Management Response to Evaluation

Administrative data for disaggregated Sustainable Development Goals indicators in Africa, Asia and the Pacific and Latin America
Report completed December 2024

Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 1: Clarify project overall goal and better match resources to the strategic vision

Management Response: SD does not agree with the recommendation. The project had a combined objective of 1) supporting countries in using administrative data and 2) producing more statistics. Having a process where country priorities and needs are defined at project start while also keeping a longer-term objective of increasing data availability is a common project approach. Project results also imply that both objectives where worked on and that SDG reporting goals at time of reporting only was one country short of the goal, with several countries still having ongoing processes. SD does not see a need to change this approach in future projects.

Key Action(s) to be taken	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Status update	
			Status	**Remarks**
1.1.				
1.2.				
1.3.				

Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 2: Tighten the geographic scope

Management Response: SD does not agree with the conclusion but is aware that the DA team generally aims for less countries being supported under a small project like this. From the project implementation team perspective, project results would not have been substantially different if less countries were covered as the process to obtain and start using administrative data is time consuming, with a need to process learning, engaging etc. Many countries have also competing activities, and would not necessarily have had the capacity to engage much more than what was supported.

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)		
			Status	**Remarks**
2.1.				
2.2.				
2.3				

Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 3: Use the project to kick start or accelerate other initiatives

Management Response: SD partially agrees with the recommendation. Generally, there is agreement that small projects like these should look at possibilities for generating additional funding from elsewhere. What the evaluation does not consider is how the project linked up closely with, and supported, the Collaborative on administrative data (CAD). While the project directly maybe had limited impact on accelerating resource mobilization for administrative data work, it ensured increased

awareness and support through the CAD and other avenues. Overall, SD can consider wider outreach for future projects, however.				

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Status update	
			Status	**Remarks**
3.1. SD to consider how to use DA projects as accelerators for other donor mobilization moving forward	2025-2027	SD	ongoing	
3.2.				
3.3.				

Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 4: Adopt a time-bound, agile approach with more in-country resources

Management Response: SD partially agrees with the recommendation. SD has positive experiences from hiring local consultants to support implementation in other projects and could, moving forward, also consider this for DA projects. In some cases more condensed support may also work better, but in other cases, this may also be overwhelming when there are many competing activities. Third, the project did engage with both RCOs and other UN agencies in the majority of countries as is outlined in the final report, something the consultant may not have picked up fully in the assessment.

Key Action(s) to be taken	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Status update	
			Status	**Remarks**
4.1. Consider hiring local consultants in countries to increase SD presence and support inter-governmental dialogues	2025 – 2027	SD	ongoing	
4.2. Consider the sprint approach where project implementation approach allows	2025-2026	SD	ongoing	
4.3.				

Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 5: Design robust results and learning frameworks that feed into strategic decision making

Management Response: SD partially agrees with this recommendation. A stronger monitoring and evaluation framework may have made goals more clear to implementing countries and partners, but SD was following the required set-up by the DA team. The DA team has already taken action to strengthen reporting in more recent DA projects, including a requirement of a ToC narrative.

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)		
			Status	**Remarks**
5.1. SD to use new ToC requirement by DA team	2024-	SD	ongoing	
5.2.				
5.3				

Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 6: Rely on e-learning course

Management Response: The project team agrees with this recommendation and has already been taking this approach in various contexts.				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Status update	
			Status	Remarks
6.1. Ensure wide outreach of the e-learning	2025 -	SD	Implemented	Letter was sent to all NSOs to register for facilitated version.
6.2. Making e-learning prerequisite for trainings on use of administrative data	2025 -	SD	Ongoing	Requirement has already been implemented for SADC workshop
6.3.				

Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 7: Allow the purchase of equipment

Management Response: SD does not agree with this recommendation. Overall, since the projects are small, equipment purchase is not encouraged by the DA team. SD also believes that this can be better covered through large support programs like those of the WB as SDs comparative advantage is in the capacity development. In the context of improving IT infrastructure, SD also believes that much can be achieved without purchase of servers as a modernization of the system, use of cloud technology already can go a long way. The project did, however, consider purchase of a server in Sri Lanka, but did in the end not receive needed specifications from the NSO due to various external circumstances.				
Key Action(s) to be taken	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Status update	
			Status	Remarks
7.1.				
7.2.				
7.3.				

Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 8: Introduce country call for proposal

Management Response: SD partially agrees with this recommendation. Calls for proposals can be considered in some contexts, but there is a risk that there is a bias in mainly stronger countries submitting proposals as the weaker ones do not have the knowledge/initiative/capacity even though they'd potentially benefit more from the support. SD therefore seeks to diversify support across projects as is also an overall recommendation. A possible approach could be targeted outreach and offering of support to develop proposals. This would then require some flexibility in how many countries are supported as it may be unpredictable how many actually go through with it. And it would be discouraging for countries who then submit proposals to not receive support				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)		
			Status	Remarks

8.1. SD to explore possibilities of introducing country calls for proposals in DA and other projects where relevant	2025-2026	SD	Not yet started	
8.2.				
8.3				

Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 9: Introduce peer reviews				

Management Response: SD partially agrees with this recommendation. SD overall believes that peer reviews can be good mechanisms for experience exchange between countries. It does, however, believe that peer reviews have a larger impact if they are over-arching and not specific to an area such as administrative data or in the context of a small project like the DA13.

Key Action(s)	**Time Frame**	**Responsible Unit(s)**	**Status update**	
			Status	**Remarks**
9.1. SD to explore peer review mechanisms as part of south-south cooperation support in larger projects	2025-2027	SD	Not yet started	
9.2.				
9.3.				

Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 10: Provide technical assistance from the onset (identify technical priorities)				

Management Response: SD partially agrees with this recommendation. While it is key to initiate a project to identify the baseline and set priorities, a project can also provide general guidance and information on the topic from the onset. The project also did this through multiple online engagements with project countries. Capacity development was thus provided from the onset, but in more informal ways, such as through the meetings that were held. The project countries also had the opportunity to benefit from the webinars and learning materials of the Collaborative on administrative data. For future projects, it may be useful to have a concrete information deck that is shared with countries.

Key Action(s)	**Time Frame**	**Responsible Unit(s)**	**Status update**	
			Status	**Remarks**
10.1. SD to consider developing a resource list or information deck of project relevant materials for countries to explore in combination with inspiration workshops	2025	SD	ongoing	Already implemented in fex Data for Now
10.2.				
10.3.				

| Prepared by: Vibeke O Nielsen | Position: Senior statistician | Unit/Branch/Division: DDOB/SD |
| Cleared by: Yongyi Min | Officer in Charge, Development Data and Outreach Branch | Unit or Branch/Division: SD |

Yongyi Min (signature)

In order to increase evaluation use, a management response for each evaluation should be prepared using the template in the table above.

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.