

Original Article

Development Activities through User Committee by Local Government: Its Practice & Legal Provision

Austa Kumar Shrestha^{1*}

1. Department of Indigenous Education Development (MIED), Kathmandu University, Nepal.

* Correspondence: austa_mied2024@kusoed.edu.np

Abstract: In recent years, it's been seen the growing push for community participation in development- especially in small-scale projects managed by Local Governments (LGs) in Nepal. According to United Nation (2015), the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development emphasizes community participation in decision-making for effective governance and sustainability, and it has to be rooted in local voices and ownership. The study reflected on how local development projects are implemented through User Committees (UCs) in Nepal, based on my own participation and conversations with others directly involved. While policies and guidelines emphasize community-led, inclusive development, the reality on the ground is more complex. Through two personal narratives from Ward-1 of Changunarayan Municipality- one led by a woman, the other by a man- it has been explored that how community leaders navigate bureaucracy, financial pressure, and institutional limitations. What it was found is that, despite good intentions, UC leaders often struggle with technical procedures and end up handing over responsibilities to informal contractors just to get things done. These stories, shaped by real-time experience and reflection, reveal that meaningful participation is still difficult to achieve without stronger institutional support, clearer processes, and practical help for local actors. The paper invites a closer look at how participatory governance plays out in practice and what changes are needed to make it work better for communities like mine. To make participatory development more meaningful and sustainable, there is a need for simplified procedures, timely institutional support, technical guidance, and gender-sensitive capacity-building. As these narratives show, community members are willing to lead, but without institutional scaffolding, they are forced into informal outsourcing and symbolic leadership. The undermines the very goals of ownership, sustainability, and participatory development as emphasized in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Keywords: users committee, local government, participatory development, community-led development

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, it's been seen the growing push for community participation in development- especially in small-scale projects managed by Local Governments (LGs) in Nepal. According to United Nation (2015), the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development emphasizes community participation in decision-making for effective governance and sustainability, and it has to be rooted in local voices and ownership. Consequently, In Nepal, LGs promote participatory development by mobilizing User Committees (UCs), which help to enhance community involvement, foster ownership, and ensure sustainable project implementation [1]. According to the Public Procurement Act (2007, Section 44), involving a beneficiary community as a UC improves efficiency, quality, or sustainability, or if the project aims to create jobs and engage the community, they may be assigned the work by following the

required procedures. Similarly, Public Procurement Rules/Regulation (2007/2008, Rule 97) limits the budget allocated for projects undertaken by UCs to six million rupees [2]. In the context, Ministry of Federal Affairs & General Administration (MO FAGA) has formulated a model law titled “Procedures for the Formation, Operation, and Management of User Committees at the Local Level-2074 (2017)” under serial number 31. However, Changuarayan Municipality of Bhaktapur- study area has not published its specific procedures on its website, unlike other LGs [3]. The model law outlines provisions regarding the formation, operation, and management of UCs. While formulating the UCs, the presence of municipal or ward representative is mandatory and minimum seven days prior information. It stipulates that a UC should consist of 7-13 members. Additionally, at least 33% of members must be women, with minimum one woman in a key position. UCs are prioritized for financial collaboration and encouraged to self-implement projects rather than hiring contractors, individuals or other organizations [4]. The law also allows UCs to handle projects with budgets up to 10 million rupees and mandates at least one woman in financial operations, as well as a monitoring committee that includes at least one woman. According to the model procedure, a user committee refers to a group formed by beneficiaries for the construction, operation, management, and maintenance of a project. While the UC is formulated, it should be participatory, inclusive, and self-managed, ensuring community ownership as part of governance; challenges persist in its implementation. Despite structured legal provisions, projects are often led by individuals outside the UC due to bureaucratic delays, frequent travel requirements for coordination with officials, and financial constraints under the current advance payment system. In addition, the UC members are struggling to fulfill the compliances even after completion of work. Furthermore, according to [5], UCs is frequently formed based on local political power-sharing, with political leaders and teachers actively participating. An author [6] argues that challenges- such as bureaucratic hurdles, capacity limitations, and coordination with higher-level government agencies have to be recognized and addressed to enhance the prospects of UC-led projects. While extensive study articles can be observed on Drinking Water UCs and Community Forest UCs, there is limited formal study on UCs can be found for LG development activities in online. Unlike drinking water and forest user committees, which function indefinitely, UCs for local development projects are temporary-existing only until project completion. However, they are also responsible for ownership, maintenance, and sustainability to [7], it can be hardly observed in existing context. The lack of a long-term governing structure for these UCs raises concerns about their effectiveness and sustainability, making the study significant. On the other hand, there is only limited study on that area; however, it has remarkable contribution for small scaled development. Given that local governments invest less than six million rupees per project through UCs, assessing their efficiency and challenges is crucial. In that existing legal scenario, only formulating policies and applying in the ground, can lay-man understand those complicated provisions of legal framework? Can it be applicable in the community? Only forming the UC in inclusive way, can make it inclusive? While talking on participatory in development in policy, has it been applied in real ground? These are the questions in the ground, and the study has tried to explore it. While global frameworks such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and national policies in Nepal emphasize participatory development- particularly for small-scale projects that aim to strengthen local ownership and effectiveness, many challenges persist at the grassroots level. Community members often face practical barriers that existing policies have not adequately addressed. Despite the emphasis on inclusivity, the ground reality reveals a gap between policy intentions and actual implementation. The study adopted a narrative inquiry approach, allowing for an in-depth exploration of participants' personal experiences to explore participants lived experiences and perspectives. Participants for the study include two key UC members (Chairperson) from different UCs, one external contractor and one ward representative (ward elected member), selected through convenience sampling. The study methodology is from decolonial point of views. The data have been collected through observation, self-reflection as I have experienced as a UC member in two projects, and

conversational interview with participants. The study focused on Ward-1 of Changunarayan Municipality, Bhaktapur, selected for its accessibility. The study examines the influence of external actors in the implementation of development projects through UCs, analyzing both the legal framework and actual practices. While the study offers insights into UC mobilization in LG development activities, its findings may not be generalizable to other wards or municipalities. Nonetheless, it serves as a foundation for further exploration of UCs effectiveness, governance, and sustainability in local development. In my own experience, forming and leading the user's committee for a small development project in the community isn't just about organizing work or following procedures. It's deeply tied to who we are- our way of life, our relationships with one another, and the responsibilities we carry as a community. From it perspective, participatory development isn't simply about calling people to meetings; it's about honoring the decisions of community people, valuing the knowledge and voices that have kept our community strong for generations, and nurturing the connections that bind us. According to [8], participatory development is to shift power by putting people at the center of decisions that affect their lives. And [9] claims that participation isn't just a process- its political influences. It's about who gets to speak, who decides, and whose voices are heard. Nevertheless, in practice, as [10] point out that many people are left out from the process as they don't care, and as a result, they face barriers every day. In that case too, women, laborers, and those who don't understand the bureaucracy struggled to be part of the process. Instead of empowering the community, some of the participation rules ended up making them relying more on people with technical knowledge or official connections. It leads to feel like community is just marking containers, not making real choices. That is what [11] call the "new tyranny" of participation- when it looks inclusive from the outside but doesn't shift the power inside. If participation is going to mean something real, it should be meaningful participation. It has to change how decisions are made, who controls the resources, and whose knowledge actually matters. Without that, it's too easy for the system to repeat the same inequalities it says it wants to fix.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study adopts a narrative inquiry approach, grounded in a decolonial perspective, to explore the lived experiences of individuals involved in user committees. As [12] explain, narrative inquiry begins and ends with experience- it is both the method and the phenomenon being studied. Similarly, [13] frame narrative inquiry as a way of understanding lives through stories, unfolding within a three-dimensional space that considers interaction (personal and social), continuity (through time), and place (context). Drawing from that approach, I collected stories from two user committee leaders—one male and one female to capture diverse perspectives on how community-led development is practiced on the ground. These narratives were not simply "gathered," but co-created through a process of relational engagement. Alongside storytelling, I used participant observation [14] to gain insight into how these individuals actually navigated their roles in real-time. Rather than structured interviews, I held conversational dialogues- informal, open-ended conversations that allowed participants- UC members, external contractor and ward representative, to share their experiences naturally. These interactions became shared reflective spaces, shaped by trust, attentiveness, and mutual understanding. My role was not just that of a study, but a fellow participant- I, too, have served in two different user committees, which shaped my relational and ethical engagement throughout the study. Its positioning enabled a deeper level of rapport and insight, particularly important when working within one's own community. In selecting stories from both a male and a female committee leader, I aimed to maintain gender balance in representation and highlight the different ways leadership is experienced and enacted within the community. The study is situated in Ward No. 1 of Changunarayan Municipality, specifically in the Duwakot, Besi area of Bhaktapur district. The site was selected based

on its accessibility and the studies personal connection to the community. According to the Policy and Program for Fiscal Year 2080/081 issued by the municipality, that ward receives an annual allocation of approximately 20 million rupees through the ward-level budget. In addition, further financial resources are channeled from the municipality to implement small-scale development projects, many of which are executed through UCs. These financial flows highlight the ward's active engagement in participatory development, making it a relevant and meaningful site for that inquiry. For that study, two chairpersons of the project- Way to Ghimire Tole Road Improvement and Ghimire Tole Road Improvement have been interviewed, and their lived experience stories have been shared. The budget of project is NPR 3, 27, 875 (Government: 261,900, Community: 65,975) and 7, 63,932 (Government: 6,11,100, Community: 1,52,832) respectively. Given the qualitative nature of the study, I employed thematic analysis to interpret the data gathered from participant narratives and observations. The approach helped uncover recurring themes and patterns that reflect how UCs is mobilized and how they function in practice. By organizing the stories and experiences into meaningful categories, thematic analysis allowed for a more nuanced understanding of the challenges, strategies, and relational dynamics shaping UC-led development at the local level. It also made space for the complexity and depth of lived experience to inform the broader discussion on participatory governance. As a former member of the UCs, I brought both – experience and lived experience to that study. Having served as secretary and chairperson of two different user committees in different years, I was able to build strong rapport and trust with participants—an important factor for ethical engagement in narrative inquiry [15]. The close connection not only deepened the quality of the data but also fostered a space for open and honest storytelling. To maintain study integrity, I adopted a reflexive and participatory approach, engaging in ongoing interpretation, triangulation of data through observations, and sustained dialogue with participants. While I acknowledge that my positionality is not neutral, I also recognize it as a valuable resource—one that grounds the study in real-world experience and community accountability. Ethical considerations, particularly around participant privacy and informed consent, were carefully upheld throughout the study process. There are two different stories from two different UCs which represent the male and female, who led the UCs operation for construction related projects. Story-1: Fed-up with Compliance: That is the story from Bishal (pseudonyms)- a chairperson of “Way to Ghimire Tole Road Improvement UC”, who has shared his lived experience. He shared his story of struggle to complete his responsibilities on road improvement project, while he became the chairperson of UC, funding by ward office. For the formulation of UC in respective project, the ward-representative informed the community people to gather in a certain location. As defined date and time, the ward representative came, and they also informed beneficiary households to be gathered. The ward representative briefed about the budget allocation for the road improvement heading for their community, and suggested to formulate the user's committee in inclusive way- minimum 33% women and at least one signature holder in bank. After wide discussion, the user's committee was formulated with his chairpersonship including 7 members. They discussed what they shall do within the project headings- like gravel and/or drainage construction, and finally chose to only gravelling due to limitation of budget. But they were informed that the entire budget has to be invested by committee first, and municipality will return them after completion and fulfilling necessary documentation. As He was chairperson, he had another meeting to collect the fund from community members, including community contribution, and assured them that the collected fund will be returned when they complete the project and get budget from municipality, as it was community benefited project. With lots of struggles, he was able to collect some funds. Then, he coordinated with ward officials for the project implementation- fill up form, estimation, agreement etc. and gathered information for settlement also. He adds “It was very headache process- lots of forms should be filled up, need VAT bill of gravel, attendance register of labor, making stamp of user's committee etc. With lots of struggles, he was able to make agreement with municipality, after visiting two-three times- minimal document missing or mistake would not have accepted”. Finally, the

time came to implementation. He coordinated with gravel provider, who agreed to deliver the gravel and fixed the rate. When he talked about the VAT bill, they said that UC will get VAT bill of only eight thousand, when the rate was fixed 20 thousand per tipper (big truck). He was surprised and said “I was dazzled that how to settle bills of such huge difference”. He also had discussion among the committee members, but no way could not come out. Then, he coordinated with ward officials, and they suggested making in appropriate way to fulfill the compliance, very unclearly. Anyhow, he dropped necessary gravel, but again struggle to find machineries to make gravel plain and rolling it. “I was fully dull, and could not find proper way without future risk of appropriate settlement, as I have to return the collected funds to members after certain time limitation. After thinking a lot, I coordinated with ward officials and requested to support to complete it”, he adds. With his request, ward officials suggested coordinating with a person, who works in such type of construction, and he communicated and coordinated accordingly. The so-called contractor said that he will complete all the estimated work, and settle it, but the user’s committee has to handover the received budget in the name of user’s committee to him, except expended budget for gravel. “Finally, it was very relief for me. I communicated with committee members, and all the members also agreed” - at least, it was assurance for completion of all the work and returning the collected fund”, he said with long breath. It was fully surrender of work to other. Based on our verbal agreement, the contractor completed work, but what types of documents and bills he collected, and how he did, it was his part, UC was not so much aware on it. UC members just signed the documents wherever he asked for.

Story-2: Unlimited Time and Efforts Need: The following account comes from Sharmila (Pseudonym)- the chairperson of the “Ghimire Tole Road Improvement” UC- is a housewife, but active for community related activities, reflected on her lived experience navigating the challenges of implementing a ward-funded road improvement project. She starts “After gathering community people with the presence of ward representative, and wide discussion, the user’s committee was formulated with my chairpersonship. I was not interested to be chairperson, but the road has to be improved”. Other members also suggested her to be chairperson, and lead the project as a woman. Participants of meeting also motivated her that it’s an opportunity to show the women leadership, and finally agreed. The same day, it was decided to pave gravel on road, and construction of drainage. Monitoring committee was also formulated. Bank account holders were also selected in the same minting. After few days, she coordinated with ward officials for estimation, agreement and further process. Surprisingly she whispered “I was shocked that I have to be occupied fully during the construction time- visiting series of time in ward office, technical person, municipality and bank. Lots of documents have to be prepared step by step, self and pre-investment that much huge amount by our self, stamp and hording board printing, public auditing, coordination with suppliers, seeking labor and their recording, utilization of machinery and equipment, VAT bill collection etc.”. Estimation was also difficult to understand to her. Not only that, the gravel would come only in mid-night due to restriction of tipper in the day time. “Opps... it was out of my imagination and control over”, she expressed her fatigue. Then, she had a meeting with committee members and shared every information and process she collected, and informed that it’s her out of capacity. UC members empowered her to lead, and they ensure her to help. But they could not remarkably contribute when she requested them, as they are occupied with their regular business. Then, she coordinated with members of other UC nearby her that how they completed the work. They shared their experience (Story-1). And, with consent of committee members, she handover all the responsibilities to that person- contractor, who work in construction work. “I just collected citizenship of 7 user’s committee members and gave to that person, signed and collected signature of members in given formats, visited one day in ward and municipality for agreement, and visited 1 time in bank- for account opening” shared how head-counted participatory development happened due to structured system. As they discussed, the road was paved the gravel, rolled it by machinery and drainage was construction. But she had not very clear ideas, what types of process they followed, and how it was

settled. “We are happy that the work was completed based on our meeting discussion, no need collects money and pre-investment from our side, no need cash contribution from committee’s side, no need coordination with several suppliers and labors, no tension of billings, and not need of time investment for a month”, shared how UC does community related construction work done.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

While the formal process of establishing a UCs typically begins with an official notice from the ward office, the way it actually unfolds in communities often tells a different story. In both narratives shared in the study, it became evident that social networks, personal trust, and informal influence often played a more decisive role than legal procedures. Respected community members—those with existing social standing or influence—were more likely to be nominated or accepted as leaders, sometimes without much deliberation or debate. The pattern resonances findings by [4], who observed that in many cases, the formation of UCs is less about participatory decision-making and more about navigating existing power structures and community relationships. While official documents like the Public Procurement Act (2007) and MoFAGA’s 2017 guidelines present a detailed and inclusive framework for forming UCs, the reality on the ground is often shaped by necessity, familiarity, and pre-existing hierarchies. The contrast between what should happen in theory (*de jure*) and what actually happens in practice (*de facto*) highlights a persistent gap in implementation. Rather than following a transparent and participatory path, UC formation often reflects local dynamics and practical constraints—revealing how informal norms frequently override formal policies. Writers like [7,8] talk about participation not just as a policy tool, but as something deeply affected by people lived conditions, relationships, and everyday challenges. In the case, participation wasn’t always about attending meetings or making collective decisions—it was often about stepping up because others trust, or simply because no one else would. The theory became real through Bishal and Sharmila’s stories on where political-power sharing The Kathmandu Post [16], due to bureaucratic hurdle and limited capacity [3]. Bishal’s (pseudonyms: story-1) experience, meanwhile, shows a more practical side. Having some familiarity with community work, he saw the role as a task to be managed, though still with its share of burdens. Likewise, Sharmila’s (pseudonyms: story-2) story reveals a quiet tension—she never actively sought to lead the committee. Instead, she accepted the role after being urged by others in her community, especially as a way to represent women. Her acceptance came not from ambition, but from a sense of civic responsibility and collective expectation. The idea aligns with what [4] describe as “narrative necessity”—where individuals step into roles not by free will, but because of the roles society expects them to play. In both cases, their willingness to lead was not backed by any formal training or incentive. Instead, what kept them going was a mix of obligation, trust in community ties, and a shared desire to improve their neighborhood. The guidelines set by [17] highlight the importance of User Committees taking charge of their own project implementation. However, they fall short when it comes to providing the kind of structural support needed to make that a practical reality. As a result, much of what makes these committees work often comes down to individual commitment and mutual trust within the community. In a similar vein, [18] points out that in Nepal, local institutions—especially community-based ones like UCs—tend to operate through informal networks and power-sharing, rather than strictly following formal procedures. These insights are clearly reflected in the lived experiences of the UC leaders in the study. From the perspective of Participatory Development Theory, that isn’t awful. As [19] argue that a real participation is not just about showing up to meetings or marking containers- it’s based on relationships, social trust, and in the quiet push and pull of community expectations. While the Public Procurement Act (2007, Sec. 44) and MoFAGA’s 2017 guidelines are designed to empower UCs to implement projects independently—with clear conditions around budget limits and gender inclusion—the reality on the ground often looks quite different. For many committee leaders, like Bishal

and Sharmila, the gap between policy and practice is wide and exhausting. Bishal shared how difficult it was to gather VAT-compliant bills and complete the required documentation. Even small errors in forms or missing details meant multiple trips to government offices. Similarly, Sharmila found she overwhelmed by the sheer volume of coordination needed—between technical staff, municipal offices, and banks—much of which she had never encountered before. What was supposed to be a community-led process ended up feeling more like an institutional confusion? Building on that, [20] point out that although User Committees are meant to strengthen community ownership in local development, they often encounter practical hurdles. These challenges—ranging from technical limitations to bureaucratic complexity—frequently push committees to rely on outside contractors or middlemen to get the work done. From the lens of Participatory Development Theory, that gap is not surprising. As [17] note, many development frameworks assume participation as a neutral and accessible act—but in practice, it is shaped by social and institutional barriers. Similarly, [7] remind us that meaningful participation requires not just being included but being supported—through resources, time, and capacity that many local leaders simply do not have. What Bishal and Sharmila experienced was not a failure of leadership, but a failure of the system to provide enabling conditions. The work of [3, 7,9] reinforces that, showing how UCs often struggle with technical limitations and procedural confusion. When the system becomes too heavy to carry alone, communities naturally turn to those with prior experience or connections—contractors and informal facilitators—just to get things done. That disconnect between institutional design and lived experience highlights what [5] warn about—the risk that participatory approaches, without structural support, may place excessive responsibility on local actors without giving them the tools or flexibility they need to succeed. In both cases, the UC leaders eventually handed over the actual project work to someone else—an informal contractor who had the technical know-how and connections to see it through. That goes against the core principle of UCs being the direct implementers. But in reality, it became a necessary compromise. These decisions weren't made lightly or carelessly. As [6] suggest, narrative inquiry reveals how people respond meaningfully to the circumstances they face—not just what they do, but why they do it. In that case, the decision to delegate wasn't a failure of leadership—it was a response to institutional overload, financial pressure, and fear of doing things wrong. From a theoretical perspective, that decision reflects a core insight of Participatory Development Theory—that participation does not happen in a vacuum. As [8] argue, people's ability to participate meaningfully is shaped by structural conditions, institutional complexity, and personal capacity. When systems are too burdensome, when procedures are too technical, or when financial risks fall on individuals with limited support, people adapt. They make practical choices—not out of apathy or failure, but out of a need to protect themselves and their communities. Rather than strictly following formal rules, UC formation and mobilization are shaped by informal relationships, social influence, and community familiarity—a finding consistent with [4], who notes that informal practices often drive local governance more than official procedures. Author [16] notes, policies that promote women's participation must be backed by concrete structural support to lead to genuine transformation.

4. CONCLUSION

The study explored how UCs are formed and function in local infrastructure development, with a focus on how policies play out in real-life practice. Through the personal stories of two UC leaders—a man and a woman—the study highlighted both the possibilities and the limitations of participatory governance as it currently exists in Nepal. Another recurring issue was the disconnect between administrative expectations and community capacity. Both participants faced complex procedures, financial risk, and a lack of technical support. Ultimately, both had to hand over their responsibilities to

external actors to complete the projects. It reflects what Bhattarai, Khadka, and Pahari (2023) also found that UCs, though designed for local empowerment, often depend on outsiders to navigate institutional barriers. To make participatory development more meaningful and sustainable, there is a need for simplified procedures, timely institutional support, technical guidance, and gender-sensitive capacity-building. As these narratives show, community members are willing to lead, but without institutional scaffolding, they are forced into informal outsourcing and symbolic leadership. It undermines the very goals of ownership, sustainability, and participatory development as emphasized in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN, 2015).

REFERENCES

- [1] Bhattarai, S. K., Khadka, E. S., & Pahari, B. (2023). Analysis of project implementation through Users Committees in Junichande Rural Municipality. ResearchGate.
- [2] Bhattarai, S.K., Devkota, P., Joshi, G.K., & Neupane, U. (2025). Assessing User Committees' Effectiveness in Infrastructure Projects: A Case of Palungtar Municipality, Nepal Using Exploratory Factor Analysis. *The OCEM Journal of Management, Technology & Social Sciences*, 4(1),132-143.
- [3] Bhattarai, S.K., et al. (2025). Assessing User Committees' Effectiveness in Infrastructure Projects: A Case of Palungtar Municipality, Nepal Using Exploratory Factor Analysis. *The OCEM Journal of Management, Technology & Social Sciences*, 4(1) [ISSN: 2705-4845].
- [4] Bhusal, T. (2023). Participatory Local Governance in Rural Nepal: The Primacy of Informality. ResearchGate.
- [5] Caine, V., Clandinin, D. J., & Lessard, S. (2021). *Narrative inquiry: Philosophical roots*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- [6] Chambers, R. (1994). The origins and practice of participatory rural appraisal. *World Development*, 22(7), 953-969.
- [7] Changunarayan Municipality (2081 BS). Policy and Program of FY 2080/081, Revenue and Projected Expense (Budget Speech), and Appropriation Act-2081.
- [8] Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Retrieved from
- [9] Cooke, B., & Kothari, U. (Eds.). (2001). *Participation: The New Tyranny?* Zed Books.
- [10] Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking 'Participation': models, meanings and practices. *Community Development Journal*, 43(3), 269-283.
- [11] Government of Nepal. (2007). Public Procurement Act, 2007 (Section 44). Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs.
- [12] Government of Nepal. (2007/2008). Public Procurement Rules, 2007 (Second Amendment, 2008), Rule 97. Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs.
- [13] Government of Nepal. (2017). Procedures for the Formation, Operation, and Management of User Committees at the Local Level-2074 (2017). Ministry of Federal Affairs & General Administration.
- [14] Mansuri, G., & Rao, V. (2013). *Localizing Development: Does Participation Work?* The World Bank.
- [15] Mishra, A. K., Koirala, R. & Aithal, P. S. (2022). Effectiveness of the Construction Projects: A Comparison between Users Committees and Contractor Approach. *International Journal of Case Studies in Business, IT, and Education (IJCSBE)* 2022, 6(2), 435-445. ISSN: 2581-6942., <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4256187>.
- [16] Shrestha, P.M. (2025). New rule may prevent conflicts of interest in user groups. *The Kathmandu Post*. Retrieved from
- [17] United Nations Development Programme. (2021). *UNDP Gender Equality Strategy: 2020 Annual Report*. UNDP.
- [18] United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*.
- [19] United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (A/RES/70/1)*. United Nations.
- [20] Upreti, B. R. (2004). Resource Conflicts and Conflict Resolution in Nepal. *Mountain Research and Development*, 24(1), 60–66.