

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE AND IMPLEMENTATION FOLLOW-UP

Evaluation of the UKTP Programme

Management Response, Action Plan, Results, and Means of Verification

Date of submission of final evaluation report: 15 December 2023	
Responsible manager:	Charles Lor, Programme Officer, DECI-SEC
Responsible chief:	Robert Skidmore, Chef, DECI-SEC
Responsible director:	Escipion Oliveira Gomez, Director, DECI
Head IEU:	Miguel Jiménez Pont, ITC Independent Evaluation Unit
Date of finalization of management response: 25/01/2024	

Recommendation No. 1:

Future UKTP programmes and future UK-funded programmes, in general, should focus on activities that can be implemented within a given financial year. In case that the UK’s funding continues to adopt a year-by-year approach, activities implemented across financial years have the risk of being defunded, limiting the programme’s effectiveness, sustainability and impact.

This recommendation includes:

- a. Designing activities and follow-up activities to be fulfilled within a single UK financial year (even if the project is a multi-year one).*
- b. Identifying activities that require more than a single year support and highlight to FCDO the risks associated with disrupting or shortening the support to that activity.*
- c. Tracking and report the changes experienced in the original planning due to the change in budget.*

Assigned to: ITC-UKTP Programme Management

Management Response and Justification:

The recommendation is:

Accepted:

Partially accepted:

Rejected:

UKTP was already implementing this recommendation.

In December 2023, UK Foreign Commonwealth and Development Office indicated it would grant an additional 1-year extension to UKTP.

At the direction of the FCDO, UKTP implements activities that are of a short-term nature or, if envisioned to be long term, that can achieve an intermediate milestone within the fiscal year that can be followed up on by partners if FCDO discontinues the programme.

ITC has always tracked changes in implementation plans, logframes and budgets with the FCDO. All changes are approved by the Senior Responsible Officer of the FCDO. In addition, plan changes are processed internally as part of ITC’s project cycle management.

IT should be noted that the implementation cycle of less than one year poses significant challenges to achieving development impact. Within Ministry limitations, ITC would recommend longer project cycles.

Action Plan and Responsibilities:

Actions	Expected result and means of verification	Responsible office or partner	Contributing* partner(s)	Implementation deadline	Remarks
1.1 Submit annual delivery plan to FCDO for UKTP for FY24-25	Email approval of the first donor quarterly report of FY24-25	UKTP programme manager DECI/SEC	FCDO Senior Responsible Officer	10 August 2025	
1.2 Submit change request for extension of UKTP into FY24-25	SPPG approval of change request	UKTP programme manager DEC/SECI	SPPG	31 March 2025	
1.3					

Recommendation No. 2:

Future UKTP programmes should contain a strong M&E function, covering both technical and financial outputs. In addition, a mid-term stocktaking exercise should be undertaken to draw lessons learned, informing the second part of the implementation.

This recommendation includes:

a. Strengthen the M&E function, including keeping records of activities (such as End of Activity reports, etc.) as well as reporting and tracking of expenses. The monitoring and finance teams should work closely with the intervention and programme managers to capture programme cost data and coherently attribute this to individual interventions across the different parties involved in the project implementation.

b. Codify actual expense activities by category, which will help to better analyse expenses through monetary and quantitative indicators (such as a Value-for-Money analysis). The current reporting in this programme did not associate the expenses with their related activities' category, making the analysis of allocative efficiency difficult. For example, UKTP could set up cost centres that will ensure that all expenses are recorded and available in a centralised location. Each cost entry would be assigned to a cost type, cost category and cost centre code, which would simplify the tracking and monitoring of all incomes and expenses incurred against the budget.

Note to ITC management: Mid-term evaluations or simpler stocktaking exercises are valuable instruments that can benefit not only the programme being implemented but also all ongoing and future programmes. Even in the event of a budget cut, the IEU should take the lead and implement such reviews.

Assigned to: ITC-UKTP Programme Management

Management Response and Justification:

The recommendation is:		<p>ITC accepts that a strong M&E function is essential. ITC notes that the original design of UKTP as an FCDO programme envisioned that a separate implementing partner for FCDO would carry out the M&E of UKTP with dedicated funding. This learning component was later abandoned, and ITC was tasked, with no additional funding, to carry out the M&E. With appropriate levels of funding for M&E, UKTP could undertake impact assessments estimating indirect and induced effects on jobs and growth, maintain a control group of non-core beneficiary enterprises, or produce systematically researched qualitative comparative analysis of cases of enterprise and market system change.</p> <p>ITC, as per UN financial rules and regulations, implements cost centres and cost categorization. Instead of activity-based budgeting across hundreds of different activities and 20+ countries, ITC proposes to share output level estimates of spending for the purposes of value for money analysis in the Annual Review done by FCDO. ITC will work closely with the FCDO Economist conducting the Annual Review to identify other opportunities to assess value for money as per the VFM criteria of the UK Government.</p>
Accepted:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Partially accepted:	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Rejected:	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Action Plan and Responsibilities:

Actions	Expected result and means of verification	Responsible office or partner	Contributing* partner(s)	Implementation deadline	Remarks
2.1 Advocate with FCDO that the central coordination function be properly resourced with a budget allocation in FY24-25 that allows for a strong M&E function, including estimation of direct, indirect	Additional funding allocation to the UKTP central coordination function subject to acceptance by FCDO	UKTP programme manager DECI/SEC	FCDO Senior Responsible Officer	15 April 2024	

and induced sales, jobs and growth and in depth case studies.					
2.2 Share estimates of spending per output for the FCDO Annual Review	Enable assessment of Value for Money in the FCDO Annual Review	UKTP budget officer DECI/SEC		30 April 2024	
2.3					

Recommendation No. 3:

Future UKTP programmes should also work on improving the business environment of the countries they work with. This could also be achieved through partnerships with other programmes.

This recommendation includes:

- a. Identifying possible partnerships to work together on business environment and sectoral reforms.*
- b. Balancing out the work between the business environment and institutional reforms and direct company support.*
- c. Work around business environment should be sector-focused trade facilitation, with a direct connection to exporting specific products to the UK.*

Assigned to: ITC-UKTP Programme Management

Management Response and Justification:

The recommendation is:

Accepted:

Partially accepted:

UKTP was originally designed based on a holistic approach including policy and institutional work and based on a timeline allowing for medium-term reform. Subsequently, the business environment objective of UKTP – output 2, was deprioritized during the FCDO reprogramming following the ODA budget cuts. UKTP has also become a year-to-year programme which has an effective cycle of 9 months making it difficult to achieve policy reform.

Rejected:

UKTP is specifically scoped to work on the “Making Trade Happen” objective of the FCDO trade centre of expertise and is not tasked with business environment reform. To take this recommendation on board, any work under this pillar would have to be reconciled with FCDO’s trade facilitation objectives which have been assigned to other implementing partners.

If business environment reform is added back to UKTP, given the short planning horizon, ITC would have to limit its commitments to certain activities possible in the short term such as public private dialogues.

The recommendation focuses on products with “a direct connection to the UK market”. ITC has consistent argued that, for development impact for the countries in question, targeting B2B and other efforts only to the UK market is limiting. Ideally, UKTP should focus on reforms that can have a systemic impact beyond those exclusively benefitting the UK.

Action Plan and Responsibilities:

Actions	Expected result and means of verification	Responsible office or partner	Contributing* partner(s)	Implementation deadline	Remarks
2.1 Conduct a dialogue with FCDO about the right balance between advisory at these level and more systemic interventions at the sector level through the annual budget allocation process.	Additional funding allocation to Output 2, and role for UKTP in policy change better defined, subject to agreement by FCDO.	UKTP programme manager DECI/SEC	FCDO Senior Responsible Officer	15 April 2025	
3.2					
3.3					

Recommendation No. 4:

Improve the collaboration and coherence with the UK Missions (both with FCDO and DTB staff), so as to leverage intelligence and networks in the field.

This recommendation includes:

- a. Holding regular working sessions and updates throughout the life of the project.*
- b. Engaging with the UK missions with their different projects and events, boosting the visibility of the selected participants towards UK-based companies.*
- c. Co-organising trade missions, events, and B2B sessions.*

Assigned to: ITC-UKTP Programme Management

Management Response and Justification:

The recommendation is:	ITC has developed excellent relationships with UK trade advisers and Missions, which has even allowed UKTP to obtain additional resources at Post (eg. Pacific).
Accepted: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The UK diplomatic network across 20+ countries where UKTP operates experiences high turnover in Post and requires frequent re-engagement and faces some unfilled vacancies at times. The sudden increase in geographic scope of UKTP in FY23-24 has prompted UKTP to establish new common agreements with each of the UK Missions. ITC can also, through the trade advisers and embassies, integrate relevant UK chambers of commerce such as the UK Ghana Chamber of Commerce, which can be a gateway to additional engagement of UK business.
Partially accepted: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Rejected: <input type="checkbox"/>	

Action Plan and Responsibilities:

Actions	Expected result and means of verification	Responsible office or partner	Contributing* partner(s)	Implementation deadline	Remarks
4.1 Regular meetings with UK missions in planning FY24-25	Positive feedback on engagement with UK missions	UKTP public information officer		31 January 2024	

4.2 Maintain a stakeholder engagement tracking tool	Ability to document and foresee engagement with the UK Diplomatic Network	UKTP public information officer		31 January 2024	
4.3					

Recommendation No. 5:

Future UKTP programmes should adopt strong exit strategies and overall sustainability measures.

This recommendation includes:

a. Designing sustainability measures and exit strategies for each specific country project, reporting changes and challenges as they emerge and adapting the exit strategy in light of the same.

Assigned to: ITC-UKTP Programme Management

Management Response and Justification:

<p>The recommendation is:</p> <p>Accepted: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Partially accepted: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Rejected: <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>UKTP has been extended twice and is expected to be extended at least once more making it difficult to establish definitive exit strategies.</p> <p>Once the FCDO announces the end of the programme, ITC will implement appropriate exit strategies.</p> <p>Though the recommendation does not outline what additional sustainability measures can be implemented, ITC believes that the programme should build in sustainability as part of activity design. For instance, ITC ensures that beneficiaries contribute to the activities through co-financing. For example, ITC never fully subsidizes the exhibition of beneficiaries in international trade fairs. ITC has also had positive experience working with lead firms, as was the case in Madagascar in support of a cluster of women enterprises supplying larger firms, and financial institutions as was the case in Zimbabwe and Fiji.</p>
--	--

Action Plan and Responsibilities:

Actions	Expected result and means of verification	Responsible office or partner	Contributing* partner(s)	Implementation deadline	Remarks
5.1 Adopt exit country exit strategies if UKTP is not renewed for FY25-26	Country exit strategy documents	UKTP programme manager	UK Missions	10/12/2024	
5.2 Identify cases of expected system change	5 market change case study documents	UKTP associate economic affairs officer		31/09/2024	
5.3					