

Template for Management Response to Evaluation

Title of the Evaluation: DA13 INFF Project 2124A 'Towards Integrated National Financing Framework

Date September 27, 2025

Prepared by: Monica Nogara

Senior Programme
Management Officer

Unit or Branch/Division: CDPMO

Cleared by: Haitian Lu



Head of Office

Unit or Branch/Division: CDPMO

Prepared by: Peter Chowla

Senior Economic Affairs Officer

Unit or Branch/Division: FSDO

Cleared by: Mariangela Parra-Lancourt

FSDO, Officer-in-Charge

Unit or Branch/Division: FSDO



Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 1: Project conceptualisation should be preceded by a scoping session and/ or planning meeting between the executing entities, and the cooperating entities, to establish synergies; enhance relevance; and minimise risk, including the possibility for and perception of duplicated efforts.				
Management Response: FSDO accepts this recommendation and will ensure that future project conceptualisation is preceded by a scoping session and/or planning meeting with cooperating entities to establish synergies, enhance relevance, and minimise duplication risks. CDPMO accepts this recommendation. We will strengthen our project management support to future capacity development projects, ensuring that country-level activities are designed in close consultation with Resident Coordinators and UN Country Teams. This engagement should be coordinated by the lead entity in collaboration with co-implementers. This requirement is already reflected in DESA policy and SOPs for country level engagement. CDPMO will ensure that this guidance is effectively disseminated and taken into account by project managers at the conception phase of project documents, to reinforce systematic coordination with RCOs and UNCTs.				
Key Action(s) to be taken	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Status update	
			Status	Remarks
1.1. CDPMO to ensure that during the project design phase closely consult with RCs and UNCTs to ensure alignment with country-level workplans and activities	October 2025 onwards	CDPMO/PD	Ongoing	
1.2. FSDO will convene a scoping/planning meeting with cooperating entities at the outset of each new project design.	Ongoing	FSDO/PADB	As required	
1.3.				
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 2: Clarified roles and responsibilities at the level of project management and activity coordination should be established to allow for efficient oversight throughout the implementation timeframe				
Management Response: FSDO accepts this recommendation and will ensure that roles and responsibilities at both project management and activity coordination levels are clarified at the outset to allow for efficient oversight throughout implementation. CDPMO accepts this recommendation. For projects that are co-implemented with other UN entities, project managers will be encouraged to consider centralized management and funding arrangements. This approach can improve efficiency, strengthen coordination across entities, and ensure more coherent delivery of activities.				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Status update	
			Status	Remarks
2.1. CDPMO to include in DESA 'Generic Project Document Guidelines' sample	October 2025	CDPMO/PD	Not yet started	

arrangements for governance and coordination of complex projects implemented by multiple UN entities, drawing on existing good practices				
2.2.FSDO will define and document roles and responsibilities for project management and activity coordination at project inception.	Ongoing	FSDO/PADB	As required	
2.3				
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 3: Guidance documents on the INFF methodology should provide detailed, step-by-step guidelines that can be easily contextualised by the implementing country				
Management Response: FSDO accepts this recommendation. Work is ongoing to strengthen guidance documents on the INFF methodology to support implementation at the country level.				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Status update	
			Status	Remarks
2.1. FSDO to continue to strengthen INFF guidance documents	Ongoing	FSDO/PADB	Ongoing	
2.2.				
2.3				
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 4: The FINS project should be scaled up to provide post-project technical assistance to target and non-target countries in response to their requests for context-specific support for INFF implementation				
Management Response: FSDO accepts this recommendation. The FINS initiative is a pilot project to test approaches for supporting SIDS on INFFs and will conclude end 2026. The pilot has shown the value of contextualised support through long-term in-country placement of embedded experts. While FSDO does not have the country presence to scale up the initiative to a large number of additional countries, UNDP could do so with adequate funding/resources. FSDO remains open to similar pilot initiatives to continue testing and refining ways to implement INFFs.				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Status update	
			Status	Remarks
#.1. FSDO to engage UNDP and others on potential scale-up options	2026	FSDO/PADB	Not yet started	
#.2. FSDO to explore similar pilot initiatives to further test INFF approaches	Ongoing	FSDO/PADB	Ongoing	Dependent on funding,

				including GTA staff costs
#.3.				
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 5: A strengthening of the process for finalising and approving the project results framework should be initiated, to ensure that appropriate results targets and performance measurement indicators are established to increase the usefulness of achieved results				
Management Response: FSDO accepts this recommendation and will strengthen the process for finalising and approving project results frameworks to ensure that results targets and performance indicators are appropriate and enhance the usefulness of achieved results. CDPMO accepts this recommendation. The project document guidelines will be updated to require that project authors and managers conduct a country analysis that explicitly identifies what support other UN agencies and development partners are providing to target and non-target countries and regions, to build on existing work, avoid duplication, and ensure complementarity and sustainability. In addition, under the monitoring and evaluation section of project documents, project managers will be required to identify the contribution of different funding sources (e.g., XB, RPTC, and DA) to specific project objectives to ensure proper attribution of results and track complementarities across funding sources and projects.				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Status update	
			Status	Remarks
#.1. Project document guidelines updated	October 2025	CDPMO/PD		
#.2.FSDO will institute a more rigorous review and approval process for results frameworks, including validation of targets and performance indicators prior to project launch.	Ongoing	FSDO/PADB	As required	
#.3.				

For each recommendation, there will be a management response noting if the recommendation has been accepted, partially accepted or not, and the planned follow-up action. Where recommendations are only partially accepted or not accepted the management response will clearly demonstrate the rationale for this.

The management response is intended to facilitate and promote the use of evaluation findings for future programming. It should be attached to the evaluation report and shared with CDPMO.

Please note that the evaluation of a capacity development project is generally designed to present recommendations directed to the management of the division(s) that commission(s) the evaluation based on the evidence found through the evaluation, and that when any recommendations included in the draft evaluation report are directed to other divisions/offices of DESA or other entities, they should be asked to voluntarily participate in the review of the draft evaluation report, the finalization of the evaluation

report as well as the development of the management response to the evaluation. If a division/office of DESA or another entity that is not the commissioner of the evaluation commits to actions to implement a specific evaluation recommendation(s), the head of the division/office or the relevant official of the entity should either co-sign/co-clear a single management response along with the Director of the commissioning division, or a separate management response specifically addressing the recommendations directed to them be developed and signed off by the head of the division/office or the relevant official of the entity, who will then be responsible for ensuring the implementation of actions identified in the document. In the case of an evaluation of a joint project, participating divisions or entities should agree on who should be involved in the management of the evaluation and the development of a management response to the evaluation, as well as who will be responsible for ensuring the implementation of the planned actions to implement recommendations in the evaluation TOR and how (through what processes/systems) the implementation will be monitored/tracked.

Divisions should also enter evaluation recommendations (summarizing information in the above management response) in the [DESA evaluation recommendations tracker on SharePoint](#) as soon as the evaluation is finalized, and should update the status of action on each of the recommendations in the tracker.