

The logo for SADEV, consisting of the acronym in bold black letters.

SADEV

The full name of the organization, with a vertical bar to the left of the text.

SWEDISH
AGENCY FOR
DEVELOPMENT
EVALUATION

The effectiveness and relevance of management response systems in aid organisations

-Case studies of Sida, IFAD and EuropeAid

Presentation at the Easy-Eco Conference, Vienna 12 March

Sara Bandstein and Erik Hedblom, SADEV



What is a management response system?

”Formal system that governs the procedures following a completed evaluation”

Why a management response system?

- To link evaluation findings to future activities
- To ensure that evaluation recommendations are implemented and integrated into future decision



Three aid Organisations:

1. Sida, the Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency
2. EuropeAid, Directorate General of the European Commission (external aid programmes and projects)
3. IFAD, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (specialized fund within the United Nations)

Purpose of the evaluation:

“Identify components that are important when designing a management response system that performs effectively and is relevant”

Definitions:

- effectiveness
 - Implementation (outputs)
 - Achievement of objectives (outcomes)
- relevance
 - The extent to which the systems are adapted to suit their objectives

Methodological Considerations

- Programme Theory Evaluation
 - reconstruction of the Intervention Logics
 - Theoretical and practical assessment of the Intervention Logics
- Data collection methods
 - Focus group interviews with a large number of staff members
 - Individual interviews with key staff
 - Document analysis of guiding principles and policies
 - Quality assessment of a number of evaluation and management response documents
 - In-depth study of a number of evaluation and response processes

The different systems:

Sida: Dual system (centralised and decentralised)

- Comments to evaluation findings (management)
- Action plan – response to accepted recommendations (management)
- Implementation
 - Director General responsible (centralised)
 - Head of department responsible (decentralised)
- Bi-annual follow-up by:
 - Director General (centralised)
 - Controller of respective department (decentralised)

EuropeAid – the Fiche Contradictoire

- Centralised system (only for the common Evaluation Unit)
- The Fiche Contradictoire
 - 1: Summary of evaluation (evaluation unit)
 - 2: Response to recommendations (management)
 - 3: follow-up of the response (respective department)
- Response and evaluation published (evaluation unit)
- Reference group
- Inter-Service Quality Support Group

IFAD – the Agreement at Completion Point

- Centralised evaluation system
- Issues Paper (evaluation office)
- Stakeholder workshop (org. by evaluation office)
- Agreement at Completion Point (IFAD management and partner government)
 - Response to the evaluation findings and recommendations
- Report on follow-up to agreed actions, PRISMA (management)
- Partner focus/ Core Learning Partnership



Objectives of the systems

1. Create awareness of evaluation findings
2. Clarified lines of responsibility/commitment
3. Transparency
4. Accountability (DG, Commissioners or Executive Board)
5. To ensure that appropriate actions are taken as a response to findings and recommendations



Some differences:

Sida (both systems): more focus on strengthened learning

IFAD: consensus over what actions to take by both IFAD and partner government

How effective are the systems?


1. Implementation of the systems (outputs)

Sida centralised system: successful

Sida decentralised system: unsuccessful

EuropeAid: successful

IFAD: successful



2. Achievement of objectives (outcomes)

Sida centralised system: partially

Sida decentralised system: no

EuropeAid: partially

IFAD: partially



Are the systems relevant (adapted to suit their objectives)?

Sida centralised system: to a great extent

Sida decentralised system: no

EuropeAid: to a great extent

IFAD: to a great extent

Conclusions

-how to design an effective and relevant system

Several components have been identified:

- Joint discussions and time for reflection
- A follow-up tool
- Receiver of information
- Documentation and publication
- Responsible unit for supervising implementation

A decorative vertical element on the left side of the slide, consisting of two parallel lines: a red line on the left and a blue line on the right.

Continuation:

- Overall policy-making structures
- Quality control mechanism
- Clarify roles and responsibilities within the organisation (evaluation unit, management etc.)



Finally – and importantly:

- Set clear and realistic objectives
- Adapt the system components to reflect the objectives
- Consider the organisational context
 - The overall evaluation system
 - A decentralised system?
 - The role of partners in the response system