Proposed framework, indicators, and full sources for assessing evaluation and institutional learning in development agencies

Indicator	Proposed sub-indicator	DAC Peer Review (2019-20)	MOPAN 3.0 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)
1. Evaluation system (Average of sub-indicator scores – score out of 4)	(a) **Evaluation policy** with defined roles and responsibilities	6.2 An evaluation policy with clearly defined roles and responsibilities	Can be established from micro-indicators and narrative text in MOPAN reviews
	(b) There is a dedicated **overall evaluation plan and budget** to allow consistent coverage of activities	6.2 There is an overall evaluation plan and dedicated budget for the evaluation of development assistance activities to ensure coverage	8.1 Element 4: A separate budget line (approved by the Governing Body) ensures budgetary independence 8.1 Element 5: The central evaluation programme is fully funded by core funds 8.2 Element 3: A prioritised and funded evaluation plan covering the organisation's planning and budgeting cycle is available
	Evaluation function is: (c) **independent and impartial**	6.2 The evaluation process is impartial and independent from the process concerned with policymaking and the delivery of development assistance	8.1 Element 1: Evaluation function is independent from other management functions 8.1 Element 3: evaluation office has full discretion in deciding the evaluation programme 8.1 Element 7: Evaluators are able to conduct their work throughout the evaluation without undue interference by those involved in implementing the unit of analysis being evaluated
	(d) with sufficient **expertise** and systems in place to ensure quality	6.2 There is an evaluation function with sufficient expertise to ensure quality	8.1 Element 2: Head of evaluation reports directly to the Governing Body of the organisation 8.1 Element 6: Evaluations are submitted directly for consideration at the appropriate level of decision-making pertaining to the subject of evaluation 8.3 Systems applied to ensure the quality of evaluations

Indicator	Proposed sub-indicator	DAC Peer Review (2019-20)	MOPAN 3.0 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)
2. Institutional learning (Average of sub-indicator scores – score out of 4)	(a) Programme management and *accountability systems ensure follow-up* on recommendations and learning	6.3 Feedback mechanisms that involve all parties and link to the overall programme management and accountability systems to ensure follow-up on recommendations and learning	8.6 Clear accountability system ensures responses and follow-up to and use of evaluation recommendations
	(b) A *knowledge management system* based on results and evidence is used as a forward-looking management tool; there is *uptake of lessons and best practices*	6.3 Knowledge management system used across development cooperation system as a forward-looking management tool – building on results and evidence for learning and analysis	8.7 Uptake of lessons learned and best practices from evaluations
	(c) The donor has *implemented past recommendations / made progress* in areas identified as weak in the previous assessment	Share of recommendations from the previous Peer Review that have been implemented. Score as: Fully implemented (weighted 1); partially implemented (weighted 0.5); or not implemented (weighted zero), added together to provide a single composite %.[1]	Assessment of progress made on previously identified weaknesses in the 'Performance Journey' narrative section of MOPAN Review. *Score using the usual four-part rating system.* *This excludes multilaterals that have had only one MOPAN Review to date.[2]*

---

[1] This measure excludes five DAC members that have had only one Peer Review: Czech Republic, Iceland, Poland, Slovak Republic and Slovenia. In these cases, it will be treated as a missing data point, and simply calculate the learning sub-score based on two inputs rather than three.

[2] Nine organisations have only had one MOPAN review (and six orgs will be reviewed for the first time in 2019-20) - although only one of these (the Global Fund) was included in QuODA 2018. For all the other multilaterals in QuODA 2018 there is now both a MOPAN 3.0 review (2017-8 or 2015-6 cycle) and a previous MOPAN review (between 2010-4) to compare with.

Scoring system

Each indicator would receive a score of between 0 and 4. To calculate this:

- For multilaterals, we will use the score given for each micro-indicator or element(s) in their MOPAN review, or the average of two or more scores where relevant. MOPAN's four-part rating system is as follows:

    - Highly satisfactory (3.01 – 4)
    - Satisfactory (2.01 – 3)
    - Unsatisfactory (1.01 – 2)
    - Highly unsatisfactory (0 – 1)

    The scoring criteria for each micro-element or indicator that underpin the rating above is judged as follows:

    - 4 = Element is fully implemented/implemented in all cases
    - 3 = Element is substantially implemented/implemented in the majority of cases
    - 2 = Element is partially implemented/implemented in some cases
    - 1 = Element is present, but not implemented/implemented in zero cases
    - 0 = Element is not present

- For OECD DAC Reviews, we will award scores ourselves using the same scoring criteria and categorisation as used by MOPAN, to allow as much consistency as possible between two sets of donors/sources, but with one small change. In piloting this approach with bilaterals, we found that the scenario "element is present, but not implemented" never occurred in practice. Instead, we use the score of 1 to represent a more frequently occurring scenario in which the element is not present but the donor merits some additional credit, for example due to reforms currently underway to introduce the element in future.