3 Artisan Relief

In the initial aftermath of the earthquake, CCF and GHT partnered together to provide relief and support to those most in need. While CCF focused its primary attention on General Earthquake Relief Projects and the Besari Clinic Earthquake Relief Project, with a secondary emphasis on assistance to the Artisan Relief, GHT exclusively focused its support in the area of Artisan Relief. GHT’s intimate and relationship based business model made it possible for them to establish direct contact with many of the producers almost immediately after the earthquake, allowing them to respond quickly and efficiently to the needs of producers themselves, as well as the needs of their villages. After the initial provision of this relief by GHT, CCF was able to confidently step in and provide the necessary medium and long-term relief to these communities.
Borang and Ghat Besi Relief Project

In the immediate wake of the earthquake CCF, GHT, and trusted contacts on the ground in Nepal began organizing relief for the village of Ghat Besi in the district of Ghorka. This relief was comprised mainly of CGI sheeting for the construction of temporary shelters. In total, 140 out of the original 144 homes in Ghat Besi, together with the two local schools and clinic had been destroyed or rendered unsafe by the earthquake. With the help of local community leaders, GHT wired the $2,500 necessary for the acquisition and distribution of 12 CGI sheets to each home, 60 for the temporary reconstruction of the primary school, and 120 for the larger secondary school just 10 days after the initial earthquake.

Ghat Besi is home to many of those who work at Sadle Traders, a long standing fair trade partner and supplier of GHT, and as such, many of those at Sadle lost family members, homes, and livestock in Ghat Besi and the surrounding area during the earthquake. It was thus GHT that initially wired the money necessary for this project to the Ghat Besi community, using contacts made over their 25+ years of working with Sadle.

Evaluation

Though CCF representatives were only able to interview several individuals, these interviewees were key community leaders and as such knew a significant amount about the trials that had faced the village after the earthquake, the methods of coping with these trials, and the current situation of the community. Moreover, CCF representatives toured much of the village and the results of the Ghat Besi Relief Project could be seen clearly around the village; every home had been rebuilt, at least partially, using the CGI provided by CCF and GHT. CCF representatives also visited the local primary and secondary schools to which CGI had been delivered, and which again clearly displayed the use to which the Ghat Besi society had put GHT aid; every roof of the 12 classrooms had pieces of CCF purchased CGI sheeting. Moreover, due largely to the initiative and the Ghat Besi Villagers and the emphasis they place on education, but also as a result of GHT’s rapid reaction, these schools were among the first buildings to be temporarily rebuilt, meaning that kids lost less than two weeks out of their school year despite going through one of the largest natural disasters of 2015.

Conclusion

Three factors made this project particularly valuable:

1. Apart from the assistance provided by GHT in this project, the village of Ghat Besi received no other aid from NGOs or INGOs, and only menial financial assistance from the government despite being almost entirely destroyed.
2. Supplies were distributed by Sadle staff just *10 days* after the earthquake, allowing villagers to get a head start on rebuilding their homes/temporary shelters in preparation for the quickly approaching monsoon season.

3. The choice of aid provided to Ghat Besi proved to be particularly relevant.

Due to these three factors, the assistance of GHT was made even more valuable in the crucial weeks after the earthquake, as villagers were able to not only rebuild, but do so quickly and with effective reliable material. Given this extra time, some villagers had even been able to complete the reconstruction of *permanent* housing, in which many had reused the GHT donated CGI. For those who had remained in temporary shelters, these shelters had been built with appropriate insulation, with local materials, and in a manner sufficient to last the winter. Ultimately, the choice of CGI sheeting in itself proved successful, as Ghat Besi was accessible enough to deliver them by road immediately after the earthquake, villagers have experience using them before, and the sheets themselves are reusable once villagers are able to rebuild permanently.

Though much of this credit is due to the villagers of Ghat Besi themselves, the success of this project is also due to the strong relationships between GHT, CCF and community leaders such as A.D. Aryal. These relationships, developed over 25+ years, as in other projects, allowed GHT and CCF to intervene in the village with legitimacy and a level of trust that lends itself to a greater efficiency and effectiveness that would not be possible otherwise.

---

**Chunta Relief**

Two days after the April 25th earthquake, Chunta Nepali, Kesang Yudron, and Pema Dhokar, began to purchase emergency supplies including food, tents, and any other items they thought necessary with money from their own pockets. On April 28th, they hired a local truck to cart themselves and their supplies into the mountains of Nuwakot and Dhading Districts. In this first excursion, they were able to provide these materials to 88 families in three villages. Several days later, on May 11th, CCF (through GHT) wired $1,110 to reimburse them and provide additional funds.

**Evaluation**

As CCF representatives were unable to personally reach the beneficiaries of this aid and/or an unbiased third party, and the evaluation of this aid consisted mainly of interviewing the facilitators of these projects, Chunta Nepali, and Kesang Yudron, it should be taken into account that organizational bias may have affected the resultant conclusions.
Conclusion

Though the aid distributed through this project undoubtedly benefited those who received it and the efforts of those involved was well intended, due to the lack of records, personal recollection, and connection to those villages that were aided, CCF has very little knowledge of how effective this project was. Furthermore, there was no follow-up with these villages by the aid facilitators, and no other long-term connection, two principles which have proven to be the most effective in other ERPs of CCF. The inexperience of those distributing the aid with the regions in which they were working, and humanitarian aid in general must also be taken into account. Ultimately, it is recommended that, should such a project have the potential to be undertaken in the future, considerations including follow-up with the communities involved, prior relationships with the communities, and accountability to both beneficiaries and CCF donors be taken into account before beginning.

ACP Home Reconstruction

When the homes and looms of 12 ACP weavers were destroyed in the earthquake, these artisans began an investigation into the construction of a centralized safe weaving center for future work. On June 12th, 2015, CCF wired $10,000 to the Association for Craft Producers (ACP) to be put towards the construction of such a center for the 12 women of Laxmi Maharjan's weaving group in Kirtipur. However, upon further deliberation between the weavers, ACP management, and CCF it was decided that it would be more appropriate for the artisans to divide this money among themselves and use it to reconstruct their own personal workshops and homes. For the disbursement of funds, a committee comprised of ACP Board Members, general members and Senior Managers has been formed. This committee will determine the criteria for fund disbursement. Application is to be called from artisans and staffs affected. To date 6 applications have been submitted by those who lost their entire homes.

The distribution of these funds was initially delayed by continuous aftershocks and the monsoon season, it is now being delayed by the inflated prices, lack of transportation, and other roadblocks caused by the Nepal Blockade which began in August of 2015 and continues to heavily impact the local economy. ACP plans to carry out this distribution as soon as these impediments have abated. Due to these delays, an evaluation of this project was not possible, as there are of yet, no known outcomes to speak of.

5. SURVEY CONCLUSIONS

Along with gathering information for the evaluation aspect of this research, the surveys and other forms of methodology described in section 1.4 were used to assess key observations and trends affecting the people of Nepal now. In order to gather a holistic perspective on the needs of past
or potential beneficiaries of CCF, this research drew information from as many demographics, age, gender, social position, as representatively as possible. This surveying identified the following main needs and concerns that were common to a majority of earthquake victims and should be considered by CCF in any future ERPs.

**Warmth** - With the coldest months of Himalayan winter (February and March) now upon us, many individuals living at higher altitudes still lack adequate clothing, shelter, insulation etc. to safely withstand the extreme temperatures and weather that are common in higher altitudes. Those materials which would previously have been used for this purpose were often damaged irreparably or lost in the rubble. Conditions are generally worst in the most remote villages which, due to the Nepal blockade, are also those communities which have received the least aid, both after the earthquake, and in preparation for winter.

**Shelter** - Out of the 12 villages taken into account for the purpose of this research, only Ghat Besi had begun to rebuild *permanent* shelter after the earthquake, the rest were still making due with temporary shelters generally constructed out of tin, wood, and sometimes tarps. Appropriate shelter is needed not only for winter, but also the approaching monsoon season which will begin in early June. However, the missing variables in this equation are the desperately needed techniques with which to rebuild in a way that would be resistant to future seismic activity while at the same time remaining affordable to low income villagers and utilizing as my local materials as possible, a challenge particularly in the more remote regions that lack road access.

**Community Infrastructure** - In many cases, the initial structures to be rebuilt after the earthquake were the public facilities which served the entire community. Sometimes just days after their homes had been devastated, entire communities came together to erect makeshift structures which then housed temporary schools and clinics. This immediate reaction quintessentially demonstrates the importance of these institutions to villagers, yet now these temporary shelters are becoming less viable as time wears on, and it becomes more apparent that permanent structures must take their place as soon as possible.

**Food** - People in every village surveyed were worried about their lack of food supplies for the coming winter and beyond. An extremely common problem after the earthquake was that people’s food stores had been in their homes and were crushed when the roof and walls collapsed. Some was recoverable, but large amounts of food were lost in every village. Most families had received enough emergency food from aid agencies to make it through monsoon season but now are concerned about when they will do in the future.

**Communication and NGO Presence** - Surveyed individuals were asked whether they felt they have the ability to communicate their needs and concerns to NGOs, or the federal government. The majority of people surveyed said no, they don’t feel they have that ability, although, the response towards local VDC’s communication was slightly more positive. Though
NGOs or the government may have distributed aid to an area, they often left no way for the aid recipients to stay in contact about what else they may need in the future. Furthermore, in the villages that CCF surveyed, almost every NGO that had delivered aid was no longer assisting the area. Many people felt abandoned and left to fend for themselves at a time when they needed help the most.

6. REAL-TIME RECOVERY PROJECTS

With the survey conclusions in mind, CCF started to put new projects in motion as soon as possible to address these greatest needs. These projects were being documented by CCF representatives in Nepal as they were being conducted and have therefore been designated as “Real-Time Recovery Projects.” With some of these new projects, CCF shifted from the relief phase to the recovery phase. Relief, in the context of humanitarian action, describes the immediate response and aid, whereas recovery refers to the long-term rebuilding of resilience.

6.1 General Relief

Thugman Relief Project

When CCF representatives trekked into the village of Thugman in mid October, through personal observation and communication with locals, it became apparent that the earthquake had left many on the edge of exposure and in a dire predicament: the prospect of facing the Himalayan winter at ~8,200ft with the typical shelter consisting of little more than a patchwork of tarps. In a season where temperatures drop well below zero and snowfall typically covers the landscape to a depth of several feet, the problem of staying warm was a key issue to the entire community.

In order to address this central issue of cold, CCF partnered with the Kathmandu-based wholesale company Everest Hardware to provide high-quality, warm jackets to Thugman. CCF purchased 100 fleece jackets for $6.90 apiece, with a total cost of $690. Additionally, Everest Hardware donated 100 fleece hats to CCF, of which 50 went to Thugman and 50 went to other areas of Nepal where needed.

Ram Karki, a long-time, trusted friend of CCF and an extremely knowledgeable trekking guide, transported this clothing to Thugman in early November. With the help of Mingmar Chhiring, the owner of a guest house in Thugman, Ram distributed the jackets and hats to a large crowd of eager recipients. 100 jackets weren’t enough to supply every villager, so CCF and Ram worked with Mingmar so that the supplies that could be provided would go towards the neediest members of the village.
Sertung Relief Project

In another effort to address the need for winter supplies in the remote mountains, CCF sent two large duffels packed with donated knit hats and sweaters to the village of Sertung, another village where CCF representatives observed firsthand the total destruction imposed by the earthquake.

The clothing was donated by Padhma Creations through Kesang Yudron, a business partner of GHT who helped with CCF’s immediate earthquake relief. The transportation and distribution of the clothing was organized by Yogendra Tamang, a man from Sertung who was interviewed by CCF representatives while they were staying there.

Since this first distribution of clothing, and with the help of community volunteers, CCF has continued to support Sertung with more clothing (donated by friends of CCF in the USA) and the distribution of 200 winter blankets to several communities in Sertung VDC. These two-ply Lotus blankets are large enough to comfortably cover several family members (160x220cm) and will serve approximately 600 individuals living in villages at high altitudes in the mountains which, due to their extremely remote location, have received little aid in response to the earthquake, and nearly none in preparation for winter. As Sertung is a three day walk from the nearest road head, each of these 200 blankets were transported by hand into the mountains and to the villages by local porters. These blankets were delivered successfully on 9th of February!

Ghat Besi School Reconstruction Project

During a brief visit to the village of Ghat Besi in November of 2015, CCF representatives were approached by local community leaders to assist in the reconstruction of the local public primary school. Though a temporary structure had been rebuilt just weeks after the earthquake in order to continue lessons, this building was becoming less and less viable as time progressed. To this end, CCF’s board of directors agreed to take part in the construction of a permanent school.

Ghat Besi is a vibrant community, one that is passionate about education and the cultivation of its village; villagers are willing to volunteer time, energy, and whatever building materials they can. The funding provided by CCF has, and will be, utilized for those materials which can not be provided locally, and any skilled labor which will have to be brought in from beyond Ghat Besi. The school will provide for an estimated 82 children in Kindergarten through 3rd grade with one teacher for each grade. In total, there will be five rooms: four classrooms -one for each grade- and an office for the staff. As this school will be located at the center of the village and requires no fees for tuition, it is available to all villagers, regardless of their socio-economic status.

Should students desire, upon graduating from third grade, they can then attend the secondary school to further their studies. Furthermore, when this school is completed Ghat Besi will be one
of the first communities in the area to rebuild their school in an earthquake-resistant way, hopefully serving as an example to neighboring villages, and emphasizing the importance of education. With the reconstruction of this school, CCF also hopes that adjoining villages will see the influence that such a serious emphasis on education has had in Ghat Besi, and will look to imitate that in their own communities.

The building itself will be constructed to government specifications, and is designed specifically to be earthquake-resistant, and utilize as many local building materials as possible in order to decrease cost, and increase public ownership. If all goes according to plan, the building should be finished by mid April at the latest as supplies have already been purchased, and work has begun on the construction. A CCF team will visit the school upon its completion. It is estimated that this school will cost approximately $7,500 to build, and take around three months to reconstruct.

6.2 Baseri Relief

Earthbag Model Home Project

From observations, surveys, and interviews conducted in Nepal, the CCF evaluation team recognized that one of the biggest challenges of Nepal’s recovery process is rebuilding with methods and materials that are resistant to future earthquakes. Throughout rural Nepal, countless buildings were wiped out or rendered uninhabitable because they were built of nothing but stones and mud mortar, traditional materials which offer little to no structural support in the face of an 7.8 earthquake. Not only are new methods needed to rebuild homes, but CCF also had a responsibility to determine the best way to rebuild the clinic in Baseri. Having identified this as a major need of the Nepali people, CCF began researching various methods of earthquake-resistant building, including rammed earth, Gabion bands, and earthbag.

Earthbag is a building technique where polypropylene bags or tubes are filled with dirt, and then compressed and stacked with barbed wire tying the courses together, to form strong, durable, earthquake-resistant walls. CCF was first exposed to this method through a workshop taught by Owen Geiger of the Geiger Research Institute of Sustainable Building. Later, CCF representatives would volunteer on an earthbag building project supervised by Woven Earth Design and receive earthbag building certifications from that organization. As CCF learned more and more about earthbag, it seemed like a possible option with which to rebuild the clinic.

However, it would have been rash to immediately begin building the clinic with a method that CCF and its volunteers were largely unfamiliar with. Therefore, before building the clinic, CCF decided to build two model homes out of earthbag in Baseri. These model homes aimed to serve multiple purposes.
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1. To test the feasibility of earthbag as a construction method for the Baseri clinic.
2. To provide a model of earthquake-resistant building that villagers in Baseri could emulate in rebuilding their own homes.
3. To relocate the two families who had fled after the earthquake to the land where the clinic will be rebuilt and where they are now squatting.

In order to move forward with this project to build two model earthbag homes, CCF required more technical experience. CCF partnered with Good Earth Nepal (GEN), a local NGO at the forefront of earthbag technology. CCF would provide the funds, land, labor, etc for the project and GEN would provide the technical experience in the form of engineers, managers, and supervisors.

The CCF model house construction team included Dhane Gurung, a local of Baseri who acted as project manager, Ram Karki, trusted friend and guide, Ishwor Basnet, a Nepali civil engineer, and CCF representatives Grant Gallaher and Cameron Conner. These partners were crucial in making the arrangements for materials, labor, land, and construction.

The construction of the houses began on December 3rd with the digging of a 30 inch foundation. Once that was completed, a French drain was laid down and covered by three layers of gravel bags to provide a sturdy yet flexible foundation with the ability to move independently of the earth. GEN engineers and CCF volunteers who had worked with earthbag previously taught the villagers of Baseri to lay earthbags, and later long tubes. The villagers absorbed the teaching quickly and soon were able to effectively lay bags completely independent of assistance. At the time when the CCF evaluation team left the project, the earthbag walls were almost complete. After that step, a cement bond beam would be placed over the walls, tying the building together and providing tensile strength, then a half story of wood and tin would finish the structure. The walls would be covered with an earthen plaster that breathes better than cement, is more traditional and whose materials are locally available.

Unfortunately, CCF faced many unforeseen challenges throughout this project. Some of the most noteworthy were:

1. The petrol shortage in Nepal caused by the blockade imposed by India. This made the transportation and building materials cost over double what they would have under normal circumstances.
2. Difficulty of communication between Baseri, Kathmandu, and USA. At times during this project there were moments of miscommunication between CCF and GEN staff in Spokane, Baseri, and Kathmandu. Frequently, important details about the building designs, costs, or logistics would be lost, creating confusion and frustration later on.
3. Insufficient communication with the entire community of Baseri. Some villagers in Baseri resented the fact that CCF was building homes only for two people when so many others were homeless as well. This frustration resulted from a lack of communication by
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CCF’s team with the local community explaining the purposes of the model houses and that these families were getting these homes to remove them from the land needed by the new clinic, a building by CCF which would serve the entire community equally.

4. Unavailability of certain materials nearby Baseri. Obtaining gravel for the foundations was one of the biggest unexpected expenditures of this project. CCF had expected to be able to pay villagers to break local rocks down to gravel, but it was learned that the rocks in Baseri were too soft to use in the building. Instead, six truckloads of gravel, each costing roughly $200, had to be brought in from a market several hours away. Beyond that, materials like wood and appropriate earthbag soil that CCF had been led to believe was available in Baseri turned out not to be. Building plans had to be modified and more money spent to accommodate this new information.

As the building continued and these roadblocks appeared, it was more important than ever for CCF’s representatives to adopt an emergent strategy and adapt to the situation. From every mistake, lessons were learned for the continuation of this project and future ones. Overall, CCF learned that earthbag building has a much higher cost and many more complications in the process than originally described by experts in the field. It is recommended that CCF does not pursue further earthbag building projects unless the method is shown to be more feasible for remote locations in the ever-changing environment of Nepal.

As of the writing of this report, the homes are being plastered and the second stories have been added. A final cost is unavailable at the moment as the project is still ongoing, but it is estimated to cost $21,000 for the two model earthbag homes. The construction is projected to be complete at the end of March. CCF representatives will visit these homes in early April.

---

**Baseri Blanket Distribution Project**

On December 3rd, CCF representatives distributed large, warm blankets to the village of Baseri. Each of the 162 homes in Baseri were given one two-ply Lotus blanket large enough to comfortably cover several family members (160x220cm). Through this project, CCF aimed to increase the villagers’ resilience against the cold winter months ahead of them.

These blankets were purchased with the assistance of Chunta Nepali, the in country manager of GHT, for approximately $14.81 apiece for a total cost of $2399.22. Transportation costs for this distribution were shared with the Baseri Model Home Project, as the blankets and materials for the homes were brought to Baseri on the same truck at the same time. This project was organized with the help of Dhane Gurung, a local of Baseri with experience working with the United Nations on humanitarian aid projects in Nepal. The distribution itself was facilitated by Dhane and Lal Bahadur, a schoolteacher in Baseri who is highly trusted and respected by the community.
Community members of Baseri, or at least one member from each household, gathered at the top of the village at a central meeting place on the morning of the 3rd. At that location, Lal called each family up from a list of the entire village and Dhane, CCF volunteers, and other villagers helped hand the blankets to the recipients. Some families were unable to attend this initial distribution. The leftover blankets were set aside in a safe location and later given to the intended recipients.

The entire distribution was observed by CCF representatives and occurred quickly and without any complications. It took only an hour to pass out blankets to all the people who were present, which allowed these people to return promptly to their daily routines with minimal disruption. Furthermore, the leadership of partners like Dhane and Lal, who know the village and every person in it, ensured that the distribution proceeded without oversights, disputes, or attempts at fraud. CCF has not yet had the opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness and impact of these blankets, but the organization plans to in future trips to Nepal.
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7. Conclusions

8. What’s Next: Steps Forward
7. CONCLUSIONS

Over the course of this evaluation certain trends in the overall structure of the earthquake relief provided by CCF became apparent, trends of exceptional performance with certain procedures, and trends which could be improved upon with others. The following categories are organized according to the initial Terms of Reference laid out in the Research Matrix (Annex B) and include the overarching ways in which CCF can best take advantage of these trends to carry out projects as effectively as possibly in the future, and why it should do so.

7.1 Relevance: Were the right things done?

The aid provided by CCF immediately after the earthquake addressed some of the most important needs of the people, such as food and shelter, without including nonessential or redundant items. CCF aid was also tailored to the needs of individual villages to insure that each contribution would be as effective as possible. The following topics were particularly instrumental in this success:

**Relationships:** Relationships cultivated over 30+ years of working in Nepal allowed CCF to immediately connect with individuals on the ground, discern which communities were in need of what aid, and then source and deliver that aid through trusted conduits in a timely and economical manner. Moreover, in those projects which CCF contacts had their own relationships with those they were assisting, aid could be distributed with a knowledge of the local context to ensure that none were overlooked or received more than their share.

**Transition from Relief to Recovery:** As donations initially flooded into CCF with astonishing generosity, the leadership of CCF judiciously and effectively applied incoming funds to fit the constantly evolving needs of those they sought to help, and ensured that immediate aid gave way to long term reconstruction and recovery when appropriate. Not only were needs met with corresponding solutions when the changing climate called for such a shift, but funds were purposefully allocated to future projects in order to insure that communities would not be left without proper support due to a potential lack of finances in CCF.

7.2 Effectiveness & Efficiency: Were the right things done in the right way?

**Effective Areas**

**Expedient Response:** By reaching villages in the critical few weeks directly after the first earthquake and before many other organizations had arrived, CCF was able to provide crucial materials that people needed immediately to survive.

**Re-granting:** Looking at the success of TEAM Nepal’s projects that were supported by CCF, it is apparent that re-granting can be and was in this case an effective method of providing
humanitarian aid. That said, re-granting requires a large amount of trust between the granting party and the recipient, and therefore this action is only recommended with cases like TEAM Nepal where that high level of trust has been long established.

**Areas in Need of Improvement**

**Choice of Beneficiary Communities:** When CCF intervenes in villages without prior relationships that give an appropriate knowledge of the local situation and context, the organization abandons those advantages that makes it particularly successful as a small NGO. Such situations are better left to larger organizations with federal connections and more experience in these humanitarian situations.

**Taking the Necessary Time:** Finally, it is important to note the pace at which CCF initiated projects. Although there were many examples to the contrary, some ERPs were placed on the production line before due thought was given to exploring the overall aspect of the proposal, and potentially negative consequences. Though this trend is meant particularly for projects that do not deal directly with immediate relief, it is no less important to take the necessary time in all scenarios. This will be even more important to consider in the future as we move towards projects with a more specific goal than simple earthquake relief. Furthermore, an adequate allocation of time will allow CCF to ensure that all of the above trends are taken into consideration as well.

**Lessons Learned**

**Relationships in the Future:** The projects in which CCF was the most effective were those wherein it had direct, personal connections to the communities involved. Such connections often took shape in the form of mavens and/or leaders, who acted as resourceful intermediaries between what was needed and what CCF could provide. Many of the advantages which CCF might have over larger, better funded, and more experienced humanitarian aid organizations are a direct result of its close connections to those it works with. Relationships between CCF and its beneficiaries allow for reciprocal communication between these two stakeholders; a channel of communication that gives those who receive aid a larger voice in their own recovery. In those projects which CCF did not have this advantage, there was little ability to ensure fair distribution, and even less attention paid to long-term follow-up. Such projects include Chunta’s ERP and Ramche Relief to a certain extent. Though this aid may have reached all those in need, there would be no way to ensure so without direct community connections. In those villages that lack any outside connections, the process of distributing aid should be left to those larger humanitarian organizations that have better access to international and governmental assistance.

**Cultivation of Current Relationships:** Due notice should also be paid to strengthening current relationships. Not only have these allowed for a greater degree of trust between CCF and the communities it partners with, but it has also shown to promote ownership of projects in those
whom it is meant to help and better assure that CCF aid remains as responsive to local needs as possible. A prime example of this trend is the Ghat Besi Primary School Reconstruction Project, in which the Ghat Besi community has provided the ideas, logistical support, and community support, with CCF providing only financial support to trusted partners such as A.D. Aryal.

7.4 Sustainability

**Follow-Up and Long-Term Assistance:** Follow-up in ERPs has helped to ensure that CCF remain accountable to those it is attempting to aid and provide transparency for all stakeholders. Follow-up also allows CCF to improve future efficiency by learning from their successes and failures. With the transition from the immediate need for relief to more gradual need for recovery, many organizations have left Nepal. Along with this absence, there is inevitably a decline in relief, meaning communities are set to the task of permanent recovery on their own. As such, the commitment of CCF to long-term assistance is yet another characteristic that sets it apart from many other humanitarian aid organizations. Where CCF intervenes, it should be willing to commit to long-term projects focused on recovery, fostering stronger relationships, and building channels communication. Additionally, where such long-term programs are implemented, it is much easier for CCF to evaluate the effectiveness of its actions as it becomes more trusted by the community and aware of local context. This emphasis on long-term relationships will also serve to gently guide CCF back to its original mission of providing education, healthcare, and skills development.

**Mavens vs. Leader:** Within the categories of immediate and long-term aid, this research observed multiple important players that worked together to achieve their specific goals, each with their own strengths in particular situations. The first category, Mavens, were those that constantly had an ear to the ground in search of information. When such individuals were able, they then passed their information along to CCF for consideration. Ram Karki filled such a role: Kattike, Kalikasthan, and Thugman Relief Projects, along with many others, were all undertaken due largely to the information he provided. Because of his intimate knowledge about these and countless other villages, Ram was able to pinpoint where assistance was most needed, what form that assistance should take, and how it could best be delivered. Other examples of mavens include Yogendra Tamang, Kesang Yudren, and others.

Leaders on the other hand are those individuals who can inspire a community to undertake a particular goal; whereas mavens are those who gather together the opinions of those involved to determine what must be done, leaders are often those that have the support, foresight, and ability to ensure that the project does get done and is done so as to promote ownership of that project throughout the community. Prime examples of such leaders include A.D. Aryal and Neel Shahi, both of whom have the rare ability to motivate a community into action. They are able to do this in turn because of their relationship with those around them: relationships of understanding, trust, and respect. Leaders have a tendency to catalyze a process whereas mavens act to direct energy and attention towards where it is most needed.
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When projects involving the acquisition and distribution of relief were undertaken, these were set in motion and carried through by both mavens and leaders. As these projects dealt mainly with the collection of information and facilitation of logistical problems, both leaders and mavens possessed the necessary skills to accomplish these projects quickly and effectively while working individually of each other. However, it is the long-term recovery projects that most require an active consolidation of these two forces. In those situations where both long-term interaction with a community, motivational communication, and an in depth knowledge of the issue at hand are required, the experience of this research has been that it is imperative for both mavens and leaders to be present -along with a host of other players. Alone, mavens often do not have the ability to actively lead a large group of people, and leaders can often lack the skills necessary to consolidate large amounts of information from a wide array of sources and direct this information where it needs to go. Together however, they can accomplish a great deal as we have seen in such projects as those carried out by TEAM Nepal.

7.5 Coordination

Inter-Organization Coordination: Although CCF was largely able to avoid duplicating the aid delivered through other organizations by communicating with community leaders and other contacts on the ground, there was a general lack of understanding by CCF of its role in the overall context of earthquake relief in Nepal. Though this lack of understanding seemed to have little direct harm on CCF’s ERPs, there is the possibility that greater communication with other organizations, and a better understanding of their methods could have improved certain CCF projects, particularly those that have, and will continue to take place in the recovery phase. As CCF was not designed to act as a disaster relief organization, it is no surprise that it lacked certain vernacular tools important to such work.

8. What’s Next: Steps Forward

For each individual trend mentioned in Section 7.1, there is a plethora of ways in which they can best be put to use by CCF. Whereas the above descriptions highlight the overarching flow of these trends and how their course can be directed to obtain the best possible outcome, the following topics are specific recommendations for how these outcomes can be achieved.

7.1 Relevance: What must be done in the future?

Channels of Communication: In those communities with which CCF has worked for many years, and those in which it has just begun to, it is vital that CCF find those individuals with whom it can communicate easily, that speak for and are respected by the community at large, and in whom CCF can have trust. It was relationships such as these that allowed CCF to excel in certain areas of its earthquake relief, as CCF was truly able to partner with communities where
this communication and leadership (in the form of both mavens and leaders) was present. With the cooperation of those individuals that have the ability to motivate and organize their peers, CCF can truly “provide a trusted conduit for donors to give” and have a more natural impact on the local community. To cultivate such relationships, CCF needs to have a better understanding of those village environments in which it chooses to work. To accomplish this, and depending upon the degree to which CCF hopes to become involved with a particular community, it is recommended that CCF undertake a similar process as that outlined in the recommendation above: Finding the Limit: Mavens vs. Leaders. Not only will this propitiate the all important relationships and allow such individuals to be integrated into the CCF team, but it also widens the corresponding channels of communication that grow along with these relationships. Additionally, if possible, it is recommended that CCF representatives spend a concentrated time in these villages gathering information on the local environment. Ultimately, however, the final and most important perspective to have is that of the local leader(s), through whose eyes the community will see CCF and visa versa. This kind of investment in a community will not take place in every location in which CCF has provided earthquake relief. Rather, as CCF concludes its ERPs in a majority of locations, it should begin to focus on those with which it can have the most meaningful impact in the future because of available skills, relationships, and local leadership as well as its fit within CCF’s original mission.

When CCF decides which communities it plans to continue working with throughout the long-term process of earthquake recovery, it is recommended that the Board of Directors articulate strategies with which to involve local government and general community participation as much as possible. In the development of this process, it might be wise to include outside assistance from individuals such as Kimberly Maynard, George Wilson, Ben Dagani, and Rachel Houglum who are familiar with such work. The ultimate goal of this work will be to have even stronger relationships of trust, understanding, and respect with the overall community. Without these relationships, and without the ability to communicate with key individuals within a society, humanitarian aid becomes the one sided, paternalistic, and isolated act towards which CCF and its philosophy of Fair Aid has so long desired to reach beyond.

**Fracturing of Households:** Throughout many villages, the destruction of a home meant that some members of the family were forced to relocate elsewhere, meaning the number of individual households after the earthquake was significantly higher than prior to it. As the Nepali Government and many NGOs distribute aid according to the VDC records which catalogue families according to the head of the family, many individuals were overlooked by such aid. Though this evaluation did not encounter such an issue in relation to CCF aid, it should nonetheless be taken into consideration for future projects. This observation serves as yet one more example of how important intimate knowledge of a community is for effective assistance to be undertaken.
7.2 Effectiveness & Efficiency: How can CCF do better?

Ownership of Projects: In the experience of this research, it appears that those individuals and communities which have invested more into a project, are more likely to care for and make use of the result. However, ownership is generally not the goal of immediate relief projects, and as such can be discounted in such particular cases. Instead it is those projects in which recovery is the goal, that such cultivation of ownership must take place. Although CCF has only embarked on two long-term relief projects, the degree to which CCF has successfully incorporated the community lay on opposite ends of the spectrum and serve as an appropriate window through which to view this effect. In Ghat Besi, the community members volunteer together on a communally created project designed to benefit the entire village, and with direction of community leaders facilitate their own cooperation. In Baseri, community members are paid to work on a private project designed, organized, and created by outside forces for the benefit of two separate families. In the case of Ghat Besi, villagers have been reported to be enthusiastic to partake in the labor, in Baseri, villagers are justifiably skeptical, at times reluctant and jealous of perceived favoritism. What is present in the former but lacking in the latter? Though this is a difficult idea to implement in practice, particularly in more remote locations, it is once again a vital part of a healthy partnership, and as such will be made that much easier with the establishment of good connections within a community. To this end, when CCF considers undertaking large projects which will foreseeably require substantial time and resources to complete, it is recommended that:

- CCF ensure that the community in which the planned project is to take place has strong pre-existing trust, understanding, respect, and communication with CCF. Such understanding must include a reasonable knowledge of why certain actions are proposed (i.e. the building of two houses for particular individuals). Respect must, in part, emanate from knowledge of CCF’s work and that of the villagers: an appreciation for the assistance of both parties. Trust then will incorporate under these auspices to ensure that a partnership can truly take place without one side wielding undue power.
  - Involvement of local government or committees in the development of said project would again aid this purpose by instilling the fact that whatever project is being proposed, it will *by the community, for the community*.
  - This is the arena in which leaders excel, and is precisely why CCF must understand the community dynamics wherever it hopes to become involved.

- CCF consult outside sources, including the members of this reports peer review group, for assistance.

Utilization of Committees & Standardization of Proposal Process: In order to assure that due time and attention is paid to the potential viability and consequences of individual project proposals, it is recommended that CCF upgrade its use of committees. Although committees have been employed with success in the past, for projects such the Power of 5 fundraiser, some
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have not been utilized as effectively as possible. When a project is proposed which will require an extended period of time and significant allocation of resources to complete, the following should occur:

1. A committee be created for the investigation of said proposal
2. Immediate goal be set
3. The first committee meetings be scheduled
4. Expectations for the committee be listed
5. At the next board meeting, or other opportune time, the committee report its findings to the board in an organized format determined by the expectations already declared.

With this information presented the board can then make an educated decision on the proposal, and all of the above information will be available in the board minutes should the committee, board, or any other individual wish to refer to the proposal process and its decision.

Should such a process be implemented, it is also recommended that the Board of Directors consider adopting a standardized project checklist which incorporates the following questions:

- Does this project follow our new ERP guidelines?
- Does CCF have the necessary relationships with village leaders to motivate the community?
- What knowledge does CCF have of the local environment and context?
- Does the project promote ownership in its intended beneficiaries?
- Are relationships of trust, understanding, respect, and communication present?
- What is the role of CCF in the project, and what responsibilities will be left to the community?
- What is CCF long-term goal for the community involved?
- How will this project be followed up on?
- Could other NGOs or INGOs be of assistance?
- Has CCF taken the necessary time to ensure that all potential consequences of the project have been explored?

7.4 Sustainability

Reassess and Update Earthquake Relief Goals: As focus on immediate relief has diminished to make way for new ERPs focused around rebuilding and recovery, CCF should update its guiding goals to reflect this change and ensure that those projects which are pursued in the future embody the intention of the entire organization and its representatives. This discussion should include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Public (community centered) vs. private (individual centered) projects
- Physical construction vs. skills and community capacity building projects
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- Should CCF engage with communities that have the resources and skills to improve their community and thus create a “model community” for others to replicate, or should CCF create skills within communities without those resources?
- The role of CCF; what combination of outside ideas, logistical support, financial support, etc. should we aim to provide?
  - Which aspects is it the responsibility of the community to provide?

7.5 Coordination

**International Guidelines and Standards:** A potential solution to CCFs lack of inter-organizational coordination, would be to look into programs designed and administered by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA). Such programs as the Cluster System serve to facilitate the distribution of all aid provided by NGOs, INGOs, and governmental organizations after a natural disaster so as to ensure that basic needs are met in all affected areas, with as little overlap and miscommunication as possible. In total, there are eleven clusters focused around such needs as Shelter, Sanitation, Education, and Health that are administered to by OCHA. Smaller organizations can choose to what extent they will follow OCHA programs depending on their individual preferences. Based on interviews with representatives of several INGOs who actively participate in the Cluster System and its programs, it is recommended that CCF should participate in this coordination to some extent, or at least become familiar with the Cluster System and other OCHA humanitarian principles. This is particularly recommended in the case of further CCF earthquake relief activity, or in future disasters.

Additionally, to prepare for situations wherein CCF is asked by those in need to reach beyond its natural and limited capabilities, it would be useful to consider creating a list of identifiable contacts within larger NGOs/INGOs who CCF might in turn connect with those in need.

**Finding the Limit: Mavens and Leaders:** As mentioned above, those with the unique ability to efficiently gather and distribute large quantities of information (mavens), and those with the skill to motivate others in the process of creation (leaders) are both invaluable partners in any project, yet though individually they are effective distributors of relief, only by working together can long-term recovery projects be achieved. The necessary question then arises: *how can CCF determine whether an individual has the skills and potential to enact such a role?* As with all Fair Aid projects, these must begin with relationships, and they must start small. Nourish trust, understanding, and respect by building upon a foundation of friendship and mutual interest in improving the situation of the community at hand. As in the case of Sertung, the first step should begin with a project that asks only a small amount of service from the community and/or individual in question and see how the resources are utilized. Depending on the results of this initial step, additional programs should be considered which allow for greater responsibility on the part of those in the community and specifically the individual in question. As the load of the work is transferred from CCF to this individual, relationships build and all stakeholders better
come to understand the capabilities of those they work with, and themselves. Should this process falter at any point along its course, CCF will hopefully be able to postpone progress to the next level, or even see the issues mounting in preceding steps and mitigate the potential negatives before they arise. At each stage, the following questions should be considered as qualifications for proceeding to the next:

- Were resources distributed equally, or given with preference to disadvantaged demographics?
- How does the CCF contact incorporate the community into the project?
- Is there community ownership of the project?
  - If so, what is the outcome of such ownership?
- How does the beneficiary community interact with or incorporate surrounding communities?

**ERPs Beyond this Report:** Due to time constraints and difficulties in transportation, CCF representatives were unable to reach and evaluate the following projects:

- Harmi Relief
- Ramche Relief
- Barpak Relief
- Jyamiri Khadka Relief
- Bhudathum Relief

As these projects are remote, it is unlikely that CCF will ever be able to assess them directly; however, the beneficiaries of these projects and others in the future none the less deserve full evaluation and follow-up just like all of the others included in this report. To this end, it is recommended that CCF enlist the assistance of those individuals that directly undertook the distribution of aid to these specific locations. Individuals such as Hari Maya Gurung in Ramche, Ishwor Basnet in Harmi, Arjun Nepali in Jyamiri Khadka, and others all have the ability to provide follow-up details, testimonials, and observations of their respective villages to CCF’s Board of Directors. Though it should be recognized that, as this method lacks a viable third party, there is potential for biased information, it also has the potential to relate vital information concerning the utilization of aid, and currently evolving needs to CCF. When the same team of CCF representatives visits Nepal in March of 2016, one branch of its mission to follow up with ERPs will be the implementation of such a system or one similar.
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Annex A: CONTACTS

Facilitators: Those individuals who directly organized which emergency aid would go where, obtained the necessary resources, and how the aid would be transported and distributed.

- Neel Bahadur Shahi, TEAM Nepal, neel@teamnepal.org.np
- Somraj Shahi (Bikash), TEAM Nepal, raj_shahi99@yahoo.com
- A.D. Aryal, Sadle Traders, sadle@ntc.net.np
- Meera Bhatterai, Association of Craft Producers, program@craftacp.org.np
- Chunta Nepali, Ganesh Himal Trading, chuntayangzom@gmail.com

Distributors: Those who actively took part in distributing aid resources.

- Dhan Bhahadur Gurung (Dhanee), Besari Health Clinic, gurungdhanee@hotmail.com
- Gabish Joshi, Hinrich Foundation, gabish_joshi@hotmail.com
- Yogendra Tamang, yogen3121@gmail.com
- Iswor P. Dhakal, Ghat Besi Community Leader, ipdhakalg@gmail.com
- Kesang Yudron, Padhma Creations, kyudron@gmail.com

Outside Key Disaster Relief Representatives: Individuals who have played/are playing a role in the Nepali earthquake relief process, but are not directly connected with the work of CCF.

- John Rose, Waves for Water, john@wavesforwater.org
- Ryan Sirianni, Waves for Water, rsirianni@roarkrevival.com
- Massimo Diana, United Nations, massimo.diana@one.un.org
- Rachel Houglum, GlobalGiving, houglumr@gmail.com
- Allison Dworschak, Mercy Corps., adworschak@mercycorps.org
- George Wilson, Mercy Corps., spokeytown@yahoo.com
- Reeti K.C., Women LEAD, kcreeti@gmail.com
- Nripal Adhikari, Abari Bamboo and Earth Initiative
- Owen Geiger, Geiger Research Institute of Sustainable Building, naturalhouses@gmail.com
- Ishwor Basnet, Cotton Bag Associates, cbahandicraft@gmail.com
- Ben Dagani: IsraAID, bdagani@israaid.org
- Amy Pareezer, Birds of Paradise, apareezer@hotmail.com
- Michael Smith, Woven Earth Designs, kilgoersmith@gmail.com
- Brandon Bodhi Denton, The Permacultourism Initiative, permacultourism@gmail.com
- Dil Ghale, Majuwa School Reconstruction, dghale56@yahoo.com
Recovery Project Contacts:

- Kateryna Zemskova, Good Earth Nepal, kateryna@goodearthnepal.org
- Nitesh Shrestha, Good Earth Nepal, walk.nitesh@gmail.com
- Roshan Jha, Good Earth Nepal, roshan@goodearthnepal.org

Consultants:

- Ram Karki, Ram’s Treks and Tours, himalayanram@yahoo.com
- Pradeep Karki, Ram’s Treks and Tours, pradeepkarki57@yahoo.com
- Kim Maynard, Mansfield Fellow in International Affairs, maynard@maters.us
- Matt Shelly, Edward R. Murrow School of Journalism WSU, matthew.shelley@wsu.edu

Key Informants were also contacted from the following categories:

- **CCF Recipients**: Those who could directly attribute the aid they received to CCF. Such recipients were able to give specific feedback on CCF’s aid, procedures, and effectiveness.
- **General Aid Recipients**: Those individuals who received disaster relief from any aid organization, not only CCF. General aid recipients were extremely valuable in assessing the overall landscape of humanitarian aid in Nepal and in determining what future steps should be taken.
## Annex B: EVALUATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION CRITERIA</th>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>METHODOLOGY: Approach most likely to answer questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DR=Desk Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KI=Interviews with Key Informants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S=Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FO=Field Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELEVANCE</strong></td>
<td>1. Have CCF’s Earthquake Relief Projects addressed the most pressing humanitarian needs in Nepal?</td>
<td>1. KI, S, FO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFFECTIVENESS</strong></td>
<td>1. How many of the Emergency Earthquake Relief goals set by CCF have been achieved?</td>
<td>1. KI, S, FO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Do all primary stakeholders have access to all relevant and necessary information?</td>
<td>2. KI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Were the resources provided by CCF distributed fairly and without prejudice?</td>
<td>3. DR, KI, S, FO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Were the resources provided by CCF effectively and responsibly used?</td>
<td>4. KI, S, FO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFFICIENCY</strong></td>
<td>1. How efficiently has the money donated for CCF Earthquake Relief Projects been utilized?</td>
<td>1. DR, KI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Were the resources provided by CCF efficiently distributed?</td>
<td>2. DR, KI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. How long did it take CCF’s aid to reach its intended recipients?</td>
<td>3. DR, KI, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. How can CCF more efficiently utilize and distribute its resources in the future?</td>
<td>4. KI, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUSTAINABILITY</strong></td>
<td>1. What long-term problems and solutions were taken into account at the initial project inception?</td>
<td>1. DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How will CCF achieve their goals for future rebuilding and long-term relief?</td>
<td>2. KI, S, FO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. What are the greatest needs of the Nepali people as the relief process shifts towards rebuilding?</td>
<td>3. KI, S, FO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COORDINATION</strong></td>
<td>1. Where can CCF be the most effective in the overall humanitarian aid arena?</td>
<td>1. DR, KI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. What can CCF learn from other humanitarian aid organizations?</td>
<td>2. DR, KI, FO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. What aspects of CCF’s intervention could be applied to other organizations?</td>
<td>3. DR, KI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Earthquake Humanitarian Aid Efforts
- Community Perceptions in Post-Earthquake Nepal
- Geiger, Owen. Earthbag Construction

Evaluation of Humanitarian Aid
- Buchanan-Smith, & M., Cosgrave, J., Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action.

Culture of Nepal
Annex D: DRAFT INTERVIEW OUTLINE

Interview questions and format were adapted for each Key Informant.

Date ………………………..  
Village ……………………….  
Interviewers  GG  CC  Other

1. Name, Agency, and Location ……………………………………………………………………
2. What was your role in the earthquake relief process? ……………………………………..
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………
3. What is your connection to CCF? ……………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………
4. Overall impression of the earthquake relief work? …………………………………………..
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………
   a) Greatest strength/benefit……………………………………………………………………
   b) Most important weakness/gap……………………………………………………………..
5. Any specific comments regarding:
   1. Time, pace, and chronology of aid distribution
   2. Equality of aid distribution (particularly in regards to marginalized groups)
   3. Coordination of relief efforts
   4. Collaboration with other organizations
   5. Relevance of the aid distributed
   6. Quality of aid distributed
   7. Flexibility and adaptive ability of relief process
   8. Management of relief process
   9. Collaboration of aid workers with local custom and culture
   10. Accountability to beneficiaries of aid
   11. Undiscovered/unknown emergencies
   12. Long-term problem solving (both initially and now)
Annex E: DRAFT SURVEY FORM

Although this survey was originally intended to collect quantitative data on the earthquake relief and current situation of affected populations in Nepal, to do this in a meaningful, statistically significant way was determined to be unfeasible by the evaluation team. With this in mind, the survey questions were modified to facilitate more open, relevant discussions with affected individuals. This draft survey reflects the standard adapted survey questions, topics, and format; however, many additional questions were brought up in conversation or depending on local context. Such questions included queries about livestock, supplies of CGI sheeting, monsoon preparation, etc.

Date ………………………
Village ………………………
Surveyors ☐ GG ☐ CC ☐ Other

Interviewee Name, Age, Gender ……………………………………………

Earthquake Relief/Aid

a. What aid did you receive after the earthquake?
b. From who (NGOs, friends, government)?
c. When did you receive it?
d. What did you do with it?
e. What was the most helpful/useful aid? Short-term? Long-term?
f. Are any aid organizations still helping you and/or your village?

In villages that received immediate aid from CCF, additional survey questions were added to more thoroughly assess who received that aid, when they did, and how effective it was.

Temporary Shelter

a. If currently living in temporary shelter (tarps, tents, tin), where did you get the materials for that?
b. How soon after the earthquake were you able to get temporary shelter?
c. Who built it?
d. Is your current shelter suitable for the winter?

Permanent Shelter

a. When do you plan to rebuild a permanent shelter?
b. What materials do you plan to do so with?
c. What is the estimated cost?
d. How will you pay for it?
e. Are you aware of any earthquake-resistant building techniques?
f. Would you be interested in learning about any?

**General Needs/Concerns**

a. What are your greatest needs now?
b. Do you have clean water to drink? Do you have access to enough?
c. Do you have enough food for winter?
d. Have you begun replanting your fields yet?
e. Do you feel you have the ability to communicate your needs with your community, VDC, NGOs, or the government?
f. What is the status of your local school?
g. What is the status of your local health clinic?
h. Do you have access to electricity?
i. Did you have any loss of livestock in the earthquake?
# Annex F: DRAFT FIELD OBSERVATION FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Observers</th>
<th>Types of Aid Observed</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GG CC Other</td>
<td>HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary shelter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raw materials (tin, roofing, walls, doors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Utilities (electric, gas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GG CC Other</td>
<td>FOOD/NUTRITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food (rice, dal, protein sources)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food storage/refrigeration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water (filtering, village sources)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural aid (seeds, money, labor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GG CC Other</td>
<td>HEALTH/SANITATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical (clinics, medicine, personnel)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sanitation (pit toilets, soap)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GG CC Other</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unskilled volunteers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specialists (foreign, Nepali)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GG CC Other</td>
<td>OTHER OBSERVATIONS/COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GG CC Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex F: GLOSSARY

These definitions are provided by the ALNAP Evaluation of Humanitarian Aid Pilot Guide, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and ReliefWeb’s Glossary of Humanitarian Terms.

1. **Accountability-Oriented/Summative Evaluation**: An evaluation of how well resources have been applied.
2. **ALNAP**: Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action
3. **Coordination**: The extent to which different actors’ interventions are harmonized, promote synergy, and avoid gaps, duplication, and resource conflicts.
4. **Effectiveness**: How well an activity has achieved its purpose, or can be expected to do so on the basis of existing outputs (defined deliverables provided by the actor or actors being evaluated).
5. **Efficiency**: A measure of the outputs (defined deliverables provided by the actor or actors being evaluated), qualitative and quantitative, achieved as a result of the inputs.
6. **Financial Accountability**: The duty an organization has to its donors and other stakeholders to be as cost-effective and efficient in its actions as possible.
7. **Learning-Oriented/Formative Evaluation**: An evaluation designed to facilitate individual, group, or organizational learning. Highly effective at examining what worked, what didn’t, and how performance can be improved.
8. **Managerial Accountability**: The duties, rules, and standards which managers are held responsible for carrying out and adhering to.
9. **Outputs**: Defined deliverables provided by the actor or actors being evaluated (i.e. inception report, advice provided by the evaluation team directly in the field, workshops, the evaluation report, and dissemination events)
10. **Recovery/Development**: The aim of the recovery phase is to restore the affected area to its previous state. It differs from the response phase in its focus; recovery efforts are concerned with issues and decisions that must be made after immediate needs are addressed.
11. **Relevance**: How well humanitarian activities are tailored to local needs.
12. **Relief**: Assistance and/or intervention during or after disaster to meet the life preservation and basic subsistence needs. It can be of emergency or protracted duration. (UN DHA)
13. **Strategic Accountability**: The duty an organization has to fulfilling its mandates and objectives.
14. **Sustainability**: The extent to which short-term emergency response steps take longer-term and interconnected problems into account.
15. **Triangulated**: In many types of research, triangulation serves as a powerful tool for the validation of information through the cross verification of sources.