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1. Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide a practical guide for how to integrate document review into the MOPAN Common Approach (CA) assessment in 2014. It builds on the 2013 version of the Document Review Guide and is intended to complement other MOPAN documents, such as the 2014 Methodology paper. This year constitutes the fifth round of document review in the MOPAN Common Approach, and adjustments have been made based on experience from previous years. However, further adjustments may be required based on the availability of documentation this year. As such, this Guide should be viewed as a working document.

1.1 Purpose of the Document Review

Through an examination of publicly available documents, the MOPAN assessment looks for evidence that multilateral organisations have the systems, practices and behaviours that MOPAN considers to be important factors in an organisation’s effectiveness and that they are contributing to development/humanitarian results.

The document review considers various types of documents:

- Multilateral organisation documents relevant to the assessment of the MOPAN micro-indicators, such as strategic plans, results frameworks, policies and procedures in various areas of organisational effectiveness. Documents that present the results achieved at various levels of the organisation are also consulted. The organisations help to identify these documents.
- Organisational evaluations, reviews, or assessments (external or internal) about the organisation’s performance on the dimensions of the MOPAN framework (strategic management, operational management, relationship management, and knowledge management) and about the organisation’s contributions to development/humanitarian results. These studies are either found on the organisation’s web site or are provided by the organisation.
- External assessments, such as Quality of Official Development Assistance conducted by the Brookings Institution and the Center for Global Development, the Global Partnership Monitoring Survey, and previous MOPAN surveys.
- Evaluations, either internal or external, that address relevance and achievement of results at the institutional/organisation-wide, thematic, or country programme levels.

2. Approach

This section describes the general approach to conducting the document review in the MOPAN assessment. The MIs and the basis for assessment for each MI are presented in Section 3 below.

2.1 Document Collection

The collection of documents follows the general steps outlined below, although it is not a linear process:

1. Documents are considered to be “publicly available” if they are on the organisation’s web site or if the organisation is able to provide them upon request for the purpose of assessing the micro-indicators.
2. The review of documents excludes bilateral assessments of the multilateral organisations.
3. If data from these sources are not available for the multilateral organisations participating in this year’s survey, either an alternate approach is developed or the micro-indicators are not assessed.
• Initial document research on the web site of the multilateral organisation
• Preparation of a preliminary list of all documents to be reviewed, by indicator
• Consultation with the multilateral organisation to fill any gaps in the list of documents
• Multilateral organisation reviews and refines the list of documents

Once the document review has commenced, further documentation may be needed from the organisation in order to fill any gaps in information for certain indicators. The assessment team is conscious of the potential burden on the organisation and keeps the requests for documents within reasonable limits. After a number of requests have been made, the consultant team makes the initial assessment based on the information available.

2.1.1 Sampling

The multilateral organisations selected for review represent a wide variety of organisational structures, processes, and practices – which makes it challenging to create a generic sampling strategy. However, the collection of documents follows a number of overall principles to ensure consistency and focus the sampling process.

All documents, regardless of type or level within the organisation, should be approved by the relevant authority (e.g., organisation-wide documents are usually approved by the multilateral organisation’s Executive Management or Board).

In general, the types of documents will include:

• Policies or guidelines, at any level within the multilateral organisation that are in force as of the year of assessment;
• Organisation-wide and country strategies and workplans from the current (year of the MOPAN assessment) and previous strategy cycles;
• Organisation-wide and country –specific performance reports for the past three – five years, depending on the strategy cycle;
• Evaluations conducted at corporate, regional, or country level in the past three to five years inclusive of the year of assessment that provide information on organisational practices and systems, the relevance of the organisation’s work, and the achievement of stated results;
• Thematic documents, including strategies, plans and reports;
• Information presented on the multilateral organisation’s web site (i.e., the text from a page on this site, not a downloadable document available on the site), which is assumed to be current unless the web page itself states otherwise.

In addition, the assessment team seeks documents that provide a clear picture of the current practice in a certain area and thus will focus on:

• Project/programme level documents: the current or previous year
• Country, regional, or organisation-wide documents: the past three years inclusive of the year of assessment

When indicators require a sample of evaluations, sector strategies, country strategies, or project level documentation, a specific sampling approach is developed and tailored for each multilateral organisation.

---

4 This is intended to ensure that documents reviewed are final documents (rather than drafts) and that they are providing guidance for organisational behaviour.

5 However, in some cases it is also necessary to review older documents in order to appreciate any changes introduced by the organisation.
Country-level documents will normally focus on the MOPAN survey countries (Bangladesh, Cambodia, DRC, Ecuador, Kenya, Tanzania) unless there is a need to broaden the scope in order to better understand the nature of the organisation’s practice in a particular area.

2.2 Analysis

2.2.1 Overview

In general, the review of documents is guided by criteria that help to assess the content of documents. These criteria draw on existing resources or standards in the indicator area (where available) and are adapted to the needs of the MOPAN Common Approach.

The analysis of indicators in the organisational effectiveness component may include an examination of one or more of the following elements, depending on the nature of the indicator, criteria and sources of information:

- **Quality**: Documents are assessed in terms of their content, and in particular for the presence or absence of particular items or characteristics defined by MOPAN as standards of best practice.

- **Use**: While difficult to assess by document review, some proxy indicators for the use or implementation of a document are examined, such as evidence from budget documents that a certain policy or priority area is being financed, or evidence from evaluations that show implementation of a policy or priority area.

- **Consistency**: Where possible, several documents of the same type are examined (such as country strategies in different countries) to assess the extent to which criteria are met consistently across the organisation.

- **Improvement over time**: In some cases, documents are examined over several years to assess the extent to which progress can be seen over time.

Documents are also used to aid in understanding the contexts in which the multilateral organisations work.

In the development/humanitarian results component, both institutional and country level documents are reviewed to analyse evidence on the extent to which planned results from the strategic period were achieved and to identify evidence of the multilateral organisation’s relevance and contributions to national goals and priorities. The document review focuses on performance reports and thematic or programme evaluations in relevant areas to examine the data on results.

2.2.2 Approach to Rating

The multilateral organisations are assessed on relevant micro-indicators in the Common Approach document review framework. The document review ratings are generally defined according to a six-point scale for the majority of the organisational effectiveness questions (very weak, weak, inadequate, adequate, strong, very strong).

**Organisational Effectiveness**

The document review ratings determined for the majority of the MIs in the Common Approach build on the definitions and scale used in the survey.

---

6 Not all MOPAN micro-indicators are identified for document review.

7 For document review, however, the definition of “Very Weak” is expanded to mean that “the multilateral organisation does not have this system in place and this is a source of concern / or the organisation has limited documentation that provides evidence of such a system being in place.”
For most micro-indicators, five criteria are established which, taken together, are considered to approach ‘best practice’ in that topic area as defined by MOPAN members. Each criterion is designed as a ‘met/not met’ alternative and each ‘met’ counts as one point. Ratings are arrived at by totalling the number of criteria met, taking into account all the evidence in the assessment (giving special attention to evaluations that address the topic of the indicator), and the assessment team’s judgment.

**Document review criteria and rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of criteria met</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No criteria met (or required document(s) do not exist)</td>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>The multilateral organisation does not have this practice, behaviour or system in place and this is a source of concern/ or the multilateral organisation has limited documentation of such a system being in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One criterion met</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>The multilateral organisation has this practice, behaviour or system but there are important deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two criteria met</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>The multilateral organisation’s practice, behaviour or system in this area has deficiencies that make it less than acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three criteria met</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>The multilateral organisation's practice, behaviour or system is acceptable in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four criteria met</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>The multilateral organisation's practice, behaviour or system is more than acceptable yet without being “best practice” in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All five criteria met</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>The multilateral organisation’s practice, behaviour or system is “best practice” in this area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings for key performance indicators (KPIs) are based solely on the ratings for the component micro-indicators in each KPI. Each KPI rating is calculated by taking the arithmetic mean of all micro-indicator ratings in that KPI rounded to the nearest whole number. This number is then given the appropriate descriptor. In cases where the micro-indicator ratings for one key performance indicator are highly divergent (i.e., if there are two micro-indicators, and one is rated as “very weak” while the other is rated as “very strong”), this is noted in the narrative of the report.

**Contributions to Development/Humanitarian Results**

As noted in the 2014 MOPAN Common Approach Methodology (p. 19), the ratings for each of the KPIs developed to assess an organisation’s contributions to development/humanitarian results are based on multiple sources of evidence. There is no rating provided based solely on the review of documents, although the organisation’s reports and evaluations are considered as a key source of evidence on its progress towards its objectives/results and its relevance. The criteria and guiding questions used in the review of documents are provided in section 3.5.

**2.2.3 Quality assurance**

The assessment teams for each multilateral organisation carry out quality assurance during the document review process at various stages and at multiple levels.
At the level of individual document review criteria, the research analyst and junior consultant on each team conduct the initial document review and analysis, which is then vetted by the senior consultant leading the assessment for that multilateral organisation. As necessary, the document review ratings are also reviewed by the project manager and by the senior methodological advisor.

At the level of the micro-indicator, the assessment teams for each multilateral organisation hold regular joint meetings by topic area to help ensure consistency across reports – in conceptual interpretation of the various indicators, data sources, and the standards/criteria against which the documentation is rated. These meetings are overseen by the project manager and the senior methodological advisor.

At the level of the key performance indicator, the senior consultants leading each of the multilateral organisation assessments and the project manager review the ratings given to each of the organisations to ensure that ratings are accurate.

For the results component, each assessment team reviews all the evidence available for each KPI and comes to a preliminary judgment on the rating. The ratings are then discussed with the project manager prior to presentation of evidence and proposed ratings to a Results Panel which includes the senior methodological advisor and other experts in managing for development results and/or with knowledge of the organisation.

In the report for each organisation assessed, a methodological appendix provides the document review template, a list of the main documents used to assess each criterion, and any comments or explanations for the rating.

2.3 Limitations

While MOPAN uses recognised standards and criteria for what constitutes good or best practice for a multilateral organisation, such criteria do not exist for all MOPAN indicators and some of the criteria used in reviewing document content were developed by MOPAN in the course of the assessment process. These are a work in progress and should not be considered definitive standards.

The document review component works within the confines of an organisation’s disclosure policy. In some cases, low document review ratings may be due to unavailability of organisational documents that meet the MOPAN criteria (some of which require a sample of a type of document, such as country plans, or require certain aspects to be documented explicitly). When the information required to make a rating is unavailable, this is noted in the report.

While the document review can evaluate the contents of a document, it cannot assess the extent to which the spirit of that document has been implemented within the organisation (unless implementation is documented elsewhere). This limitation will be partially managed in the following ways:

- Some proxies for use may be identified in the document review. For example, we may examine budget documents to ascertain if financial resources have been committed towards a certain policy area, which may indicate implementation of that policy. Evaluation reports may also identify the extent to which a particular policy has been implemented, and this will be given special attention in the assessment.

- In analysis and report-writing, establishing linkages across MIs may build the case for implementation. For example, MIs 3.1 and 3.2 assess the organisation-wide results frameworks. MI 19.1 asks whether or not the organisation “reports against its organisation-wide strategy, including contribution to outcomes”. By establishing the link from the latter MI to the former, we may build the case that the results frameworks have or have not been implemented (i.e., data is collected against the indicators in the framework).
Triangulation with survey findings will also help to go beyond document contents. Perceptions from survey respondents may provide an indication as to the success of implementation of a certain strategy, policy or other document. For example, if the document review provides a high score for MI 4.1 on gender as a cross-cutting thematic priority, but the survey respondents give it a low rating, this may indicate that the policy document is in place but it is not being effectively implemented across the organisation.

3. Assessment Criteria and Questions

In the organisational effectiveness component, a separate table is provided for each MI. In each table, the performance area, sub-performance area, KPI and MI are presented, in line with the MOPAN Common Approach framework. The table also includes the reference sources that support the MI and/or include norms or standards for the MI (where available). In some cases, no specific sources are mentioned because the MI reflects expectations for practices that have been generally agreed by MOPAN.

The row labelled “sample” in the tables below identifies the document sources which will be used in assessing that micro-indicator. The “assessment criteria” row lists the (normally five) criteria which provide the basis for rating the organisation. The “rating” row describes how the number of criteria met translates into a rating for that MI.

In the development/humanitarian results component, the criteria and questions used to guide the analysis of documents are listed for each of the KPI. (The ratings are only provided at the level of KPI.) The types of documents to be considered are also included as part of the sample.

More information on assessment criteria, rating and basis for judgement is provided in section 2.2 above.
### 3.1 Performance area I – Strategic management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>I Strategic management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Leadership and Culture for Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>1. The Multilateral Organisation (MO) provides direction for the achievement of development/humanitarian results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>1.3 The MO ensures application of an organisation-wide policy on results management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available</td>
<td>OECD. “Managing for Development Results”, Policy Brief, March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It includes, under “Shared Strategies”:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus on development outcomes with agreed indicators and time-bound targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Broad agreement on goals and alignment of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of results chains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It provides the following definition of Results-based management, which illustrates the type of requirements of a policy on results management:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Results-based management is an approach aimed at achieving important changes in the way that organizations operate, with improving performance in terms of results as the central orientation. It provides the management frameworks and tools for strategic planning, risk management, performance monitoring, and evaluation. Its main purposes are to improve organizational learning and to fulfill accountability obligations through performance reporting.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Organisation-wide policy, strategy, framework, or plan pertaining to results-based management (RBM) and/or managing for development results (MfDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidelines on RBM/MfDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviews or evaluation of the organisation’s application of RBM/MfDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed assessment criteria</td>
<td>1. An organisation-wide policy, strategy, framework, or plan that describes the nature and role of results based management (RBM) and/or management for development results (MfDR) in the organisation is corporately approved (alternatively, the approach to RBM/MfDR may be described in the context of a strategic plan and further operationalised through other documents).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The MO has guidelines on RBM/MfDR, either in hard copies or online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The MO provides opportunities for capacity building of staff on RBM/MfDR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. There is evidence (e.g. in the policy itself, in the MO’s general reform agenda, etc.) that the MO regularly reviews the implementation of its policy on RBM/MfDR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. There is evidence that the MO is ensuring application of RBM/MfDR in practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>No criteria met = very weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One criterion met = weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two criteria met = inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three criteria met = adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four criteria met = strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All five criteria met = very strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance area

#### Strategic management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-performance area</th>
<th>Corporate Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>2. The MO's corporate/organisation-wide strategies are clearly focused on the mandate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>2.1 The MO's corporate/organisation-wide strategy is based on a clear definition of mandate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available

OECD, Effective Aid Management: Twelve Lessons from DAC Peer Reviews, 2008

*Lesson 1: Have a clear, top-level statement of the purpose of development co-operation, whether in legislation or another form, that has wide ownership and can remain relevant for a sufficient period*

Recent DAC peer reviews demonstrate the importance of obtaining clarity at the highest political level on the overall aim of the national aid programme. [...] Anchoring development policy unambiguously in legislation has provided an effective framework for governments that have a strong interest in development. However legislation, if not regularly updated, also can restrain system efficiency in the fast evolving world of development co-operation, so too much detail can be counter-productive. [...] Peer reviews also note the importance of a clear high-level mandate for downstream aid management and for delivery approaches that are internally efficient and that can adjust to evolving international agendas, such as that of aid effectiveness.*

### Sample

- MO's mandate statement (on website or any other corporately approved document)
- General Assembly, ECOSOC, and other relevant documents, including QCPR
- Organisation-wide strategic plan
- Strategic updates/monitoring reports

### Proposed assessment criteria

1. The necessary periodic revisions of the MO mandate/mission statement are made so it has continuing relevance.
2. The organisational strategic plan articulates goals & focus priorities.
3. The organisational strategic plan gives a clear indication of how the MO will implement the mandate in a certain period.
4. There is evidence that the organisational strategic plan is monitored to ensure it is focused on the MO's mandate.
5. There is evidence that any discrepancy between the organisational strategic plan and the MO's mandate has been addressed (i.e. the organisational strategic plan and the mandate have been realigned).

### Rating

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong

**Mandate:** An authorisation to act. This authorisation can come from many sources (the UN General Assembly, the Secretary General, etc.) and may be subject to periodic adjustments.

**Mission:** Description of the work that an organisation is mandated to perform. It includes the type of activities, outputs, targeted clients (e.g. displaced persons, the poor, etc.) upon which its public image is developed. The mission is the answer to the question: why does the organisation exist? Working from a mandate an organisation develops a mission.

**Vision:** The situation that an organisation or institution aspires to. A vision statement answers the question: where do we want to go? The vision is meant to inspire, guide, and encourage the organisation as a whole to reach the desirable state.

**Strategy:** A plan describing how the organisation will carry out its mission and achieve its goals. A strategic plan is the highest-level document that serves to guide and direct the operations of the multilateral organisation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>I Strategic management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Corporate Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>2. The MO’s corporate/organisation-wide strategies are clearly focused on the mandate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>2.2 The MO aligns its strategic plan to the quadrennial comprehensive policy review (QCPR) guidance and priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available**

UNDG. *QCPR Action Plan and Narrative, 19 June 2013*

The 2012 QCPR resolution (GA/Res/67/226) includes a total of 178 mandates from the General Assembly to enhance development effectiveness of operational activities: (a) capacity-building and development, e.g. through the use of national systems; (b) gender equality and women’s empowerment; (c) South-South cooperation; (d) regional dimensions of development; (e) results-based management and planning; and (f) evaluation.

Some, but not all of these areas are covered in the other KPI in the MOPAN framework.

All QCPR mandates will be addressed by the UN Funds, Programmes and Agencies as relevant. The QCPR emphasizes the importance of ensuring that strategic plans of Funds and programmes are consistent with and guided by the comprehensive policy review (GA/Res/67/226, para 184).

**Sample**

- Most recent organisation-wide strategic plan
- Mid-term reviews of progress on the strategic plan
- Ad hoc memorandum and other documents on QCPR
- Most recent country strategy documents

**Proposed assessment criteria**

1. The MO refers to QCPR directives and their implications for strategy and operations (in strategy or other policy documents).
2. The most recent strategic plan adopts directives of the QCPR or mid-term reviews of strategies recommend ways of aligning with QCPR in cases when strategy cycle is not aligned with QCPR.
3. The strategic plan DRF and MRF reflect elements of the QCPR.
4. At least half of the new country strategies sampled reference QCPR directives.
5. There is evidence of progress in implementing QCPR resolutions.

**Rating**

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong
### Performance area

I Strategic management

#### Sub-performance area

Corporate Strategy

#### KPI

3. The MO’s corporate/organisation-wide strategies are results-focused.

#### MI

3.1 Results frameworks have causal links from outputs through to outcomes and impact.

### Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available

- OECD. *Results based management in the development co-operation agencies: a review of experience*, 2000
- UN DESA. *Results-based Management in the United Nations Development System: Progress and Challenges*

> “Development stakeholders now recognize that the process of improving conditions in the world, a country, or an organization is a process of change management. Defining clear results provides a better target for change. Periodically measuring results provides guideposts or markers that allow for corrections to keep programs or projects on track toward their stated outcomes. Ultimately, better managing for results helps demonstrate more clearly whether development outcomes have been achieved.”


This document defines results chain as:

> “Causal sequence for a development intervention that stipulates the necessary sequence to achieve desired objectives, beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes, impacts and feedback.” (p.166) It also mentions that “A logframe links the activities, results, purpose, and objectives of a program, policy, or project in a hierarchy.” (p.168)

### Sample

- Organisation-wide MRF and DRF
- Organisation-wide strategic plan
- Evaluations or mid-term reviews

### Proposed assessment criteria

1. At least one organisation-wide level results framework (i.e. MRF and/or DRF) exists, either contained within the strategic plan or as a separate document which is referred to by the strategic plan.

2. The DRF contains both statements of outputs and expected outcomes appropriate to their results level (i.e., what are called outputs are actually outputs; what are called outcomes are actually outcomes).

3. There is either an *implicit or explicit* description in the DRF (or in the strategic plan) of the results chain – that is, how the outputs in the results framework(s) are linked to the expected outcomes.

4. In the DRF, there is a clear and logical progression from outcomes to impact.

5. All above criteria are met in both a management results framework and programme results framework.

**Note:** Management results and development results may be presented together in one framework. This combined framework will be assessed according to the above criteria.

### Rating

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong

---

**Development results framework:** a description (in tabular, chart or narrative form) of development, beneficiary/stakeholder-focused results (including indicators) that are expected as effects of the the MO’s activities (technical assistance, services, funding, normative work, others).

**Management results framework:** a description (in tabular, chart or narrative form) of management (in-house/business focused) results, including indicators, that are expected as effects of an MO’s efforts to improve operational and program management.

**Output:** The products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes. (OECD-DAC, Glossary of Terms in Evaluation and Results-based Management, 2010)
**Outcome**: The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs. Related terms: result, outputs, impacts, effect.
### I Strategic management: Corporate Strategy

#### KPI
3. The MO’s corporate/organisation-wide strategies are results-focused.

#### MI
3.2 Standard performance indicators are included in organisation-wide plans and strategies at a delivery (output) and development results level.

### Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available

OECD. *Results based management in the development co-operation agencies: a review of experience*, 2000

“Indicators are developed for measuring implementation progress and achievement of results. The logframe provides a five-level structure around which the indicators are typically constructed. Indicators specify what to measure along a scale or dimension. [...] The relative importance of indicator types is likely to change over the project’s life cycle, with more emphasis at first to input and process indicators, while shifting later to output, outcome (purpose-level), and impact (goal-level) indicators.”


“Indicators for measuring achievement of the objectives are validated according to generally accepted criteria, such as SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Timely).”


“If indicators are used as a basis for results assessment these should be SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time bound).”

### Sample
- Organisation-wide MRF and DRF
- Organisation-wide strategic plan
- Evaluations or reviews

### Proposed assessment criteria

1. In the development results framework, few of the performance indicators at the outcome level and output level are SMART.
2. In the DRF, some of the performance indicators at the outcome level and output level are SMART.
3. In the DRF, most of the performance indicators at the outcome level and output level are SMART.
4. In the DRF, all of the performance indicators at the outcome level and output level are SMART.
5. All above criteria are also met in the MRF.

### Rating
- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong

---

**Indicator:** Quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect the changes connected to an intervention, or to help assess the performance of a development actor. (OECD DAC. *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management*, 2002)

**Standard performance indicator:** By “standard” indicators, we refer to performance measures that meet certain quality criteria such as those known as SMART.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>I Strategic management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Corporate Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>4. The MO maintains focus on the cross-cutting thematic priorities identified in its strategic framework, and/or considered important by MOPAN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>4.1 Gender equality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“The CEB policy further commits members to: “providing strong leadership within our organizations to ensure that a gender perspective is reflected in all our organizational practices, policies, and programmes.” The policy sets out six elements for promotion of gender equality and women’s empowerment:
- Strengthening accountability for gender equality results among staff at all levels in order to close implementation gaps both in policy areas and in the field
- Enhancing results-based management for gender equality by utilizing common-system indicators and measurement protocols
- Establishing oversight through monitoring, evaluation, and reporting by utilizing, inter alia, peer reviews, gender audits as well as collecting sex-disaggregated data
- Allocating sufficient human and financial resources including better utilization of current resources, joint programming, allocation of additional resources where required, alignment of resources with expected outcomes and tracking the utilization of resources
- Developing and/or strengthening staff capacity and competency in gender mainstreaming by adopting both common-system and individual organization’s capacity development approaches
- Ensuring coherence/coordination and knowledge/information management at the global, regional, and national levels”. |
<p>| In this document, there are directives on gender equality and women’s empowerment, such as: |
| “88. Calls upon the United Nations development system to acquire sufficient technical expertise for gender mainstreaming in programme planning and implementation to ensure that gender dimensions are systematically addressed […]” |
| 90. Encourages the organizations of the United Nations development system to collect, analyse, and disseminate comparable data, disaggregated by sex and age, in a regular and systematic manner, in order to guide country programming, and to support the preparation of organization-wide and country-level documents, such as the strategic, programmatic and results-based frameworks, and to continue to refine their tools for measuring progress and impact; |
| 91. Calls upon the organizations of the United Nations development system, within their organizational mandates, to further improve their institutional accountability mechanisms and to include intergovernmentally agreed gender equality results and gender-sensitive indicators in their strategic frameworks; |
| 92. Also calls upon the organizations of the United Nations development system to continue efforts to achieve gender balance in appointments within the United Nations system at the central, regional, and country levels for positions that affect operational activities for development, including appointments of resident coordinators and other high-level posts, with due regard to the representation of women from programme countries, in particular developing countries, and keeping in mind the principle of equitable geographical representation.” |
| “mainstreaming a gender perspective is the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making women’s as well as men’s concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality.” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>I Strategic management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Corporate Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sample | - Organisation-wide strategic plan  
- Organisation-wide gender policy  
- Organisation-wide reports on performance  
- Organisation-wide evaluation/review reports (that explore how the organisation is mainstreaming gender)  
- Self-reported data contributed to UN System-Wide Action Plan (SWAP) for Implementation of the CEB United Nations System-Wide Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women  
- Country strategy documents  
- Country-level performance reports |
| Proposed assessment criteria | 1. The organisation has a policy or strategic framework on the mainstreaming of gender or has clearly stated gender equality results as part of its organisational strategic plan.  
2. Country strategy/programming documents also articulate gender equality/mainstreaming as a priority. More than half of the country-level strategies and results frameworks sampled include results that integrate gender equality.  
3. The organisation has clearly defined roles and responsibilities with regard to the mainstreaming of gender.  
4. There is evidence that the organisation has resourced its policy/strategy for gender mainstreaming (in terms of staffing, funding, and technical expertise).  
5. There is evidence that the organisation monitors its progress in mainstreaming gender in order to take action to correct any identified issues.  
**Note:** If a review or evaluation notes that there are still several areas for improvement, the organisation should be rated no better than adequate and the findings of this evaluation should be noted. If the review notes that the organisation is deficient in this area then the rating should be inadequate. |
| Rating | No criteria met = very weak  
One criterion met = weak  
Two criteria met = inadequate  
Three criteria met = adequate  
Four criteria met = strong  
All five criteria met = very strong |

**Mainstreaming:** The horizontal and vertical integration of a topic so as to produce process-related and programmatic results.
### Performance area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-performance area</th>
<th>Corporate Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>4. The MO maintains focus on the cross-cutting thematic priorities identified in its strategic framework, and/or considered important by MOPAN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>4.2 Environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available


  Environmental sustainability is one of the five UN Country Programming Principles.

  “The concept [i.e. sustainable development] has a unique inter-generational imperative: that development should meet the needs of the current generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs. Environmental sustainability is therefore one of the five key principals that must by applies in conducting a CCA and preparing an UNDAF.”


  QCPR resolution also considers environment as one of the three pillars of sustainable development that should be supported by the United Nations development system.

### Sample

- Organisation-wide strategy
- Organisation-wide environmental policy
- Organisation-wide reports on performance
- Organisation-wide evaluation/review reports (concerned with the implementation of the commitment to environment)
- Country strategy documents
- Country-level performance reports

### Proposed assessment criteria

1. The organisation has a policy or strategic framework on the mainstreaming/promotion of environmental sustainability or has clearly stated environmental sustainability results as part of its organisational strategic plan.

2. Country strategy/programming documents also articulate environmental sustainability as a priority. More than half of the country-level strategies and results frameworks sampled include results that integrate environmental sustainability.

3. The organisation has clearly defined roles and responsibilities with regard to the promotion of environmental sustainability.

4. There is evidence that the organisation has resourced its policy/strategy for the promotion of environmental sustainability (in terms of staffing, funding, and technical expertise).

5. There is evidence that the organisation monitors its progress in promoting environmental sustainability in order to take action to correct any identified issues.

**Note:** If a review or evaluation notes that there are still several areas for improvement, the organisation should be rated no better than adequate and the findings of this evaluation should be noted. If the review notes that the organisation is deficient in this area then the rating should be inadequate.

### Rating

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong

**Mainstreaming:** The horizontal and vertical integration of a topic so as to produce process-related and programmatic results.

**Environmental mainstreaming:** The informed inclusion of relevant environmental concerns into the decisions of institutions that drive national, local and sectoral development policy, rules, plans, investment and action.
### Performance area: I Strategic management

#### Sub-performance area: Corporate Strategy

**KPI**

4. The MO maintains focus on the cross-cutting thematic priorities identified in its strategic framework, and/or considered important by MOPAN.

**MI**

4.3 Good Governance.

#### Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available


Governance consists of the traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised. This includes the process by which governments are selected, monitored and replaced; the capacity of the government to effectively formulate and implement sound policies; and the respect of citizens and the state for the institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them.

#### Sample

- Organisation-wide strategy
- Organisation-wide governance policy
- Organisation-wide reports on performance
- Organisation-wide evaluation/review report (concerned with the implementation of the commitment to promoting good governance)
- Country strategy documents
- Country-level performance reports

#### Proposed assessment criteria

1. The organisation has a policy or strategic framework on the mainstreaming/promotion of the principles of good governance or has clearly stated good governance results as part of its organisational strategic plan.
2. Country strategy/programming documents also articulate good governance as a priority. More than half of the country-level strategies and results frameworks sampled include results that integrate the principles of good governance.
3. The organisation has clearly defined roles and responsibilities with regard to the promotion of the principles of good governance.
4. There is evidence that the organisation has resourced its policy/strategy for the promotion of the principles of good governance (in terms of staffing, funding, and technical expertise).
5. There is evidence that the organisation monitors its progress in promoting the principles of good governance in order to take action to correct any identified issues.

**Note:** If a review or evaluation notes that there are still several areas for improvement, the organisation should be rated no better than adequate and the findings of this evaluation should be noted. If the review notes that the organisation is deficient in this area then the rating should be inadequate.

#### Rating

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong (however, please see the caveat above)

**Good governance:** Good governance is characterised by participation, transparency, accountability, rule of law, effectiveness, equity, etc. Good governance refers to the management of government in a manner that is essentially free of abuse and corruption, and with due regard for the rule of law. (OECD Glossary of Statistical Terms, 2007). UNDP defines ‘good governance’ as, “participatory, consensus-oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive and follows the rule of law” (2004)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>I Strategic management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Corporate Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>4. The MO maintains focus on the cross-cutting thematic priorities identified in its strategic framework, and/or considered important by MOPAN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>4.4 Human rights-based approaches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available**

Policy and guidance is provided by United Nations Statement of Common Understanding among UN Agencies (2003). This has been followed by Inter-Agency Plans of Action for strengthening human rights-related UN action at the country level. [http://www.undg.org/index.cfm?P=221](http://www.undg.org/index.cfm?P=221)

The Plans were adopted by UNDG, ECHA, and OHCHR. The Statement of Common Understanding indicates that the following elements are necessary, specific, and unique to a human rights-based approach.

- Assessment and analysis identify the human rights claims of rights-holders and the corresponding human rights obligations of duty-bearers as well as the immediate, underlying, and structural causes of the non-realization of rights.
- Programmes assess the capacity of rights-holders to claim their rights, and of duty-bearers to fulfill their obligations. They then develop strategies to build these capacities.
- Programmes monitor and evaluate both outcomes and processes guided by human rights standards and principles.

Programming is informed by the recommendations of international human rights bodies and mechanisms.

**Sample**

- Organisation-wide strategic plan
- Organisation-wide policies
- Organisation-wide financial analyses
- Other relevant sources

**Proposed assessment criteria**

1. The organisation has a policy or strategic framework on the mainstreaming of human rights-based approaches or has clearly stated gender equality results as part of its organisational strategic plan.
2. Country strategy/programming documents also articulate human rights-based approaches as a priority. More than half of the country-level strategies and results frameworks sampled include results that integrate human rights-based approaches.
3. The organisation has clearly defined roles and responsibilities with regard to the mainstreaming of human rights-based approaches.
4. There is evidence that the organisation has resourced its policy/strategy for mainstreaming human rights-based approaches (in terms of staffing, funding, and technical expertise).
5. There is evidence that the organisation monitors its progress in mainstreaming human rights-based approaches in order to take action to correct any identified issues.

**Note:** If a review or evaluation notes that there are still several areas for improvement, the organisation should be rated no better than adequate and the findings of this evaluation should be noted. If the review notes that the organisation is deficient in this area then the rating should be inadequate.

**Rating**

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong (however, please see the caveat above)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>I Strategic management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Strategies – Country, regional, thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>5. The MO’s country strategies are results-focused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5.1 Country results frameworks have causal links from outputs through to outcomes and impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available</td>
<td>Generally agreed practices in results-based management / MfDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>• Country strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed assessment criteria</td>
<td>1. At least half of the countries sampled have results framework(s), either contained within the strategic plan or as a separate document which is referred to by the strategic plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. More than half of the country strategies/results frameworks contain both statements of outputs and expected outcomes appropriate to their results level (i.e., what are called outputs are actually outputs; what are called outcomes are actually outcomes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. More than half of the country strategies/results frameworks sampled implicitly or explicitly describes the results chain – that is, how the outputs in the results framework(s) are linked to the expected outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. In more than half of the country strategies/results frameworks there is a clear and logical progression from outcomes to impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. All above criteria are met for all country strategies/results frameworks sampled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>No criteria met = very weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One criterion met = weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two criteria met = inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three criteria met = adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four criteria met = strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All five criteria met = very strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Performance area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-performance area</th>
<th>I Strategic management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>5. The MO’s country strategies are results-focused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5.2 Performance indicators are included in country plans and strategies at a delivery (output) and development results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available

- “Indicators for measuring achievement of the objectives are validated according to generally accepted criteria, such as SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Timely).”
- “If indicators are used as a basis for results assessment these should be SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time bound).”

### Sample

- Country strategies

### Proposed assessment criteria

1. In all the country strategies sampled, few of the performance indicators at the outcome level and output level are SMART.
2. In all the country strategies sampled, some of the performance indicators at the outcome level and output level are SMART.
3. In all the country strategies sampled, most of the performance indicators at the outcome level and output level are SMART.
4. In at least half of the country strategies sampled, all performance indicators at the outcome level and output level are SMART.
5. In all the country strategies sampled, all performance indicators at the outcome level and output level are SMART.

**Note:** If a review or evaluation notes that there are still several areas for improvement in developing SMART indicators at the country level, the organisation should be rated no better than adequate and the findings of this evaluation should be noted. If the review notes that the organisation is deficient in this area and/or that this practice is not widespread in the organisation, then the rating should be inadequate.

### Rating

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong

**Indicator:** Quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect the changes connected to an intervention, or to help assess the performance of a development actor. (OECD DAC. *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management*, 2002)

**SMART criteria:** specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, timebound.
# 3.2 Performance area II – Operational management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>II Operational management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Financial Resources and Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>6. The MO’s development cooperation funding is transparent and predictable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>6.1 The MO’s criteria for allocating resources are transparent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available | Proposed Indicators, Targets and Process for Global Monitoring of the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (Proposal by the Post-Busan Interim Group, 2012)  
International agreements (e.g., Paris Declaration) speak to the principles of transparency and predictability.  
Paris Declaration commitment to “disburse aid in a timely and predictable fashion according to agreed schedules” (PD §26; reaffirmed in Busan).  
“By 2013…provide available, regular, timely rolling three-year to five-year indicative forward expenditure and/or implementation plans as agreed in Accra…” (Busan §24a). |
| Sample                   | • MO organisation-wide web site  
• Description of resource allocation system                                                 |
| Proposed assessment criteria | 1. A policy for the allocation of resources to country programmes clearly describes how resources are allocated to countries during a planning cycle.  
2. The policy is periodically reviewed by the Executive Board as necessary.  
3. There is evidence of the application of this policy.  
4. The policy is available on the agency’s public website.  
5. The policy is available in more than one of the UN official languages. |
| Rating                   | No criteria met = very weak  
One criterion met = weak  
Two criteria met = inadequate  
Three criteria met = adequate  
Four criteria met = strong  
Five criteria met = very strong |
Performance area | II Operational management
---|---
Sub-performance area | Financial Resources and Risk Management

KPI
- 7. The MO engages in results-based budgeting.

MI
- 7.1 Budget allocations are linked to expected results.

Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available
- Different sources talk about the tendency for development/donors agencies to align their budget with the results.
- OECD. Results based management in the development co-operation agencies: a review of experience, 2000 mentions that “Performance budgeting (or performance based budgeting) is the general term used to refer to the infusion of performance information into resource allocation processes. Initially the effort is usually to link budgets with expected performance – that is, identifying what resources will be needed to achieve a planned result.”

Sample
- Annual or multi-year organisation-wide budgets
- Guidance documents on budgeting
- Evaluations or audits of MfDR or specific business processes
- Executive Board/governing body discussions on budget and results

Proposed assessment criteria
- 1. In the most recent annual or multi-year organisation-wide budget, budget information illustrates how resources are distributed across strategic objectives or higher-level results.
- 2. Some output costs and/or outcome costs in both the DRF and MRF are presented in the budget document.
- 3. Most output costs and/or outcome costs in both the DRF and MRF are presented in the budget document.
- 4. There is evidence of improvement of outputs and outcomes costing over time in budget documents reviewed (evidence of building a better system).
- 5. There is evidence (from evaluations or audits conducted in this area) of a system that allows the organisation to track costs from activity through to outcome.

Rating
- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong

Note: Results-based budgeting requires an activity-based accounting system as opposed to an accounting system that supports line-based budgeting. Most organisations have the latter, so in order to fully implement such an approach they would need to change their accounting system. As a result, many organisations are trying to customise their existing system or develop ad hoc systems that move them towards a workable results-based budgeting approach. The criteria are defined in order to try to assess the extent to which the organisation is moving in that direction.

The presentation of budget information is results-oriented if it is linked to outputs and outcomes.
## Performance area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-performance area</th>
<th>II Operational management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Resources and Risk Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### KPI

7. The MO engages in results-based budgeting.

### MI

7.2 Expenditures are linked to results.

### Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available

Please refer to the general references presented for MI 7.1.

### Sample

- Annual performance reports
- Organisation-wide financial reports
- Organisation-wide strategic plan
- Guidance documents on budgeting and reporting
- Executive Board/Governing body discussions on budgeting and reporting

### Proposed assessment criteria

1. In recent reports to the governing bodies, statements of results achieved are aligned with expected results described in the organisation-wide strategic plan.
2. Recent reports to the governing bodies align expenditures with organisation-wide results (i.e., the reports show how much was spent to achieve outputs or make progress towards outcomes).
3. In recent reports to the governing bodies, variances in organisation-wide expenditure and results achievement (i.e. differences between planned and actual expenditures and between planned and actual results achievements) are reported.
4. **If the third criterion is met**, variances in organisation-wide expenditure and results achievement (i.e. differences between planned and actual expenditures and between planned and actual results achievements) are explained.
5. In the documents consulted, there is evidence of consistent improvement over time in the way that expenditures are linked to organisation-wide results.

### Rating

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong
## II Operational management
### Financial Resources and Risk Management

| KPI | 8. The MO has policies and processes for financial accountability (audit, risk management, anti-corruption). |
| MI | 8.1 External financial audits meeting recognized international standards are performed across the organisation (external or UN Board of Auditors). |

### Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available

As explained in the sources below, the UN Board of Auditors is responsible for performing the audits (meeting recognized international standards) in the UN system.

- U.N. Board of Auditors Website (http://www.un.org/auditors/board/mandate.shtml#mandate)
- By Resolution 74 (I) of 7 December 1946, the General Assembly established the United Nations Board of Auditors (BOA) to audit the accounts of the United Nations organisation and its funds and programmes and to report its findings and recommendations to the Assembly through the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.
- The United Nations Financial Regulations and Rules give the UN external auditors and the Board of Auditors the exclusive right to audit the accounts and statements of the United Nations, and allow only the United Nations General Assembly to direct, and the United Nations Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to request that the United Nations Board of Auditors conduct specific audits. This is known as the “Single Audit Principle”. In accordance with the single audit principle as set forth in the Report of the Secretary-General (A/48/587) dated 10 November 1993.
  - “The Board conducts its audits in conformity with the International Standards on Auditing. The audits are also conducted in accordance with the additional terms of reference set out in the annex to the Financial Regulations and Rules of the United Nations.”

### Sample

- Reports from the external corporate auditors of the MO
- Letters from auditor confirming adherence to international standards (might be in the financial report); or reports and/or audit opinions from Board of Auditors in case of UN agencies.
- Organisation-wide annual/biennial financial reports

### Proposed assessment criteria

1. Annual or biennial organisation-wide reports on financial performance exist.
2. **If the first criterion is met**, the most recent financial report reviewed includes an audit opinion or is accompanied by a letter from the external auditor confirming that an external financial audit was undertaken at the organisation-wide level.
3. **If the first two criteria are met**, the letter or audit opinion from the external auditor confirms that the external financial audit was undertaken in accordance with international standards (GAAP or equivalent).
4. **If the first criterion is met, all** financial reports reviewed include an audit opinion or are accompanied by a letter from the external auditor confirming that the external financial audit was undertaken in accordance with international standards (GAAP or equivalent).
5. The organisation’s external audit reports are made available to the public, either by request or on line.

**Note:** If no letter from an external auditor is available, other evidence of external financial audits undertaken at an organisation-wide level is admissible.

### Rating

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong

---

**GAAP:** Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) are a common set of accounting principles, standards, rules and procedures used to prepare and review financial statements.
IFRS: “a single set of high quality, understandable, enforceable and globally accepted international financial reporting standards (IFRSs)” developed through the IFRS Foundation’s standard-setting body, the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB). (IFRS. “About the IFRS Foundation and the IASB”, The IFRS Foundation website, http://www.ifrs.org/The+organisation/IASC+F+and+IASB.htm)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>II Operational management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Financial Resources and Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>8. The MO has policies and processes for financial accountability (audit, risk management, anti-corruption).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>8.2 External financial audits meeting recognised international standards are performed at the regional, country or project level (as appropriate).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available**
The two most common types of international standards are the GAAP and the IFRS.

**Sample**
- Policy on financial audit
- Guidelines/instructions on external financial audits
- External audit reports
- Reports to and from audit committees or oversight committees

**Proposed assessment criteria**
1. The documents available provide evidence that external financial audits are performed at regional, country, or project levels (as appropriate).
2. There are established rules/procedures for the conduct of external financial audits in the organisation.
3. The rules/procedures ensure ample external audit coverage of the organisation’s programmes and operations.
4. The evidence also indicates that the external financial audits are carried out using international standards, or provides an indication that the MO uses national audit systems and procedures.
5. External financial audit reports at the country, project, and/or regional levels are made available to the public by the MO, either by request or online.

**Rating**
- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>II Operational management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Financial Resources and Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>8. The MO has policies and processes for financial accountability (audit, risk management, anti-corruption)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>8.3 Internal audit processes are used to provide management / governing bodies with credible information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available**

The Institute of Internal Auditors, *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing*, 2011

1100 – Independence and Objectivity

The internal audit activity must be independent, and internal; auditors must be objective in performing their work.

**Interpretation:**

Independence is the freedom from conditions that threaten the ability of the internal audit activity to carry out internal audit responsibilities in an unbiased manner. To achieve the degree of independence necessary to effectively carry out the responsibilities of the internal audit activity, the chief audit executive has direct and unrestricted access to senior management and the board. This can be achieved through a dual-reporting relationship. Threats to independence must be managed at the individual auditor, engagement, functional, and organizational levels.

Objectivity is an unbiased mental attitude that allows internal auditors to perform engagements in such a manner that they believe in their work product and that no quality compromises are made. Objectivity requires that internal auditors do not subordinate their judgment on audit matters to others. Threats to objectivity must be managed at the individual auditor, engagement, functional, and organizational levels."

2400 – Communicating Results

Internal auditors must communicate the results of engagements.

[...] 2420 – Quality of Communications

Communications must be accurate, objective, clear, concise, constructive, complete, and timely.

**Interpretation:**

Accurate communications are free from errors and distortions and are faithful to the underlying facts. Objective communications are fair, impartial, and unbiased and are the result of a fair-minded and balanced assessment of all relevant facts and circumstance. [..]"

**Sample**

- Guidelines/policies on internal financial audits
- Reports available from the Audit Committee (or equivalent) of the Executive Board

**Proposed assessment criteria**

1. There is evidence that internal audits are conducted in the organisation.
2. There is evidence that the internal audit function is separate from the programming areas, enabling it to provide an "independent" audit opinion. (The key is that internal auditors are not influenced by the programs they are auditing.)
3. There is evidence that the internal audit function reports directly at least to the Chief Executive Officer/Executive Director, thus providing maximum assurance of its independence from programming.
4. Reports available from the audit committee (or equivalent) of the Executive Board confirm receipt of internal audit information.
5. There is evidence of Management and Executive Board use of internal audit information.

**Rating**

No criteria met = very weak
One criterion met = weak
Two criteria met = inadequate
Three criteria met = adequate
Four criteria met = strong
All five criteria met = very strong
### Performance area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-performance area</th>
<th>II Operational management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Resources and Risk Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### KPI
- 8. The MO has policies and processes for financial accountability (audit, risk management, anti-corruption).

#### MI
- 8.4 The MO implements its policy on anti-corruption.

#### Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available
  - This paper discusses the link between aid and corruption and the changes that need to be done in aid agencies to counter corruption.
  - “It is important to move from high-level policy commitments to operational policy measures, which pro-actively support solutions to counter corruption in aid delivery at the local level. A review of disincentives preventing staff in aid agencies from progressing on the identification and prevention of corruption could provide insights.”
  - “Donors can revise incentive and reward structures for managers and staff; use learning approaches to develop context-tailored training on corruption; develop project design options that model public accountability and contribute to recipient empowerment; or build in public corruption complaint and advocacy mechanisms so that there is recourse when corruption comes knocking.”

#### Sample
- Organisation-wide policy, guidelines or framework on anti-corruption, fraud and mismanagement
- Country, regional or other level policy on anti-corruption, fraud and mismanagement
- Programme manuals and guidance

#### Proposed assessment criteria
1. Policy, framework, and/or guidelines on anti-corruption are corporately approved (i.e., not in draft form).
2. **If the first criterion is met**, the policy or framework defines the roles and responsibilities of management, staff and experts/specialists in implementing and complying with the policy.
3. There is evidence that the policy or framework is being operationalised (e.g., training for staff, incentive and reward structures for staff, complaint and advocacy mechanisms, whistle blowing mechanisms).
4. There is evidence that the implementation of the policy or framework is being monitored.
5. There is evidence that problematic practices identified in the monitoring process are being changed.

#### Rating
- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong

**Corruption:** “The abuse of entrusted power for private gain. Corruption can be classified as grand, petty or political, depending on the amounts of resources lost and the sector where it occurs.” (Transparency International. “Glossary”, Preventing Corruption in Humanitarian Operations, 2010)

**Fraud:** “The act of intentionally deceiving someone in order to gain an unfair or illegal advantage (financial, political or otherwise). Countries consider such offences to be criminal or a violation of civil law.” (Transparency International. “Glossary”, Preventing Corruption in Humanitarian Operations, 2010)

**Whistle blowing:** “The sounding of an alarm by an employee, director or external person, in an attempt to reveal neglect or abuses within the activities of an organisation, government body or company (or one of its business partners) that threaten the public interest and the organisation’s integrity and reputation.” (Transparency International. “Glossary”, Preventing Corruption in Humanitarian Operations, 2010)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>II Operational management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Financial Resources and Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>8. The MO has policies and processes for financial accountability (audit, risk management, anti-corruption).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>8.5 Processes are in place to quickly follow up on any irregularities identified in audits at the country (or other) level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available**

The systems for following up on irregularities form part of generally accepted practices in audit.

**Sample**

- Policy or guidelines that describe the procedure for immediate measures against irregularities identified during an audit (with particular emphasis on financial irregularities).
- Board documents confirming management follow-up on audits.

**Proposed assessment criteria**

1. There is a policy on audit that refers to measures to be taken against irregularities identified in audits.
2. Management guidelines or rules support the policy and describe the procedure for a response to irregularities identified during audits.
3. **If the second criterion is met**, these guidelines set timelines for the response to irregularities identified during an audit, including any suspicion or allegations of corruption and fraud (i.e., the managers have to respond to audit findings within a certain period of time).
4. There is evidence in audit reports to the Board or other documents that audit recommendations are followed up by management.
5. Major or systemic irregularities are reported to the board/governing body, as appropriate.

**Rating**

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>II Operational management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Financial Resources and Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI</strong></td>
<td>8. The MO has policies and processes for financial accountability (audit, risk management, anti-corruption).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MI</strong></td>
<td>8.6 The MO’s procurement procedures provide effective control on purchases of goods and services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available**

- The document refers to public procurement, but it can also apply to procurement in multilateral organisations.

> "Individual procurement processes as described in the previous section require an enabling environment to be developed in an effective and transparent way. These conditions are embodied in the overall procurement system of individual countries. A well-structured procurement system should follow the principles of economy and efficiency, so that public expenditure ensures value-for-money; competitiveness, so that equal opportunities are guaranteed for all eligible bidders (and thus real cost competitiveness results); and transparency, so that public oversight and equal access to information is provided.

Following these principles, a number of elements are needed for the effective operation of a procurement system”:

- Legal framework and implementing regulations
- Institutional structures
- Access to information
- Capacity development
- Control and auditing systems
- Appeals mechanism
- Anti-corruption measures


> “The cornerstone of a public procurement system operating with integrity is the availability of mechanisms and capacity for ensuring effective internal control and audit. Furthermore, mechanisms for lodging complaints and challenging administrative decisions contribute to ensuring the fairness of the process. [...] Without an adequate internal control system, an environment is created in which assets are not protected against loss or misuse; good practices are not followed; goals and objectives may not be accomplished; and individuals are not deterred from engaging in dishonest, illegal or unethical acts. It is particularly important to have functioning internal controls in procurement, including financial control, internal audit and management control. It is the responsibility of procurement authorities to set up effective internal control systems that monitor the performance of procurement officials, assist compliance with laws and regulations and help ensure the reliability of internal and external reporting.”

**Sample**

- Organisation-wide policy, guideline or instructions on procurement and contract management processes
- Organisation-wide strategic plan
- Audit, evaluation or review of the MO’s procurement and contract management processes
- Other documentary evidence that the MO has functioning procurement and contract management systems

**Proposed assessment criteria**

1. There is a policy and/or guidelines on procurement procedures.
2. These procedures take into account both price/cost and quality considerations.
3. The policy/guidelines lay out a transparent process for making procurement decisions.
4. Evidence in documents suggests that the MO regularly reviews its procurement practice to introduce improvements in the system.
5. An audit, evaluation or other review has been undertaken of the MO’s procurement processes and finds that these are effective, generally ensuring accountability and control.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>II Operational management</th>
<th>Sub-performance area</th>
<th>Financial Resources and Risk Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>No criteria met = very weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One criterion met = weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two criteria met = inadequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three criteria met = adequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four criteria met = strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All five criteria met = very strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance area</td>
<td>II Operational management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Financial Resources and Risk Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>8. The MO has policies and processes for financial accountability (audit, risk management, anti-corruption).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>8.7 The MO has strategies in place for risk identification, mitigation, monitoring and reporting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available**


  "Risk management is the process of evaluating alternative regulatory and non-regulatory responses to risk and selecting among them. The selection process necessarily requires the consideration of legal, economic and social factors."

- ISO 31000 Risk Management

  The Institute of Risk Management, *A risk management standard*, 2002

  The Institute of Risk Management, *A structured approach to Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) and the requirements of ISO 31000*, 2010

The two above-listed documents provide guidance on terminology, process, organisational structure, and objectives for risk management. These documents also suggest that the approach to risk management must be comprehensive, i.e., that it must identify different types of risk for the organisation (financial, political, reputational, etc.) and clearly present a structured approach for planning, implementing, monitoring, and learning and reporting on risk management.

An excerpt from *A risk management standard* (2002) is presented below:

“Risk management should be a continuous and developing process which runs throughout the organisation’s strategy and the implementation of the strategy. It should address methodically all the risks surrounding the organisation’s activities past, present and in particular, future. It must be integrated into the culture of the organisation with an effective policy and a programme led by the most senior management. It must translate the strategy into tactical and operational objectives, assigning responsibility throughout the organisation with each manager and employee responsible for the management of risk as part of their job description. It supports accountability, performance measurement and reward, thus promoting operational efficiency at all levels.”

**Sample**

- Organisation-wide risk management policy, strategy, framework or guidelines
- Policy, strategy, framework or guidelines on risk management at the country, regional or other level
- Audit, evaluation or review of the MO’s risk management framework

**Proposed assessment criteria**

1. The MO has an organisation-wide policy, framework and/or guidelines on risk management.
2. If the first criterion is met, these documents follow international standards on managing risk, including a description of roles and responsibilities of key actors.
3. If the first criterion is met, there is evidence that the risk management policy guidance applies to country, regional and corporate activities. In other words, risk analysis is undertaken as appropriate at these different levels.
4. If the first criterion is met, major risk analysis (significant programs, projects, etc.) is presented to the Board.
5. If the first criterion is met, management and/or Board documents demonstrate utilisation of risk management policy and procedures.

**Rating**

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong

**Risk management:** Coordinated activities to direct and control an organisation with regard to risk (ISO Standard IS 31000, ISO Guide 73: 2009)

**Risk:** “Risk can be defined as the combination of the probability of an event and its consequences (ISO/IEC Guide 73). In all types of undertaking, there is the potential for events and consequences that constitute opportunities for benefit (upside) or threats to success (downside). […] The risks facing an organisation and its operations can result from factors both external and internal to the organisation. […] some specific risks can have both external and“
internal drivers and therefore overlap to two areas. They can be categorised further into types of risk such as strategic, financial, operational, hazard, etc.” (The Institute of Risk Management, *A risk management standard*, 2002)

**International standards on managing risk:** To meet international standards, risk management must, among others:

- Cover different types of risk (i.e., be comprehensive);
- Include a structured approach to planning, implementing, monitoring and reporting on risk management;
- Have clear objectives and responsibilities assigned throughout the organisation;
- Be integrated into the culture of the organisation.
### Quadrant II Operational Management

**Sub-quadrant** Performance Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>9. The MO demonstrates the use of performance information for decision-making.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>9.1 Performance information is used by the MO for revising policies and strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available

OECD. *Results based management in the development co-operation agencies: a review of experience, 2000*

"**Management improvement (managing-for-results):** The first major use of performance information is to provide continuous feedback to managers about the results they are achieving, so they can then use this information to improve their performance even more. This use is often referred to as "managing-for-results". Sometimes discussions of this internal management use are further sub-divided into two related aspects of processes – promoting learning and facilitating decisions-making.

**Promote learning.** Performance information promotes continuous management learning about what results are being achieved by their projects/programs and why – i.e., what factors are influencing good or poor performance. Improved knowledge is a prerequisite for better decisions.

**Facilitate decision-making.** Management’s learning in turn facilitates their making appropriate decisions. Continuous performance information about progress towards results and about the factors influencing performance will facilitate good decision-making and timely action. Lessons from experience can help agency managers to continually improve their development assistance projects and programs, and to formulate better policies. A special type of decision-making that performance information is increasingly being called upon to influence is resource allocations.”

"**Contributing to Organizational Learning and Improving Agency Policies and Strategies:** A final use of performance information is to promote agency-wide organizational learning about what works and what does not, under what country contexts. Often this is a key function of central evaluation offices. […] All of these approaches [taken by central evaluation offices] have common aims – not only of assessing performance in a particular area, but also of understanding the factors and contexts that influence that performance, in order to draw lessons with relevance for agency-wide policy and program strategy formulation. Knowledge about what works and what does not under what conditions can then be translated into agency policies and program strategy planning and “best practices” guidance for managers.”

### Sample

- Organisation-wide strategic plan
- Annual performance reports
- Organisation-wide evaluation and audit reports (performance-related) and management responses
- Organisation wide policies approved within the last two years, which have been mentioned in one of the above documents as having been affected by decisions resulting from review of performance information
- Executive Board meeting minutes / reports and decisions

### Proposed assessment criteria

1. Information on organisation-wide performance (i.e., progress towards objectives or key result areas) is available, for instance in annual performance reports, organisation-wide evaluations or audits.
2. There is evidence that the MO analyses/asses its performance through regular reviews of progress on strategies and key policies.
3. There is evidence that the MO adopts recommendations from organisation-wide audits, performance reports and/or evaluations.
4. There is evidence that the MO revises and adjusts its policies and strategies in response to performance issues (problems and successes) raised in audits, performance reports and/or evaluations.
5. **If the fourth criterion is met,** there is evidence that the organisation is making systematic use of performance information for improvement of processes and performance and continuous learning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant</th>
<th>II Operational Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-quadrant</td>
<td>Performance Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No criteria met = very weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One criterion met = weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two criteria met = inadequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three criteria met = adequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four criteria met = strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All five criteria met = very strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance information:** Performance information refers to data used to inform stakeholders about progress in achieving results. Performance information typically refers to data gathered through monitoring and evaluation activities.
### Performance area II: Operational management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-performance area</th>
<th>Performance Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>9. The MO demonstrates the use of performance information for decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>9.2 Performance information is used by the MO for planning new interventions at the country level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available

| OECD, Results based management in the development co-operation agencies: a review of experience, 2000 |
| Promoting learning and influencing country programming and resource allocation decisions in the country operating units: At the level of country operating units, performance information is used to make broader programming decisions. For example, knowledge gained about what works and what does not from previous projects may feed into the design of new follow-on projects. |

#### Sample

- Corporate reviews, evaluations, audits
- Country strategies or work plans
- Country performance reports
- Internal or external audits
- Project/programme PIPs, PADs or other planning documents
- Country programme evaluations

#### Proposed assessment criteria

1. Information on the MO’s performance in the country (i.e., progress towards outcomes) is available.
2. **If the first criterion is met**, for at least half of the countries reviewed, there is evidence of an analysis/assessment of performance (problems as well as successes).
3. **If the second criterion is met**, there is evidence of an analysis of the implications of this performance information on the planning of new interventions (i.e., how new interventions in the planning stage need to be altered, or what new interventions should be developed in response to the performance information).
4. **If all above criteria are met**, for at least half of the countries reviewed, there is evidence from country strategies or reports that new interventions have been introduced in response to performance information.
5. **If all above criteria are met**, they are met for all countries reviewed.
   **Note:** If recent corporate reviews/evaluations/audits identify significant issues with use of performance information by country offices, then the rating will be no better than adequate.

#### Rating

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong

**PIP:** Project Implementation Plan, a document developed prior to implementation, which describes the activities and intended results of a project, along with the schedule of implementation, roles and responsibilities, budget, and all other details needed to ensure effective and efficient management of the project.

**PAD:** Project Appraisal Document, a document that appraises the relevance, feasibility and potential sustainability of a project during concept stage, prior to more detailed project planning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>II Operational management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Performance Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>9. The MO demonstrates the use of performance information for decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>9.3 Poorly performing programmes, projects and/or initiatives area addressed so as to improve performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available</td>
<td>One of the fundamental principles of RBM is to use results information to help manage the organisation and its programmes. Organisations are expected to use information for learning and managing, as well as for reporting and accountability. See for example Mayne, John, <em>Best Practices in Results-Based Management: A Review of Experience</em>. A Report for the United Nations Secretariat, July 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sample | • Guidelines or other document on the MO’s process for reviewing the performance of its programmes/projects/initiatives  
• Guidelines or other document on the MO’s process for reviewing poorly performing programme, projects and initiatives |  
| Proposed assessment criteria | 1. The MO has a process for reviewing the performance of its programmes, projects or initiatives.  
2. There is evidence that the MO is implementing this process.  
3. The MO has a specific process for reviewing poorly performing programmes, projects or initiatives.  
4. The MO has a way for following up on poorly performing programmes, projects or initiatives.  
5. There is evidence that changes to poorly performing programmes, projects or initiatives are being implemented. |  
| Rating | No criteria met = very weak  
One criterion met = weak  
Two criteria met = inadequate  
Three criteria met = adequate  
Four criteria met = strong  
All five criteria met = very strong |
### Performance area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-performance area</th>
<th>Performance Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### KPI

9. The MO demonstrates the use of performance information for decision-making.

#### MI

9.4 Evaluation recommendations reported to the Executive Committee/Board are acted upon by the responsible units.

##### Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available

- **UNEQ. Norms for Evaluation in the UN System, April 2005 (updated 23 Feb 2012)**

  The UNEG norms for evaluation provide the following indications regarding evaluation follow-up:

  12.1 Evaluation requires an explicit response by the governing authorities and management addressed by its recommendations. This may take the form of a management response, action plan and/or agreement stating responsibilities and accountabilities.

  12.2 There should be a systematic follow-up on the implementation of the evaluation recommendations that have been accepted by management and/or the Governing Bodies.

  12.3 There should be a periodic report on the status of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations. This report should be presented to the Governing Bodies and/or the Head of the organization.

  Please note that for the purpose of this assessment, the term “Governing Bodies” is taken to be synonymous with “Executive Committee/Board”.

#### Sample

- Evaluation policy or guidelines
- Evaluation reports and reports on implementation of recommendations
- Reports to the Executive Board on evaluation findings/recommendations
- Executive Committee/Board meeting minutes

#### Proposed assessment criteria

1. A policy or guidelines on evaluation in the MO exist and include the requirement that a management response, action plan and/or agreement be produced to identify accepted recommendations and state responsibilities and accountabilities for follow-up action.

2. The MO’s evaluation policy/guidelines outline a process for tracking the implementation of accepted evaluation recommendations.

3. There is evidence that the management response, action plan and/or agreement accepting recommendations are presented to the executive management (head of the organisation) and/or governing body (Executive Board).

4. There is evidence that periodic reports on the status of implementation of these evaluation recommendations are presented and accepted by the MO’s management or governing body.

5. There is evidence that responsible units have taken the actions they committed to in the management response.

#### Rating

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong

**Management response**: Management responses constitute the formal response of an organisation’s management to the findings and recommendations of an evaluation study. These responses generally highlight the recommendations that the organisation will take on and the responsibilities and accountabilities for follow up. As noted by UNEG guidelines, however, organisations may not have a formal management response, but instead propose an action plan or another format for indicating their agreement to follow up on aspects of the evaluations. The key feature is the identification of responsibilities and accountabilities.

**Evaluation recommendation**: Proposals [arising out of the findings of an evaluation], aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality, or efficiency of a development intervention; at redesigning the objectives; and/or at the reallocation of resources. Recommendations should be linked to conclusions. (OECD DAC. *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management, 2002*)
### II Operational management

#### Human Resources Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>MI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-performance area</strong></td>
<td>10. The MO manages human resources using methods to improve organisational performance.</td>
<td>10.1 The MO uses results focused performance assessment systems (that also apply to senior staff) to make decisions on human resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available

- Generally accepted practices in performance-oriented human resource systems
- Senior staff include: President/Chief Executive, Vice Presidents, Sector/Program/Division Directors, Regional Directors, Resident Representatives, Country Representatives/ Directors

#### Sample

- Human resources policy
- Guidelines or other document detailing the performance assessment system
- Reports on the performance assessment system
- Newsletter commenting on the performance assessment system

#### Proposed assessment criteria

1. There is evidence in the documents reviewed that a system is in place that requires performance assessments for all staff (including senior staff).
2. There is evidence of compliance with the performance assessment system. In other words, there are management indicators or documents (e.g. newsletters, reports, etc.) that monitor/comment on the application of the performance assessment system.
3. There is evidence that the results of staff performance assessment are codified and stored in personnel files.
4. There is evidence that the performance assessment of staff is used to make decisions on staff, for instance with regard to promotion (i.e., advancing from one grade to the next) or dismissal, incentives, rewards, etc.
5. A review, evaluation, or other document comments positively on the performance assessment system and on use of this system for decision-making.

#### Rating

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong

**Performance assessment systems:** A performance assessment system is synonymous with staff performance appraisal system that focuses on achieving results. This system typically bases performance on agreements and an annual review process (work plans that commit different staff to achieve results during the year).
## Performance area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-performance area</th>
<th>II Operational management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Human Resources Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The MO manages human resources using methods to improve organisational performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MI</strong></td>
<td>10.2 There is a transparent system in place to manage staff performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available</strong></td>
<td>People in Aid. <em>Code of good practice in the management and support of aid personnel</em>, 2003&lt;br&gt;The People in Aid <em>Code of Good Practice</em> is an internationally recognised management tool that helps humanitarian aid and development agencies enhance the quality of their human resources management. Under the key principle of: Managing People, the Code suggests the following indicator: The rewards and benefits for each [staff] role are clearly identified and applied in a fair and consistent manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample</strong></td>
<td>• Human resources policy/strategy&lt;br&gt;• Documents about the MO’s system for managing staff performance&lt;br&gt;• Evaluation or review of the performance management system and human resources practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Proposed assessment criteria** | 1. There is evidence either in a human resources policy or through other documents that the MO has a system for managing staff performance (see MI 10.1) that is operational.  
2. **If the first criterion is met**, documents describe the approach to creating performance assessments and the content of those assessments.  
3. **If the first criterion is met**, there is an explicit policy or strategy (HR or otherwise) that summarises the aims of the performance assessment system.  
4. There is a clear reference in a policy or strategy to the way that the MO motivates staff to improve their performance.  
5. There is a review or evaluation that comments positively on the performance management system and MO transparency in human resources decisions, specifically with regards to incentives. **Note:** If the review is a recent one and comments quite negatively on the MO’s human resources systems (particularly in relation to its performance management system and the transparency of this system), then the organisation should not be rated higher than adequate on this indicator. |
<p>| <strong>Rating</strong> | No criteria met = very weak&lt;br&gt;One criterion met = weak&lt;br&gt;Two criteria met = inadequate&lt;br&gt;Three criteria met = adequate&lt;br&gt;Four criteria met = strong&lt;br&gt;All five criteria met = very strong |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>II Operational management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Portfolio Management (Country or Other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>11. Country/regional programming processes are performance oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>11.1 Prior to approval, new initiatives are subject to appropriate analysis (gender, environmental, cost-benefit, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available**

- UNEG. *Norms for Evaluation in the UN System*, 2005

Benefits analysis is a generic way of labelling special studies or analysis that are carried out before an initiative is approved by the relevant authority. In international finance institutions (IFIs), these studies are generally referred to as “impact analysis”, “cost-benefit analysis”, “cost-effectiveness analysis” or “internal rate of return”. The purpose of such studies is to provide an evidence base about the potential social, economic, environmental, or other effects of the new initiative.

These benefits analysis (or impact analysis as most commonly referred to in IFIs) form part of the “appraisal” process for a new initiative or project. While appraisal is a term most commonly used in the IFIs, in the UN system appraisal may also be carried out and is defined as a “critical assessment of the potential value of an undertaking before a decision is made to implement it”. Benefits analysis would thus be part of the assessment of the potential value of an undertaking.

**Sample**

- Policy and guidelines that describe the type of studies/analysis to be carried out before project/programmes are approved
- Project/programme appraisal documents
- Project evaluability reports

**Proposed assessment criteria**

1. There is a policy that requires appropriate analysis (e.g. gender, environmental, cost-benefit, risk analysis, etc.) to be conducted prior to initiating new programmes/projects/initiatives.
2. There are guidelines for staff on the types of analysis to be carried out.
3. There is evidence that the MO’s staff are informed about and trained on the guidelines.
4. There is evidence that the guidelines are implemented.
5. There is evidence that appropriate analyses are used for decision-making in the sample of projects/initiatives reviewed.

**Rating**

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong

The following terms may be considered similar to benefits analysis:

**Appraisal**: An overall assessment of the relevance, feasibility and potential sustainability of a development intervention prior to a decision of funding. Note: In development agencies, banks, etc., the purpose of appraisal is to enable decision-makers to decide whether the activity represents an appropriate use of resources.

**Ex-ante evaluation**: An evaluation that is performed before implementation of a development intervention. Ex-ante evaluations are part of appraisal and benefit analysis.

**Project Appraisal Document**: A document that appraises the relevance, feasibility and potential sustainability of a project during concept stage, prior to approval.
### Performance area II: Operational management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-performance area</th>
<th>Portfolio Management (Country or Other)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>11. Country/regional programming processes are performance oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>11.2 Milestones/targets are set to rate the progress of (project) implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available

**OECD. Results based management in the development co-operation agencies: a review of experience, 2000**

The document highlights five processes or phases for measuring performance at the project level:

1. Formulating objectives
2. Selecting indicators
3. Setting targets
4. Monitoring (collecting) performance data
5. Reviewing and reporting performance data

The following is stated regarding phase 3) on setting of targets:

"Setting targets: Once indicators have been identified, actual baseline values should be collected for each, ideally just before the project gets underway. This will be important for gauging whether progress is being made later. Often agencies also set explicit targets for their indicators. A target specifies a particular value for an indicator to be accomplished within a given time frame. (For example, child immunization rates increased to 80 percent of children by 2003.). Targets help clarify exactly what needs to be accomplished by when. It represents a commitment and can help orient and motivate project staff and managers to the tasks at hand."

#### Sample

- Project implementation plans, country work plans, or other documents that provide operational planning details on milestones and targets

#### Proposed assessment criteria

1. At least two of the project implementation plans or other work plans sampled in each of the six assessed countries contain a description of milestones and/or targets for project/programme implementation.

2. **If the first criterion is met**, baseline values have been established for each indicator used to measure the progress of project/programme implementation in most of these plans.

3. **If the first criterion is met**, the milestones/targets provided are appropriate to the activities described in most of these plans.

4. **If the first criterion is met**, dates are established for the milestones/targets in more than half of these plans.

5. **If all above criteria are met**, they are met for all project implementation plans or other work plans sampled.

#### Rating

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong

### Target

“**Target**: “A target is a specific indicator value to be accomplished by a particular date in the future. Final targets are values to be achieved by the end of the project, whereas interim targets are expected values at various points-in-time over the life of the project.” (OECD. Results based management in the development co-operation agencies: a review of experience, 2000)

### Baseline value

“**Baseline value**: “the value of the indicator just before project implementation begins. Baselines may be established using existing secondary data sources or may require a primary data collection effort.” (OECD. Results based management in the development co-operation agencies: a review of experience, 2000)

### Project Implementation Plan

**Project Implementation Plan**: A document developed prior to implementation of a project, which describes the activities and intended results of the project, along with the schedule of implementation, roles and responsibilities, budget, and all other details needed to ensure effective and efficient management of the project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>II Operational management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Portfolio Management (Country or Other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>12. The MO delegates decision-making authority and staff accordingly (to the country or other levels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>12.2 Aid reallocation decisions can be made locally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available**

- Organisation wide financial policy and guidelines, accountability frameworks, programme manuals
- Operational/organisational reviews that comment on decentralisation of aid reallocation decisions

**Proposed assessment criteria**

1. An organisation-wide policy or guidelines exist, are corporately approved, and describe decision-making authorities at different levels within the organisation.
2. If the first criterion is met, this policy/guidelines or other documents provide sufficient evidence of the level of autonomy available at the country level (or other local level as appropriate) regarding project-related decision making processes, and the staffing arrangements to support that, as appropriate.
3. If the first two criteria are met, in the documents available, it is possible to identify the parameters within which the local level, project/programming-related decisions do not require central level approval.
4. There is evidence that the organisation has made efforts to improve delegation of decision-making on aid reallocation to the country or other relevant levels.
5. An operational review/evaluation of the MO comments positively on progress in the delegation of aid reallocation decision making authority to the country or other relevant level.

**Note:** If there is a recent review/evaluation that comments negatively on the MO’s delegation of decision-making, the findings should be noted and the rating should not be higher than adequate.

**Rating**

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong

**Local level:** Any level within the organisational structure which is more local than regional (i.e., country level or units within a specific country)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>Sub-performance area</th>
<th>Portfolio Management (Country or Other)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI</strong></td>
<td>12. The MO delegates decision-making authority and staff accordingly (to the country or other levels).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MI</strong></td>
<td>12.3 New programmes/projects can be approved locally within a budget cap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available**
- Document describing the policy for delegation of authority
- Reviews/evaluations of the MO that cover decentralisation of its operations

**Proposed assessment criteria**
1. An organisation-wide policy or guidelines exist, are corporately approved, and describe decision-making authorities for new programmes/projects.
2. **If the first criterion is met**, this policy or other documents provide sufficient evidence of the types of decisions about new initiatives (plans, projects, programs) that can be made at the country level (or other local level as appropriate).
3. **If the first two criteria are met**, in the documents available, it is possible to identify the parameters (e.g. budget ceilings or allocations) within which the local level does not require central level approval prior to making decisions on new initiatives.
4. The organisation has made efforts to improve delegation of decision-making to the country or other relevant levels.
5. An operational review/evaluation of the MO comments positively on progress in the delegation of authority to the country or other relevant level.

**Note:** If there is a recent review/evaluation that comments negatively on the MO’S delegation of authority, the findings should be noted and the rating should not be higher than adequate.

**Rating**
- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong
## 3.3 Performance area III – Relationship management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>III Relationship management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>13. The MO coordinates and directs its development cooperation at the country level in support of agreed national plans or partner plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>13.2 Statements of expected results are consistent with those in the national development strategies and UNDAF, as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available**

The *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness*, 2005

The Declaration committed donors and development organisations to increase efforts in alignment.

Alignment: “Donors base their overall support on partner countries’ national development strategies, institutions and procedures.”


This document also mentions the importance of the alignment concept.

“Many development agencies are using results-based approaches to improve alignment of their country programming to country strategy. They are deriving country programming objectives directly from the results specified in partner country poverty reduction strategies (or equivalent), and linking their support to partner’s national expenditure frameworks.”

**Sample**

- Country strategies
- May be necessary to review the national development strategy/PRSP, as appropriate

**Proposed assessment criteria**

1. At least half of the country strategies make reference to the country’s national development strategies, as applicable.
2. At least half of the country strategies make reference to the UNDAF, as applicable.
3. At least half of the country strategies link the results statements to national goals and/or UNDAF objectives as applicable.
4. All the country strategies note how the intended results are aligned with national development strategies and UNDAF as appropriate.
5. Evidence from country-level evaluations or external reviews confirms that the MO’s strategy is aligned or consistent with national development strategies and UNDAF, as appropriate.

**Rating**

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong

**UNDAF**: The UNDAF is the strategic programme framework that describes the collective response of the UN system to national development priorities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>III Relationship management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Harmonisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>17. The MO harmonises arrangements and procedures with other programming partners (donors, UN agencies, etc.), as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>17.1 The MO coordinates planning, programming, monitoring and reporting with other partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available</td>
<td>This MI is informed by one of the Paris Declaration <em>Indicators of Progress</em>. Indicator 10a: Extent to which MO engages in joint missions. This indicator was not carried forward as part of the Global Partnership Monitoring indicators. Harmonisation of programming and business processes is highlighted in the QCPR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sample | • Organisation-wide strategies, workplans, reports  
• Country strategies, workplans, reports  
• MO’s reports on its Paris Declaration commitments, if applicable.  
• Joint programme documents  
• UNDAF, UNDAP, as applicable  
• Evaluations of UNDAF, UNDAP, and joint programmes when applicable |
| Proposed assessment criteria | 1. In the sample of countries under review, country strategies, UNDAF, or other documents provide evidence of the MO’s joint planning with other development partners (such as other members of UNCT).  
2. In the sample of countries under review, country strategies, UNDAF or other documents provide evidence of the organisation’s participation in joint programmes with other development partners (such as other members of UNCT).  
3. The MO’s organisation-wide strategies, workplans, reports, or other documents provide evidence that it monitors efforts to coordinate and/or harmonise with other partners at the organisation-wide level.  
4. The MO’s country strategies, workplans, reports, or other documents provide evidence that it monitors efforts to coordinate and/or harmonise with other partners at the country level.  
5. Evaluations or reviews of the MO’s work (corporate and country levels) tend to comment favourably on the organisation’s efforts to coordinate and harmonise efforts with others. |
| Rating | No criteria met = very weak  
One criterion met = weak  
Two criteria met = inadequate  
Three criteria met = adequate  
Four criteria met = strong  
All five criteria met = very strong |
### 3.4 Performance area IV – Knowledge management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>IV Knowledge management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>18. The MO consistently evaluates its results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>18.1 The MO has a structurally independent evaluation unit within its organisational structure that reports to senior management or the Executive Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available**

- UNEG. *Norms for Evaluation in the UN System*, April 2005 (updated 23 Feb 2012)
  - The UNEG norms for evaluation “provide a reference for strengthening, professionalizing and improving the quality of evaluation in all entities of the United Nations system”. With respect to the notion of independence, these norms specify that:
    1. The evaluation function has to be located independently from the other management functions so that it is free from undue influence and that unbiased and transparent reporting is ensured. It needs to have full discretion in submitting directly its reports for consideration at the appropriate level of decision-making pertaining to the subject of evaluation.
    2. The Head of evaluation must have the independence to supervise and report on evaluations as well as to track follow-up of management’s response resulting from evaluation.

  - The OECD-DAC also recognises the importance of having an independent evaluation unit: “Impartiality and independence will best be achieved by separating the evaluation function from the line management responsible for planning and managing development assistance. This could be accomplished by having a central unit responsible for evaluation reporting directly to the minister or the agency head responsible for development assistance, or to a board of directors or governors of the institution.”
  - Please note that for this MI the term "evaluation function" is considered to be synonymous with "evaluation unit".

**Sample**

- Organisation-wide evaluation policy
- Reports from the evaluation unit to senior management/Executive Board on evaluations
- Peer reviews of the evaluation function

**Proposed assessment criteria**

1. An organisation-wide (central) evaluation unit or function exists.
2. An organisation-wide evaluation policy exists, which includes guidance on how the MO ensures independence of evaluations and evaluation systems.
3. **If the first criterion is met**, there is evidence of the independent nature of evaluations in reports being submitted by the organisation-wide evaluation unit or function to senior management (Head of the Organisation), to the Executive Board or to the committee responsible for independent evaluations.
4. **If the first criterion is met**, the organisation-wide evaluation unit has a direct reporting function to the senior management.
5. The organisation-wide (central) evaluation unit has a direct reporting function to the MO’s Executive Board.

**Note:** If the findings of a recent peer review or other study raise important concerns about the independence of evaluations or evaluation system, then the assessment team should consider ratings of inadequate or lower.

**Rating**

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>IV Knowledge management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KPI**

| 18. | The MO consistently evaluates its results. |

**MI**

| 18.2 | The evaluation function provides sufficient coverage of the MO’s programming activity (projects, programmes, etc.). |

**Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available**

- Existing standards speak to the need for useful evaluation coverage (DAC-OECD) and for that coverage to be specified in evaluation plans and policies (UNEG).
- The text for UNEG Standard 1.2 indicates that there must be an explanation on how evaluations are prioritised and planned (such an explanation would also address the issue of evaluation coverage).
- The text for UNEG Standard 1.3 indicates that plans of evaluation activities are submitted to Governing Bodies and/or Heads of the organisation for review and/or approval; this ensures that the Governing Body is aware of the proposed coverage.

**Sample**

- Organisation-wide evaluation policy or plan
- Recent independent evaluation reports
- Peer reviews of the evaluation function
- Board meeting minutes

**Proposed assessment criteria**

1. An organisation-wide evaluation policy or plan exists and is corporately approved which identifies the need for independent evaluations of projects and programmes.
2. **If the first criterion is met**, this policy or plan clearly explains how evaluations are planned and prioritised.
3. The organisation-wide policy defines expectations for coverage with regard to thematic areas, country programmes, or other relevant dimension (for example, may identify the frequency of certain types of evaluations, the percentage of projects and programs, etc).
4. There is evidence that the organisation implements its policy (evidence of annual evaluation plans, with appropriate resourcing, evidence of monitoring of its coverage, etc).
5. Recent independent evaluations reports exist for all countries sampled.

**Note:** If peer reviews or other studies mention that the organisation is not meeting expectation for coverage, then the assessment team should consider ratings of inadequate or lower.

**Rating**

- No criteria met = very weak
- One criterion met = weak
- Two criteria met = inadequate
- Three criteria met = adequate
- Four criteria met = strong
- All five criteria met = very strong
### Performance area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-performance area</th>
<th>IV Knowledge management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI</strong></td>
<td>18. The MO consistently evaluates its results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MI</strong></td>
<td>18.3 The MO ensures quality of its evaluations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available

| Standards for the quality of evaluations have been developed by different entities. |
| OECD. **DAC Evaluation Quality Standards**, 2006 |
| This document identifies the key pillars needed for a quality evaluation process and product. |
| UNEG. **Norms for Evaluation in the UN System**, 2005 |
| This document includes a section pertaining to the quality of evaluation in the UN system: |
| "8.1 Each evaluation should employ design, planning and implementation processes that are inherently quality oriented, covering appropriate methodologies for data-collection, analysis and interpretation. |
| 8.2 Evaluation reports must present in a complete and balanced way the evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations. They must be brief and to the point and easy to understand. They must explain the methodology followed, highlight the methodological limitations of the evaluation, key concerns and evidenced-based findings, dissident views and consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. They must have an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report, and facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons." |
| UNEG. **Standards for Evaluation in the UN system**, 2005 |
| “These standards build upon the UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN system (UNEG/FN/Norms [2005]). They are drawn from best practice of UNEG members. They are intended to guide the establishment of the institutional framework, management of the evaluation function, conduct and use of evaluations.” |
| “In addition to evaluation policies and guidelines existing within the various organizations of the United Nations system, the standards have also drawn from the following sources: OECD/DAC evaluation principles; national standards of OECD countries; evaluation policies of the international financial institutions; evaluation policies of the European Union standards of evaluation associations; evaluation guidance developed by ALNAP for humanitarian action.” |

### Sample

- Policy/procedures on quality control of the MO’s evaluations
- Reports on the quality of evaluations/ review of evaluations

### Proposed assessment criteria

1. The MO has a policy/procedures for the quality control of its evaluations.
2. The MO implemented the quality control procedures (i.e. reviewed its evaluations) within the past five years.
3. There is evidence (in the reports on the quality of evaluations/review of evaluations) that the MO is respecting relevant evaluation standards (e.g. UNEG standards and DAC standards) in its centralised and decentralised evaluations.
4. The reports on the quality of evaluations cover organisation-wide, country and project level evaluations.
5. There is evidence that the MO’s evaluation practices have changed as a result of the review of evaluations.

### Rating

| No criteria met = very weak |
| One criterion met = weak |
| Two criteria met = inadequate |
| Three criteria met = adequate |
| Four criteria met = strong |
| All five criteria met = very strong |
Performance area | IV Knowledge management
---|---
Sub-performance area | Performance Evaluation
KPI | 18. The MO consistently evaluates its results.
MI | 18.5 Direct beneficiaries and stakeholder groups are involved in evaluation processes.

Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available
- UNEG. *Standards for Evaluation in the UN system*, 2005
- UNEG Standard 3.11 references the need to involve stakeholders in evaluation:
  "Stakeholders should be consulted in the planning, design, conduct and follow up of evaluations."
The text further explains:
  "Stakeholders must be identified and consulted when planning the evaluation (key issues, method, timing, responsibilities) and should be kept informed throughout the evaluation process. The evaluation approach must consider learning and participation opportunities (e.g. workshops, learning groups, debriefing, participation in the field visits) to ensure that key stakeholders are fully integrated into the evaluation learning process."
- One World Trust. *Pathways to Accountability: The GAP Framework*, 2005

Sample
- Policy/guidelines statement on involving direct beneficiaries and stakeholder groups in evaluation process
- Evaluation reports – corporate, and for the 6 countries under review
- Evaluation review process

Proposed assessment criteria
1. The MO has a policy or guidelines for involving direct beneficiaries and stakeholder groups in evaluation processes.
2. This document specifies that efforts should be made to include both women and men, primary stakeholders from different socioeconomic groups and ethnicities, and girls and boys in the evaluation process.
3. The evaluation reports sampled show evidence that relevant beneficiaries and stakeholders were involved in at least one part of the evaluation process (e.g., planning, data collection, reporting, conclusions and recommendations, and identification of lessons learned).
4. The evaluation reports sampled show evidence that relevant beneficiaries and stakeholders were involved in more than one part of the evaluation processes (e.g., planning, data collection, reporting, conclusions and recommendations, and identification of lessons learned).
5. The MO has a review process that ensures the involvement of direct beneficiaries and stakeholders in the evaluation processes (i.e., it tries to improve their involvement).

Rating
No criteria met = very weak
One criterion met = weak
Two criteria met = inadequate
Three criteria met = adequate
Four criteria met = strong
All five criteria met = very strong

Beneficiary: "The term 'beneficiary' refers to individuals, groups, or organisations who have been designated as the intended recipients of humanitarian assistance or protection in an aid intervention. In this context, the term 'beneficiary' is concerned with the contractual relationship between the aid agency and the persons whom the agency has undertaken to assist." (Transparency International. "Glossary", *Preventing Corruption in Humanitarian Operations*, 2010)

Stakeholder: "All those – from agencies to individuals – who have a direct or indirect interest in the humanitarian intervention, or who affect or are affected by the implementation and outcome of it. Within the context of the Quality Pro Forma, primary stakeholders refer to both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries within the affected population. (ALNAP)" (ReliefWeb. *Glossary of Humanitarian Terms*, 2008)
### IV Knowledge management

#### Performance area
Performance Reporting

#### KPI
19. The MO presents performance information on its effectiveness.

#### MI
19.1 The MO reports against its organisation-wide strategy, including contribution to outcomes.

#### Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available

This document stresses the importance of supporting the achievement of development outcomes.

“Managing for Development Results has evolved as part of the global work by both national governments and development agencies to reduce poverty, support sustainable and equitable economic growth, and better define and measure development outcomes. Development effectiveness (broadly defined) means that countries and agencies are better able to achieve their collective development outcomes, and that they have the right tools at their disposal to measure progress toward those outcomes, report on them, and use the lessons learned to continuously improve performance.”

UN DESA. *Results-based Management in the United Nations Development System: Progress and Challenges*

#### Sample
- Organisation-wide annual performance reports
- Information on results tracking system, data aggregation
- Executive Board minutes/discussions on the reports

#### Proposed assessment criteria
1. There is an annual report (performance report) provided by the MO to its Board and other stakeholders on the progress being made toward the organisation-wide strategy.
2. The annual organisation-wide report provides evidence (through monitoring data, evaluations, assessments, field reports, etc) with respect to the delivery of outputs as identified in its strategy.
3. The annual organisation-wide report provides evidence (not only through monitoring data, but also through evaluations, assessments, field reports, etc) with respect to the organisation’s contribution to outcomes.
4. The annual report presents variances between planned and actual organisation-wide results and explains the reasons for the variance.
5. All above criteria are met for all performance reports sampled.

#### Rating
No criteria met = very weak
One criterion met = weak
Two criteria met = inadequate
Three criteria met = adequate
Four criteria met = strong
All five criteria met = very strong
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>IV Knowledge management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Performance Reporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| KPI | 19. The MO presents performance information on its effectiveness. |
| MI | 19.2 The MO reports performance using data obtained from measuring indicators. |

| Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available | Many sources mention the importance of reporting performance using indicators. OECD. *Results based management in the development co-operation agencies: a review of experience*, 2000

“Indicators are developed for measuring implementation progress and achievement of results. The logframe provides a five-level structure around which the indicators are typically constructed. Indicators specify what to measure along a scale or dimension. […] The relative importance of indicator types is likely to change over the project’s life cycle, with more emphasis at first to input and process indicators, while shifting later to output, outcome (purpose-level), and impact (goal-level) indicators.”

The World Bank. *Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System*, 2004

“Comparisons of performance data over time are critical. Providing data for a specific quarter or year by itself is not useful. To distinguish trends, one needs to begin with baselines. Always report against the baseline and intermediate measurements to determine whether progress has been sustained, whether there was only a short spurt of improvement, or whether early improvements have all disappeared. Comparing actual outcomes to targets is central to reporting results.” |

| Sample | • Organisation-wide annual performance reports
• Information on results tracking system, data aggregation |

| Proposed assessment criteria | 1. Annual performance reports exist at the organisation-wide level.
2. **If the first criterion is met**, the most recent performance report sampled specifies indicators for the reporting period that respect SMART criteria for indicators.
3. **If the first criterion is met**, the most recent performance report sampled presents an illustration of trends in measurement over a period of time (i.e., indicator data are compared across X years).
4. **If the first criterion is met**, the most recent performance report sampled compares indicator measurement to baseline (in the case of outcomes) and target amounts (in the case of both outputs and outcomes) (either in graph or narrative form).
5. **If all above criteria are met**, they are met for all performance reports sampled. |

| Rating | No criteria met = very weak
One criterion met = weak
Two criteria met = inadequate
Three criteria met = adequate
Four criteria met = strong
All five criteria met = very strong |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>IV Knowledge management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Performance Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>19. The MO presents performance information on its effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>19.3 The MO reports against its country strategies, including contribution to outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available**

OECD. *Results based management in the development co-operation agencies: a review of experience, 2000*

“Performance measurement involves routine or periodic monitoring, review (assessment), and reporting on project or program performance. It is particularly concerned with assessing effectiveness in achieving pre-established objectives and targets, although it also often addresses other performance issues as well. Assessments tend to be relatively straightforward presentations of results data or performance ratings following a standard format (often without a great deal of in-depth analysis, interpretation, context or explanation of the results presented). It is typically conducted as a self-assessment by project/program management, and is used both as a management tool and for accountability reporting to agency headquarters. […]

Routine self-assessments by managers discussed in previous chapters (such as annual project performance reports, project completion reports, program results and resource requests reports, etc.), as well as agency annual performance reports, are considered in this paper to be an integral part of the performance measurement system itself, and distinct from evaluation.”

**Sample**

- Country level annual performance reports

**Proposed assessment criteria**

1. Annual performance reports (i.e. reporting on progress made towards the country strategies) exist at the country level.
2. At least half of the recent country performance reports sampled provide credible evidence (through evaluations, assessments, field reports, etc.) with respect to delivery of outputs and contribution to outcomes as identified in the country strategy.
3. At least half of the recent country performance reports sampled explain variances between planned and actual results.
4. There is evidence in at least half of the country sampled that the MO is improving the evidence base it provides in its annual reporting on country results (e.g., establishes link between country level outputs and outcomes, identifies limitations in the data, refers to efforts to address limitations and otherwise ensure quality of data)
5. **If all above criteria are met**, they are met for all country performance reports sampled.

**Rating**

No criteria met = very weak
One criterion met = weak
Two criteria met = inadequate
Three criteria met = adequate
Four criteria met = strong
All five criteria met = very strong
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>IV Knowledge management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Performance Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>19. The MO presents performance information on its effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>19.4 The MO reports against its aid effectiveness commitments (e.g. Busan commitments) using indicators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available | *Busan Partnership for effective development co-operation, Fourth High Level Forum on aid effectiveness, Busan, Republic of Korea, 29 November-1 December 2011*  
In the Busan document, donors, aid agencies, developing and developed countries and civil society organisations have agreed to report against and monitor aid effectiveness.  
“12 b) Strengthen our efforts to achieve concrete and sustainable results. This involves better managing for results, monitoring, evaluating and communicating progress; as well as scaling up our support, strengthening national capacities and leveraging diverse resources and initiatives in support of development results.”  
“18 c) We will partner to implement a global Action Plan to enhance capacity for statistics to monitor progress, evaluate impact, ensure sound, results-focused public sector management, and highlight strategic issues for policy decisions.” |
| Sample           | * Strategic plan*  
|                  | * Report on commitments related to the fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (Busan commitments)*  
|                  | * Other aid effectiveness reports*  
|                  | * Executive Board meeting minutes* |
| Proposed assessment criteria | 1. The MO identifies its aid effectiveness commitments in its strategic plan or in another document.  
2. An annual, organisation-wide report on the MO’s aid effectiveness commitments exists (this may not be a separate report, but part of another report, such as the annual performance report or reports on QCPR).  
3. **If the second criterion is met**, the most recent report describes the general progress with regards to aid effectiveness commitments.  
4. **If the second criterion is met**, the most recent report describes progress and achievements to date on aid effectiveness commitments, using indicators.  
5. Evidence (e.g. in meeting minutes, etc.) suggests that the reporting meets the requirements of governing board or other relevant body. |
| Rating           | No criteria met = very weak  
|                  | One criterion met = weak  
|                  | Two criteria met = inadequate  
|                  | Three criteria met = adequate  
|                  | Four criteria met = strong  
<p>|                  | All five criteria met = very strong |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>IV Knowledge management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-performance area</td>
<td>Dissemination of Lessons Learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI</strong></td>
<td>20. The MO encourages the identification, documentation and dissemination of lessons learned and/or best practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MI</strong></td>
<td>20.1 The MO reports on lessons learned based on performance information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources Related to this MI and Norms or Standards when available**


“Information on results should be publicly available. However, use of results monitoring information for reporting and accountability (for both partner countries and development agencies) can prompt behaviors that are overly risk-averse. Two approaches can mitigate this possibility: (a) using reports on results in a positive way for management learning and decision making, taking into account lessons for better future action; and (b) when using reports for accountability purposes, setting performance measures that reflect the level of responsibility of the actor (whether a country, development agency, ministry, institution, NGO, or other stakeholder) and results that the actor can reasonably achieve.”

**Sample**

- Knowledge management or other such strategy

**Proposed assessment criteria**

1. There is evidence that the organisation is committed to the identification of lessons learned and/or best practices.
2. The MO has a system for collecting and disseminating internal lessons learned and/or best practices.
3. There is a unit/coordinating group responsible for documenting and disseminating lessons learned and/or best practices.
4. The MO has an easily accessible platform that collects and disseminates both internal and external lessons learned and/or best practices.
5. There is evidence that the MO uses lessons learned and/or best practices based on performance to change management and programming practices.

**Rating**

No criteria met = very weak
One criterion met = weak
Two criteria met = inadequate
Three criteria met = adequate
Four criteria met = strong
All five criteria met = very strong

**Lessons learned**: Generalisations based on evaluation experiences with projects, programs, or policies that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations. Frequently, lessons highlight strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design, and implementation that affect performance, outcome, and impact. (OECD DAC. *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management*, 2002)
3.5 Contributions to Development/Humanitarian Results

In this component, there is a different approach to the review of documents. The content of documents is reviewed in order to synthesize information in relation to a set of questions about the organisation’s relevance and effectiveness (progress towards results). The sources, scope, and key questions for each of the four KPI are described below.

KPI A – Evidence of the multilateral organisation’s relevance

MOPAN’s approach builds on the OECD-DAC definition of relevance as the extent to which the objectives (results) of an organisation are consistent with beneficiary requirements, country needs, global priorities, partner policies and donor policies. It also assesses relevance in terms of the extent to which the multilateral organisation works towards results in areas within its mandate.

Sources: The Assessment Team conducts a review and synthesis that draws on the organisation’s performance reports, strategies, significant corporate evaluations (or a sample of such evaluations), country-level reporting, country programme evaluations, and any other evaluations conducted in each of the six countries included in the MOPAN assessment. UNDAF evaluations are also considered when appropriate. Evaluations that comment on relevance of the organisations work are particularly important to this assessment.

Scope: The assessment considers the documented evidence of relevance, both corporately and at the country level, with a focus on the last 3 to 5 years.

Key questions

- To what extent do evaluations or performance reports at the corporate and country level (in the sample countries) confirm that the MO results respond to the needs/priorities of its target groups/beneficiaries?
- To what extent do evaluations or performance reports at corporate and country level (in the sample countries) confirm that the MO adapts its work to the changing needs and priorities of countries?
- To what extent do evaluations or performance reports at corporate and country level (in the sample countries) confirm that the MO results are in line with global trends and priorities in its field? To what extent do the MO's strategies – at corporate level, country level – articulate the trends and priorities that it seeks to align with? What are those trends and priorities?
- To what extent do evaluations or performance reports at corporate and country level (in the sample countries) confirm that the MO is pursuing results in areas within its mandate?

Dimensions of relevance

- MO results respond to the needs/priorities of its target group (beneficiaries)
- MO adapts its work to the changing needs and priorities of countries
- MO’s results are in line with global trends and priorities in the development/humanitarian field
- MO is pursuing results in areas within its mandate

KPI B – Evidence of the multilateral organisation’s progress towards its institutional/organisation-wide results

The assessment team conducts a review and synthesis of the evidence presented by multilateral organisations on progress towards their strategic objectives or key organisation-wide results (normally at the outcome level).
Sources: The review and synthesis draws on the organisation’s performance reports and independent evaluations on key thematic areas or strategic objectives.

Scope: Because of the emphasis on results, the assessment usually focuses on the objectives and results from the most recently completed strategy cycle, although often there is a certain degree of continuity with the objectives in the current cycle. Thus, the assessment usually focuses on the progress reported on the past 3 to 5 years. The scope of the assessment is agreed with the organisation.

Key questions:

1. To what extent do the organisation’s reports and corporate evaluations demonstrate progress (organisational contributions) towards the planned outcomes articulated in its strategic plan?
   a. Reports/evaluations comment on the outcomes that were articulated in the strategy
   b. Reports/evaluations clearly identify key outputs delivered by the organisation

2. What do the reports and evaluations indicate as the main areas of achievement? What do the reports and evaluations indicate as areas needing improvement?

3. To what extent do reports and evaluations provide evidence that supports the results claims?
   a. Reports/evaluations describe or comment on explicit theory or theories of change that help to clarify the organisation’s contributions in different outcome areas
   b. Reports use baselines and/or targets included for indicators as a basis for judging progress
   c. Data in the reports is checked for quality and reliability, and any limitations to the data are explicitly noted

KPI C – Evidence of the multilateral organisation’s progress towards its stated country-level results

The assessment team conducts a review and synthesis of the evidence presented by multilateral organisations on progress towards the objectives or key results at the country level.

Sources: The review and synthesis draws on the organisation’s performance reports, country programme evaluations and mid-term reviews, and programme and project evaluations

---

8 This refers to the OECD definition of outcomes (i.e. higher level results). Some MOs use different terminology for the various levels of results. Evidence of reporting according to a theory or theories of change will be sought as a way of substantiating the reported higher-level results.

9 This refers to the OECD definition of outputs (i.e. lower level results). Some MOs use different terminology for the various levels of results.

10 ‘Theory of change’ is understood in the sense defined by Rist and Morra Imas (2009) as, “a representation of how an intervention is expected to lead to desired results” and in the sense defined by Michael Quinn Patton who has stated that a theory of change is more than the sequential order of results statements presented in a logic model; it requires key assumptions related to the results chain and context (e.g. policy and environment), and important influences and risks to be made explicit - Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods (2002).

11 According to Rist and Morra Imas, The Road to Results – “Reliability is the term used to describe the stability of the measurement – the degree to which it measures the same thing, in the same way, in repeated tests.” Attention is also given to the quality of the evidence – specifically, whether or not it has been derived from or validated by an external and/or independent source.
conducted in each of the six countries included in the MOPAN assessment. UNDAF evaluations are also considered.

**Scope:** Because of the emphasis on results, the assessment usually focuses on the progress/results reported on the past 3 to 5 years. The scope of the assessment is agreed with the country office.

**Key questions:**

1. To what extent do the organisation’s reports and evaluations demonstrate progress (organisational contributions) towards the objectives or outcomes articulated in the country programming document/strategy?
   - a. Reports/evaluations comment on the outcomes that were articulated in the strategy
   - b. Reports/evaluations clearly identify key outputs delivered by the organisation

2. What do the reports and evaluations indicate as the main areas of achievement? What do the reports and evaluations indicate as areas needing improvement?

3. To what extent do reports and evaluations provide evidence that supports the results claims?
   - a. Reports/evaluations describe or comment on explicit theory or theories of change that help to clarify the organisation’s contributions in different outcome areas
   - b. Reports use baselines and/or targets included for indicators as a basis for judging progress
   - c. Data in the reports is checked for quality and reliability, and any limitations to the data are explicitly noted

4. What do reports and evaluations highlight as the main improvements in reporting of results in the past three years?

**KPI D – Evidence of the multilateral organisation’s contributions to national goals and priorities, including the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)**

This KPI analyses the evidence of a multilateral organisation’s contributions to relevant national goals in the work that it carries out in the sampled countries. National goals and priorities as

---

12 This refers to the OECD definition of outcomes (i.e. higher level results). Some MOs use different terminology for the various levels of results. Evidence of reporting according to a theory or theories of change will be sought as a way of substantiating the reported higher-level results.

13 This refers to the OECD definition of outputs (i.e. lower level results). Some MOs use different terminology for the various levels of results.

14 ‘Theory of change’ is understood in the sense defined by Rist and Morra Imas (2009) as, “a representation of how an intervention is expected to lead to desired results” and in the sense defined by Michael Quinn Patton who has stated that a theory of change is more than the sequential order of results statements presented in a logic model; it requires key assumptions related to the results chain and context (e.g. policy and environment), and important influences and risks to be made explicit - Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods (2002).

15 According to Rist and Morra Imas, *The Road to Results* – “Reliability is the term used to describe the stability of the measurement – the degree to which it measures the same thing, in the same way, in repeated tests.” Attention is also given to the quality of the evidence – specifically, whether or not it has been derived from or validated by an external and/or independent source.

16 This KPI will be reviewed and adjusted as necessary in the case of humanitarian organisations.
defined in national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, and other country plans to achieve the MDGs are usually the basis for agreeing the UNDAF and often referred to by multilateral organisations in their country-level strategies and results frameworks.

**Sources:** The Assessment Team conducts a review and synthesis that draws on the organisation’s performance reports, country programme evaluations and mid-term reviews, and programme and project evaluations conducted in each of the six countries included in the MOPAN assessment. UNDAF evaluations are also considered.

**Scope:** The assessment usually considers the documented evidence of contributions by the MO in a particular country over the last 3 to 5 years, depending on where the organisation is in its country programming cycle. The scope of the assessment is agreed with the country office.

**Key questions:**

- To what extent do MO-specific and UNDAF evaluations in-country provide evidence that the MO is making contributions to national goals or priorities? What are the areas that are most frequently cited?
- To what extent do the MO reports and UNDAF progress reports refer to MO contributions in specific national priority areas? What are the areas that are most frequently cited?
- To what extent do MO reports or other documents (from the MO, UNCT, or others) find that the MO is making contributions in MDG areas? What are the areas that are most frequently cited?
- To what extent do evaluation reports available in each country confirm that the MO programming has resulted in positive benefits for the country under review? What are the benefits or concerns most frequently cited?

17 Only those national goals or priorities that relate directly to the multilateral organisation’s approved programme or strategy in that country will be considered. If there are no references to national goals or the MDGs in the approved programme of the organisations, this will be noted in the assessment report.