Executive Feedback

**Title of the evaluation**  
FINAL EVALUATION OF THE NATIONAL PLAN OF ACTION FOR CHILDREN 2004-15

**Sequence No**  
2016-002

**Region**  
South Asia Regional Office

**Country**  
Nepal

**Evaluation Type**  
Strategy

**Year of Report**  
2016

**OVERALL RATING**  
Fair

**SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)**  
Fair  
The report provides description of the object and the context in multiple places, meaning that the reader has to flick backwards and forwards to understand a complete picture. This is not ideal, but the information that is present is detailed, relevant and useful. The evaluators do a good job of addressing gaps in the material provided by the NPA, including reconstructing a theory of change

**SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)**  
Satisfactory  
The evaluation treats the plan as a project and looks for attribution, but many of the questions are not attribution questions. The scope is more implicit rather than explicit, leading to lack of clarity in the evaluation.

**SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)**  
Fair  
The methodology section is overall relatively weak. There was an intention to use different sampling methods, and an intention to involve the voice of rights holders. However, a fuel crisis in Nepal, insecurity, and a lack of knowledge of the NPA by national authorities (which would have allowed for positive deviance sampling) severely hampered the evaluation. As a result, the methods - as described - are subject to known problems with validity and limit the evaluation in terms of being able to answer the questions. Whilst is acknowledged that the evaluation team have recognised and clearly stated these limitations, given the severe impact in the quality of evidence available a more appropriate management response would have been to suspend the evaluation until these issues could be addressed.

**SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)**  
Fair
Findings are systematic, but are limited in terms of evidence. Overall, therefore, findings are not robust as most of them only state that there is no information or that it is not possible to respond the evaluation questions. Whilst it is appropriate that the evaluators did not develop evaluative judgements beyond the constraints of their data, it would have been interesting to delve deeper into some of the questions (such as if there are no partnerships, why is this and what is holding organisations back)?

SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)

Satisfactory
Conclusions section offers real insight into the challenges facing the NPA, and this adds significant value to the analysis. It is unfortunate that the evidence available to the evaluation was so limited by the circumstances.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

Satisfactory
The recommendations are overall good: relevant and quite realistic, relatively thorough and thoughtful. They advance key points that would strengthen the initiative, and as such add value.

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)

Satisfactory
All of the required elements of the report are present and there is sufficient detail. The initial sections of the report (from background to methods) would benefit from some reorganising for greater clarity.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)

Fair
Reference is made to the HRBAP and to gender equality and equity. Reference is also made to the inclusion of human rights in the frameworks, though this could be more robust in the body of the report. Finally, participatory elements are to some extent included though this could be stronger.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)

Satisfactory
The executive summary gathers a fair amount of the information in the report, that provide a good idea of the evaluation's most relevant data.

Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

8 Meets requirements

Recommendations for improvement
| Section A | A more complete description of the object of the evaluation (including of intended beneficiaries and implementation status) and of the context (including linking back to the implementation of the evaluation and the findings), as well as more explicit discussion of the logic of the intervention and of the role and contributions of key stakeholders would make it stronger. |
| Section B | Due to all the challenges faced due to the nature and state of the evaluation object, a previous or even expost evaluability assessment could have been included, to better clarify the scope and potential uses. |
| Section C | A more clear methodological design with the phases though would provider a higher level of credibility. |
| Section D | Include clear references to data. More clearly identify limitations and gaps of data to provide credibility to the findings. |
| Section E | The conclusions would be stronger if they were rooted in stronger data and a more focused and systematic analysis, while the lessons learned have some puzzling statements and problematic claims that render them quite weak. |
| Section F | It would be better if the recommendations were prioritised, as well as if the linkages to the findings were made more explicit. |
| Section G | The report could be more disciplined about the contents included in each of the sections (Ex. No findings in the Object section) and a Methodology section would be appreciated. A final proofread would improve the quality of English, which occasionally presents challenges to understanding certain sentences. |
| Section H | The approach to these principles should be mainstreamed along the report in a much more explicit way. |
| Section I | None |