


# National Survey on Nepal's Constitution Building Process

September 2015





# National Survey on Nepal's Constitution Building Process

September 2015



© International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA), OUTLINE Media and Rooster Logic 2015

This is a joint publication by International IDEA, OUTLINE Media and Rooster Logic. This publication is independent of specific national or political interests.

Views expressed in this publication do not necessarily represent the views of international IDEA, OUTLINE Media and Rooster Logic or their respective Board or Council Members.

Applications for permission to reproduce or translate all or any part of this publication should be made to:

International IDEA, OUTLINE Media and Rooster Logic encourage dissemination of its work and will promptly respond to requests for permission to reproduce or translate their publications.

International IDEA  
Strömsborg  
SE-103 34 Stockholm  
Sweden  
Email: [info@idea.int](mailto:info@idea.int)

Rooster Logic Pvt Ltd.  
Campus Marg, Chakupat, Patan  
Dhoka, Lalitpur, Nepal  
Email : [info@roosterlogic.com](mailto:info@roosterlogic.com)  
Tel: + 977- 1 526 1530, 526 0506

OUTLINE Media Pvt. Ltd.  
Thapathali, Kathmandu, Nepal  
Email: [info@outline.com.np](mailto:info@outline.com.np)  
Tel: +977-1 4102103, 4227325

ISBN: 978-91-7671-023-4

# Contents

List of Tables.....	iv
List of Figures .....	v
Acronyms .....	vi
Foreword .....	vii
Acknowledgements.....	viii
Executive Summary .....	ix
<b>Chapter 1</b>	
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Background .....	1
Objectives .....	1
Partners .....	1
<b>Chapter 2</b>	
<b>Methodology.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Data collection tools.....	3
Study area and population.....	3
Sample design .....	3
Research team .....	4
Data management and analysis .....	4
Quality control.....	4
Challenges and limitations .....	5
Study Area and Actual Sample Distribution .....	6
<b>Chapter 3</b>	
<b>Characteristics of Respondents.....</b>	<b>7</b>
Age group.....	7
Gender .....	7
Ethnicity.....	7
Location.....	8
<b>Chapter 4</b>	
<b>Results .....</b>	<b>9</b>
Performance of CA representatives during constitution building process.....	9
Overall performance of CA II.....	11
Trust and confidence in CA II to deliver the constitution .....	13
Most important constitutional issue.....	15
Awareness of development projects by CA representatives .....	17
Changes expected from new constitution .....	19
<b>Chapter 5</b>	
<b>Summary and Conclusions .....</b>	<b>21</b>
Annex 1. Survey Questionnaire .....	22
Annex 2. Planned Sample Distribution .....	24
Annex 3. Actual Sample Distribution .....	30

# List of Tables

Table 1.	Distribution of respondents by ethnicity
Table 2.	Distribution of respondents by development region
Table 3.	Distribution of respondents by ecological zone
Table 4.	Distribution of respondents on the performance of their CA representative by gender
Table 5.	Distribution of respondents on the performance of their CA representative by age
Table 6.	Distribution of respondents on the performance of their CA representative by ethnicity
Table 7.	Distribution of respondents on the performance of their CA representative by development region
Table 8.	Distribution of respondents on the performance of CA representative by ecological zone
Table 9.	Distribution of respondents on the performance of the CA II by gender
Table 10.	Distribution of respondents on the performance of the CA II by age
Table 11.	Distribution of respondents on the performance of the CA II by ethnicity
Table 12.	Distribution of respondents on the performance of the CA II by development region
Table 13.	Distribution of respondents on the performance of the CA II by ecological zone
Table 14.	Distribution of respondents on trust and confidence in CA II to deliver a constitution by gender
Table 15.	Distribution of respondents on trust and confidence in CA II to deliver Constitution by age
Table 16.	Distribution of respondents on trust and confidence in CA II to deliver constitution by ethnicity
Table 17.	Distribution of respondents on trust and confidence in CA II to deliver constitution by development region
Table 18.	Distribution of respondents on trust and confidence in CA II to deliver constitution by ecological zone
Table 19.	Distribution of respondents on most important constitutional issue by gender
Table 20.	Distribution of respondents on most important constitutional issue by age
Table 21.	Distribution of respondents on the important constitutional issue by ethnicity
Table 22.	Distribution of respondents on the most important constitutional issue by development region
Table 23.	Distribution of respondents on most important constitutional issue by ecological zone
Table 24.	Distribution of respondents' awareness of development projects initiated by their CA representative by gender

Table 25.	Distribution of respondents' awareness of development projects initiated by their CA representative by age
Table 26.	Distribution of respondents' awareness of development projects initiated by their CA representative by ethnicity
Table 27.	Distribution of respondents' awareness of development projects initiated by their CA representative by development region
Table 28.	Distribution of respondents' awareness of development projects initiated by their CA representative by ecological zone
Table 29.	Distribution of respondents' expectations from the new constitution by gender
Table 30.	Distribution of respondents' expectations from the new constitution by age group
Table 31.	Distribution of respondents' expectations from the new constitution by ethnicity
Table 32.	Distribution of respondents' expectations from the new constitution by development region
Table 33.	Distribution of respondents' expectations from the new constitution by ecological zone

## List of Figures

Figure 1.	Distribution of respondents by age
Figure 2.	Distribution of respondents by gender
Figure 3.	Distribution of respondents on the performance of their CA representative
Figure 4.	Distribution of respondents on the performance of the CA II
Figure 5.	Distribution of respondents on trust and confidence in CA II to deliver the constitution
Figure 6.	Distribution of respondents on most important constitutional issue
Figure 7.	Distribution of respondents' awareness of development projects initiated by CA representatives
Figure 8.	Distribution of respondents' expectations of change from the new constitution

# Acronyms

CA	Constituent Assembly
CA I	Constituent Assembly 2008–2012
CA II	Constituent Assembly 2013–2017
GPS	Global Positioning System
IDEA	International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance
REMO	Research and Monitoring Platform
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
VDC	Village Development Committee



# Foreword

The idea for this national survey on Nepal's constitution building process was conceived by OUTLINE Media prior to Nepal's two major earthquakes in April and May 2015. As a media and research organization focused on enhancing political understanding in Nepal they saw a need to assess how the people of Nepal perceived the work of the body charged with writing Nepal's new constitution, the Constituent Assembly. They approached International IDEA, an organization with global and Nepal specific experience in measuring the state of democracy through surveys, to collaborate on development of the survey questionnaire and analysis of its results. International IDEA suggested the addition of Rooster Logic to the survey project to ensure statistical relevance and enhance data collection using its mobile phone application REMO (Research and Monitoring Software). The technical knowledge and skills brought by each of the three collaborating organizations were complementary and value added.

The survey commenced on 8 June 2015 – the very day that Nepal's political parties reached the 16 point agreement – and ended on July 31 – one month after the release of Preliminary Draft Constitution. As such, it was conducted during a time when the nation's attention was squarely on the work of the Constituent Assembly. OUTLINE Media's nation-wide network of journalists made national coverage possible notwithstanding challenges posed by monsoon weather and protests sparked by the Preliminary Draft Constitution.

This survey provides statistically relevant evidence of the opinion and perception of Nepali people on the work of the Constituent Assembly during a critical moment in Nepalese history. We hope its results and the analysis contained herein will enhance political understanding of this particular point in time and serve as a base line from which to measure the work of Nepal's Legislative Parliament as it commences the arduous task of implementing the work of the Constituent Assembly, the constitution.



Sheri Meyerhoffer  
Head of Mission  
International IDEA, Nepal



Saroj Dahal  
Director  
Outline Media



Suman Shakya  
Director  
Rooster Logic

# Acknowledgements

International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), OUTLINE Media and Rooster Logic are happy to present you with the Report of National Survey on Nepal's Constitution Building Process 2015.

We would like to extend our sincere gratitude to Sheri Meyerhoffer, Head of Mission; Melanie Allen, Acting Head of Mission; Khushee Tharu, Constitution Building Advisor; Rita Rai, Gender and Social Inclusion Officer and staff of International IDEA for their technical inputs to produce this report.

We owe a debt to Suman Shakya, Director; Pravin Raj Joshi, Chief Technical Officer; Pravat Uprety, Statistician, Mero Raja Prasad Pradhan, Senior Developer and Brijendra R. Joshi, Chief Operating Officer of Rooster Logic for their technical support and perseverance to consolidate the statistical findings of the survey in the report.

We would like to express a special thanks to Saroj Dahal, Director; Samjhana Poudel, Manager and Amrit Adhikari, Survey Coordinator of OUTLINE Media for their hard work and efforts in conducting the survey, mobilizing the enumerators and writing this report. Likewise, our thanks to Susan Sellars for copy editing this report into a readable format.

Lastly, we are grateful to all the survey respondents without whom this report would not have been accomplished and shared with you.

# Executive Summary

At the time this survey was conducted, the Nepali community was anxiously observing and awaiting the final outcome of the Constitutional Assembly (CA) II constitution making process. On 20 September 2015, Nepal promulgated its new constitution. However, gaps and misunderstandings remain about the CA's performance and the outcome – the new constitution.

The report presents the results of a survey conducted by OUTLINE Media, with the technical expertise of Rooster Logic and International IDEA, between 8 June and 31 July 2015. The survey was initiated to assess people's perceptions of CA II and identify their expectations of the constitution once promulgated. The specific objectives of the survey were to: i) provide an analysis report to the CA members containing evidence-based information to help them address popular concerns; and, ii) foster two-way communication between the CA members and their constituents on issues of national and local concern, to increase mutual trust and address apprehensions regarding the ongoing constitution-building process. Now that the constitution has been promulgated, the change in the country expected from the new constitution (question number 6) will be of particular interest to the elected members and will help them better meet the needs of their constituents as they fulfil their new role in the legislative parliament.

Using the Research and Monitoring (REMO) mobile application, local journalists interviewed 8,420 voters from each of Nepal's 240 election constituencies (30–49 from each constituency) for the survey. In each constituency, the respondents resided in either one municipality or, in the absence of a single municipality, two village development committees (VDCs). Survey respondents were asked six key questions (see Annex 1). Respondent profiles and each question were analysed according to five variables – age, gender, ethnicity, development region and ecological zone – to provide demographic information and social-geographical insight. The analysis also provides an overall view of the responses to each question. This survey provides statistically relevant evidence of the opinions and perceptions of the Nepali people on the work of the Constituent Assembly during a critical movement in Nepalese history.

This survey found that only 31% of all respondents rated the CA II's performance as good or very good, with the majority of respondents (nearly 40%) rating it as fair. This figure dropped a little under 30%, when respondents were asked about their particular CA representative, again with the majority rating their performance during the constitution building process as fair (39%). A large proportion were dissatisfied with their CA representative's performance (32%), rating it as poor or very poor.

Respondents showed a little more optimism when asked about the CA II's ability to deliver a new constitution, with nearly half expressing their trust and confidence as somewhat high or very high. Trust was highest (nearly 61% for somewhat high and very high combined) in the Far West Development Region.

Federalism topped the list of what respondent's considered to be the most important constitutional issue, with slightly more than 50% overall selecting it. However, the importance of federalism fluctuated

significantly among ethnic groups with approximately 44% of hill Brahmin-Chhetri respondents identifying it as most important, compared to 77% of Madhesi Brahmins, 73.5% of Madhesi Dalits and 74% of Madhesis. The high interest in federalism shown by people in the Madesh is consistent their 2007 demand that federalism be included in the constitution building agenda. The lowest interest in federalism was exhibited by hill Dalits (33% selected this as the most important issues). Other issues considered important by hill Dalits were social inclusion (selected as most important by 27.5% compared to 10.4% overall).

Women were split on which issue they considered most important, with approximately 35% citing federalism (compared to 56% of men) and 33% citing women's issues as most important. In contrast, less than 1% of men identified women's rights as the most important issue. This might be a reflection of Nepal's dominant patriarchal mind-set. On the other hand, as the question required respondents to select a single issue as most important, it is possible that male respondents consider rights of women as more important than the data, on its face, suggests. Male respondents may also have considered federalism and social inclusion as encompassing the rights of women. Furthermore, the proportion of respondents under the age of 35 who selected rights of women as the most important issue was higher than those over that age, suggesting a possible generational shift on this issue.

Approximately 50% of all respondents stated that they were not aware of any development activities in their constituency or that there were none. Another 34% said that they were aware of 1–3 projects.

Respondents seemed optimistic about the benefits that the new constitution would bring. More than half (52%) of respondents expected an increase in development after promulgation of the new constitution and almost 19% expected better services. These figures were roughly consistent for men and women and across all groups. This is encouraging as it evidences hope. It is also, however, a factor that elected officials need to be aware of so that they move quickly to ensure that these expectations are either met or managed.

## Introduction

### Background

In 2006, leaders came together to sign the Comprehensive Peace Accord, signalling the end of the 10-year armed conflict in Nepal. It was an historic moment, but the hard work of building a new, stable and peaceful nation had only just begun. Today, Nepal has been working on the foundations of this new stable and inclusive democracy for more than 8 years. At the very heart of the process has been the drafting of the new constitution to protect the fundamental rights and interests of all citizens.

The Constitutional Assembly (CA) I (2008–2012) made remarkable progress in writing the constitution. However, when the tenure of the CA I ended in 2012, key issues remained unresolved, forcing the CA to disband without finalising a constitution. A new CA (CA II) was elected in 2013, and equally struggled to resolve the issues that led to the failure of CA I to promulgate a new constitution.

Following the earthquake in Nepal on 25 April 2015, the political parties came to an agreement on contentious issues, which moved the constitution writing process forward. A draft constitution was publicised on 30 June 2015 and public consultations were held on 20 and 21 July 2015. At the time of writing this report, Nepal has just promulgated the Constitution of Nepal 2015 (on 20 September 2015).

### Objectives

The main objective of this research was to collect and assess the views of constituents on the performance of the CA II on the constitution making process. This research is intended to:

- help CA members address popular concerns related to constitution building and development efforts
- foster two-way communication between the CA members and their constituents on issues of national and local concerns to increase mutual trust and address apprehensions regarding the constitution-building process

### Partners

The survey was conducted by OUTLINE Media, with the technical expertise of Rooster Logic and International IDEA, between 8 June and 31 July 2015.

**OUTLINE Media** is a media, research and training organisation that focuses on enhancing political understanding in the country so that the people know what is really happening and can be part of society. It provides consultancy services on research, training, workshops, and evaluations focusing on human rights, democracy, development, politics and socioeconomic issues. It produces documentaries and books on significant events, issues and people with specific reference to politics, human rights and democracy.

It also facilitates media dialogue for policy advocacy through live interactions with policy makers, service providers, and political parties, as well as a news service via radio, print and other mediums. In order to disseminate reliable news, OUTLINE Media operates the Outline News Service and online news ([www.onsnews.com](http://www.onsnews.com)) with the sole intention of providing transparent news to the public in Nepal and worldwide.

**Rooster Logic** ([www.roosterlogic.com](http://www.roosterlogic.com)) is a Nepali company operated by Nepali professionals with expertise in business, technology and project management. The company's goal is to be a world class technology company and global innovator bringing cutting-edge strategic intelligence products and services to government, corporate and non-profit entities in Nepal and South Asia to increase their productivity. Rooster Logic focuses on big data that builds products and services. It aims to foster knowledge, develop simple and creative solutions and drive change in organisations. It works with different skill sets to develop and implement solutions and drive continuous improvement in these solutions. The key is to have all the big data processes streamlined to collect, analyse, clean and extract intelligence for all levels of management on a real time basis. Value and innovation are the priority of the team at Rooster Logic.

**International IDEA** ([www.idea.int](http://www.idea.int)) is an intergovernmental organisation with 28 member states (current member states are Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Finland, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Namibia, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Uruguay). Founded in 1995, International IDEA's mandate is to support sustainable democracy worldwide. International IDEA's early expertise focused on electoral processes and it has become a recognised leader in the field of electoral design and management. However, International IDEA also has globally recognised expertise in constitution building, political parties and representation, and gender and democracy. International IDEA has been working in Nepal since 2004, initially offering its State of Democracy tool to enable citizens to assess the country's democracy. Following the rise of the People's Movement for Democracy and the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in 2006, International IDEA has been supporting national actors in the process of constitution building by providing knowledge, facilitating dialogues and promoting public participation.

This research study is based on a survey of registered voters in Nepal's 240 constituencies to determine their views on the work and role of the CA and its members, and their expectations of the Constituent Assembly. The research was carried out as a cross sectional study, uses primary sources of data and is descriptive in nature. A structured questionnaire was used to collect the data.

### Data collection tools

A questionnaire was used to collect the data. The questionnaire included six substantive questions, as well as demographic questions related to gender, age, ethnicity, and location. Demographic as well as perception and opinion data were collected. The questionnaire consisted of classification and multiple choice single response questions (see Annex 1).

Data was collected using mobile phones with a mobile application called REMO (Research and Monitoring Software) and analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and Microsoft Excel. REMO is a software platform that collects and tracks information along with the global positioning system (GPS) locations of the respondents. The software was designed with developing countries in mind and is able to work offline. The software is flexible in that the survey information input forms can be edited midway and it supports local languages.

### Study area and population

The study area was the whole of Nepal and, specifically, all 240 constituencies. The population for this study was comprised of individuals aged 18 or older with a voter ID cards issued for the 2013 CA II election.

### Sample design

A two-stage sampling technique was used. For the first stage, the sampling unit was a single municipality selected randomly from within each election constituency. Where a constituency had no municipality, two village development committees (VDCs) were selected. For the second stage, the sampling unit was individuals (one per household) from the municipality or two VDCs, as applicable. Individuals were selected randomly from the 2013 election voter's list for these municipalities or VDCs.

Nepal's 240 constituencies do not have the same number of voters. The proportion of voters in each constituency was computed by dividing the number of voters in that constituency by the total numbers of voters in Nepal. Using the proportionate share of voters in each constituency, the numbers of respondents in each constituency were adjusted as follows (keeping in mind that a minimum sample size of 30 is required to be statistically relevant):

- If the number calculated was less than 30, it was increased to 30.
- If the number calculated was equal or greater than 30, the calculated number was used.

Based on these calculations, the minimum sample size was 7,675, with the number of respondents per constituencies ranging from 30 to 49 (see Annex 2). Extra interviews were conducted where needed to ensure that the minimum sample size of 7,675 was achieved. The final number of interviews conducted (sample size) was 8,420 (see Annex 3).

## Research team

The research team, which consisted of representatives from all three the partners (OUTLINE Media, Rooster Logic and International IDEA), developed a structured questionnaire (see Annex 1) and collected information directly from voters resident in each of Nepal's 240 election constituencies. OUTLINE Media identified, hired and managed 60 locally-based professional journalists to serve as survey enumerators. The demographics of survey respondents in each constituency were identified and the survey enumerators instructed to conduct surveys in their assigned constituencies, to ensure that they interviewed the required number of women, men and representatives of various ethnic groups.

Training for the enumerators was conducted by Rooster Logic at their office premises. The training included: an introduction to the proposed programme; the objectives, needs and methodology of the survey; general interviewing techniques and the field procedures of the survey; as well as a detailed review of each question.

## Data management and analysis

The data using REMO were imported into Microsoft Excel and entered into SPSS for further analysis. The coding, editing and cleaning were done using SPSS; some classifications such as age, ethnicity, gender, and location (development region and ecological zone) were also made in SPSS. The tables and charts were made in Excel.

To analyse the data, descriptive analyses were computed to meet the objectives, such as frequency, percentage analysis and cross tabulation. Univariate analysis (overall) and bivariate analysis (two variables) were computed.

## Quality control

Rigorous training was given to the enumerators on the questionnaire, question type, technique for asking questions, and techniques for cross-checking confusing answers, as well as how to operate the mobile and mobile application. During the data collection period the core team from OUTLINE Media frequently monitored and reviewed the completed questionnaires.



## Challenges and limitations


While conducting the survey, OUTLINE Media experienced a few challenges, such as having to replace some of the journalists who were unable to manage the assigned interviews due to technical problems with their mobiles or monsoon-related transport issues, which prevented them from reaching rural villages. In the Terai, voter response was negatively impacted by the political situation.

In 13 constituencies, the enumerators were unable to interview the required number of individuals for the reasons stated above. To maintain the overall minimum sample size, additional respondents were chosen from other constituencies. Notwithstanding this slight deviance from the sample distribution table (Annex 2), the statistical relevance of this research remains intact as the results are presented by development region and ecological zone.

The number of women and men surveyed was not equal. The enumerators reported that women were hesitant to speak and referred to their husbands and other members of their family when asked questions. It is assumed that their hesitation is due to Nepal's patriarchal society and the role of women within it. Women may have been more willing to speak if they were interviewed in a separate room/place from other family members, but this is also culturally and practically difficult and was not possible in most cases.

The proportion of respondents from the Far West Development Region was also lower than for other region (at only 9%). Similarly, in terms of ecological zone, also at 9% of respondents were from the mountains. This was due to technical problems with the REMO mobile application, time constraints and geography.

# Study Area and Actual Sample Distribution



# CHAPTER 3



## Characteristics of Respondents

### Age group

A total of 8,420 respondents participated in the survey, representing various age groups and genders. With respect to age, the group between 26–35 years old was the largest at approximately 32% of the total, with those over the age of 56 comprising the smallest age group at around 11%. Figure 1 provides further details of the breakdown of respondents according to age.

### Gender

With respect to gender, the split was roughly three-quarters male (72%) and one-quarter female (28%). The participation of third gender was statistically irrelevant as only 2 respondents identified themselves as belonging to this gender group. Figure 2 shows the breakdown of all respondents on the basis of gender.



### Ethnicity

In terms of ethnicity, the largest respondent groups were hill Brahmin/Chhetri (45%), Janajati (21%) and Madhesi (14%) (See Table 1).

**Table 1. Distribution of respondents by ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Frequency	%
Hill Brahmin/Chhetri	3,814	45.3
Madhesi Brahmin	118	1.4
Madhesi	1,165	13.8
Hill Dalit	600	7.1
Madhesi Dalit	117	1.4
Janajati	1,746	20.7
Adhibasi	568	6.7
Muslim	205	2.4
Other	87	1.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,420</b>	<b>100.0</b>

## Location

With respect to the number of respondents from each development region, the Central Development Region had the highest level of representation at 34%, whereas the Far West Development Region had only 9%. The disparity in the number of respondents between regions was the result of multiple factors, including technical problems with the REMO mobile application and some enumerators being unable to go to VDCs due to time constraints and geography.

In terms of ecological zone, most were from the Terai (48%), followed closely by the hills (43%), with 9% from the mountains. Terai participation was higher due to greater accessibility to the Internet, other forms of communication and transportation. Further details on where respondents resided are set out in Tables 2 and 3.

**Table 2. Distribution of respondents by development region**

Development region	Frequency	%
Eastern	2,032	24.1
Central	2,849	33.8
Western	1,635	19.4
Mid Western	1,158	13.8
Far West	746	8.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,420</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 3. Distribution of respondents by ecological zone**


Ecological zone	Frequency	%
Terai	4,055	48.2
Hills	3,601	42.8
Mountains	764	9.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,420</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Univariate (overall) and bivariate (two variables) answers were computed for each question. The variables analysed were age, gender, ethnicity, development region and ecological zone. This section of the report provides details on the results of the univariate and five bivariate responses for each of the six questions.

### Performance of CA representatives during constitution building process

#### *How would you rate the performance of your representatives during the constitution building process?*

Nearly 30% of respondents rated the performance of their CA representative as good or very good and another 39% rated it as merely fair. A significant proportion were dissatisfied with their CA representative's performance (32%), rating it as poor or very poor (Figure 3).



There was little variance in how men and women and respondents from different age groups, ethnic groups, development regions and ecological zone evaluated the performance of their CA representatives (see Tables 4–8).

**Table 4. Distribution of respondents on the performance of their CA representative by gender**

Gender	Very good		Good		Fair		Poor		Very poor		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Female	119	5.1	542	23.2	949	40.7	555	23.8	169	7.2	2,334
Male	383	6.3	1,436	23.6	2,332	38.3	1,342	22.1	591	9.7	6,084
<b>Total</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>1,978</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>3,281</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>1,897</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>760</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>8,418</b>

**Table 5. Distribution of respondents on the performance of their CA representative by age**

Age group	Very good		Good		Fair		Poor		Very poor		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
18–25	91	7.5	300	24.6	491	40.3	229	18.8	108	8.9	1,219
26–35	160	6.0	621	23.1	1,026	38.2	624	23.2	256	9.5	2,687
36–45	129	5.9	512	23.3	845	38.4	520	23.6	193	8.8	2,199
46–55	81	6.0	316	23.3	514	37.8	317	23.3	130	9.6	1,358
56 or above	41	4.3	229	23.9	405	42.3	209	21.8	73	7.6	957
<b>Total</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>1,978</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>3,281</b>	<b>39.0</b>	<b>1,899</b>	<b>22.6</b>	<b>760</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>8,420</b>

**Table 6. Distribution of respondents on the performance of their CA representative by ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Very good		Good		Fair		Poor		Very poor		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Hill Brahmin/ Chhetri	253	6.6	971	25.5	1,513	39.7	848	22.2	229	6.0	3,814
Madhesi Brahmin	10	8.5	27	22.9	28	23.7	29	24.6	24	20.3	118
Madhesi	56	4.8	205	17.6	376	32.3	312	26.8	216	18.5	1,165
Hill Dalit	47	7.8	142	23.7	259	43.2	109	18.2	43	7.2	600
Madhesi Dalit	2	1.7	23	19.7	38	32.5	28	23.9	26	22.2	117
Janajati	92	5.3	433	24.8	737	42.2	366	21.0	118	6.8	1,746
Adhibasi	32	5.6	122	21.5	219	38.6	143	25.2	52	9.2	568
Muslim	9	4.4	44	21.5	79	38.5	41	20.0	32	15.6	205
Other	1	1.1	11	12.6	32	36.8	23	26.4	20	23.0	87
<b>Total</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>1,978</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>3,281</b>	<b>39.0</b>	<b>1,899</b>	<b>22.6</b>	<b>760</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>8,420</b>

**Table 7. Distribution of respondents on the performance of their CA representative by development region**

Development region	Very good		Good		Fair		Poor		Very poor		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Eastern	141	6.9	592	29.1	756	37.2	335	16.5	208	10.2	2,032
Central	56	2.0	408	14.3	1,103	38.7	952	33.4	330	11.6	2,849
Western	117	7.2	446	27.3	657	40.2	309	18.9	106	6.5	1,635
Mid Western	108	9.3	330	28.5	483	41.7	176	15.2	61	5.3	1,158
Far West	80	10.7	202	27.1	282	37.8	127	17.0	55	7.4	746
<b>Total</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>1,978</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>3,281</b>	<b>39.0</b>	<b>1,899</b>	<b>22.6</b>	<b>760</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>8,420</b>

Ecological zone	Very good		Good		Fair		Poor		Very poor		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Terai	210	5.2	950	23.4	1,456	35.9	924	22.8	515	12.7	4,055
Hills	201	5.6	816	22.7	1,507	41.8	863	24.0	214	5.9	3,601
Mountains	91	11.9	212	27.7	318	41.6	112	14.7	31	4.1	764
<b>Total</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>1,978</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>3,281</b>	<b>39.0</b>	<b>1,899</b>	<b>22.6</b>	<b>760</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>8,420</b>


## Overall performance of CA II

### *How would you rate the overall performance of the CA II?*

Nearly 31% rated the performance of the CA II as good or very good and another nearly 40% rated it as fair. Although less than 8% of respondents showed extreme dissatisfaction with its performance, when combined with those who rated it as poor, they comprised almost a third of all respondents (29%). The univariate or overall results for this question are set out in Figure 4.

The perceptions and opinions of respondents were similar across different age groups and for men and women.

Approximately 40% of all respondents rated the CA II's performance as fair. When it comes to those who rated its performance as good and very good, the hill Brahmin/Chhetris and hill Dalits show significantly greater satisfaction than the Madhesi Brahmins and Dalits.



**Figure 4.** Distribution of respondents on the performance of the CA II

In terms of development region, the percentage of respondents in the Central Region who rated the CA II's performance as poor or very poor (combined total of 41%) was almost equivalent to those who thought it has done a fair job (42%). Only 17% of those in the Central Region thought that the CA II's performance was good or very good, compared to 41–42% of respondents in the Eastern, Mid Western and Far Western regions.

Finally, comparing the views of respondents in the three ecological zones, while the largest number of respondents in all regions rated the CA II's performance as fair, the percentage of respondents in the hills who gave this rating was nearly 10 percentage points higher than for respondents in the Terai (Tables 9–13).

Gender	Very good		Good		Fair		Poor		Very poor		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Female	103	4.4	605	25.9	949	40.7	523	22.4	154	6.6	2,334
Male	289	4.8	1,633	26.8	2,387	39.2	1,297	21.3	478	7.9	6,084
<b>Total</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>2,238</b>	<b>26.6</b>	<b>3,336</b>	<b>39.6</b>	<b>1,820</b>	<b>21.6</b>	<b>632</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>8,418</b>

**Table 10. Distribution of respondents on the performance of the CA II by age**

Age group	Very good		Good		Fair		Poor		Very poor		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
18–25	68	5.6	309	25.3	487	40.0	269	22.1	86	7.1	1,219
26–35	129	4.8	749	27.9	1,009	37.6	593	22.1	207	7.7	2,687
36–45	100	4.5	577	26.2	886	40.3	467	21.2	169	7.7	2,199
46–55	65	4.8	370	27.2	548	40.4	275	20.3	100	7.4	1,358
56 or above	30	3.1	233	24.3	407	42.5	217	22.7	70	7.3	957
<b>Total</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>2,238</b>	<b>26.6</b>	<b>3,337</b>	<b>39.6</b>	<b>1,821</b>	<b>21.6</b>	<b>632</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>8,420</b>

**Table 11. Distribution of respondents on the performance of the CA II by ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Very good		Good		Fair		Poor		Very poor		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Hill Brahmin/ Chhetri	198	5.2	1,124	29.5	1,478	38.8	796	20.9	218	5.7	3,814
Madhesi Brahmin	4	3.4	23	19.5	34	28.8	41	34.7	16	13.6	118
Madhesi	31	2.7	220	18.9	454	39.0	288	24.7	172	14.8	1,165
Hill Dalit	36	6.0	158	26.3	255	42.5	118	19.7	33	5.5	600
Madhesi Dalit	2	1.7	23	19.7	47	40.2	31	26.5	14	12.0	117
Janajati	78	4.5	450	25.8	754	43.2	367	21.0	97	5.6	1,746
Adhibasi	33	5.8	181	31.9	199	35.0	115	20.2	40	7.0	568
Muslim	7	3.4	46	22.4	81	39.5	47	22.9	24	11.7	205
Other	3	3.4	13	14.9	35	40.2	18	20.7	18	20.7	87
<b>Total</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>2,238</b>	<b>26.6</b>	<b>3,337</b>	<b>39.6</b>	<b>1,821</b>	<b>21.6</b>	<b>632</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>8,420</b>

**Table 12. Distribution of respondents on the performance of the CA II by development region**

Development region	Very good		Good		Fair		Poor		Very poor		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Eastern	89	4.4	733	36.1	742	36.5	324	15.9	144	7.1	2,032
Central	37	1.3	433	15.2	1,206	42.3	890	31.2	283	9.9	2,849
Western	92	5.6	461	28.2	650	39.8	316	19.3	116	7.1	1,635
Mid Western	112	9.7	359	31	453	39.1	176	15.2	58	5	1,158
Far West	62	8.3	252	33.8	286	38.3	115	15.4	31	4.2	746
<b>Total</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>2,238</b>	<b>26.6</b>	<b>3,337</b>	<b>39.6</b>	<b>1,821</b>	<b>21.6</b>	<b>632</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>8,420</b>

**Table 13. Distribution of respondents on the performance of the CA II by ecological zone**


Ecological zone	Very good		Good		Fair		Poor		Very poor		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Terai	179	4.4	1,174	29.0	1,438	35.5	862	21.3	402	9.9	4,055
Hill	154	4.3	825	22.9	1,584	44.0	831	23.1	207	5.7	3,601
Mountain	59	7.7	239	31.3	315	41.2	128	16.8	23	3.0	764
<b>Total</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>2,238</b>	<b>26.6</b>	<b>3,337</b>	<b>39.6</b>	<b>1,821</b>	<b>21.6</b>	<b>632</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>8,420</b>



## Trust and confidence in CA II to deliver the constitution

*How much trust and confidence do you have at this time that CA II will deliver a constitution?*

Respondents demonstrated a high level of optimism that the CA II would deliver a new constitution, with nearly 50% stating that their trust and confidence was somewhat high or very high. The breakdown of responses is set out in Figure 5.



In terms of gender, more males than females indicated a somewhat high or high level of trust and confidence in the CA II’s ability to deliver the constitution (52% men; 44% women). There was little difference in the level of confidence and trust on the basis of age. With respect to ethnicity, more hill Brahmin/Chhetris than Madhesi Dalits had a very high level of trust and combining those who with a somewhat high and very high level of confidence, the difference was almost 19 percentage points. The Far West and Eastern regions demonstrated the highest level of confidence and trust with the Far West Region’s level exceeding that of the Central Region by 19 percentage points (at almost 61%). Finally, among the three ecological zones, the proportion of respondents in the mountains with somewhat high and very high levels of confidence and trust was 20 percentage points higher than for respondents in the Terai (see Tables 14–18).

Gender	Very high		Somewhat high		Neutral		Somewhat low		Very low		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Female	232	9.9	800	34.3	944	40.4	216	9.3	142	6.1	2,334
Male	818	13.4	2,335	38.4	2,099	34.5	455	7.5	377	6.2	6,084
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,050</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>3,135</b>	<b>37.2</b>	<b>3,043</b>	<b>36.1</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>8,418</b>

**Table 15. Distribution of respondents on trust and confidence in CA II to deliver Constitution by age**

Age group	Very high		Somewhat high		Neutral		Somewhat low		Very low		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
18–25	153	12.6	404	33.1	467	38.3	110	9.0	85	7.0	1,219
26–35	338	12.6	1,000	37.2	956	35.6	228	8.5	165	6.1	2,687
36–45	274	12.5	881	40.1	752	34.2	159	7.2	133	6.0	2,199
46–55	179	13.2	521	38.4	471	34.7	98	7.2	89	6.6	1,358
56 or above	106	11.1	329	34.4	397	41.5	76	7.9	49	5.1	957
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,050</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>3,135</b>	<b>37.2</b>	<b>3,043</b>	<b>36.1</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>8,420</b>

**Table 16. Distribution of respondents on trust and confidence in CA II to deliver constitution by ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Very high		Somewhat high		Neutral		Somewhat low		Very low		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Hill Brahmin/ Chhetri	585	15.3	1,589	41.7	1,156	30.3	299	7.8	185	4.9	3,814
Madhesi Brahmin	6	5.1	30	25.4	55	46.6	7	5.9	20	16.9	118
Madhesi	94	8.1	327	28.1	510	43.8	102	8.8	132	11.3	1,165
Hill Dalit	76	12.7	224	37.3	232	38.7	38	6.3	30	5.0	600
Madhesi Dalit	8	6.8	37	31.6	49	41.9	12	10.3	11	9.4	117
Janajati	209	12.0	647	37.1	661	37.9	151	8.6	78	4.5	1,746
Adhibasi	50	8.8	189	33.3	248	43.7	47	8.3	34	6.0	568
Muslim	15	7.3	64	31.2	91	44.4	11	5.4	24	11.7	205
Other	7	8.0	28	32.2	41	47.1	4	4.6	7	8.0	87
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,050</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>3,135</b>	<b>37.2</b>	<b>3,043</b>	<b>36.1</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>8,420</b>

**Table 17. Distribution of respondents on trust and confidence in CA II to deliver constitution by development region**

Development region	Very high		Somewhat high		Neutral		Somewhat low		Very low		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Eastern	266	13.1	911	44.8	642	31.6	135	6.6	78	3.8	2,032
Central	223	7.8	959	33.7	1,084	38.0	313	11.0	270	9.5	2,849
Western	205	12.5	547	33.5	710	43.4	98	6.0	75	4.6	1,635
Mid Western	240	20.7	382	33.0	393	33.9	77	6.6	66	5.7	1,158
Far West	116	15.5	336	45.0	214	28.7	48	6.4	32	4.3	746
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,050</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>3,135</b>	<b>37.2</b>	<b>3,043</b>	<b>36.1</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>8,420</b>


**Table 18. Distribution of respondents on trust and confidence in CA II to deliver constitution by ecological zone**

Ecological zone	Very high		Somewhat high		Neutral		Somewhat low		Very low		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Terai	427	10.5	1,373	33.9	1,620	40.0	318	7.8	317	7.8	4,055
Hill	458	12.7	1,432	39.8	1,237	34.4	302	8.4	172	4.8	3,601
Mountain	165	21.6	330	43.2	186	24.3	51	6.7	32	4.2	764
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,050</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>3,135</b>	<b>37.2</b>	<b>3,043</b>	<b>36.1</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>8,420</b>

# Most important constitutional issue

## *What do you think is the most important constitutional issue?*

Federalism was by far the most important constitutional issue, with half of all respondents selecting it from a list of seven issues, with the option to name any issue not listed. In second and third place were social inclusion and rights of women with 10% of all respondents identifying them as the most important issues. The univariate or overall responses to this question are set out in Figure 6.



Comparing male and female perspectives, it is interesting to note that, while both genders identified federalism as the most important issue, more males than females selected it (56% men; 35% women). The second most important issue for males was social inclusion, whereas for females it was rights of women. However, the difference in percentage between males’ first and second choices was almost 46 percentage points, whereas for females the difference was only 2 percentage points (almost evenly split). The third choice for females was social inclusion with almost 10% selecting it as the most important issue.

Less than 1% of male respondents identified women’s rights as the most important issue. This might be a reflection of Nepal’s dominant patriarchal mind-set. On the other hand, as the question required respondents to select a single issue as most important, it is possible that male respondents consider rights of women as more important than the data, on its face, suggests. Male respondents may also have considered federalism and social inclusion as addressing and encompassing the rights of women. It is interesting to note that the proportion of respondents under the age of 35 who selected rights of women as the most important issue was higher than those over that age, suggesting a possible generational shift on this issue.

With respect to ethnicity, the percentage of Madhesi Brahmins who selected federalism as the most important constitutional issue was almost 33 percentage points higher than their hill counterparts. Similarly, the percentage of Madhesi Dalits who selected this issue was over 40 percentage points higher than their hill counterparts. A higher percentage of Muslim respondents also selected federalism, with hill Brahmin/Chhetris and hill Dalits comprising the lowest percentage of respondents who identified federalism as most important. Respondents from the Far West Region comprised the lowest percentage of those considering federalism as the most important issue and the Terai ecological zone comprised the highest percentage of those who selected federalism (see Tables 20–24).

**Table 19. Distribution of respondents on most important constitutional issue by gender**

Gender	Federalism		Judicial system		Electoral system		Forms of governance		Social inclusion		Fundamental rights		Rights of women		Other		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Female	813	34.8	170	7.3	66	2.8	135	5.8	225	9.6	132	5.7	767	32.9	26	1.1	2,334
Male	3,430	56.4	527	8.7	272	4.5	582	9.6	650	10.7	477	7.8	56	0.9	90	1.5	6,084
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,243</b>	<b>50.4</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>875</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>609</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>823</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>8,418</b>

**Table 20. Distribution of respondents on most important constitutional issue by age**

Age group	Federalism		Judicial system		Electoral system		Forms of governance		Social inclusion		Fundamental rights		Rights of women		Other		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
18–25	553	45.4	112	9.2	60	4.9	109	8.9	117	9.6	87	7.1	167	13.7	14	1.1	1,219
26–35	1,361	50.7	241	9.0	99	3.7	236	8.8	270	10	172	6.4	277	10.3	31	1.2	2,687
36–45	1,144	52.0	159	7.2	82	3.7	192	8.7	235	10.7	147	6.7	213	9.7	27	1.2	2,199
46–55	710	52.3	108	8.0	54	4.0	116	8.5	142	10.5	101	7.4	103	7.6	24	1.8	1,358
56 or above	476	49.7	77	8.0	43	4.5	64	6.7	112	11.7	102	10.7	63	6.6	20	2.1	957
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,244</b>	<b>50.4</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>876</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>609</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>823</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>8,420</b>

**Table 21. Distribution of respondents on most important constitutional issue by ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Federalism		Judicial system		Electoral system		Forms of governance		Social inclusion		Fundamental rights		Rights of women		Other		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Hill Brahmin/Chhetri	1,691	44.3	416	10.9	210	5.5	441	11.6	317	8.3	303	7.9	392	10.3	44	1.2	3,814
Madhesi Brahmin	91	77.1	5	4.2	6	5.1	2	1.7	5	4.2	5	4.2	0	0.0	4	3.4	118
Madhesi	864	74.2	37	3.2	24	2.1	40	3.4	71	6.1	48	4.1	56	4.8	25	2.1	1,165
Hill Dalit	198	33.0	37	6.2	20	3.3	49	8.2	165	27.5	56	9.3	67	11.2	8	1.3	600
Madhesi Dalit	86	73.5	5	4.3	1	0.9	5	4.3	15	12.8	1	0.9	4	3.4	0	0.0	117
Janajati	845	48.4	129	7.4	46	2.6	134	7.7	218	12.5	121	6.9	228	13.1	25	1.4	1,746
Adhibasi	282	49.6	48	8.5	18	3.2	39	6.9	62	10.9	58	10.2	55	9.7	6	1.1	568
Muslim	132	64.4	9	4.4	12	5.9	5	2.4	18	8.8	8	3.9	19	9.3	2	1.0	205
Other	55	63.2	11	12.6	1	1.1	2	2.3	5	5.7	9	10.3	2	2.3	2	2.3	87
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,244</b>	<b>50.4</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>876</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>609</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>823</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>8,420</b>

**Table 22. Distribution of respondents on most important constitutional issue by development region**

Development region	Federalism		Judicial system		Electoral system		Forms of governance		Social inclusion		Fundamental rights		Rights of women		Other		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Eastern	1,099	54.1	226	11.1	64	3.1	95	4.7	215	10.6	156	7.7	155	7.6	22	1.1	2,032
Central	1,491	52.3	190	6.7	136	4.8	282	9.9	265	9.3	133	4.7	294	10.3	58	2.0	2,849

Western	833	50.9	101	6.2	57	3.5	180	11.0	158	9.7	117	7.2	179	10.9	10	0.6	1,635
Mid Western	516	44.6	64	5.5	27	2.3	80	6.9	152	13.1	158	13.6	141	12.2	20	1.7	1,158
Far West	305	40.9	116	15.5	54	7.2	80	10.7	86	11.5	45	6.0	54	7.2	6	0.8	746
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,244</b>	<b>50.4</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>876</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>609</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>823</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>8,420</b>


**Table 23. Distribution of respondents on most important constitutional issue by ecological zone**

Ecological zone	Federalism		Judicial system		Electoral system		Forms of governance		Social inclusion		Fundamental rights		Rights of women		Other		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Terai	2,369	58.4	299	7.4	138	3.4	237	5.8	408	10.1	272	6.7	279	6.9	53	1.3	4,055
Hill	1,568	43.5	290	8.1	151	4.2	419	11.6	375	10.4	286	7.9	454	12.6	58	1.6	3,601
Mountain	307	40.2	108	14.1	49	6.4	61	8.0	93	12.2	51	6.7	90	11.8	5	0.7	764
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,244</b>	<b>50.4</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>876</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>609</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>823</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>8,420</b>

## Awareness of development projects by CA representatives

*Are you aware of any development projects in your constituency initiated by your CA representative?*

Almost 50% of all respondents indicated that they either were not aware of any development projects initiated by their CA representative in their constituency or were aware and there were none. Another 34% said that there were 1–3 projects in their constituency and fewer than 8% acknowledged the existence of six or more projects. The details of the overall responses are set out in Figure 7.



More females than males indicated that they did not know of any development projects initiated by their CA representative (40% women; 27% men). Janajatis and hill Dalits also indicated a lack of awareness on this question (39%). All age groups were equally aware or unaware of the presence of development projects (see Tables 26–30).

**Table 24. Distribution of respondents' awareness of development projects initiated by their CA representative by gender**

Gender	0		1 to 3		3 to 5		6 or more		Do not know		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Female	436	18.7	681	29.2	170	7.3	113	4.8	934	40	2,334
Male	1,147	18.9	2,137	35.1	630	10.4	524	8.6	1,646	27.1	6,084
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,583</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>2,818</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>637</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>2,580</b>	<b>30.6</b>	<b>8,418</b>

**Table 25. Distribution of respondents' awareness of development projects initiated by their CA representative by age**

Age group	0		1 to 3		3 to 5		6 or more		Do not know		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
18–25	245	20.1	399	32.7	116	9.5	73	6.0	386	31.7	1,219
26–35	501	18.6	898	33.4	267	9.9	216	8.0	805	30.0	2,687
36–45	407	18.5	784	35.7	208	9.5	170	7.7	630	28.6	2,199
46–55	247	18.2	463	34.1	121	8.9	108	8.0	419	30.9	1,358
56 or above	183	19.1	274	28.6	88	9.2	70	7.3	342	35.7	957
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,583</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>2,818</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>637</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>2,582</b>	<b>30.7</b>	<b>8,420</b>

**Table 26. Distribution of respondents' awareness of development projects initiated by their CA representative by ethnicity**

Ethnicity	0		1 to 3		3 to 5		6 or more		Do not know		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Hill Brahmin/ Chhetri	680	17.8	1,351	35.4	389	10.2	369	9.7	1,025	26.9	3,814
Madhesi Brahmin	29	24.6	35	29.7	9	7.6	7	5.9	38	32.2	118
Madhesi	301	25.8	365	31.3	116	10	67	5.8	316	27.1	1,165
Hill Dalit	80	13.3	184	30.7	58	9.7	45	7.5	233	38.8	600
Madhesi Dalit	29	24.8	37	31.6	6	5.1	9	7.7	36	30.8	117
Janajati	269	15.4	548	31.4	150	8.6	100	5.7	679	38.9	1,746
Adhibasi	116	20.4	196	34.5	41	7.2	30	5.3	185	32.6	568
Muslim	58	28.3	73	35.6	20	9.8	5	2.4	49	23.9	205
Other	21	24.1	29	33.3	11	12.6	5	5.7	21	24.1	87
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,583</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>2,818</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>637</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>2,582</b>	<b>30.7</b>	<b>8,420</b>

**Table 27. Distribution of respondents' awareness of development projects initiated by their CA representative by development region**

Development region	0		1 to 3		3 to 5		6 or more		Do not know		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Eastern	330	16.2	848	41.7	197	9.7	117	5.8	540	26.6	2,032
Central	701	24.6	797	28.0	169	5.9	133	4.7	1,049	36.8	2,849
Western	272	16.6	401	24.5	195	11.9	218	13.3	549	33.6	1,635
Mid Western	127	11.0	500	43.2	175	15.1	80	6.9	276	23.8	1,158
Far West	153	20.5	272	36.5	64	8.6	89	11.9	168	22.5	746
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,583</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>2,818</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>637</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>2,582</b>	<b>30.7</b>	<b>8,420</b>

**Table 28. Distribution of respondents' awareness of development projects initiated by their CA representative by ecological zone**


Ecological zone	0		1 to 3		3 to 5		6 or more		Do not know		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Terai	844	20.8	1,491	36.8	405	10.0	242	6.0	1,073	26.5	4,055
Hill	644	17.9	1,100	30.5	329	9.1	281	7.8	1,247	34.6	3,601
Mountain	95	12.4	227	29.7	66	8.6	114	14.9	262	34.3	764
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,583</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>2,818</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>637</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>2,582</b>	<b>30.7</b>	<b>8,420</b>

## Changes expected from new constitution

### *What change in the country do you expect from the new constitution?*

With respect to respondent expectations flowing from the new constitution, 52% indicated that they expected increased development and almost 19% expected better services from the government. The univariate or overall responses are set out in Figure 8.

Expectations about change were virtually the same between genders and across age groups. All three Madhesi and Muslim respondent groups expected increased development from the constitution, ranging from 60–64%, whereas the percentage of those in other ethnic groups expecting increased development was 47–51%. A higher percentage of those from the Eastern and Central regions expected increased development than those from the Western, Mid Western and Far West regions; similarly, those in the mountain zone had higher expectations of increased development than those in the Terai and hill zones. The Mid Western Region had the highest percentage of respondents expecting no more violent conflict (see Tables 32–36).



**Figure 8.** Distribution of respondents' expectations of change from the new constitution

**Table 29.** Distribution of respondents' expectations from the new constitution by gender

Gender	Increased development		More inclusive political system		No more violent conflict		Better services from the government		Other		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Female	1,187	50.9	237	10.2	376	16.1	506	21.7	28	1.2	2,334
Male	3,228	53.1	930	15.3	746	12.3	1,059	17.4	121	2.0	6,084
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,415</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>1,167</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>1,122</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>1,565</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>8,418</b>

**Table 30.** Distribution of respondents' expectations from the new constitution by age group

Age group	Increased development		More inclusive political system		No more violent conflict		Better services from the government		Other		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
18–25	697	57.2	131	10.7	147	12.1	228	18.7	16	1.3	1,219
26–35	1,393	51.8	402	15.0	359	13.4	484	18.0	49	1.8	2,687
36–45	1,119	50.9	332	15.1	292	13.3	408	18.6	48	2.2	2,199
46–55	698	51.4	195	14.4	178	13.1	269	19.8	18	1.3	1,358
56 or above	508	53.1	108	11.3	147	15.4	176	18.4	18	1.9	957
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,415</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>1,168</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>1,123</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>1,565</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>8,420</b>

**Table 31. Distribution of respondents' expectations from the new constitution by ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Increased development		More inclusive political system		No more violent conflict		Better services from the government		Other		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Hill Brahmin/Chhetri	1,912	50.1	476	12.5	574	15.0	786	20.6	66	1.7	3,814
Madhesi Brahmin	74	62.7	18	15.3	10	8.5	9	7.6	7	5.9	118
Madhesi	721	61.9	179	15.4	92	7.9	152	13.0	21	1.8	1,165
Hill Dalit	280	46.7	106	17.7	77	12.8	127	21.2	10	1.7	600
Madhesi Dalit	75	64.1	18	15.4	9	7.7	15	12.8	0	0.0	117
Janajati	896	51.3	256	14.7	248	14.2	320	18.3	26	1.5	1,746
Adhibasi	284	50.0	72	12.7	92	16.2	109	19.2	11	1.9	568
Muslim	122	59.5	28	13.7	15	7.3	34	16.6	6	2.9	205
Other	51	58.6	15	17.2	6	6.9	13	14.9	2	2.3	87
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,415</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>1,168</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>1,123</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>1,565</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>8,420</b>

**Table 32. Distribution of respondents' expectations from the new constitution by development region**

Development region	Increased development		More inclusive political system		No more violent conflict		Better services from the government		Other		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Eastern	1,140	56.1	302	14.9	226	11.1	330	16.2	34	1.7	2,032
Central	1,583	55.6	338	11.9	309	10.8	540	19.0	79	2.8	2,849
Western	757	46.3	285	17.4	251	15.4	328	20.1	14	0.9	1,635
Mid Western	585	50.5	108	9.3	234	20.2	220	19.0	11	0.9	1,158
Far West	350	46.9	135	18.1	103	13.8	147	19.7	11	1.5	746
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,415</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>1,168</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>1,123</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>1,565</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>8,420</b>

**Table 33. Distribution of respondents' expectations from the new constitution by ecological zone**

Ecological zone	Increased development		More inclusive political system		No more violent conflict		Better services from the government		Other		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Terai	2,185	53.9	617	15.2	508	12.5	671	16.5	74	1.8	4,055
Hill	1,755	48.7	457	12.7	525	14.6	804	22.3	60	1.7	3,601
Mountain	475	62.2	94	12.3	90	11.8	90	11.8	15	2	764
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,415</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>1,168</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>1,123</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>1,565</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>8,420</b>



## Summary and Conclusions

This survey was conducted to assess people's perceptions of CA II and their expectations of the constitution once promulgated. A total of 8,420 voters were interviewed from all 240 of Nepal's election constituencies on six key questions. The responses to each question were analysed overall as well as according to gender, age, ethnicity, development region and ecological zone. As the sample size is statistically relevant, the results can be extrapolated to the entire Nepal electorate.

**The main conclusions and findings for each question are as follows:**

- **Performance of CA representatives during constitution building process:** When asked about their particular CA representative's performance during the constitution building process, the majority of respondents rated it as fair (39%) and a further 30% rated their performance as good or very good. A significant proportion were dissatisfied with their CA representative's performance (32%), rating it as poor or very poor.
- **Overall performance of CA II:** With regard to overall performance of the CA II, only 31% of all respondents rated its performance as good or very good, with nearly 40% rating it as fair.
- **Trust and confidence in CA to deliver the constitution:** Respondents showed a little more optimism when asked about the CA II's ability to deliver a new constitution, with nearly half (almost 48%) expressing their trust and confidence as somewhat high or very high. Trust was highest (nearly 61% for somewhat high or very high combined) in the Far West Development Region.
- **Most important constitutional issue:** Federalism topped the list of what respondent's considered to be the most important constitutional issue, with slightly more than 50% selecting it. However, the importance of federalism fluctuated significantly among ethnic groups with the highest interest shown by all Madhesis groups (at 75%), and the lowest by hill Dalits (at 33%). Women were split on which issue they considered most important, with approximately 35% citing federalism (compared to 56% of men) and 33% citing women's issues as most important. In contrast, less than 1% of men identified women's rights as the most important issue.
- **Awareness of development projects by CA representatives:** Approximately 50% of all respondents stated that they were not aware of any development activities in their constituency or that there were none. Another 34% said that they were aware of 1–3 projects.
- **Changes expected from new constitution:** Respondents seemed optimistic about the benefits that the new constitution would bring. More than half (52%) of respondents expected an increase in development after promulgation of the new constitution and almost 19% expected better services. These figures were roughly consistent for men and women and across all groups.

# Annex 1

## Survey Questionnaire

1. **How would you rate the performance of your representatives during the constitution building process?**

[Select one answer]

- a. Very good
- b. Good
- c. Fair
- d. Poor
- e. Very poor

2. **How would you rate the overall performance of the CA II?**

[Select one answer]

- a. Very good
- b. Good
- c. Fair
- d. Poor
- e. Very poor

3. **How much trust and confidence do you have at this time that the CA II will deliver a constitution?**

[Select one answer]

- a. Very high
- b. Somewhat high
- c. Neutral
- d. Somewhat low
- e. Very low

4. **What do you think is the most important constitutional issue?**

[Select one answer]

- a. Federalism
- b. Judicial system
- c. Electoral system
- d. Forms of governanceSocial inclusion
- e. Fundamental rights
- f. Rights of women
- g. Other (free to submit an open answer)

**5. Are you aware of any development projects in your constituency initiated by your CA representatives?**

[Select one answer]

- a. 0
- b. 1–3
- c. 3–5
- d. 6 or more
- e. Do not know

**6. What change in the country do you expect from the new constitution?**

[Select one answer]

- a. Increased development
- b. More inclusive political system
- c. No more violent conflict
- d. Better services from the government
- e. Other (free to submit an open answer)

## Annex 2

### Planned Sample Distribution

Zone		District	Region	Population size	Proportion	30 from each	Proportional allocation	Maintaining 30
Mechi	1	Taplejung	1	32,950	0.002712411	30	20	30
			2	25,859	0.002128687	30	15	30
	2	Panchthar	1	50,187	0.004131343	30	30	30
			2	45,610	0.003754569	30	27	30
	3	Ilam	1	59,816	0.004923993	30	35	35
			2	51,747	0.004259761	30	31	31
			3	51,991	0.004279847	30	31	31
	4	Jhapa	1	64,303	0.005293358	30	38	38
			2	64,879	0.005340774	30	38	38
			3	59,486	0.004896828	30	35	35
			4	72,387	0.005958825	30	43	43
			5	70,715	0.005821188	30	42	42
			6	49,690	0.004090431	30	29	30
			7	73,031	0.006011838	30	43	43
Koshi	5	Sankhuwasabha	1	40,234	0.003312022	30	24	30
			2	41,003	0.003375326	30	24	30
	6	Tehrathum	1	52,426	0.004315655	30	31	31
	7	Bhojpur	1	46,070	0.003792436	30	27	30
			2	44,873	0.0036939	30	27	30
	8	Dhankuta	1	43,384	0.003571327	30	26	30
			2	39,248	0.003230856	30	23	30
	9	Morang	1	54,722	0.00450466	30	32	32
			2	53,345	0.004391307	30	32	32
			3	56,016	0.004611181	30	33	33
			4	48,140	0.003962836	30	29	30
			5	53,073	0.004368916	30	31	31
			6	57,473	0.004731119	30	34	34
			7	59,255	0.004877812	30	35	35
			8	56,565	0.004656374	30	34	34
			9	56,844	0.004679341	30	34	34
	10	Sunsari	1	65,789	0.005415684	30	39	39
			2	76,390	0.006288348	30	45	45
			3	61,856	0.005091924	30	37	37
		4	58,191	0.004790224	30	34	34	
		5	53,634	0.004415097	30	32	32	
		6	56,294	0.004634065	30	33	33	
Sagarmatha	11	Solukhumbu	1	5-2,749	0.004342245	30	31	31
	12	Khotang	1	50,063	0.004121136	30	30	30
			2	49,601	0.004083104	30	29	30
	13	Okhaldhunga	1	39,670	0.003265594	30	24	30
			2	40,858	0.003363389	30	24	30

	14	Udaypur	1	51,278	0.004221153	30	30	30
			2	48,339	0.003979218	30	29	30
			3	43,271	0.003562025	30	26	30
	15	Saptari	1	54,838	0.004514209	30	33	33
			2	45,727	0.003764201	30	27	30
			3	50,550	0.004161225	30	30	30
			4	47,775	0.00393279	30	28	30
			5	48,018	0.003952793	30	28	30
			6	47,799	0.003934765	30	28	30
	16	Siraha	1	46,918	0.003862242	30	28	30
			2	48,700	0.004008935	30	29	30
			3	50,041	0.004119325	30	30	30
			4	44,261	0.003643521	30	26	30
			5	49,133	0.004044579	30	29	30
		6	52,073	0.004286597	30	31	31	
<b>Janakpur</b>	17	Dolakha	1	55,877	0.004599738	30	33	33
			2	55,197	0.004543761	30	33	33
	18	Ramechhap	1	55,315	0.004553475	30	33	33
			2	56,406	0.004643285	30	33	33
	19	Sindhuli	1	41,269	0.003397222	30	24	30
			2	53,998	0.004445061	30	32	32
			3	44,852	0.003692171	30	27	30
	20	Dhanusha	1	46,180	0.003801491	30	27	30
			2	44,720	0.003681305	30	27	30
			3	47,887	0.00394201	30	28	30
			4	53,097	0.004370892	30	31	31
			5	47,447	0.003905789	30	28	30
			6	49,046	0.004037417	30	29	30
			7	49,351	0.004062525	30	29	30
	21	Mahottari	1	44,186	0.003637347	30	26	30
			2	43,742	0.003600797	30	26	30
			3	47,287	0.003892618	30	28	30
			4	43,375	0.003570586	30	26	30
			5	44,547	0.003667064	30	26	30
			6	44,227	0.003640722	30	26	30
22	Sarlahi	1	51,278	0.004221153	30	30	30	
		2	55,079	0.004534048	30	33	33	
		3	54,819	0.004512645	30	32	32	
		4	54,147	0.004457326	30	32	32	
		5	53,171	0.004376983	30	32	32	
		6	52,155	0.004293347	30	31	31	
<b>Bagmati</b>	23	Rasuwa	1	23,533	0.001937213	30	14	30
	24	Dhading	1	43,526	0.003583016	30	26	30
			2	63,626	0.005237628	30	38	38
			3	63,886	0.005259031	30	38	38
	25	Nuwakot	1	55,222	0.004545819	30	33	33

		2	50,435	0.004151758	30	30	30	
		3	49,360	0.004063265	30	29	30	
26	Kathmandu	1	39,164	0.003223941	30	23	30	
		2	63,873	0.005257961	30	38	38	
		3	45,905	0.003778853	30	27	30	
		4	56,887	0.00468288	30	34	34	
		5	55,377	0.004558579	30	33	33	
		6	50,854	0.00418625	30	30	30	
		7	53,090	0.004370315	30	31	31	
		8	46,430	0.003822071	30	28	30	
		9	57,957	0.004770962	30	34	34	
		10	62,573	0.005150946	30	37	37	
27	Bhaktapur	1	67,340	0.005543361	30	40	40	
		2	82,218	0.006768103	30	49	49	
28	Lalitpur	1	55,119	0.004537341	30	33	33	
		2	67,193	0.00553126	30	40	40	
		3	77,892	0.006411991	30	46	46	
29	Kavrepalanchowk	1	45,961	0.003783463	30	27	30	
		2	51,357	0.004227656	30	30	30	
		3	57,249	0.00471268	30	34	34	
		4	54,059	0.004450082	30	32	32	
30	Sindhupalchowk	1	64,825	0.005336329	30	38	38	
		2	53,987	0.004444155	30	32	32	
		3	52,292	0.004304625	30	31	31	
Narayani	31	Makwanpur	1	45,480	0.003743868	30	27	30
			2	44,939	0.003699333	30	27	30
			3	62,013	0.005104848	30	37	37
			4	39,802	0.003276461	30	24	30
	32	Rautahat	1	45,642	0.003757203	30	27	30
			2	42,728	0.003517326	30	25	30
			3	46,158	0.00379968	30	27	30
			4	49,247	0.004053963	30	29	30
			5	46,659	0.003840922	30	28	30
			6	49,438	0.004069686	30	29	30
	33	Bara	1	48,097	0.003959297	30	29	30
			2	47,500	0.003910152	30	28	30
			3	50,353	0.004145008	30	30	30
			4	50,128	0.004126486	30	30	30
			5	47,180	0.00388381	30	28	30
			6	53,270	0.004385133	30	32	32
	34	Parsa	1	53,582	0.004410816	30	32	32
			2	48,879	0.00402367	30	29	30
			3	49,316	0.004059643	30	29	30
			4	48,436	0.003987203	30	29	30
		5	51,658	0.004252434	30	31	31	
35	Chitwan	1	53,972	0.004442921	30	32	32	

		2	60,058	0.004943914	30	36	36	
		3	54,765	0.0045082	30	32	32	
		4	59,693	0.004913868	30	35	35	
		5	45,315	0.003730285	30	27	30	
<b>Gandaki</b>	36	Gorkha	1	51,401	0.004231279	30	30	30
			2	45,567	0.00375103	30	27	30
			3	41,689	0.003431796	30	25	30
	37	Manang	1	4,795	0.00039472	30	3	30
	38	Lamjung	1	41,602	0.003424635	30	25	30
			2	46,946	0.003864547	30	28	30
	39	Kaski	1	54,663	0.004499803	30	32	32
			2	48,625	0.004002761	30	29	30
			3	41,218	0.003393024	30	24	30
			4	53,162	0.004376242	30	32	32
	40	Tanahun	1	51,164	0.004211769	30	30	30
			2	57,959	0.004771126	30	34	34
			3	53,645	0.004416002	30	32	32
	41	Syangja	1	57,279	0.00471515	30	34	34
			2	53,372	0.004393529	30	32	32
		3	52,228	0.004299356	30	31	31	
<b>Lumbini</b>	42	Gulmi	1	39,270	0.003232667	30	23	30
			2	60,384	0.00497075	30	36	36
			3	51,010	0.004199092	30	30	30
	43	Palpa	1	45,173	0.003718596	30	27	30
			2	45,115	0.003713821	30	27	30
			3	45,893	0.003777865	30	27	30
	44	Arghakhanchi	1	50,682	0.004172091	30	30	30
			2	56,550	0.004655139	30	34	34
	45	Nawalparasi	1	59,998	0.004938975	30	36	36
			2	52,405	0.004313927	30	31	31
			3	57,223	0.00471054	30	34	34
			4	50,943	0.004193576	30	30	30
			5	51,499	0.004239346	30	31	31
			6	45,715	0.003763213	30	27	30
	46	Rupandehi	1	57,413	0.00472618	30	34	34
			2	56,945	0.004687655	30	34	34
			3	63,990	0.005267592	30	38	38
			4	65,204	0.005367528	30	39	39
			5	52,790	0.00434562	30	31	31
			6	49,546	0.004078577	30	29	30
			7	42,427	0.003492548	30	25	30
47	Kapilvastu	1	55,787	0.00459233	30	33	33	
		2	43,958	0.003618578	30	26	30	
		3	44,425	0.003657021	30	26	30	
		4	48,944	0.004029021	30	29	30	
		5	45,743	0.003765518	30	27	30	

Dhawalagiri	48	Mustang	1	6,942	0.000571458	30	4	30
	49	Myagdi	1	56,553	0.004655386	30	34	34
	50	Baglung	1	47,881	0.003941516	30	28	30
			2	39,764	0.003273332	30	24	30
			3	41,401	0.003408089	30	25	30
	51	Parbat	1	45,203	0.003721065	30	27	30
			2	37,871	0.003117503	30	22	30
Rapti	52	Rukum	1	38,542	0.003172739	30	23	30
			2	47,921	0.003944808	30	28	30
	53	Rolpa	1	41,902	0.00344933	30	25	30
			2	52,557	0.004326439	30	31	31
	54	Pyuthan	1	49,627	0.004085245	30	29	30
			2	56,859	0.004680576	30	34	34
	55	Salyan	1	51,349	0.004226998	30	30	30
			2	51,886	0.004271203	30	31	31
	56	Dang	1	46,129	0.003797293	30	27	30
			2	43,047	0.003543586	30	26	30
			3	49,249	0.004054128	30	29	30
			4	51,563	0.004244614	30	31	31
		5	48,749	0.004012969	30	29	30	
Karnali	57	Dolpa	1	14,860	0.00122326	30	9	30
	58	Mugu	1	23,821	0.001960921	30	14	30
	59	Jumla	1	47,445	0.003905625	30	28	30
	60	Kalikot	1	53,534	0.004406865	30	32	32
	61	Humla	1	22,116	0.001820567	30	13	30
Bheri	62	Jajarkot	1	32,965	0.002713646	30	20	30
			2	31,538	0.002596176	30	19	30
	63	Dailekh	1	57,626	0.004743714	30	34	34
			2	56,447	0.00464666	30	33	33
	64	Surkhet	1	47,938	0.003946208	30	28	30
			2	58,901	0.004848671	30	35	35
			3	47,972	0.003949007	30	28	30
	65	Banke	1	59,163	0.004870239	30	35	35
			2	46,796	0.0038522	30	28	30
			3	49,294	0.004057832	30	29	30
			4	53,914	0.004438146	30	32	32
	66	Bardiya	1	54,368	0.004475519	30	32	32
			2	55,876	0.004599656	30	33	33
		3	56,192	0.004625669	30	33	33	
		4	49,953	0.004112081	30	30	30	
Seti	67	Bajura	1	58,810	0.00484118	30	35	35
	68	Achham	1	56,574	0.004657115	30	34	34
			2	56,256	0.004630937	30	33	33
	69	Bajhang	1	40,371	0.0033233	30	24	30
			2	44,541	0.00366657	30	26	30
	70	Doti	1	48,168	0.003965141	30	29	30



			2	41,245	0.003395247	30	24	30
	71	Kailali	1	53,677	0.004418637	30	32	32
			2	52,040	0.00428388	30	31	31
			3	54,884	0.004517996	30	33	33
			4	57,216	0.004709963	30	34	34
			5	57,933	0.004768986	30	34	34
			6	57,911	0.004767175	30	34	34
<b>Mahakali</b>	72	Darchula	1	66,082	0.005439804	30	39	39
	73	Baitadi	1	58,496	0.004815332	30	35	35
			2	55,521	0.004570433	30	33	33
	74	Dadeldhura	1	65,868	0.005422187	30	39	39
	75	Kanchanpur	1	46,740	0.00384759	30	28	30
			2	56,521	0.004652752	30	33	33
			3	48,967	0.004030914	30	29	30
			4	46,692	0.003843638	30	28	30
				12,147,865	1	7,200	7,200	7,675

## Annex 3

### Actual Sample Distribution

Districts	Constituencies										TOTAL
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Taplejung	34	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Panchthar	36	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Ilam	35	31	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Jhapa	40	42	42	43	42	42	43	0	0	0	294
Sankhuwasabha	31	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Tehrathum	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Bhojpur	33	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Dhankuta	29	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Morang	32	33	35	32	31	43	38	34	35	0	313
Sunsari	40	46	38	34	32	33	0	0	0	0	223
Solukhumbu	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Khotang	40	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Okhaldhunga	31	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Udaypur	37	37	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
Saptari	43	40	33	61	36	36	0	0	0	0	249
Siraha	32	35	35	30	35	34	0	0	0	0	201
Dolakha	38	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Ramechhap	35	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Sindhuli	36	35	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Dhanusha	31	31	31	31	34	33	34	0	0	0	225
Mahottari	30	35	35	30	30	30	0	0	0	0	190
Sarlahi	30	38	32	32	33	31	0	0	0	0	196
Rasuwa	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Dhading	34	40	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
Nuwakot	41	33	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
Kathmandu	35	32	40	42	25	33	34	27	43	47	358
Bhaktapur	50	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
Lalitpur	43	42	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
Kavrepalanchowk	32	31	37	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
Sindhupalchowk	34	41	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
Makwanpur	39	45	37	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	160
Rautahat	30	36	32	31	36	29	0	0	0	0	194
Bara	30	32	30	30	41	33	0	0	0	0	196
Parsa	33	36	33	32	33	0	0	0	0	0	167
Chitwan	39	36	32	41	36	0	0	0	0	0	184
Gorkha	30	30	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Manang	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Lamjung	30	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Kaski	32	30	30	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
Tanahun	32	33	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

Syangja	40	40	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
Gulmi	38	36	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Palpa	29	32	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Arghakhanchi	33	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Nawalparasi	38	32	34	30	32	30	0	0	0	0	196
Rupandehi	35	34	39	44	31	30	32	0	0	0	245
Kapilvastu	33	30	32	31	30	0	0	0	0	0	156
Mustang	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Myagdi	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Baglung	38	36	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Parbat	31	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Rukum	30	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Rolpa	30	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Pyuthan	31	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Salyan	30	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Dang	38	39	37	38	51	0	0	0	0	0	203
Dolpa	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Mugu	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Jumla	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Kalikot	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Humla	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Jajarkot	30	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Dailekh	32	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Surkhet	35	35	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Banke	36	36	35	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
Bardiya	33	39	38	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
Bajura	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Achham	35	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Bajhang	28	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Doti	39	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Kailali	33	35	33	36	34	36	0	0	0	0	207
Darchula	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Baitadi	37	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Dadeldhura	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Kanchanpur	30	33	33	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
	2,605	2,179	1,318	856	622	473	181	61	78	47	8,420







International IDEA  
Strömsborg  
SE-103 34 Stockholm  
Sweden  
Email: [info@idea.int](mailto:info@idea.int)

International IDEA, Nepal Office  
Ward no. 4, Baluwatar,  
Kathmandu, Nepal  
Post Box No: 8975, EPC 2865  
Tel: +977-1 4435972, 4432846  
Fax: +977-1 4432846  
Email: [info-nepal@idea.int](mailto:info-nepal@idea.int)  
Website: [www.idea.int](http://www.idea.int)



Rooster Logic Pvt Ltd.  
Campus Marg, Chakupat, Patan  
Dhoka, Lalitpur, Nepal  
Email : [info@roosterlogic.com](mailto:info@roosterlogic.com)  
Tel: + 977- 1 526 1530, 526 0506



OUTLINE Media Pvt. Ltd.  
Thapathali, Kathmandu, Nepal  
Email: [info@outline.com.np](mailto:info@outline.com.np)  
Tel: +977-1 4102103, 4227325

