

## Methodology Revisions Plan 2019

05 April 2019

### Methodology revisions to be integrated in 2019 cycle

Task / Action / Outputs	Target date
<b>Enhancing external stakeholder feedback and country level data</b>	
<p><b>2019.1. Prepare clearer guidelines for collection of survey respondents.</b> A clearer typology of external stakeholders required for inclusion in the survey and possibly interviews will be defined. What constitutes an external stakeholder will also be clarified. This will serve as starting point for discussion with MOs and Members during the inception phase of the assessment to define a more relevant range of respondents.</p>	
Updated Methodology Manual (section 5.2)	Completed
<p><b>2019.2. Refine the generic survey questionnaire and implementation process.</b> The generic questionnaire for the survey will be reviewed, especially looking at questions with high percentage of "Don't know" responses that may be not relevant. The questionnaire will further be customized during the inception phase. A working assumption remains that the survey data feeds into the assessment of organisational performance (KPIs 1-8), and not the assessment of results (KPIs 9-12).</p>	
Updated generic survey questionnaire (basis for further customisation during inception)	Completed
Updated survey process (in-housing of the survey) as part of on-going SOPs for assessment implementation	Completed
<b>Reviewing the results assessment</b>	
<p><b>2019.3. Refine the list of acceptable documents for inclusion in the assessment of results.</b> The updated list would clarify that country level secondary data can be included as relevant, with the understanding that the documentary review will still only include a manageable sample as per resources available; and would mention the DAC Evaluation Resource Centre (DEReC) as resource for collecting evaluation information, in particular country level evaluations.</p>	
Updated Methodology Manual (section 5.1)	Completed
<p><b>2019.4. Establish criteria for ex-ante appreciation of results data and level of confidence.</b> An initial analysis of the universe of results data available including aligning sources to the assessment framework will be undertaken as part of the inception framework. The level of confidence will be appreciated as part of the same process to clarify understanding, and form basis for dialogue with the institution during inception, as well as for designing gap filling actions.</p>	
Updated Methodology Manual (section 5.1 and chapter 7)	15/12/2019
<b>Improving the assessment process</b>	
<p><b>2019.5. Define an enhanced inception phase.</b> The objective of the enhanced inception phase is to define all requirements (methodology / tools) needed for the assessment to be implemented swiftly. The underlying assumption for this enhanced phase is the implementation of a preliminary document review and preliminary analysis allowing to build a good understanding of the institution ahead of the inception mission.</p>	
Template inception report (by institution assessed)	Completed
Updated inception process as part of on-going SOPs for assessment implementation	Completed

### Methodology revisions to be integrated from 2020 cycle

Task / Action / Outputs	Target date
<b>Enhancing external stakeholder feedback and country level data</b>	
<b>2020.1. Define options for piloting different methods of country data collection</b> (e.g. field visits). The objective is undertaking a comparison to garner insight on to what methods are most appropriate for gathering credible feedback from external stakeholders (at various levels/locations) to feed into the assessment of organisational performance (KPIs 1-8).	
Specify piloting modalities (e.g. organisations, countries, indicators impacted) as part of the inception phase for 2019 assessments	30/06/2019
<b>Reviewing the results assessment</b>	
<b>2020.2. Review the results component.</b> In continuation to previous actions related results assessment, this action envisages a deeper review of KPIs 9 to 12, in terms of KPIs, MIs, and scoring criteria building on lessons from previous assessment cycles. This work could for example include a review of KPIs/MIs 9-12 to reassess their relevance, identify overlap, and examine balance between themes. It would also include the identification of options for strengthening the results assessment system, including options for potentially differentiated components for different types of results (normative, financial, humanitarian etc.). The working assumption however remains a results assessment on the basis of secondary data.	
Inception report	30/04/2019
<b>Enhancing the methodology</b>	
<b>2020.3. Implement a case study around the preparedness to the Agenda 2030 in organisations assessed throughout all three MOPAN 3.0 assessment cycles (2015-2019).</b> This study would allow: (i) generating knowledge about preparedness of selected key organisations to the SDGs, and (ii) gathering lessons about indicators / methods that can be used to integrate the preparedness to the 2030 Agenda into MOPAN assessments, and related resources requirements. The case study may test different options such as additional KPI/MIs or additional MIs under existing KPIs.	
Draft report	31/07/2019
<b>2020.4. Implement a case study around the integration of safeguards against SEA/SH in organisations assessed throughout all three MOPAN 3.0 assessment cycles (2015-2019).</b> This study would allow: (i) generating knowledge about the implementation of safeguards against SEA/SH in a group of selected organisations, and (ii) further defining the additional MIs that would be used to integrate safeguards against SEA/SH into MOPAN assessments, as well as related data collection methods and resources requirements.	
Draft report	31/08/2018
<b>2020.5. Design a module for monitoring the implementation of UN Reform.</b> This is a thematic topic previously mentioned by Members and requested for addition in 2019 work of the TWG and possible implementation in 2020. This action is about analysing implications with respect to framework, data collection methods and cost. Action 2020.1 could be directed in a converging direction so as to contribute to this action.	
Inception report	31/08/2018
<b>Differentiating the methodology</b>	
<b>2020.6. Explore differentiation of assessment modality.</b> This action will aim at exploring the modalities of a light-touch approach based on members' needs, and the conditions for its applicability for specific organisations. Other modalities may also be analysed such as deeper analysis applied to specific areas. The analysis should also clarify cost implications of such an approach.	
Inception report	30/04/2019

### Pipeline of additional potential methodology

Task / Action / Outputs	Target date	Contributors
<b>Enhancing the methodology</b>		
<p><b>202x.2. Review the relationship management performance area.</b> This action is building on lessons from the pilot case study on collaboration between the three Rome-based UN agencies with respect to KPI 6.</p>		
Tbd		
<p><b>202x.3. Review the assessment of standardised function such as audit or evaluation.</b> This action is building on lessons from previous implementation cycles. For functions such as audit where external standards exist, the assessment could make use of external certification when it exists. In other cases, even when external certification standards do not formally exist, de-facto standards may apply for example in the case of evaluation functions building on UNEG or ECG knowledge.</p>		
Tbd		
<p><b>202x.4. Review the scoring system.</b> This action is building on lessons from previous implementation cycles. Averaging scores for elements to get the score for a MI may not be relevant and clarifying rating scales at the MI level may be more appropriate. This action proposes a review of the scoring system in general, using lessons but also taking into account good practice in evaluation.</p>		
Tbd		
<p><b>202x.5. Provide recommendations.</b> This action is building on feedback received from members and some organisations alike, requesting more specific recommendations from the MOPAN assessment. Further analysis may include looking at practice in the evaluation world and reflecting on pros and cons in the context of MOPAN.</p>		
Tbd		