



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

UNIDO EVALUATION GROUP

ODG/EVA Review

Follow-up of Recommendations

from completed evaluations 2008 to 2012

August 2013

Table of contents

I Background and introduction

II Status of management responses to evaluations

- 2.1. Management response sheets issued in 2012
- 2.2. Management response sheets with the one-year follow-up cycle completed by 2012
- 2.3. Review of Management response sheets from 2008 to 2011

III System of management response: Observations and challenges

IV Summary

- Annex 1. Level of acceptance of recommendations issued in 2012
- Annex 2. Status of implementation of recommendations for evaluations with follow-up cycle completed during 2012
- Annex 3. Status of implementation of recommendations for evaluations with follow-up cycle completed during 2008 to 2011

I Background and introduction

1. The present report provides the status and progress made towards the follow-up to recommendations from independent evaluations conducted during 2012. It also provides a historical overview of status of recommendations and management responses for the period 2008 to 2011, on the basis of the information and documentation available in the UNIDO Management Response System.

2. The management response system was introduced by issuance of the Evaluation Policy in May 2006. As of that date an evaluation report is transmitted to UNIDO management together with a Management Response Sheet (MRS). The MRS allows tracking of the status of implementation of each recommendation, in terms of its acceptance (i.e., fully accepted, partially accepted, or non-acceptance), and provides information on the level of implementation, i.e. on the action taken vis-à-vis individual recommendations, (e.g., completed, in progress, not started). Normally, the MRS is to be filled in and returned to ODG/EVA by the programme/project manager within one month of the submission of the evaluation report (= first input to MRS) and the information on the status and follow-up actions to be provided one year after issuance of the MRS (= second and final input to MRS).

3. Since 2008, ODG/EVA has reported annually on the follow-up to recommendations¹ and related issues. These reports are available online, from the ODG/EVA intranet page².

4. In response to issues raised by the External Auditor³ in relation to the acceptance and implementation of recommendations, ODG/EVA decided to revisit the MRSs information for the years 2008 to 2011 and to further assess the situation. Details on the findings of this review are presented in chapter II below.

¹ [http://www.unido.org/evaluation/evaluation-reports](#)

² [http://www.unido.org/evaluation/evaluation-reports](#)

³ [http://www.unido.org/evaluation/evaluation-reports](#)

II Status of management responses to evaluations

2.1. Management response sheets issued in 2012

5. From the 20 MRSs issued in 2012, a total of 18 MRSs, equivalent to 90 per cent, had been returned at the time of reporting, i.e., May 2013. These include the first input/comment on the level of acceptance⁴ of individual recommendations and the action(s) to be taken to address the recommendation. This compares favorably to information received the same date in the previous year (60 per cent for 2011). Out of a total number of 328 recommendations issued in MRSs in 2012, project/programme managers/responsible officer(s) replied to 250 recommendations (76 per cent). Out of the 250 replies, 95 per cent indicated their acceptance/partial acceptance. A total of 4 per cent were not accepted and 1 per cent of the comments provided was not clear. Annex 1 to the present report provides detailed information on the level of acceptance of recommendations for each evaluation issued during 2012.

6. Table 1 below provides a snapshot of the follow-up on recommendations for evaluations and their respective MRSs issued in 2012.

Table 1. Snapshot of follow up on recommendations issued in 2012 (as at 2013-05)

Category	Number of MRSs issued	Number of MRSs returned	Number of MRSs returned with acceptance/partial acceptance	Number of MRSs returned with no acceptance	Number of MRSs returned with unclear comments	Number of MRSs returned with other comments	Number of MRSs returned with no response	Number of MRSs returned with other responses	Number of MRSs returned with other responses	Number of MRSs returned with other responses
Category 1	10	9	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category 2	10	9	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category 3	10	9	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category 4	10	9	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category 5	10	9	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category 6	10	9	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category 7	10	9	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category 8	10	9	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category 9	10	9	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category 10	10	9	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

⁴ Acceptance/partial acceptance

7. Each MRS contains a questionnaire (as an annex) that gives project/programme managers the opportunity to provide feedback on the evaluation process. In 2012, from the 18 MRSs that were received, 10 questionnaires (56 per cent) were completed. The feedback provided indicates that 97 per cent of the respondents found the evaluation timely and that the resources allocated were adequate. A total of 94 per cent of the respondents found the evaluation findings relevant and useful and 100 per cent considered the recommendations pertinent and useful. Another 97 per cent confirmed that lessons learned were valid for wider application and beyond the project that was evaluated.

Lessons learned are valid for wider application, beyond the project under evaluation.
"... it will help to design and implement future projects with full recognition on the role and importance of effective business information services for making a lasting impact in developing MSMEs and potential opportunities to the youth."

(Source: Independent evaluation. Uganda Business Information Centre)

2.2. Management response sheets with the one-year follow-up cycle completed by 2012

8. As regards the status of implementation of recommendations from 20 evaluations issued in 2011 and for which the one-year follow-up cycle was to be completed by 2012, all 20 MRSs were returned containing the final inputs/comments. This marks a 100% return rate, up from previously 67 per cent for 2011. A total of 35 per cent of the recommendations responded to had already been implemented, 54 per cent were under implementation while 11 per cent had not been implemented at the time of reporting (see Annex 2).

9. It can be noted that during the previous reporting period, the percentage of recommendations that were reported as not implemented was 21 per cent. The fact that 89 percent of recommendations had been or were in the process of being implemented in 2012 is a remarkable achievement and due credit should be given to the programme/project managers.

2.3 Review of Management response sheets from 2008 to 2011

10. This enlarged review exercise covered 92 evaluations/MRSs and responsible managers were requested to provide updated information on the status of implementation of recommendations. The request was met with a high level of compliance.

11. Table 3 below provides an overview of the response rate and acceptance of recommendations for each year.

Table 3. Overview – Acceptance level of responded MRSs

2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2011	2008-2011	2008-2011
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

12. Overall, out of a total number of 1,746 recommendations that emanated from 2008-2012 evaluations, managers have replied to 1,565 of these. This represents an average response rate of 90 per cent⁶.

13. With regard to the average level of acceptance for all recommendations, it was found that 96 per cent⁷ of the recommendations were accepted/ partially accepted. Out of the total recommendations responded to, 3 per cent⁸ were not accepted and for 1 per cent⁹ the comments provided thereon were not clear.

⁶ 1,565 / 1,746 = 90 per cent

Status of implementation of recommendations

14. Table 4 below provides an overview of the status of implementation of recommendations¹⁰ for MRSs for which the one year management response cycle was completed during 2008 to 2011. Annex 3 provides more detailed information on the follow-up to recommendations for each individual evaluation issued between 2008 and 2011.

Table 4. Status of implementation of recommendations, 2008-2011

Number of recommendations issued	Number of recommendations implemented	Number of recommendations under implementation	Number of recommendations not implemented	Number of recommendations not responded to	Number of recommendations responded to	Number of recommendations not responded to
1,429	771	216	442	131	1,298	131
1,429	771	216	442	131	1,298	131
1,429	771	216	442	131	1,298	131
1,429	771	216	442	131	1,298	131
1,429	771	216	442	131	1,298	131

Source: Evaluation Group (EVA) data.

15. Between 2008 and 2011, the Evaluation Group (EVA) issued a total of 1,429 recommendations. Respondents provided information on the status of implementation to 1,311 of these, which corresponds to 92 percent. It can be highlighted that 54 per cent of all recommendations responded to had been implemented and that an additional 25 per cent of the recommendations responded to were under implementation at the time of reporting, i.e., May 2013. A total of 21

¹⁰ Recommendations that were not implemented or under implementation at the time of reporting were classified as "not implemented" or "not responded to".

IV Summary

20. In 2012, a total of 18 management response sheets – out of 20 issued– have been filled in. With regard to the acceptance rate of 2012 evaluation recommendations, 95 per cent of the recommendations were accepted/partially accepted while 4 per cent were not accepted and 1 per cent of the comments received were not clear.

21. Out of 20 MRSs issued in 2011 and for which the one year follow-up cycle was completed by 2012, a total number of 20 MRSs (100%) were returned, thus providing information on the status of implementation of action taken vis-à-vis individual recommendations. A total of 35 per cent of the recommendations responded to were implemented, 54 per cent were still under implementation and 11 per cent had not been implemented at the time of reporting.

22. The review exercise covering the period 2008 to 2011 generally received excellent support from managers responsible for the follow-up, which enabled a 90 per cent response rate. A positive finding was that 54 per cent of the recommendations responded to had been implemented and that implementation of another 25 per cent was ongoing.

Level of acceptance of recommendations (= first input to MRS) for Management Response Sheets issued in 2012 (as at 2013-05)

Recommendation	Accepted	Partially Accepted	Not Accepted	Not Accepted - No Response	Not Accepted - No Response	Not Accepted - No Response	Not Accepted - No Response
Recommendation 1: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 2: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 3: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 4: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 5: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 6: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 7: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 8: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 9: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 10: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 11: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 12: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 13: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 14: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 15: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 16: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 17: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 18: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 19: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Recommendation 20: [Detailed description]	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Status of implementation of recommendations for evaluations with follow-up cycle completed during 2012

Management responses with follow-up cycle completed in 2012

Description of the recommendation	Status	Responsible entity	Start date	End date	Comments
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]
[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]	[Faint text]

[Faint text]

Management responses with follow-up cycle completed in 2012 (cont.)

<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>

Status of implementation of recommendations for evaluations with follow-up cycle completed during 2008 to 2011 (as at 2013-05)

Management responses with follow-up cycle completed in 2011

Description of recommendation	Status	Date of completion	Responsible party	Budget	Comments
[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]

[Redacted footnote text]

Management responses with follow-up cycle completed in 2011 (cont.)

<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Management response</p>	<p>Start date</p>	<p>End date</p>	<p>Responsible</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>

¹ Management response

Management responses with follow-up cycle completed in 2008

Management response (Detailed description of the response)	Status (e.g., Implemented, Not implemented)	Date of implementation (Month and year)	Date of follow-up (Month and year)	Date of completion (Month and year)	Date of evaluation (Month and year)
[Management response text]	[Status]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]
[Management response text]	[Status]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]
[Management response text]	[Status]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]
[Management response text]	[Status]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]
[Management response text]	[Status]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]
[Management response text]	[Status]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]
[Management response text]	[Status]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]
[Management response text]	[Status]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]
[Management response text]	[Status]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]
[Management response text]	[Status]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]
[Management response text]	[Status]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]	[Date]

19 [Footnote text]