



Governing Body

313th Session, Geneva, 15–30 March 2012

GB.313/PFA/7/1

Programme, Financial and Administrative Section
Audit and Oversight Segment

PFA

Date: 10 February 2012

Original: English

SEVENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Other questions: Office response to the suggestions and recommendations of the annual evaluation report 2010–11

Purpose of the document

In the present document, the Governing Body is invited to provide guidance on and endorse the plan of action for the implementation of the recommendations and suggestions contained in the annual evaluation report 2010–11 (see the point for decision in paragraph 2).

Relevant strategic objectiveAll four strategic objectives.

Policy implications: None.

Legal implications: None.

Financial implications: The additional direct costs of US\$80,000 are identified in the appendix and will be covered through the reprioritization of other evaluation activities.

Author unit: Coordination of inputs by the Evaluation Unit (EVAL).

Related documents: GB.312/PV/Draft, GB.312/PFA/8.

1. When the Governing Body confirmed the priorities for the work programme of the ILO's Evaluation Unit (EVAL) in November 2011, it requested that a paper be submitted to the March 2012 session of the Governing Body for adoption, containing recommendations on how to give effect to the suggestions of the annual evaluation report 2010–11 and planned next steps, including the incorporation of impact assessment as part of the recurrent discussion reports of the International Labour Conference (ILC).¹ The requested plan of action, including a schedule for implementation, is set out in the appendix to the present document.

Draft decision

2. *The Governing Body adopts the plan of action for the implementation of the recommendations and suggestions contained in the annual evaluation report 2010–11, as proposed in the appendix to document GB.313/PFA/7/1.*

¹ GB.312/PV/Draft, para. 709.

Appendix

Plan of action for the implementation of the recommendations and suggestions contained in the annual evaluation report 2010–11

Suggestions and next steps	Long-term improvements	Short-term actions 2012–13	Who/additional cost 2012–13
1. Assessing the effectiveness of the ILO's strategic framework			
1.1. Operational alignment and resource allocation should be based on assessment of the achievement of the four strategic objectives rather than the reverse. Stocktaking and, potentially in the longer run, impact assessment should be part of the recurrent discussion reports. Their discussion by the ILC as required under the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization could provide a good basis for this process.	The evaluability of the results framework for the Strategic Policy Framework 2016–20 improved to allow for a sound assessment of the achievement of the four strategic objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Conduct each year two high-level in-depth strategy evaluations of Strategic Policy Framework outcomes or ILC-related topics, as mandated by the Governing Body. 	EVAL/none
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Perform an evaluability assessment of the Strategic Policy Framework results framework (by November 2012). EVAL produces a comparative analysis of the evaluability of 2010–11 and 2012–13 project and budget results frameworks and highlights achievements and areas for improvement in the annual evaluation report 2011–12. 	EVAL/none
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Produce by March 2012 a guidance note on targeted impact evaluation methodologies for technical departments, including guidelines on the selection of consultants and quality review of the eventual reports. 	EVAL/none
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ To enhance organizational learning, a working paper systematically synthesizing results and lesson learned from completed independent evaluations, impact studies and other research related to the topic under review in the recurrent discussion report will be produced prior to the ILC session. EVAL will collaborate with relevant department to prepare such systematic review as of 2013. <p>Note: The last action can be conducted only if the topic of the recurrent discussion report is confirmed one year ahead.</p>	EVAL and relevant departments/ \$50,000 per topic
1.2. Articulate explicitly and codify [systematize] a results-oriented accountability framework for the ILO, differentiated for managers and staff and linked to (weighted) outcome indicators.	The system for supporting implementation of the results framework for the Strategic Policy Framework 2016–20 improved to enhance the monitoring of outcomes, including risk management strategies, thus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ By the end of 2013, a critical assessment of the results framework with respect to indicators, measurement criteria and the validity of assumptions will be carried out to inform the development of the next Strategic Policy Framework. ■ In the context of unit workplans and performance management, establish criteria for the timely delivery of outputs to the required quality standards, as 	Bureau of Programming and Management (PROGRAM)/none Human Resources Development Department (HRD)/PROGRAM/Managers

Suggestions and next steps	Long-term improvements	Short-term actions 2012–13	Who/additional cost 2012–13
<p>In the logic of the results framework, managerial accountability for results could be cast in the form of the following triangulation:</p> <p>(i) accountability for the timely delivery of outputs to the required quality standards, as a necessary condition for achieving the expected results;</p> <p>(ii) accountability for the relevance, validity, sustainability and attainability of the assumptions establishing the link between outputs and expected outcomes; and</p> <p>(iii) accountability for the quality of the “operational” risk management.</p> <p>On the basis of a properly managed triangulation, managers can safely expect the outcomes to materialize.</p>	ensuring managerial accountability for results.	<p>a necessary condition for achieving the expected results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Complete biennial independent validation of the quality of operations and risk management strategies. 	PROGRAM with EVAL support/none
<p>1.3. Include the list of critical assumptions in the outcome-based workplan (OBW) template and identify suitable methodological approaches for monitoring the implementation of the programme and budget and Strategic Policy Framework.</p>	idem	In 2012–13, review assumptions and risks in relation to outcomes in the results framework.	Outcome managers and PROGRAM/none
<p>2. Methodologies for synthesizing evaluation-generated performance information</p>			
<p>2.1. Carry out a meta-analysis of operational performance on a biennial basis, drawing from findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned from independent evaluations completed during the</p>	<p>A sound methodology in place for linking technical cooperation performance and results with Strategic Policy Framework outcomes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Second biennial outcome-level meta-analysis report completed for November 2013. ■ To align operational performance data more directly with Strategic Policy Framework outcomes, EVAL will fine tune its methodology to better link technical cooperation performance with each Strategic Policy Framework outcome. Much of the data will focus on country-level indicators, drawing 	EVAL/\$30,000

Suggestions and next steps	Long-term improvements	Short-term actions 2012–13	Who/additional cost 2012–13
previous biennium.		<p>primarily from the list of country programme outcomes associated with each Strategic Policy Framework outcome.</p> <p>Note: This action can be conducted only if country programme outcome performance data are collected and verified by the Office.</p>	
2.2. Revise the methodology and integrate into evaluation procedures for independent evaluations; collect performance data directly from the independent evaluator(s).	Management and information system maintained for evaluation data storage and analysis.	Beginning in 2012, EVAL will regularly collect data on standardized performance indicators as part of the independent evaluations of technical cooperation projects.	EVAL/none
2.3. Incorporate in the scope of upcoming evaluations of ILO programme and budget outcomes consideration of project evaluation findings including performance scoring.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Relevant project performance based on the above assessment methodology will be incorporated in the analysis of all 2012–13 high-level strategy evaluations. 	EVAL/none
3. Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs): Lessons learned			
<p>Strengthen design and implementation of DWCPs based on recommendations contained in meta-study of nine DWCPs in 2010 by ensuring that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the design reflects sound understanding of each country's unique character and flexibility to adapt to external shocks; (ii) constituents are fully engaged in developing DWCPs; (iii) DWCP monitoring and evaluation frameworks are an essential part of the design process and the necessary resources should be provided to implement them; 	DWCPs are the main vehicle for ILO support and tackle within national development frameworks major decent work deficiencies through efficient programmes that embrace each of the strategic objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The DWCP <i>Guidebook</i> version 3 (released in December 2011) has addressed all the recommendations contained in the DWCP meta-study reported on in the annual evaluation report 2010–11. The <i>Guidebook</i> reinforces the requirement of direct participation of ILO constituents and contains language suggesting that monitoring plans and implementation plans are mandatory. The quality assurance checklist contains a question on constituent ownership. During 2012–13, the DWCP <i>Guidebook</i> will be actively promoted and used in training events and other learning and exchange opportunities. ■ Currently the ILO is moving towards fewer earmarked extra-budgetary technical cooperation resources aimed at supporting outcomes. This complements the regular budget and Regular Budget Supplementary Account which can already be programmed flexibly towards DWCPs. This has allowed for the development of rigorous outcome-based programmes which can ensure project quality and consistency across regions. The next step will be to coordinate outcome level actions into coherent country packages in support of integral DWCPs. To do this, the ILO will strengthen the consultation mechanisms between outcome coordinators and field offices 	<p>Partnership and Development Cooperation Department/none</p> <p>EVAL/none</p>

Suggestions and next steps	Long-term improvements	Short-term actions 2012–13	Who/additional cost 2012–13
<p>(iv) progress is made towards the institutionalization of the Decent Work Agenda, including its monitoring and evaluation framework, into the country's institutions, budgets and procedures;</p> <p>(v) funding support for DWCP is programme- rather than project-based and country office structures are aligned to support the DWCP approach; and</p> <p>(vi) an appropriate communication strategy is developed and funded to share experiences on DWCP results.</p>		<p>to see how outcome-based programmes can also work in synergy at the country level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The tentatively scheduled high-level evaluation of the field structure review in 2013 will allow for an assessment of progress made in aligning country office structures and resources to support the DWCP approach. 	

