Technical Note

**MOPAN 2010-2014 Assessments**

**Technical info on Download Package**

The present download package made available by the MOPAN Secretariat contains 34 Excel files, two for each of the 23 assessments carried out by MOPAN in the period 2010-2014. This is only a partial selection of all MOPAN Assessments (2003-2014). The assessment choice was based on the availability of Excel files. The data from all the assessments since 2003 are available in PDF format on the [MOPAN website](http://www.mopanonline.org/sitemap/)[[1]](#footnote-1).

|  |
| --- |
| TABLE 1: List of MOPAN Assessments, 2010-2016 |
| Year | **MOs Assessed** | **# of MOs** | **Methodology** |
| 2010 | WHO, UNFPA, ADB, IFAD | 4 | **MOPAN Common Approach** |
| 2011 | UNRWA, FAO, IDB, UNEP, UNHCR | 5 |
| 2012 | AfDB, GAVI, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNICEF, WB | 6 |
| 2013 | ADB, IFAD, WFP, WHO | 4 |
| 2014 | UNWOMEN, UNHCR, UNFPA, FAO | 4 |

The 34 Excel files available are divided into two types:

* Summary files which only contain the Survey and Document Review results for each MO assessed (i.e. “Summary\_WHO\_2010 & 2013\_MOPAN.xlsx”)
* Full data files which contain Survey and Document Review results as well as all relevant technical/statistical information (i.e. “WHO\_2010 & 2013\_MOPAN Data.xlsx”)

Each of the 17 Excel files from each type (full data & summary) included in this Package contains data on one individual multilateral organization. Where an organisation has been assessed twice in the 2010-2014 period, data for *both* assessments was integrated into the same Excel file (i.e. the “WHO\_2010 & 2013\_MOPAN Data.xlsx” file contains all results data for the WHO 2010 and 2013 assessments). These multiple-assessment files also contain an extra table comparing the results for the same MO across the two assessments for all identical Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) across the surveys. **Nevertheless, as will be further noted below, due to changes in methodology from year to year, cross-assessment comparisons should be handled with caution.**

Each Excel file should normally contain the following elements:

* 5-6 tabs for each Assessment, including:
	+ List of all KPIs, Micro-indicators (MIs) and Sub-MIs and their respective survey descriptors;
	+ Document Review scores and Survey ratings (organised by Respondent Group) for all KPIs, MIs and sub-MIs;
	+ Technical information such as survey screening questions and respondent frequencies (weighted and unweighted) for all KPIs, MIs, and Sub-MIs;
	+ KPI Ratings Comparison Table (for MOs that were assessed more than once in 2010-2014).

Some KPIs, MIs, and Sub-MIs are based on survey responses from specific respondent groups, or from specific respondent groups within a specific country. For example, under the “Development Results Component”:

* Ratings for KPI A are presented only for respondents from Headquarters (HQ);
* Ratings for KPIs B and C are presented for most respondent groups, but the results are grouped by country. For WFP2013, KPIs B and C ratings are listed for every country where surveys were conducted: Ethiopia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Mozambique, Pakistan.

The survey question labels and/or attached comments in the Excel tables clearly indicate any cases where a survey question was only asked of specific groups and/or in specific countries.

**Basic information on the methodology: MOPAN Common Approach**

This section is meant to give some basic information about the MOPAN methodology behind the assessment results and to acquaint users with the data sources used.

The aim is merely to allow for a correct interpretation of the results, rather than to provide a comprehensive methodological overview. A full explanation of the methodology used for each multilateral assessment is detailed in the technical volumes of the institutional reports (available on the [MOPAN website](http://www.mopanonline.org/sitemap/)). All technical volumes published to-date are also available online. The website also contains go more in-depth into MOPAN’s institutional mandate and the evolution of its methodological approaches to assessing multilateral effectiveness.

Data sources:

*Survey*

MOPAN gathers stakeholder perceptions through a survey of MOPAN members (at headquarters and in-country) and other key stakeholders of the multilateral organisation. Donor respondents are chosen by MOPAN member countries; other respondents are identified by the multilateral organisation being assessed. The survey questions relate to both organisational effectiveness and to the achievement of development and/or humanitarian results. Survey respondents are presented with statements and are asked to rate the organisation’s performance on a six-point scale where a rating of 1 is considered “very weak” up to a rating of 6 which is considered “very strong.” A mean score is calculated for each respondent group (e.g. donors at headquarters), which explains why many Survey scores go down to decimals (as opposed to the Document Review where scores for specific indicators are always integers). Frequencies on the number of respondents and other technical information for each indicator are included in the Full Data Excel files and further explained in the technical volume II of each assessment.

*Document review*

The document review considers four types of documents: multilateral organisation documents; internal and external reviews of the organisation’s performance; external assessments such as the Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration, the Common Performance Assessment (COMPAS) report, and previous MOPAN surveys; and evaluations, either internal or external, of the achievement of results at various levels. Document review ratings are based on a set of criteria that MOPAN considers to represent good practice in each area. The criteria are based on existing standards and guidelines (for example, UNEG or OECD-DAC guidelines), on MOPAN identification of key aspects to consider, and on the input of subject-matter specialists. The rating for each micro-indicator depends on the number of criteria met by the organisation, but will always be an integer number between 1 “very weak” and 6 “very strong”. The document review scores are most often given at the Micro-indicator (MI) level, but for comparability purposes, the Excel files in this Download Package consolidated mean document review scores per Key Performance Indicator (KPI) from the existing MI scores. For that reason, some of the KPI mean document review scores have a decimal breakdown.

*Interviews*

Interviews are conducted with staff based at headquarters and country offices of multilateral organisations who are knowledgeable in areas that relate to the MOPAN assessment. Interview data are not coded or used as a formal data source but rather to help ensure that the Assessment Team has all appropriate and necessary documents to enhance the triangulation of data from various sources and provide contextual information to assist in the analysis of the key performance indicators.

**For any further inquiries, please contact the MOPAN Secretariat at** **contact@mopanonline.org****.**

1. http://www.mopanonline.org/publications/ [↑](#footnote-ref-1)