



## MANAGEMENT RESPONSE (REFLECTION ON THE FINDINGS OF EXTERNAL PROJECT EVALUATIONS)

To be completed by Programme staff at Plan International UK, in collaboration with colleagues who were involved with the project where relevant.

FAD Number	NPL100393
Project Title	Inclusive and adaptive recovery and resilience support for Earthquake affected communities
Project Country	Nepal
Thematic Area	Response and recovery programming
Programme Staff	Tala Budziszewski

Please select recommendations from the evaluation that relate the work of Plan International UK within the project and put them in the first column below.

In the second column please explain whether you agree or disagree with the recommendation and why, and add any other explanatory information that you think is relevant.

The key recommendations from the evaluation were as follows. The ones highlighted in green have been prioritised to take forward or respond to and are further discussed in the table below:

- 1. Greater consistency and improved information sharing need to be practised across the project.
- 2. Conduct more regular on-site monitoring of implementing partner staff, to include consultations with beneficiaries.
- 3. Plan must ensure that Rights and Protection issues are adequately and consistently covered throughout projects like this, from emergency response to recovery and phase out.
- 4. Prior to phase out, Plan International Nepal should organise a capacity building event on Child Protection for newly appoints government structures.

Plan International UK Finsgate 5–7 Cranwood Street London, EC1V 9LH United Kingdom 
 Tel:
 0300 777 9777

 Tel:
 +44 20 7608 1311 (Non-UK)

 www.plan-uk.org
 Registered charity no. 276035

 Registered company no. 1364201,
 Registered office address as shown

Programme countries Bangladesh Benin Bolivia Brazil Burkina Faso Cambodia Cameroon China Colombia Dominican Republic Ecuador Eypyr El Salvador Ethiopia Ghana Guatemala Guinea Guinea-Bissau Hatti Honduras India Indonesia Kenya Laos Liberia Malawi Mali Mozambique Myanmar Nepal Nicaragua Niger Nigeria Pakistan Paraguay Peru Philippines Rwanda Senegal Sierra Leone South Sudan Sri Lanka Sudan Tanzania Thailand Timor Leste Togo Uganda Vietnam Zambia Zimbabwe National Organisations Australia Belgium Canada Colombia Denmark Finland France Germany Hong Kong India Ireland Japan Korea Netherlands Norway Spain Sweden Switzerland United Kingdom United States

- 5. Extreme caution needs to be exercised in matching beneficiary selection with distribution.
- 6. Plan Nepal's local partners need to ensure that all field staff are aware of the support that is destined for beneficiaries and be ready and willing to respond to concerns expressed by beneficiaries.
- Prior to hand over, Plan International Nepal should organise a training event on Disaster Risk Management for newly established structures at the Gaupalika and Ward levels
- 8. Greater clarity is required for community members to understand the status of their local/Ward level disaster preparedness plan.
- Prior to hand over, Plan International Nepal through its local partners should assess the current status of protection structures it helped support, for example the Ward Citizen Forum.
- 10. Future WASH interventions should consider a more balanced approach to hardware and software provision.
- 11. Urgent reflection needs to take place on lessons learned with livelihood support in Phase 2A.
- 12. For the remainder of the project, ECARDS should mobilise communities to appoint one female representative from amongst those livelihood beneficiaries to ensure better and timely two-way communications.
- 13. A comprehensive health check should be made of all livestock being given to beneficiaries and local people should be trained by DLSO in performing animal vaccinations.

Recommendation	Comments
Greater consistency and improved information sharing need to be practised across the project.	<ul> <li>Actions already taken:</li> <li>Already conducted meeting in the presence of Plan programme and operational staff and discussed to make the communication effective based on the recommendation. This will include a learning and sharing event, on-site mentoring of partners during field visits, and weekly follow up sessions.</li> <li>Learning and sharing meeting has been already organised among the partner's staffs.</li> </ul>
	Future actions:
	<ul> <li>For future emergencies, add plans on regular information sharing and using different strategies based on what is</li> </ul>

	most appropriate and relevant to communities to the community engagement plans.
Conduct more regular on-site monitoring of implementing partner staff, to include consultations with beneficiaries.	<ul> <li>Actions already taken:</li> <li>Regular field visits (twice a month) have been ongoing to monitor the project activities including partner staffs and role of partner staffs has been consulted with beneficiaries during field monitoring.</li> <li>Monitoring of partners has been also done through the project staff and through engaging senior management teams of partners.</li> </ul>
	Future actions:
	• Partnership agreements to be reviewed to include greater clarity on responsibilities of monitoring, including more regular monitoring of partners by Plan staff or ensure this is captured in an agreed RACI table if the partnership agreement cannot be amended.
Plan Nepal's local partners need to ensure that all field staff are aware of the support that is destined for beneficiaries and be ready and willing to respond to concerns expressed by beneficiaries.	<ul> <li>Actions:</li> <li>The support was under discussion during evaluation period. Now, Economic Security Coordinator has been finalized the support of beneficiaries and oriented the partner on staff meeting as we have received feedback after the field visit of the external evaluation team.</li> <li>Now the staffs are clear and ready to response the beneficiaries' concerns on support.</li> <li>Plan staffs provide regular support as they required to address beneficiaries' concerns.</li> </ul>
	Future actions:
	<ul> <li>Communicating on beneficiary support packages, entitlements and being able to receive feedback on them to be added to the information sharing plan noted above when looking at community engagement.</li> </ul>

Future WASH interventions should consider a more balanced approach to hardware and software provision.	<ul> <li>Plan is committed to design the program as per the need of the community. Community consultation is carried out during need assessment.</li> </ul>
Urgent reflection needs to take place on lessons learned with livelihood support in Phase 2A.	<ul> <li>Actions:</li> <li>PDM report reflection was already done with district-based staffs of Local partner in 31st august by Economic Security Coordinator.</li> <li>Two event of Learning and sharing meeting was organized in December among the respective partner's staffs separately based on the draft evaluation report.</li> </ul>
	Future actions:
	<ul> <li>Projects that are 6 months or longer or are a continuation/follow on support of a previous project should have at least one learning and reflection session scheduled and budgeted for to include Plan staff and partner staff at interim stage.</li> </ul>
For the remainder of the project, ECARDS should mobilise communities to appoint one female representative from amongst those livelihood beneficiaries to ensure better and timely two-way communications.	<ul> <li>Actions:</li> <li>Based on the informal discussions after evaluation team and Plan UK visit, the project oriented ECARDS staff on identifying improved methods of communication. They have identified 3 female focal persons in each ward through beneficiary consultations. Plan and ECARDS will be able to provide information for them to disseminate and also link with the local government so that they are able to do continued follow up on the implementation of the livelihood plans after closure of the project.</li> </ul>
A comprehensive health check should be made of all livestock being given to beneficiaries and local people should be trained by DLSO in performing animal vaccinations.	<ul> <li>Actions:</li> <li>Beneficiaries are oriented on the role and services that can be provided by DLSO. Plan coordinated with the office for them to appoint staff who would provide orientation to beneficiaries and the office also appointed two technicians to cover 7 wards in Plan's working area. How to get in</li> </ul>

<ul> <li>touch with the technicians and what support they can give was communicated to beneficiaries.</li> <li>Beneficiaries were oriented on vaccination of livestock and the project will undertake follow up visits to monitor this.</li> </ul>
Future actions:
<ul> <li>For future interventions involving livestock, Plan will consider carrying out mass vaccination campaigns and training of individuals in communities on delivering vaccinations as part of the response strategy of livestock support.</li> </ul>

## Based on both the findings of the evaluation and your experience of the project what do you think are the key lessons that can be learned from the project? (In relation to both things that went well and things that could have gone better).

nsistency in the monitoring of quality of their implementation and to community engagement. Ace the necessary support systems to enable the livelihoods to be more successful. equate constant communication with to enable two-way communication k that would more constantly support ovement or make necessary changes. t lessons from earlier stages of the e used in later stages for ts.

## Is there anything you would do differently if you were working on a similar project again? If so, please give details of what and why.

The timelines and approaches for the livelihoods component to be more carefully reviewed with more time allocated for regular follow up and improved communication channels to enable taking more of a mentoring approach or connecting livelihoods beneficiaries to mentors and markets rather than focusing more on limited trainings.

## Are there any other comments you would like to add in relation to the findings of the evaluation, the approach of the evaluator or lessons learned from the project more broadly?

Based on the informal sharing, Plan has already initiated to address the concerns of external evaluation team. Some of the activities were under discussion during the evaluation period so that some of the findings and recommendations have been put in place and steps taken based on both the recommendations of the evaluation team and strategies that were under discussion by the Plan International UK team. These have also been clearly communicated to the partner staffs and there will be a mid-term and after project reflection with the Plan and partner project teams to develop learning documents. Lessons are also going to be shared within Plan Nepal for the office to consider potential risks and mitigation strategies in future projects or adopt some of the key recommendations. Plan has also prepared a phase out plan to guide the local partners during the final stages of the project.