

The IDI Management Team welcomes the findings of the Evaluation and finds the overall conclusion to be a fair reflection of the situation:

**Achievement of Outcomes and Expected Results**

“In summary, the findings show that IDI has achieved the two Outcomes established in the *Grant Agreement*, and clearly achieved two of the Expected Results. However, the delay in getting the *Handbook* finished is a shortcoming of the program and not all participants were either aware of the *Compendium* or found it useful. There is no indication that similar programs have been held by the INTOSAI regional bodies. (page 14)

It is pleasing that the two outcomes – strengthened capacity of SAIs for public debt audit, and greater acceptance of audit recommendations by sovereign borrowers – were considered achieved. At the level of expected results, IDI is encouraged to see 92% of participating SAIs completed their audits associated with the programme, and made use of the guidance material. IDI regrets the delays in finalising and publishing the handbook on Public Debt Audit, which limited its use by other SAIs outside the programme. However, this has since been published on the IDI website as an exposure draft for public comment, in accordance with IDI’s protocol for the quality assurance of global public goods. IDI considers that the final expected result – similar programmes taken up by INTOSAI regional bodies to cover SAIs not participating in the programme – was an unrealistic result that didn’t take into consideration the competing priorities and limited resources of both SAIs and INTOSAI regional bodies.

The review makes 4 specific recommendations, which the IDI management team agrees with and intends to action. IDI’s response to these recommendations is recorded in the following table.

Topic / Recommendation	IDI response	Accepted Yes/No	IDI Proposed Action
<b>Strategic Priorities</b>			
1. IDI is recommended, when designing a capacity development program and proposal to a donor, to establish and engage the relevant experts for a program, to ensure the feasibility of the program and avoid delays in the start-up phase of the program.	Generally, IDI expects to have the necessary in-house expertise and access to external experts to deliver its core programmes. However, for very specialised areas such as this programme, access to expertise was an issue.	Yes	IDI’s new strategic plan 2019-23 will focus IDI’s work in four core workstreams, allowing IDI to build both its internal capacity and external networks around delivery of these workstreams. IDI will also enter into long-term strategic partnerships to ensure it has wider access to external experts.

Topic / Recommendation	IDI response	Accepted Yes/No	IDI Proposed Action
<p>2. IDI is recommended to establish manners in which participants can interact and share experiences and learning after the program.</p>	<p>Many IDI programmes included Community Portals to enable such interaction, though this programme did not. IDI's experience is that such portals are heavily used during the programme but little used after the programme, whilst being resource intensive to maintain.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>IDI's new strategic plan 2019-23 will move away from discrete, timebound programmes of this nature, and focus instead on supporting SAIs across four workstreams which represent the core activities of an effective SAI. Within these workstreams, IDI will develop mechanisms through which participants can interact with IDI and each other to share their experiences and knowledge.</p>
<p>3. IDI is recommended to prioritize drafting and finalizing important guidance material with the aim of publishing this within the same year as the finalization of the pilot audit reports.</p>	<p>This was caused in part by turnover of successive IDI programme managers, compounded by strategic changes to IDI's processes for assuring the quality of global public goods. As noted in this and other evaluations, IDI was operating with significant staff vacancy rates during this period, caused by difficulties recruiting sufficient quantity and quality of staff, and due to uncertainties over future funding levels.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>IDI will endeavour to publish version 0 of all GPGs as soon as possible following completion of the programme, or during the programme where the programme phasing allows. IDI now monitors staff vacancy rates periodically, but expects recruitment challenges and fluctuating funding levels to continue.</p>
<p>4. IDI is recommended to invite institutions, CSOs and academic institutions that have not been involved in the program to review the Handbook to ensure that relevant and current best practice based on their experience is reflected.</p>	<p>Such institutions have been invited to comment on version 0, through publishing this on the IDI website and also inviting comments. Given the delays in finalising the handbook (noted above) IDI did not consider it appropriate to invite such comment before publishing the version 0 exposure draft for public comment.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>IDI's protocol for quality assurance of Global Public Goods (GPGs) now requires that draft GPGs are shared with a selection of independent external experts such as these for their comment and review, prior to finalisation and exposure of version 0.</p>