**planning, monitoring & evaluation**

Department:
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
**REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA**

**DPME Guideline No 2.2.5**

**How to develop a Management Response to an Evaluation Report**

Revised February 2021

| | |
|---|---|
| **Addressed to** | M&E Units in Government Departments/ State Owned Enterprises/ Municipalities and programme managers who are undertaking evaluations |
| **Purpose** | The purpose of this practice note is to give practical guidance on how to develop a Management Response to evaluation final reports |
| **Reference documents** | National Evaluation Policy Framework 2019 |
| **Contact person** | Evaluation Unit, DPME<br>E-mail: Evaluations@dpme.gov.za<br>Tel : 012 312 0162 |

## 1      Introduction

The research part of an evaluation is considered complete when the Evaluation Steering Committee approves the final evaluation report as a valid independent report. At this stage, a custodian department would have provided comments on the draft report (e.g. to correct factual errors or to query recommendations) but there may still be areas in the report that the department concerned does not agree with. For example, evaluators may come up with some recommendations that are not feasible, or departments may not agree with certain recommendations. **Provided the report is technically valid and factually correct, the report should be approved by the Evaluation Steering Committee as an independent report.** However, it is important for departments/entities/municipalities to be able to register the areas they do not agree with. Hence departments/entities/municipalities are provided an opportunity to provide a formal management response indicating which recommendations they accept, and substantive reasons for disagreement for the ones they do not accept.

## 2      Purpose of the Management Response

The purpose of the Management Response is to:

2.1     Ensure departments have an opportunity to respond to the specific recommendations from the evaluation indicating which they disagree with, and why;

2.2     Ensure that those recommendations that are agreed upon are identified for taking forward.

2.3     Ensure that all recommendations are evidence based, that they respond adequately to equity challenges, and that they have strong utilisation value.

## 3      Process for developing the Management Response

3.1     The Evaluation final report is produced and approved as technically acceptable by the Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC) in a minuted meeting.

3.2     The DG/Head of the commissioning department/unit then writes to the custodian departments/Entities/Municipalities involved (or affected by the recommendations) with a table summarising the recommendations, asking the departments concerned to indicate whether they agree or not for each recommendation, and if they disagree why.

3.3     Departments/Entities/Municipalities involved are given 30 days following the approval by the ESC to provide the management response to the evaluation.

3.4     The recommendations agreed on in the management response will be the only ones considered in the Improvement Plan. Note that an Improvement Plan is prepared within 4 months after the evaluation report is approved by the Steering Committee (see Guideline 2.2.6).

3.5     The Management Response is included in the pack of documents that accompany the Evaluation Report for purposes of briefing the Clusters, Cabinet Committees, Portfolio Committees and when the Evaluation Reports get published for access by the general public (See Guideline on Communication 2.2.8).

3.6     Once the Improvement Plan is produced, the Report, Management Response and Improvement Plan can be tabled at Cabinet for noting the outcome of the evaluation. In a case where the Management Response and the Improvement Plan are not received from the responsible programme manager within four months of approval of the report by the Steering Committee, it will be taken that there are no reservations and therefore it can proceed to the next stages of the process. In other words, the process to table the report at Cabinet will commence.


## 4       Format of the Management Response

4.1     Annexure A shows the letter written by the DG DPME to the respective departments/Entities/Municipalities requesting a management response for evaluations included in the National Evaluation Plan (NEP).

4.2     This includes a table listing the recommendations and providing an opportunity for the department/entity/municipality to indicate agreement or disagreement and to explain, if a disagreement.

4.3     Annexure B provides an example of a management response by a department/entity/municipality. This must be signed by the Director-General (DG) of the commissioning department/entity/municipality.


Signed


Mr Robert Nkuna
Director-General
Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
Date: 19/05/2021

# Annex A

Name
Director General
Department of X
Address
**PRETORIA**
0001

Dear Colleague

**Name of evaluation**

 The Department(s)/SOE(s)/Municipality(s) of X and ourselves have been collaborating on a (*name of evaluation*) which was approved in the National Evaluation Plan of 20— to 20--.

The final report has been considered by the Evaluation Steering Committee which approved it on (*date),* approving it technically and that there are no factual errors, not necessarily agreeing with the content. I attached a copy of the Final Report. The recommendations have been extracted and are shown in Table 1 in Annex 1.

The next stages in the evaluation are to obtain a formal management response from the DGs involved about the content, particularly the recommendations.  To this end, I would like to invite you to respond officially within 30 days (*date, 30 days from date of letter*), endorsing or disagreeing with the combined recommendations in the attached table in Annex 1. To simplify this process could you endorse each recommendation and indicate a substantive explanation if you disagree in the column provided. Then please initial each page and sign indicating your endorsement of the table as completed by you.

Once the management response is provided the Department with DPME will then develop an Improvement Plan based on the agreed findings, within a maximum of 3 months, but ideally sooner. The Final Report and Management Response will be presented immediately to the relevant clusters and will go up on the DPME website. Meanwhile the Improvement Plan is being prepared, after which both are submitted to Cabinet. Absence of a formal management response will imply that the content of the report are acceptable and therefore the report will proceed to the next stages of the process.

I also attach a guideline on developing an Improvement Plan.  Please let us know should you have any security concerns about a particular section of the report.

Kind regards


_____
**Director-General**
**Date:**

**Signed**


**Name**
**Director-General**
**Department of X**

**Date:**


Cc      Relevant programme manager responsible for the evaluation (probably chair of the steering committee)
Cc      Departmental M&E person involved in the evaluation

Attached:

Final report on the evaluation
Annex 1:Table showing recommendations

**Table 1:        Recommendations and management response (example from ECD)**

| RECOMMENDATION FROM THE ECD EVALUATION STEERING GROUP | RECORD OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT | REASONS FOR DISAGREEMENT |
|---|---|---|
| 1.  **A country strategy for ECD should be developed** based on a National Integrated Regulatory framework for ECD, from which each department (DBE, DSD, DoH and if relevant other departments) should develop an implementation programme for their component. A Task Team should be established to produce the Strategy – with clear roles and responsibilities of key players and government departments. The country strategy should be submitted to Cabinet for approval. | | |
| 2.  **The  national strategy should** include a common definition of ECD; agreed provisioning based on age, stage of development, socio-economic circumstance and needs (including delivery services to reach poor and vulnerable children, and promoting universal access); multidisciplinary and inter-sectoral teams with funding streams & mechanisms in line with outcomes and results; specific institutional arrangements of interdepartmental and inter-sectoral cooperation with clear protocols; mechanisms for information sharing. | | |
| 3.  **etc** | | |

## Annex B: Example of Management Response

| RECOMMENDATION FROM THE ECD EVALUATION STEERING GROUP | RECORD OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT | REASONS FOR DISAGREEMENT |
|---|---|---|
| **LEGISLATION AND POLICY FRAMEWORK (INCLUDING STRATEGIES)** | | |
| 1. A country strategy for ECD should be developed based on a National Integrated Regulatory framework for ECD, from which each department (DBE, DSD, DoH and if relevant other departments) should develop an implementation programme for their component. A Task Team should be established to produce the Strategy – with clear roles and responsibilities of key players and government departments. The country strategy should be submitted to Cabinet for approval. | Agree that we need a country strategy for ECD and that it needs to be submitted to Cabinet for approval.<br><br>Agree that a task team, with clear roles and responsibilities, should be established to produce the strategy. We propose that this task team should be established by Cabinet.<br><br>Agree that each department should develop an implementation programme for their component, based on the strategy. | The modalities of a "national integrated regulatory framework" need to be investigated further. |
| 2. **The national strategy should** include a common definition of ECD; agreed provisioning based on age, stage of development, socio-economic circumstance and needs (including delivery services to reach poor and vulnerable children, **also children with disabilities**, and promoting universal access); multidisciplinary and inter-sectoral teams with funding streams & mechanisms in line with outcomes and results; specific institutional arrangements of | Agree | |