



Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development  
Local Governance and Community Development Programme

Name of Meeting  
Technical Assistance Steering Committee (TASC)  
15<sup>th</sup> TASC meeting

DATE: 11 MAY 2016  
LOCATION: THE DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING ROOM, SINGHDURBAR  
TIME START: 11:00AM END: 1:00 PM  
COORDINATOR: MR. RESHMI RAU PANDEY, JOINT SECRETARY/NPD. MR. CHHABI RIJAL, UNDER SECRETARY/NPM

INTRODUCTION:

Mr. Reshmi Raj Pandey, National Programme Director and Joint Secretary MoFALD welcomed representatives from development partners, MoFALD officials and PCU experts in the 15<sup>th</sup> TASC meeting. The Agenda and proceedings of the meeting are as follows:

AGENDA	DISCUSSIONS
Main highlights of the presentation	
Welcome remarks by NPD: Mr. Reshmi Raj Pandey, Joint Secretary and National Programme Director LGCDP II welcomed all in the TASC meeting. He introduced the newly appointed National Programme Manager of LGCDP –II, Mr. Chhabi Lal Rijal. Since, the NPM had just joined, the NPD chaired	

the TASC meeting - generally chaired by the NPM. He then shared agenda for the meeting. This was followed by a presentation by the NPM.



<b>Status on Action on 14<sup>th</sup> TASC meeting</b>	<p>Some of the key decisions that were complied with are as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Data inconsistency corrected and DPs comment incorporated in Annual Progress Report 2015</li> <li>- Narrative report of AWP 2016 prepared.</li> <li>-Prepared the financial report showing budget by donor agencies and indicating the closing balance of December 2015.</li> <li>-Annual Work Plan (AWP) 2016 and first quarter work plan 2016 agreed in principle for execution.</li> </ul>
<b>Update on programme recruitment facility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All candidates to be on board by 10<sup>th</sup> June 2016</li> <li>-Candidate on board: DDCs-3, MUNS-4</li> <li>-Written test completed: DDCs-10, Muns-28</li> <li>-Date fixed for written test: DDCs-15, Muns-30</li> <li>-On process: DDCs-47, Muns-155</li> </ul>
<b>Achievements under PPSF in 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2016</b>	<p><b>Some of the key achievements in respective outcomes are as follows:</b></p> <p><b>Outcome 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The PCU also contributed to the revision of the 2015/16 ASIP to align with the available funds.</li> <li>- Ward Citizens Forum Categorization Directives finalized based on which 72% of WCF have been categorized.</li> <li>- Technical inputs provided to the 14th National Periodic Plan.</li> <li>- Grievance redressing guidelines printed and disseminated</li> <li>- Study on LB Equalization Formula Completed inputs being solicited before finalization.</li> <li>- Study on the prospects of revising the MCPM indicators competed, inputs being solicited before finalization.</li> <li>- District Periodic Development Plan Guidelines revised, published and disseminated.</li> <li>- Facilitated the Mid Term Review Mission and provided all necessary support to the MTR</li> <li>- Course content on six days training on social mobilization finalized and 20 training events organized for the social mobilizers in six RCU.</li> <li>- 5 Regional training on Results Based Planning Conducted.</li> <li>- 6 regional level orientation sessions organized on compliance monitoring, public hearing in 412 VDCs, 122 municipalities, 69 DDCs.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 ToT and 2 training sessions based on the Integrated Training Manual on urban planning, building by-laws and building codes facilitated</li> <li>- Web-sites of 68 DDCs updated. Out of 217 municipalities, 214 municipalities have new websites live from official standard domain</li> <li>- DPMAS training conducted to the DDCs officials</li> <li>- ICT training and activities were initiated at the new Municipalities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Organized Orientation on Downward Accountability and use of SA tools</li> <li>- Facilitated CSOs' Peer Review meetings</li> <li>- Provide technical support to prepare 'Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) of MOFALD part</li> <li>- Provided technical support in the revision process of District Annual Development Plan Guideline</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome 3:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provided technical inputs to MTR team on various aspect of LGCDP implementation and performance</li> </ul>
<b>PPSF expenditure status as of 31 March 2016</b>	The expenditure status of first quarter is 75%
<b>LGCDP (PPSF) audit 2015 Observation and Recommendation</b>	PPSF had excellent audit report based on the audit conducted by third party auditors as part of the UNDP NEX audit. The NPD Sir shall share the final PPSF audit report to the development partners.
<b>Update on MTR Review</b>	Mid term review completed, draft report prepared. Final comments to be sent to MTR team by 15 <sup>th</sup> May.
<b>Issues and Challenges</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timely fulfillment of vacant positions at different level (LBs, RCUs, and PCU)</li> <li>• Update and refresher training to professional staff on emerging issues</li> <li>• Establishment of horizontal learning culture at different level;</li> <li>• Develop and operationalize the Result Based Management Information System;</li> </ul>

- Develop and institutionalize the objectively verified robust monitoring system.

### Key discussions and responses by the management

**DFID:** Mr Bishnu Adhikari noted with regards to proposed revision of the budget for next year, how the activities were identified and budget revision proposed. The activities earlier were identified tentatively when there was no constitution and commission not formed. In the changed context, how the activities were envisioned and how is it related to the work of the commission. For example, with regards to conduct study on local body structure and facilitate the functioning of LLRC. The board requires explanation on why the activities have been changed and budget revised. Mr. Adhikari commented that it would be important to be clear on what the government will take up and what will be the government's share and what kind of support would be required of the DPs.

**Mr. Yam Nath** Sharma added that it would be good to receive a clear line of indication from the government after adequate homework regarding what kind of funds and technical expertise support would be required.

**Mr. Gopal Aryal, Output Manager 9:** In the earlier output group meeting, it was agreed to review the budget and activities. A team was formed to undertake the task. The budget for LLRC was proposed to **MoF**. Resources for the commission are being explored from various sources - GON and DPs. There is a likelihood that the budget proposed for LLRC may not be sufficient given the scope of work. Currently, funding gap is being analyzed based on which further resources for the commission will be explored. The team is making the revisions based on priorities and needs to implement Federalism in the immediate scenario.

The details of what kind of support would be required for LLRC will be shared later once there is clarity.

**DFID:** It was discussed during the output group meeting that the Ministry could do a proper mapping regarding the needs of LLRC. An overall scope was identified. Once there is a concrete picture, activities that can be supported from LGCDP can be further explored. It is only after the GON's funding analysis, a complete picture can be ascertained whereby support would be sought from development partners to fill the gaps. This will then allow to explore activities that can be supported from LGCDP. However, looking at these activities, it is difficult to comprehend how it will contribute to a complete picture. At the moment, it looks like individual activities. The rational of the proposed activities is not being questioned rather in absence of the overall picture, the proposed activities may be irrelevant.





**UNDP:** In the output group meeting, overall scenario was discussed, not just on funding but also with regards to technical support, additional human resources. Depending on the areas and issues that require further funding post GON funding analysis, further discussion would be essential.

**Mr. Gopal Aryal, Output Manager 9:** There had been a press conference on LLRC which outlined five thematic areas.

Additionally, the Commission has demanded few experts from MoFALD as soon as possible. ToR was developed in this regards by the commission. Expertise is sought for the conceptual framework of local level restructuring. Experts required are:

1. Constitutional law expert (2)
2. Financial resource management (2)
3. Local government restructuring (2)
4. GIS expert (1)

**NPD:** Activities will be gradually defined, and budget sought after the funding analysis. The activities will be further defined and therefore request will be made accordingly.

**DFID:** Is it possible to have an initial/tentative idea of by when this can be done, especially in light of the fact that there have been recommendations from the MTR and how the activities can be aligned with them?

**Mr. Gopal Aryal, Output Manager 9:** LLRC has shared five broad areas of work. There are basically five working groups- thematic

i) concept, policy and strategy on LLRC, ii) Kathmandu valley/capital integration policy strategy, iii) Analysis of data and information, iv) Fiscal decentralization. V) Local Level Administrative restructure.

Since it is a participatory process, beginning from Ilaka level, logistics support, human resources, managing different workshops and consultations meeting may be required. The GON is soliciting various proposal from LLRC regarding delineation of boundary, administrative structure, financial and other policy related studies. Thus, there are number of areas where funding would be required.

**UNDP:** It would be important to note that if the request is *ad hoc* it may be difficult to plan for the DPs. The DPs often need clearance from HQ for allocating resources, which requires time; thus sooner, the better.

**UNCDF:**

- i) Series of recommendation were provided during output meetings with regards to PPSF activities. Once all the output meetings are concluded, thorough revision of PPSF activities will take place. Presented is glimpse of output 9 revision for

ii)

discussion only. An updated PPSF work plan based on revised ASIP will be shared soon. Some activities will be seen in this year's work plan as it is only upto 2016 and others will be seen in the next. A quick review of RRF was done. In the current version, there will be number of activities and chunk of budget that will not be utilized. Activities such as, endline survey, perception survey, final review, provision for how the annual quality assurance was planned, etc-. Thus, some of these funding can be relocated or channeled into new identified activities.

**DFID:**

i)

When can be the updated PPSF workplan be finalized? The unutilized funding can be planned early on for future activities.

ii)

The MTR team very strongly flagged the TA and PPSF issue which has not been highlighted in the presentation as a challenge or issue. It is related to how activities will be prioritized and surplus budget utilized.

**DP Cell:** Anil Chandrika from DP cell mentioned that a management response has not been prepared either from GoN or DPs side on the MTR findings. Accepted responses needs to be presented to the Sub-NAC and later to NAC. Based on what is accepted or not, activities could be dropped or discontinued. There will be resources that will be remain under-utilized. In the current RRF, based on MTR recommendations-if the GoN and DPs so agree, carrying out the recommendation will require resources. The funding could be utilized in that regard. Once the output group meeting concludes by the end of the week, it will provide a tentative idea on the total budget

**UNDP:** Ms. Sachchi Karki noted that due to currency fluctuation, there has been a loss of above USD 100,000 on Norwegian funds. Hence the activities funded under the Norwegian funds may need to be funded under another fund code – Denmark being the more natural option. There has been a saving of about USD 151,000 on DFID funds owing to staff departure and delays in recruitments, which can be used to fund the RCU and Danish resources committed to RCU may be freed up to cover the activities funded under Norway. This is because, DFID funds are tied to human resource and operational costs only.

**UNCDF:** A presentation will be held soon to provide a clear summary of the savings.

**DFID:** Last PPSF board meeting was struggling with figures in terms of expenditure and savings, and what has been proposed. And now, it is a similar situation; currently, the document does not provide clear picture of the budget.

**Anil:** Presented figure 75% is of first quarter result-funding of the planned activities. It constitutes a small part of the entire budget. In the overall RRF, certain activities envisioned at the beginning of the PPSF might have to be changed or dropped given the changed context. That is a different exercise. What is presented is regarding the current plan of ASIP. Changes will be in the overall PPSF project document. If the exercise is not done now, a lot of resources will remain unutilized.



**DFID:** In order to have second quarter budget finalized, ~~there should be clarity~~ on how much saving is there in the first quarter, what other activities can be dropped or added in order to plan for the next quarter. The presentation should highlight savings of the first quarter, where will the savings be plotted in the second or third quarter accordingly including the activities.

**UNDP:** Mr. Yamnath Sharma clarified that there are two different things being discussed:

- i) Exercise for the next year's annual work plan
- ii) Quarterly workplan-2<sup>nd</sup> quarter. Most of the activities will remain the same in the second quarter except for output 9 stemming from the emerging context. Some of the activities originally proposed needs to be revised and budget adjusted. For this, based on initial figures, there will be some savings which is subject to revision of the entire RRF. From UNDP side, budget can be set aside. Once the funding gap analysis is done by the ministry for output 9 in terms of support to LLRC, it is subject to discussion amongst development partners on how to best contribute and in what areas.

**SDC: Mr. Prakash Regmi made note of following points:**

- Reporting: The reporting seems to be very activity level and not sure how it is linked with the indicators of PPSF document.
- Support to LLRC: Receiving proposal from LLRC on *ad hoc* basis would lead to revising the PPSF activities regularly. Instead an initial plan of the draft roadmap that can highlight tentative HR requirement and other gaps that can be identified and proposed accordingly would allow DPs to at least define funding areas. As discussed earlier, funding gap analysis of LLRC by the government would provide better picture.
- Technical committee formed at DDC: LLRC provisions formation of district technical committee under the convenorship of LDOs, however field observation from Ramechhap, Dailekh and Surkhet showed that LDOs seem to have limited knowledge of their tasks and support towards LLRC. If a TOR is developed for this technical committee, especially in the 14 earthquake affected districts, it would be much helpful as they are heavily under pressure due to the work of national reconstruction authority.
- Timeline: In next 10 months, LLRC is provisioned to provide recommendation to the GoN to implement the new constitution. MoFALD should come up with a roadmap so that LLRC can produce a report within the stipulated time. For that, as many support should be ensured to LLRC. TOR of LLRC is much elaborate which envisions a lot of activities to be implemented at the local level. But, timeline is the biggest challenge. Thus, development partners are eager to support GoN in this regard.
- Process and ownership: Involving all stakeholders is vital. How to ensure their ownership is important.
- Programme Officers: Recruitment seems not possible by July 2016. What is the plan of ministry to bridge the gap?





**Mr. Gopal Aryal, Output Manager 9:** LDOs have been informed that district technical committee has already been formed and their responsibilities are to work within the broad ToR. They have also been informed that LDO's detailed ToR is being prepared along with conceptual framework being designed which will be sent for comment. Orientation will be held at provincial level by July end.



**NPD:**

- Share UNDP Audit report to all DPs
- Transfer of UN vehicles to Federal division and M & E division
- PPSF account decision/Cheque signing- Proposed to transfer authority to NPM in order to create more ownership and accountability.

**UNDP:** Ms. Sophie Khemkhadze underlined that LGCDP TA support is being implemented under NEX guideline. The TASC board does not have the authority to revise its guideline, such as handing over of PPSF account decision authority to NPM from NPD.

**DFID :**Key agenda of the meeting is to review the proposed quarterly plan and approve it along with the budget. However, based on the document shared, it is difficult to endorse. Mandate of the board is to propose and endorse. Looking at some of the activities, there has not been ample discussion to revisit, drop and propose. Moreover, some of the MTR recommendation based on the observation is valid. Whether to have a blanket approach to endorse the work plan?

**Anil:** The presentation highlights PPSF second quarter work plan of ASIP 2015/16. Ongoing output meetings are discussing ASIP activities of 2016/17. For PPSF AWP of 2015/16, half of the activities come from this year's ASIP while other will come from next FY ASIP activities. Most of the activities still remain from JFA while most of PPSF activities are continued.

**UNDP:**Ms. Sachchi Karki informed that what is being proposed is based on the agreed annual work plan. The activities for quarter 2 will pretty much remain the same. However, based on current output group meetings recommendation and ongoing revision of ASIP, also based on MTR recommendation and the fact that the LLRC is already constituted, some of the activities endorsed by the PPSF AWP 2016 may need to be fine-tuned. What is being proposed was the fine tuning of the activities within the existing budget ceiling, in line with the consultations from the Federalism division. It was not proposing totally new activities.

**Norway:** Mr. Bhola Prasad Dahal emphasized that discussion and agreed points from last PPSF board meeting is not reflected in the presentation. The point is to be specific on main priorities/concrete plans of the PPSF in the last quarter. What was delivered and achieved in previous quarter, based on that what are the priorities for the next quarter. The result of PPSF is functionalizing Pillar 1,2,3.



The Norwegian funding was not released in the first quarter and looking at the report, it looks challenging to do the same in the next quarter as well. Agreed decision needs to be followed. A concrete plan for the next quarter should be reflected.

**UNDP:** Mr. Yam Nath Sharma noted that there are many activities level result activities in the report. Earlier, PPSF used to report on direct implementation of activities. However, one of the project boards made a decision to link the TA contribution with broader LGCDP activities which would reflect the linkage between the two clearly. And thus, the reporting in the current format. It may have created confusion in term of activities level reporting.

- Clarity on annual work plan to quarterly work plan: Principally, project board would agree to break down of activities on quarterly basis except for substantial revision which would require further discussion. In terms of Output 9, exclusive revision is proposed. From this meeting, PPSF operational support activities should be endorsed as it affects the salary. For other programme and policy level issues, another round of discussion is needed. Perhaps, a small taskforce can be formed.

**UNDP:** Ms. Sachchi Karki re-emphasized that what is presented is already in the agreed AWP 2016 for PPSF. The only thing that needs to be fine-tuned is activities related to output 8 and 9. The agreed AWP already had certain built in activities that would relate to the work of federalization division. Because of that, the work plan was shared with the federal division to reflect changes that could better align with the needs identified by the division. Thus, consent was sought from Federal division of the government and so that PPSF support could be more meaningful.

**Anil:** Pillar 1 and Pillar 3 will remain as it is. Only changes would be made in Pillar 2 which is in terms of support related to policies, studies, consultancies.

**DFID:** Mr. Bishnu Adhikari suggested discussing only those activities or areas that are to be endorsed in the Project Board meeting. Not every detail of ASIP is required to be presented in the TASC meeting. Even in the PPSF, highlight the priority areas for the next quarter. The progress report at the moment does not help to understand what was achieved last quarter.

**Norway:** Make two or three action points for the next quarter and adjust budget accordingly. It will contribute to increase budget expenditure as well.

**SDC:** Perhaps, another discussion is required to agree on the modality of PPSF reporting and setting priorities and how to link contribute TA support to overall programme.

**UNDP:** How to distinguish the contribution made by TA and LGCDP activities? RRF also talks about operational support. It is a theoretical challenge. Quality of report has been concerning. How to explain TA contribution at the broader level?



Anil: RRF is all about operational support.

**NPD:** The points have been well taken. Issue it to provide more clarity on specific TA contribution in the LGCDP programme. Next presentation shall incorporate suggestions. On the other hand, GoN budget cut has compromised activities. Limitations are there due to frequent staffs 'turnover'; regular reporting has been interrupted from local bodies due to which RCUs are under tremendous pressure.

**Norway:**

- In January, financial report, the expenditure up to December, 44,000 dollars expenses was shown on Norwegian funds, whereas in the current financial reporting reflects 34,000 dollars. Either it is misreported or 10,000 dollar funding is missing.
- In the first quarter, based on the compliance, financial reporting has to be made accordingly.

**UNDP:** The amount reflected in the document submitted during this quarter - USD 34,000 dollars - is based on the finalized CDR in March 2016. Out of the total planned Norwegian funds, only USD 7,932 dollar has been spent in this quarter - as all Norwegian support goes to the technical studies, policy development and field testing work - these have not moved hence the under delivery. In January, the CDR was not finalized and the figures submitted were provisional. Nevertheless, figures that were submitted earlier will be double checked and informed back to the board.

The verified information was shared on 13 May 2016. It was verified that the figures submitted during the TASC in May 2016 USD 34,771 was actually above the figures USD 34,021 submitted after the TASC in January 2016. It was informed that as discussed in the TASC, the latter is the right figure as it was computed in March 2015.

**Mr. CP Sigdel:** Mr. Sigdel made note of following issues:

- Whether TA experts are working to meet the target of ASIP or are there separate indicators to measure performance?



A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'CP Sigdel'.

- Context: It is important to acknowledge the context and environment TA staffs are working in the field. For instance, staffs are still not able to travel to some parts of inner Terai post unrest. In addition, there are number of vacant positions of staffs at RCUs and DGE/UGEs.
- Reporting: Perhaps, it needs to be more result oriented. However, there has been much changes that has been brought at the local level with rigorous efforts from technical support, in terms of increasing people's participation in planning, civil oversight, etc.

**DFID**: There should be exact clarity on what TA's actual contribution is in the LGCDP.

**NPD**: TA support has contributed in the capacity development and supporting MoFALD in terms of reporting, policy advice, and hiring quality expertise amongst others. PPSF audit report has been hailed as one of the best with the few findings reported as low risk.

**SDC**: MTR has been completed. A clear management response from both GoN and DPs is vital to create clarity and ways forward. Reporting is a collective responsibility. However, reporting issue has been consistently discussed without any improvement.

**Raghu Shrestha**: Perhaps, develop milestone in AWP trimester. It will be easier for PCU to report based on the milestone. Agree on indicators.

**UNDP**: Ms. Sophie Kemkhadze, Deputy Country Director UNDP made note of following points:

- MTR recommendation: It has not yet been finalized. Next step is to prepare a management response- number of consultation in smaller or bigger groups is required. Building consensus is vital.
- LLRC formation is important step- PPSF could be instrumental in supporting LLRC. UNDP would be keen to supporting LLRC.
- Quality assurance: It is the mandate of UNDP. The project complexity does not allow a clear delineation of what PPSF or LGCDP contribution is separately. However, collective effort is required to bring clarity. Current, RRF may not be sufficient- Perhaps bring in external M & E advisor to come up with indicators as project contribution to bigger GoN programme to bring more clarity, thus seek more competent advice on that.
- Financial reporting: On 31<sup>st</sup> march is when the system locks the financial data anything submitted before is provisional. It is the most accurate information. Nevertheless, figures will be double checked.



- 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter plan: Propose to approve outcome 1 and 3, continue discussion on outcome 2 for approval.

**AOB: Baseline Survey report**

**Anil:** Government has specified deadline by 15<sup>th</sup> March. Nothing has been heard from the firm. Cancel rest of the payments to the firm.

**Closing Remarks:**

**NPD:** Mr. Reshmi Raj Pandey acknowledged issues raised during the meeting and welcomed suggestions. It was also ensured that feedbacks will be incorporated. LLRC has been formed. He acknowledged DPs interest to support it as per the need. As per the President's speech- local election will be held in the month of November which means there are lot of work to be implemented by LLRC within limited resources and timeline, thus forward support would be required. As discussed, GoN will conduct funding gap analysis which will provide a clear picture on areas where further funding will be required.

**Decisions**

**Decisions:**

- Outcome 1 and 3 approved.**
- Under outcome 2, ongoing activities will continue. Activities proposed under outcome 2 have to be discussed.**
- Decided to transfer vehicles to LBFC and Federal Affair Division. Driver to be provided under PPSF for the transferred vehicles.**
- Approval of baseline Survey report:** Nelson consulting firm could not submit final report on baseline and perception survey report within the deadline 15 march 2016, so decided to cancel the contract.






S.N	Name	Designation	Organization
1.	Mr. Reshmi Raj Pandey	National Programme Director	LGCDP
2.	Mr. Chhabi Rijal	National Programme Manager	LGCDP
3.	Mr. Gopal Pd. Aryal	Under Secretary	MoFALD
4.	Mr. Bishnu Adhikari	Governance Advisor	DFID
5.	Ms. Sophie Kemkhadze	Deputy Country Director	UNDP
6.	Mr. Yam Nath Sharma	ACD	UNDP
7.	Mr. Bholu Pd Dahal	Governance Advisor	Norwegian Embassy
8.	Mr. Prakash Regmi	SPO	SDC
9.	Ms. Sachchi Kariki	Programme Analyst	UNDP
10.	Ms. Puspa Tuladhar	Programme Associate	UNDP
11.	Ms. Pragyan Joshi	Programme Officer	UNCDF
12.	Mr. Surendra Bhandari	AFO	LGCDP
13.	Mr. Ramesh Sharma	Admin. Officer	LGCDP
14.	Mr. Hari Pyangani	Account Officer	LGCDP
15.	Mr. Lianath Upadhyaya	Na.Su	LGCDP
16.	Ms. Martina Voss	PO	UNV
17.	Mr. Yam Nath Sharma	PFM Specialist	LGCDP
18.	Mr. Shiv Raj Pokharel	Governance Specialist	LGCDP



19.	Mr. Anil Chandrika	DP Cell	DP Cell
20.	Mr. Raghu Shrestha	CM Specialist	DP Cell
21.	Mr. Parsuram Upadhyaya	FG Specialist	LGCDP
22.	Ms. Reshu Karki	Communication and Documentation Officer	LGCDP
23.	Ms. Keshav K Acharya	CD Specialist	LGCDP
24.	Mr. Mohan P Lamsal	PFM Specialist	LGCDP/DP Cell
25.	Mr. Bishnu Puri	Consultant	UNCDF
26.	Mr. Apurwa Singh	ICT Coordinator	LGCDP
27.	Ms. Nirjala Thapa	GESI Specialist	LGCDP

*(Signature)*