



TOGETHER
for a sustainable future

OCCASION

This publication has been made available to the public on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation.



TOGETHER
for a sustainable future

DISCLAIMER

This document has been produced without formal United Nations editing. The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries, or its economic system or degree of development. Designations such as “developed”, “industrialized” and “developing” are intended for statistical convenience and do not necessarily express a judgment about the stage reached by a particular country or area in the development process. Mention of firm names or commercial products does not constitute an endorsement by UNIDO.

FAIR USE POLICY

Any part of this publication may be quoted and referenced for educational and research purposes without additional permission from UNIDO. However, those who make use of quoting and referencing this publication are requested to follow the Fair Use Policy of giving due credit to UNIDO.

CONTACT

Please contact publications@unido.org for further information concerning UNIDO publications.

For more information about UNIDO, please visit us at www.unido.org

Follow-up on completed evaluations 2008

(prepared by OSL/EVA)

6 March 2009

Follow-up on completed evaluations 2008

I Background and introduction

1. In October 2007, OSL/EVA conducted a review¹ of the progress towards the follow-up to recommendations on evaluations carried out during 2006/2007. At that time, following the introduction² of the management response system and the related electronic follow-up scheme made available by OSL/EVA on the intranet, the system of management response had been used for a total of 14 independent evaluations and five evaluations had completed the one-year follow-up cycle.

2. Since the October 2007 review, the Evaluation Group completed 17 independent evaluations and two independent reviews. These are posted under the respective entries on both the UNIDO intranet³ and the public website⁴.

3. In the current report, OSL/EVA presents the progress made towards the follow-up on recommendations, for evaluations carried out during 2008. The report also provides an overview of recommendations considered complete and of those that are still outstanding. These outstanding recommendations will be followed up and reported on electronically, on the OSL/EVA intranet⁵.

4. Recommendations contained in the respective management response sheets (MRSs) from recently completed evaluations will be added to the list of outstanding recommendations as they are approved. It should be noted that this process is regular and ongoing. Recommendations are considered to be implemented or complete when all steps towards the completion of a management response sheet have been taken by the project/programme managers and OSL/EVA has verified completion.

¹ Evaluation Group. Review of management response to evaluations included in the OSL/EVA Work Programme for 2007 and 2008 (31 October 2007).

² The system of management response was introduced in UNIDO in 2006.

³ http://intranet.unido.org/intra/Evaluation_Group_%28OSL/EVA%29.

⁴ <http://www.unido.org/index.php?id=05122>.

⁵ http://intranet.unido.org/intra/Evaluation/Follow-up_on_recommendations

II Status of management response to evaluations

5. Table 1 below provides a snapshot of the follow-up on recommendations for evaluations carried out during the reporting period. The stage of implementation depends on the date on which the evaluation report was issued and when action for implementation was taken. It should be noted that most of the "recommendations in progress" require long lead times since they are often dependent on fund-raising, formulating new programmes/activities and sometimes implementation is not possible because a next phase is not foreseen, or possible.

Table 1. Snapshot of follow up on recommendations (as at 31-12-08)
(2008)

	No. of delivered evaluation reports and management response sheets in 2008	Number of management responses with response cycle completed out of issued management response sheets	Total No. of rec.	Total No. of recs. responded to	Of which No. of recs. <u>accepted</u>	Of which No. of recs. <u>partially accepted</u>	Of which No. of recs. <u>not accepted</u>	Of which No. of recs. with a not clear comment on acceptance of recs.	Of which No. of recs. impl.	Of which No. of recs. with impl. in progress	Of which No. of recs. not impl.	Percentage of recs. impl.	Percentage of recs. with impl. in progress	Annex 1 to MRS (optional) No. of responses received
					In per cent	In per cent	In per cent	In per cent						
Independent evaluations (IPs and independent projects)	19 ^a	2	387	318	252	54	9	3	48	78	10	15	25	6
					79%	17%	3%	1%						

6. Table 1 above provides details on the total number of recommendations (387) made by the evaluators for the 19 independent evaluations (including two independent reviews). These recommendations are contained in the management response sheets of individual evaluations.

7. Project/programme managers responded on the management response sheet (MRS) to 318 recommendations and indicated their acceptance (252) and partial acceptance (54) of recommendations. Out of the 318 recommendations, 12 recommendations were either not accepted (9), or the comments received were not clearly identifiable/understood (3).

8. With regard to the status of the implementation of the 19 independent evaluations (including two independent reviews), the one-year cycle was completed for two projects. The response cycle for the remaining projects is still ongoing and this information was not requested at their stage of reporting. However, some

^a Includes two independent review reports, i.e., IP Iran and IP Mali.

project/programme managers already provided information with regard to the status of implementation of recommendations, which is also reflected in table 1 above.

9. The above table also includes information on the number of responses received for Annex 1 – Feedback on the evaluation process for the use of OSL/EVA, which is part of the management response sheet. Annex 1 is a questionnaire that gives project/programme managers the opportunity to provide feedback on the evaluation process. Client feedback received in this form is taken into consideration when reviewing the evaluation process. From the 19 management response sheets sent out, six project/programme managers availed themselves of the opportunity to provide OSL/EVA with feedback on the evaluation process.

10. Annex I of this report provides tabular, detailed information on the follow-up to recommendations for each individual evaluation. It also gives an overview of general timelines for the follow-up, the number of recommendations for each project, the acceptance rates, and – to the extent available, the percentage rate of recommendations considered complete and/or that are still under implementation. Additional information is provided on the composition of the evaluation team (OSL/EVA responsible officer and international consultant) of a particular evaluation.

11. During the reporting period, the one-year follow-up cycle was completed for 11 projects, including one Country Service Framework. Table 2 below contains summary information on the review of the relevant management responses.

12. It shows that 48 per cent of the recommendations, responded to, were completed and 35 per cent were still under implementation one year after the issuance of the management response sheet. A total of 17 per cent of the recommendations have not been implemented. The reasons for not implementing a recommendation vary (e.g., a recommendation had originally not been accepted, financing of response action did not materialize, a project/programme was not extended).

Table 2. Management responses with follow-up cycle completed in 2008

Project	Total No. of recs.	Number of recs. responded to	Of which No. of recs. implemented (percentage)	Of which No. of recs. with implementation in progress (percentage)	Of which No. of recs. not implemented / recs. not applicable (percentage)
<u>UNIDO-UNDP Cooperation Agreement pilot phase</u>	23	23	35	65	0
<u>CSF India</u>	73	73	59	32	9
<u>Viet Nam/Proj. No. TE/VIE/04/002</u>	9	9	44	0	56
<u>Viet Nam/Proj. Nos. TE/VIE/03/001 TF/VIE/04/001 TF/VIE/06/002</u>	22	22	46	36	18
<u>Viet Nam/Proj. No. US/VIE/03/083</u>	16	16	75	25	0
<u>South Asian LDCs: Bangladesh, Bhutan, Maldives, Nepal/Proj. No. TF/RAS/03/001</u>	17	17	53	47	0
<u>Global: GEF-funded UNIDO-UNEP project/Proj. No. GP/GLO/03/012</u>	4	4	100	0	0
<u>Italy/UNIDO Investment and Technology Promotion Office in Italy</u>	20	20	5 (from previous reporting); actual information pending ⁷	55 (from previous reporting); actual information pending ⁸	40 (actual information pending) ⁹
<u>France/UNIDO Investment and Technology Promotion Offices in France</u>	16	16	0 (from previous reporting); actual information pending ¹⁰	13 (from previous reporting); actual information pending ¹¹	87 (actual information pending) ¹²
<u>Argentina/Proj. Nos. UE/ARG/04/129, US/ARG/02/129, US/ARG/04/129</u>	11	10	80	0	20
<u>Japan/UNIDO Investment and Technology Promotion Offices in Japan</u>	24	24	54	46	0
TOTAL	235	234	48	35	17

⁷ The ITPO retreat that will be held during the Cleaner technologies for economic development forum in Bahrain (2 to 4 February 2009) will give the ITPO Coordination Unit the opportunity to follow-up on recommendations. Thus, enabling the ITPO Coordination UNIT to provide consolidated inputs on the outstanding management response sheets for the ITPOs in Italy, France and Japan and allow completion of the management response cycle.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*

III System of management response: Observations and changes

13. With some exceptions, compliance by project/programme managers in following up on recommendations has not significantly improved since the previous review, indicating that the system of management response has not been fully accepted, or adhered to.

14. Despite continuous efforts on the part of OSL/EVA and by using all means of communication, submission delays between one and seven months have been experienced. The average delay in the delivery of a management response was 2.4 months. The major reasons for delays remain unchanged (i.e., staff turnover, heavy workload, implementation pressure, low priority for this exercise). One case - the follow-up on the IP Ghana evaluation – needs specific attention. OSL/EVA has frequently requested – but not yet received - an indication of who will assume the function of the team leader for this programme and for follow-up on the recommendations of the evaluation. Thus the follow-up on this particular evaluation is recorded in Annex I as pending.

15. It should be noted that very often the usefulness of the management response exercise is questioned by project/programme managers. In particular, the perceived usefulness is weighed against their time available for post-project/programme completion work, the pressure to advance implementation of ongoing projects/programmes and the development of new projects/programmes.

16. The described reactions indicate a need to create awareness about the usefulness of the follow-up process. In parallel, the onus is on management to ensure that project/programme managers complete management responses as part of their responsibilities.

17. OSL/EVA observes that there is a need to inform people on the management response system when training new staff or briefing staff about evaluation activities.

18. In the light of UNIDO's commitment to RBM, as confirmed by the RBM implementation plan, OSL/EVA considers the management response sheet to be an important RBM tool as the MRS enables project/programme managers to follow-up

recommendations in a systematic manner and, in parallel, provides a monitoring framework.

19. OSL/EVA considers the management response sheet a living document and it has undergone improvements during the reporting period. This has resulted in a better environment for entering inputs into the MRS and the subsequent monitoring of recommendation compliance, thus making it more user-friendly. To this effect, pages 1 and 2 and the following response matrix (table) of the MRS have been amended. Page 1 now includes, *inter alia*, an overview on: the staff directly, or indirectly responsible for the evaluated project/programme; and the evaluation team (including an evaluation steering committee/group used, if applicable). In case of an integrated programme evaluation, all staff directly/indirectly responsible for the follow-up on recommendations is listed on a new page 3. The management response procedures (p. 2) was adapted in line with the changes made to the MRS table columns. The MRS consists of five columns, of which columns 1 and 2 (to be completed by OSL/EVA) remained unchanged. Column 3 to 5 are to be completed by the project/programme manager made responsible for the collection of responses). Column 3 – Response by project/programme manager with inputs from other responsible officer(s) was recently introduced and requires an indication on the acceptance (fully, partially, not accepted) of the individual recommendation. To complete the one-year reporting cycle, the project/programme manager has to describe, in column 4, the action taken and in column 5 the status of implementation in relation to the recommendation (e.g., completed, ongoing, not implemented, etc.).

20. With regard to the intranet entry on follow-up to evaluation recommendations, OSL/EVA has made efforts to direct staff to this site with a view to create greater awareness of the information available through this link. The page content was further improved during the reporting period by providing additional information entries (i.e., extracted executive summaries and lessons learned).

21. In addition, separate, categorized entries have been made for accessing and viewing executive summaries (extracted from evaluation reports issued during 2006-2008) from the OSL/EVA intranet page, under the header Evaluation reports: Executive summaries. Similar entries have also been made for lessons learned, which can, likewise, be accessed from the OSL/EVA intranet page, under the header Lessons learned.

IV Institutionalizing organizational learning from evaluations

Effective use of evaluation findings

22. Results-based management should serve, *inter alia*, as a system to ensure that **recommendations** and **lessons learned** from evaluations are considered in future projects and programmes. For this purpose, OSL/EVA has further developed its online follow-up (monitoring) system by (a) making the lessons learned from a given evaluation available on the follow-up entry for that evaluation and (b) presenting a compilation of all the executive summaries and lessons learned. This source covers evaluations from 2006 onwards and should be particularly useful for strategic planning purposes and management, or for designing new projects and programmes.

23. OSL/EVA has begun work on a taxonomy to enable classification and electronic distribution of lessons learned. In the future it is foreseen that for each evaluation report a "lessons learned" form will be developed. The data thus compiled will be entered in a lessons learned-specific database that will subsequently be made available on the UNIDO intranet.

Operational practices

24. Since March 2006¹³ designated staff members of the Evaluation Group participate in the capacity of advisors in meetings of the Programme Approval Committee and the Quality Advisory Group. This participation enables further dissemination of findings and conclusions from evaluations.

V Conclusion

25. With the exception of two, all management responses have been collected, but with delays. Given the present circumstances, OSL/EVA will continue to further advocate the use of the management response system and take steps to further increase its usefulness.

¹³ UNIDO/DGB/p.96, 3 March 2006.

FOLLOW-UP ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF EVALUATIONS CARRIED OUT IN 2008
(2009-02-20)

Programme / project / Proj.No.	Team leader / responsibility	OSL/EVA responsible for evaluation and international evaluation consultant	Delivery of evaluation report & management response sheet by OSL/EVA [Date]	Management response to recommendations (completed by team leader) [Actual delivery date / Management response]	Follow-up report by team leader on action taken [Expected delivery date / Report]	Total no. of rec.	No. of rec. to UNIDO ¹	No. of rec. to others ¹	No. of recs. for which comments are missing (in percent)	No. of recs. responded to	Of which No. of recs. accepted ² (in percent)	Of which No. of recs. partially accepted (in percent)	Of which No. of recs. not accepted (in percent)	Of which No. of recs. for which comments are not clear (in percent)	Of which recs. impl. (in percent)	Of which recs. with impl. in progress (in percent)
Global UNIDO-UNEP Cleaner Production Programme	LEUENBERGER, Heinz	OSL/EVA: DOBINGER, J. Intl. cons.: VAN BERKEL, R. (Team leader) - Unit Chief, UNIDO, PTC/EMB/PTU), MEYER, M. (Team member) <i>inter alia</i> , Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs - resp. for relations with multilateral entities (World Bank, Regional Development Banks, UNCTAD, UNIDO, ITC, and SCHNITZER, H. (Team member) - <i>inter alia</i> , University Professor, Graz University of Technology	May-08	Jun-08	May-09	12	12	12	0%	12	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Argentina Proj. Nos. UE/ARG.04.129, US/ARG.02.129, US/ARG.04.129	HUBBARD, D.	OSL/EVA: DOBINGER, J. Intl. cons.: TOMASIN, G. (Inter alia, UNIDO, FAO, The World Bank, EU, EBRD, European Commission agencies)	Jan-08	Apr-08	Dec-08	11	10	1	9%	10	60%	30%	10%	0%	80%	20% (not implemented / rec. not applicable)
Japan UNIDO Investment and Technology Promotion Offices in Japan	AKHVEDIANI, Y.	OSL/EVA: LOEWE, P. Intl. cons.: NAVRATIL, J. (former UNIDO s/m - Evaluation services); Natl. cons. & donor representative: TANAKA, H.	Aug-07	8-Apr	Aug-08	24	11	13	0%	24	71%		29%	0%	54%	46%
IP Mali	CISSE, M.	OSL/EVA: LOEWE, P. Intl. cons.: -	Jan-08	Apr-08	Jan-09	30	30	0	3%	29	69%	28%	3%	0%	7%	31%
IP Iran	GONG, W.	OSL/EVA: LOEWE, P. Intl. cons.: -	Jan-08	Apr-08	Jan-09	31	31	0	16%	26	85%	4%	8%	0%	12%	54%

Programme / project # Proj. No.	Team leader / responsibility	OSL/EVA responsible for evaluation and international evaluation consultant	Delivery of evaluation report & management response sheet by OSL/EVA [Date]	Management response to recommendations (completed by team leader) [Actual delivery date / Management response]	Follow-up report by team leader on action taken [Expected delivery date / Report]	Total no. of rec.	No. of rec. to UNIDO ¹	No. of rec. to others ¹	No. of recs. for which comments are missing (in percent)	No. of recs. responded to	Of which No. of recs. accepted ² (in percent)	Of which No. of recs. partially accepted (in percent)	Of which No. of recs. not accepted (in percent)	Of which No. of recs. for which comments are not clear (in percent)	Of which recs. impl. (in percent)	Of which recs. with impl. in progress (in percent)
<u>Iraq Proj. No. FB/IRQ/04/A01</u>	<u>JENANE, C.</u>	OSL/EVA: LOEWE, P. Intl. cons. (contracted by UNIDO); SLAMA, M. (<i>Inter alia</i> , former Director at IFAD, Near East, North Africa and East European Division) and GRUNEWALD, M. (contracted by FAO; worked with FAO, IFAD, ADB, UNWFP)	Feb-08	Apr-08	Feb-08	37	23	14	0%	37	92%	5%	3%	0%	38%	43%
<u>IP Ghana</u>	<u>LEVISSIANOS, A.</u>	OSL/EVA: DOBINGER, J. Intl. cons.: GETINET, G. (<i>inter alia</i> , former Director, Operation Evaluation Dept., The African Development Bank)	Apr-08	May-08	Apr-09	25	17	8	100%	0	PENDING ²	PEND ³	PEND ³	PEND ³	PEND ³	PEND ³
<u>Ethiopia Proj. Nos. TE/ETH/04/001 TF/ETH/04/001</u>	<u>CALABRO IN BELLAMOLI, A.</u>	OSL/EVA: DE GOYS, M. Intl. cons.: McCALLIN, T. A. (<i>inter alia</i> , UNIDO, APDF, ITC, USAID, CDC, Landell Mills (UK), CUOA (Italy), CDE (EU))	Mar-08	Apr-08	Mar-08	20	7	13	0%	20	90%	5%	5%	0%	0%	45%
<u>IP Saudi Arabia</u>	<u>EL GALLAF, M.</u>	OSL/EVA: LOEWE, P. Intl. cons.: KRUF, A. (<i>Inter alia</i> , 25 years of experiences in providing cons. & training services for SMEs & industries, in particular to SME policy formation, setting up support org. for SMEs)	Oct-08	Dec-08	Oct-09	3	3	0	0%	3	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
<u>Uganda Proj. Nos. UE/UGA/04/062 US/UGA/04/062</u>	<u>KREISSLER, B.</u>	OSL/EVA: DE GOYS, M. Intl. cons.: VLAAR, T. (<i>inter alia</i> , consultancy for intl. proj. ICT, Training, Counselling, Dev. Coop. Proj. Auditing and linkages, E-learning, Database management consulting/coaching, management info. Systems in African countries)	Oct-08	Oct-08	Sep-09	15	15	0	0%	15	73%	13%	7%	7%	7%	0%

Programme / project // Proj.No.	Team leader / responsibility	OSL/EVA responsible for evaluation and international evaluation consultant	Delivery of evaluation report & management response sheet by OSL/EVA [Date]	Management response to recommendations (completed by team leader) [Actual delivery date / Management response]	Follow-up report by team leader on action taken [Expected delivery date / Report]	Total no. of rec.	No. of rec. to UNIDO ¹	No. of rec. to others ¹	No. of recs. for which comments are missing (in percent)	No. of recs. responded to	Of which No. of recs. accepted ² (in percent)	Of which No. of recs. partially accepted (in percent)	Of which No. of recs. not accepted (in percent)	Of which No. of recs. for which comments are not clear (in percent)	Of which recs. impl. (in percent)	Of which recs. with impl. in progress (in percent)
IP Sierra Leone	KOROMA, Joseph ⁵	OSL/EVA: DE GOYS, M. Intl. cons. -	Sep-08	Oct-08	Sep-09	21	21	6	86%	3	Sample too small ²	Sample too small ⁴	Sample too small ⁴	Sample too small ⁴	Sample too small ⁴	Sample too small ⁴
IP Senegal (Phase II)	CISSE, M.	OSL/EVA: LOEWE, P. Intl. cons.: VAN OYEN, L. (former UNIDO s/m and UR Tunisia)	Oct-08	Dec-08	Oct-09	18	18	18	0%	18	61%	28%	11%	0%	0%	11%
Nicaragua/Proj. Nos. UE/NIC/05/001 and UE/NIC/05/003	CEGLIE, Giovanna	OSL/EVA: DOBINGER, J. Natl. cons.: BAIRE TURCIOS, O. A. (Inter alia, OXFAN CANADA, SWISSAID, NORAD / ASDI / DANIDA)	Nov-08	Dec-08	Nov-09	20	20	8	0%	20	90%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%
ITPO Greece	AKHVEDIANI, Yuri	OSL/EVA: DE GOYS, M. Intl. cons.: NAVRATIL, J. (former UNIDO s/m - Evaluation services)	July-08	Aug-08	July-09	22	9	16	0%	22	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%
ITPO Bahrain	AKHVEDIANI, Yuri	OSL/EVA: DE GOYS, M. Intl. cons.: NAVRATIL, J. (former UNIDO s/m - Evaluation services)	Nov-08	Nov-08	Nov-09	27	11	16	59%	11	100%	0%	0%	0%	18%	82%
Peru/Proj. No. UE/GLO/04/158	Fabio RUSSO	OSL/EVA: DOBINGER, J. Intl. cons. -	Nov-08	Dec-08	Nov-09	12	12	6	0%	12	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Cambodia/NCP	LEVENBERGER, Heinz	OSL/EVA: DOBINGER, J. Intl. cons.: KELLER, D. (Inter alia, proj. & progr. evaluation work; proj. cycle management)	Nov-08	Dec-08	Nov-09	22	17	5	0%	22	68%	27%	0%	5%	5%	5%

Programme / project // Proj.No.	Team leader / responsibility	OSL/EVA responsible for evaluation and international evaluation consultant	Delivery of evaluation report & management response sheet by OSL/EVA [Date]	Management response to recommendations (completed by team leader) [Actual delivery date / Management response]	Follow-up report by team leader on action taken [Expected delivery date / Report]	Total no. of rec.	No. of rec. to UNIDO ¹	No. of rec. to others ¹	No. of recs for which comments are missing (in percent)	No. of recs. responded to	Of which No. of recs. accepted ² (in percent)	Of which No. of recs. partially accepted (in percent)	Of which No. of recs. not accepted (in percent)	Of which No. of recs. for which comments are not clear (in percent)	Of which recs. impl. (in percent)	Of which recs. with impl. in progress (in percent)
Lao PDR-NCPC	LEUENBERGER, Heinz	OSL/EVA: DOBINGER, J. Intl. cons.: KELLER, D. (Inter alia, proj. & progr. evaluation work; proj. cycle management)	Nov-08	Dec-08	Nov-09	24	18	6	0%	24	71%	25%	0%	4%	4%	4%
People's Republic of China Project No. GF/CPR/04/002	PENG, Z	OSL/EVA: DOBINGER, J. Intl. cons.: NEE, S. G. K. Y.	Nov-08	Dec-08	Nov-09	13	13	9	0%	13	77%	23%	0%	0%	0%	46%

¹ Note: Some recommendations are directed to both, UNIDO and others and, thus, have been recorded under both entries. Therefore, the total number of recommendations might not tally.

² Note: Some recommendations go beyond the mandate of PTC/ITP and should also involve other divisions/branches within UNIDO. Thus, the answer with regard to acceptance of a recommendation was not provided.

³ Note: OSL/EVA has requested an indication of who will assume the function of the team leader for this programme and follow-up on the recommendations for this evaluation. Thus, the follow-up on this particular evaluation is recorded as pending.

⁴ Note: Sample too small. Thus, it has not been included in the further analysis.