

Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network

Technical Working Group

Technical Working Group

Final language-edited full set of elements for Micro-Indicators (MI) for KPI 1-8 and rating criteria for KPI 9-12 in the MOPAN 4 framework

17 April 2026

Paris, France

This document presents the final language-edited full set of all MI elements for KPI 1-8 and final rating criteria for the MI for KPI 9-12 in the MOPAN 4 framework.

Susanne MATTSSON (Susanne.MATTSON@mopan.org)

Gaia CASTORI (Gaia.CASTORI@mopan.org)

Carla MANCILLAS (Carla.MANCILLAS@mopan.org)

JT03585428

Table of contents

Final language-edited elements for all MIs for KPI 1-8 and rating criteria for KPI 9-12	3
Introduction	3
Overview of progress since May 2025 MOPAN Steering Committee meeting	3
Content of this document	4
Final endorsed and language-edited Elements and Essential Guidance KPI 1-8	5
KPI 1: Organisational architecture and financial framework are aligned with the organisation's strategic direction and enable achievement of intended result	5
KPI 2: Corporate strategy, key functions and mechanisms in place, aligned and applied to support normative frameworks for cross cutting issues at all levels	11
KPI 3: Resource management and internal collaboration support relevance, cost-efficiency, and agility	16
KPI 4: Enterprise risk management, internal and external controls, and safeguards ensure a comprehensive framework for proactively identifying, assessing, and mitigating risks while promoting accountability, compliance, and the protection of organisational assets	26
KPI 5: Operational programming, planning, and design systems and procedures support the development and delivery of quality interventions	32
KPI 6: Collaboration, harmonisation and enabling local leadership support shared outcomes	41
KPI 7: Systems and processes are in place for managing external and internal results to support learning, decision making, accountability, and communications	49
KPI 8: Incentives and accountability systems encourages use of evaluative findings and lessons learned	52
Final endorsed and language-edited KPI 9-12 MI-level Criteria	57
KPI 9 Effectiveness: Through its interventions, the MO has achieved its stated goals and objectives	57
KPI 10: Relevance and Coherence: The organization is doing the rights things, and its interventions are coherent with other interventions	63
KPI 11: Efficiency: Through its interventions, the organization delivers results in an economic and timely way	66
KPI 12: Sustainability: The net benefits of the organisation's interventions continue or are likely to continue after completion of the interventions	71

Final language-edited elements for all MIs for KPI 1-8 and rating criteria for KPI 9-12

Introduction

This document presents the final, language-edited set of elements for all MIs under KPIs 1–8, as well as the final, language-edited rating descriptors for MIs under KPIs 9–12 within the MOPAN 4 framework, reflecting the TWG agreement for a final editorial review by the Secretariat, without changes to substantive content.

Overview of progress since May 2025 MOPAN Steering Committee meeting

At the May 2025 Steering Committee meeting, MOPAN members endorsed the MOPAN 4 Indicator Framework and Analytical guidance [MOPAN/SC(2025)9]. Members agreed that the MOPAN 4 framework for KPI 1-8 will retain elements as a core feature at the sub-micro-indicator (MI) level, and that elements will continue to guide the analysis of performance and the rating against each MI, preserving analytical granularity. However, the elements will no longer be scored individually but rather used as guidance for assigning a rating at the MI level. Compared to the revisions endorsed for KPI 1-8, members agreed on relatively light revisions to KPI 9–12. These included the introduction of an evaluability assessment in the early stages of the process during inception to determine the coverage, quality and adequacy of available evidence for the results performance area (KPI 9–12) and to adjust the methodology as needed. Minor revisions were approved at the Micro-Indicator (MI) level, and two Core MIs, four MIs from the IFI adapted framework and one MI from the Humanitarian adapted framework were added. The overall level of ambition for the assessment as well as the four levels of rating criteria (from highly satisfactory to highly unsatisfactory) remains the same as in MOPAN 3.1 and the requirements for reaching/not reaching each level should be kept similar.

In June 2025 and following the Steering Committee meeting, the Technical Working Group (TWG) met to discuss and agree on the principles for the work to revise, adapt and develop the MOPAN 4 elements in line with the new indicator framework [MOPAN/TWG(2025)9]. Based upon these principles, work commenced to adapt/develop elements for a total of 51 MIs. The Secretariat was working through an iterative process that incorporated internal and external expertise including MOPAN's Service Providers and enabled TWG to provide continual feedback and oversight.

In October 2025, the TWG met to provide feedback on the process of developing and drafting the MI-related elements, including on a set of first draft MI elements and their accompanying guidance. [MOPAN/TWG/M(2025)5]. The TWG Chair highlighted key issues raised during the meeting, including the importance of having definitions accompanying each element to ensure consistent use by assessment

teams; the need to consider the importance of proportionality and cost-effectiveness of assessments, and the need for continued close engagement between the Secretariat and the TWG in the development of elements. The TWG also agreed to provide feedback on batches of initial draft MI-related elements, and thereafter on the full, final draft set of elements. Thus, TWG members provided feedback on the draft of elements for core MIs [MOPAN/TWG(2025)11] in December 2025 and on the draft of elements for specialised MIs in January 2026 [MOPAN/TWG(2025)12].

The revisions for KPI 9–12 were subsequently finalised through a streamlined internal process. Given that only minor adjustments were made following the Steering Committee’s endorsement, the refinements were completed with the support of IOD Parc and in close coordination with the Secretariat, ensuring consistency with the broader MOPAN 4 framework while maintaining continuity with the approach agreed by members.

Both the MI elements under KPI 1-8 as well as the rating criteria for MI’s under KPI 9-12 were subject to external quality assurance by two external experts prior to finalising the drafts. The revised final draft full set of elements was shared with the TWG members in February 2026 [MOPAN/TWG(2026)2] together with the draft final rating criteria for KPI 9–12 [MOPAN/TWG(2026)3]

On the 12th of March 2026, an in-person full day TWG workshop took place in Paris where the members discussed the entirety of the framework, provided constructive feedback and identified actions needed to finalise the methodology. Thereafter, and based on the agreed revisions and actions, the **TWG endorsed the final full set of elements and criteria for all MIs in the MOPAN 4 framework.**

The Secretariat prepared a summary note [MOPAN/TWG/M(2026)1], capturing all agreed changes to the elements and criteria, and circulated this summary note together with the final methodology and agreed revisions and edits [MOPAN/TWG(2026)4] [MOPAN/TWG(2026)5].

In addition, the **TWG agreed that the Secretariat will do a final grammatical, syntactic, and editorial review of all elements prior to publication, without altering the substance.**

Content of this document

This document includes the following:

Elements developed for all MIs under KPIs 1–8, including:

- **Final endorsed and language-edited elements for all MIs**
- **References to previous elements in MOPAN 3.1**, where applicable, to indicate correspondence with elements for MOPAN 4.
- **Essential guidance** for each element, including:
 - Definitions or organisational features relevant to the element.
 - Description of links to other MIs and elements in MOPAN 4, where relevant, to clarify differences and avoid duplication.

Rating descriptors for MIs under KPIs 9–12, including:

- **Final endorsed and language-edited descriptors rating criteria** for each MI.
- **References to previous criteria in MOPAN 3.1**, where applicable, to clarify adjustments in MOPAN 4.

Final endorsed and language-edited Elements and Essential Guidance KPI 1-8

KPI 1: Organisational architecture and financial framework are aligned with the organisation's strategic direction and enable achievement of intended result

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
MI 1.1 – Strategic plan and corporate strategic results framework are based on a clear vision of comparative advantage that is coherent with the mandate	<i>E 1.1.1 – The organisation defines a strategic vision and objectives (including management, development, humanitarian and peace objectives) that are coherent with its mandate.</i>	1.1 – E1; 1.1 – E2	Definitions • Strategic Plan: The direction and objectives that define the organization's purpose and priorities; often presented in a comprehensive plan that outlines how an organization will allocate its resources to support its activities and achieve its long-term goals. • Mandate: the authority conferred on an organisation to carry out certain tasks. Within the context of multilateralism, member states entrust intergovernmental organisations with mandates. These are typically established in the charter or the statute of the organisation and set out the goals and purposes of the organisation, how it should act, and to whom it is accountable. • Management and development/humanitarian/peace objectives: development/hum/peace objectives refer to the key development, humanitarian, peace operational and/or normative etc. objectives that the organisation aims to contribute to. Management objectives, by contrast refer to internal, institutional goals relating to how the organisation is set up and managed. • Coherent: in this context refers to the extent to which strategic vision and objectives are consistent with the ambitions and scope of the organisation 's mandate Links to other KPIs, MIs or Elements • 5.3.1 – Intervention design processes support alignment with strategic objectives. Likely performance dependency, as this will be influenced by the degree to which the strategic plan outlines clear strategic objectives.
	<i>E 1.1.2 – The organisation defines a strategic vision and objectives (including management, development, humanitarian and peace objectives) on the basis of a clear and credible analysis of its comparative advantage.</i>	1.1 – E1; 1.1 – E2	Definitions • Comparative Advantage: in this context, an organisation's unique strengths and comparative ability to deliver results. It determines which development or humanitarian actor should lead the delivery of a specific function within a thematic area, based on its legitimacy, partnerships, and capacity. • See 1.1.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs or Elements • See 1.1.1
	<i>E 1.1.3 – The organisation's strategic plan (or equivalent) sets out credible and prioritised actions to achieve its intended</i>	1.1 – E3	Definitions • See 1.1.1 • Actions: these refer to specific measures that the organisation will undertake to achieve intended

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
	<i>management, development, humanitarian and peace objectives.</i>		results. This may include setting out different types of intervention that the organisation will implement in support of its objectives, and/or specific outputs (particularly within the context of the plan's accompanying results framework, if present). Links to other KPIs, MIs or Elements • MI 3.7 speaks to the adaptability and flexibility of strategic planning and response. • KPI 7 – KPI 7 focuses on systems for managing management and development/humanitarian/peace results. Likely performance dependency, as these may be influenced by the clarity of actions/outputs etc. articulated in the strategic plan and accompanying results framework.
	<i>E 1.1.4 – The organisation's corporate results framework (or equivalent) provides a clear structure and adequate metrics to monitor progress towards its strategic objectives.</i>	1.1 – E3	Definitions • Corporate results framework (or equivalent): a strategic management tool used by organisations to define, monitor, and report on their performance against institutional goals at outcome and output level. It provides a structured approach to link an organisation's strategic objectives with measurable results. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • KPI 7 – KPI 7 focuses on systems for managing management and development/humanitarian/peace results. Likely performance dependency, as the credibility of monitoring will be influenced by the quality of the organisation's RBM systems. MI 7.4 in particular includes element that focus on the quality of data produced by the organisation's monitoring systems.
MI 1.2 – Strategic plan supports implementation of global commitments and associated results	<i>E 1.2.1 – The organisation's strategic plan (or equivalent) provides a credible description of how it contributes to relevant global commitments.</i>	1.3 – E1	Definitions • See 1.1.1 • Global commitments: Formal, collective agreements or pledges made by countries, international organisations, or other actors to pursue shared goals or address common challenges at the international level. These commitments are typically expressed through treaties, declarations, frameworks, or resolutions. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • KPI 2: the global commitments considered under this framework should not include those relating to the cross-cutting issues examined under KPI 2 (i.e., gender equality, climate change and environmental sustainability, human rights etc.). • MI 5.3 includes a focus on "external coherence", which among other things relates to the alignment of an organisation's interventions with external policy commitments. The global commitments considered for MI 1.2 should also be considered in the assessment for MI 5.3. The main difference between these two MIs is the level of analysis. While MI 1.2 focuses on the corporate strategy, MI 5.3 focuses on processes for designing interventions at the country/regional level.

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
MI 1.3 – Organisational structure and accountability arrangements are congruent with the MO's strategic plan	<i>E 1.2.2 – The organisation's corporate results framework (or equivalent) provides a clear structure and adequate metrics to monitor its contributions to relevant global targets.</i>	1.3 – E2	Definitions • Corporate results framework (or equivalent): see 1.1.4 • Global targets: goals, objectives, outcomes, outputs related to global commitments (see 1.2.1). Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 7.2 – focuses on the clarity of linkages between results achieved the project/country level, and results reported in the corporate results framework. This MI focuses only on whether the corporate results framework support monitoring of contributions to relevant global targets. It is likely that performance in one area will be linked to performance in the other.
	<i>E 1.2.3 – The organisation's strategic plan (or equivalent) provides a credible description of how it collaborates with different types of partners to contribute to relevant global commitments.</i>	New	Definitions: • Strategic plan: 1.1.1 • Partner: An individual or organisation that collaborates on an intervention to achieve mutually agreed objectives ("global commitments" in this case). • Global commitments: (see 1.2.1) Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • KPI 6, which focuses on collaboration, harmonisation and enabling local leadership to support shared outcomes. The key distinction is that this element focuses explicitly on how the issue collaboration in support of global commitments is addressed in the organisation's strategic plan. Other features – such as a dedicated partnerships strategy, policies governing different partnership types, individual partnership agreements etc. do not fall within the scope of this element and should be addressed instead in the MIs in KPI 6.
	<i>E 1.3.1 – The organisation's structure is aligned - or is being deliberately reconfigured - to support and deliver the priorities set out in its strategic plan (or equivalent).</i>	1.2 – E1 3.1 – E1	Definitions • Organisational structure: The formal system that defines how roles, responsibilities, authority, and communication are arranged and coordinated across different levels and units of the organisation to achieve its objectives. In this case key elements are hierarchy of authority, functional division/division of labour, geographic layers/footprint, coordination mechanisms across layers. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 3.6 focuses on internal collaboration. Likely performance dependency, as organisational structures may influence/incentivise possibilities for internal collaboration, either positively or negatively. • MI 3.7 focuses on agility and adaptability. Likely performance dependencies, as the scope for agility and adaptation may be constrained or facilitated by structural arrangements.
	<i>E 1.3.2 – The organisation's internal accountability framework (or equivalent) clearly articulates responsibilities and the division of labour across the organisation.</i>	1.2 – E4	Definitions • Accountability framework: A document or set of documents, owned by the executive head and approved by the legislative organs and/or governing bodies, that brings together a definition of an

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			accountability framework, accountability pillars, an accountability compact, an accountability system and accountability indicators). (JIU/REP/2023/3) In the case of this element the focus is on accountability compact: accountability by whom and for what. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 3.6 focuses on internal collaboration. Likely performance dependency, as organisational structures may influence/incentivise possibilities for internal collaboration, either positively or negatively. • MI 3.7 focuses on agility and adaptability. Likely performance dependencies, as the scope for agility and adaptation may be constrained or facilitated by structural arrangements.
	<i>E 1.3.3 – The organisation clearly defines and implements decision-making structures and processes that support delivery of its strategic plan (or equivalent).</i>	New	Definitions • Decision-making structures and processes: the formal systems and procedures that govern how decisions are initiated, reviewed, approved, and implemented. In this case it includes the degree of centralisation or decentralisation or an organisation with its different decision-making levels, as well as delegation of authority and escalation pathways. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 3.7 focuses on agility and adaptability. Likely performance dependencies, as the scope for agility and adaptation may be constrained or facilitated by structural arrangements. MI 3.5 focuses on information management. Likely performance dependencies, as the scope for evidence based decision making is likely constrained or facilitated by information availability • Links to MI 3.5 and 8.4
	<i>E 1.3.4 – The organisation systematically assesses changes to its organisational structure and decision-making arrangements</i>	1.2 – E5	Definitions • Organisational structure: see 1.3.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 3.6 focuses on internal collaboration. Likely performance dependency, as organisational structures may influence/incentivise possibilities for internal collaboration, either positively or negatively. • MI 3.7 focuses on agility and adaptability. Likely performance dependencies, as the scope for agility and adaptation may be constrained or facilitated by structural arrangements.
MI 1.4 – The financial framework is aligned with the corporate strategy and corporate strategic results framework	<i>E 1.4.1 – The organisation has an integrated financial framework which provides a realistic and detailed overview of its resources.</i>	1.4 – E2	Definitions • Financial framework: broadly refers to a structured set of principles, rules, processes, and instruments that guide the planning, mobilisation, allocation, management, reporting, and oversight of financial resources to achieve strategic objectives, ensure accountability, and promote transparency and efficiency. In the context of MI 1.4 and related elements the focus is on planning, mobilisation and allocation of financial resources to achieve strategic objectives.

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 3.1 focuses on financial management. Likely performance dependencies here as sound financial management practices will be influenced by the reliability, predictability, and transparency of the organisation's financial framework.
	<i>E 1.4.2 – The organisation's financial framework includes clear mechanisms to align financial resources with its strategic objectives and related functions.</i>	1.4 – E1	Definitions - Financial framework: see 1.4.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 3.1 focuses on financial management. Likely performance dependencies here as sound financial management practices will be influenced by the reliability, predictability, and transparency of the organisation's financial framework. - MI 5.7 focuses on operational efficiency. Likely performance dependency, as operational efficiency may be influenced by strategic alignment of financial resources with strategic objectives and results.
	<i>E 1.4.3 – The organisation's resource mobilisation mechanisms (or equivalent) support sufficient resourcing of its strategic objectives and related functions.</i>	3.2 – E1; 3.2 – E2; 3.2 – E3; 3.2 – E4	Definitions - Resource mobilisation mechanisms: the rules, processes and instruments that the organisation has in place to identify and secure funding for its operations in support of strategic objectives. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 3.1 focuses on financial management. Likely performance dependencies here as sound financial management practices will be influenced by the reliability, predictability, and transparency of the organisation's financial framework. - MI 5.7 focuses on operational efficiency. Likely performance dependency, as operational efficiency may be influenced by strategic alignment of financial resources with strategic objectives and results.
	<i>E 1.4.4 – The organisation's financial framework supports its long-term financial viability.</i>	New	Definitions - Financial framework: see 1.4.1 - Financial viability: the ability to sustain operations and meet financial obligations over the long term. It's a measure of whether the organisation has enough resources, revenue streams, and financial management practices to continue functioning effectively. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 3.1 focuses on financial management. Likely performance dependencies here as sound financial management practices will be influenced by the reliability, predictability, and transparency of the organisation's financial framework.
	<i>E 1.4.5 – The organisation regularly reviews its financial framework and maintains sufficient flexibility to respond to evolving priorities and funding levels.</i>	1.4 – E4	Definitions - Financial framework: see 1.4.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 3.1 focuses on financial management. Likely performance dependencies here as sound financial management practices will be influenced by the flexibility of the financial framework. - MI 3.7 focuses on agility and adaptiveness. Likely performance dependencies here, as agility and adaptiveness very likely to be influenced by the

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
MI 1.5 – The MO's approach to organisational change / transformation is fully aligned with its strategy, adaptive and feasible	<i>E 1.5.1 – The organisation's institutional documents articulate a clear rationale, vision and objectives for organisational change initiatives in line with its strategy.</i>	New	flexibility of the organisation's financial framework. Definitions Organisational change: the structured approach, methods, and processes used to transition an organisation's strategies, operations, technologies, or structures from a current state to a desired future state. Change management involves planning, implementing, and monitoring changes to ensure that they are effectively integrated into the organisation's workflows and objectives. The elements under this MI do not refer to routine restructuring. This MI is intended to focus on major, strategic change initiatives and transformational reforms rather than all change activity. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 1.1 focuses on the organisation's strategic plan and the objectives contained therein. Possible dependency, particularly if/when strategic plan includes objectives requiring major organisational changes. MI 1.1. also incorporates a view of the extent to which the Strategic Plan is regularly reviewed to ensure continued relevance and attention to risks. MI 1.3 focuses on the organisation's structure and operating model and incorporates a focus on changes to these features. Likely dependency, and this MI should consider major changes to the organisation's structure and/or operating model, as relevant.
	<i>E 1.5.2 – The organisation establishes clear governance structures and accountability arrangements to support the implementation and oversight of organisational change initiatives.</i>	New	Definitions Organisational change: see 1.5.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 1.1 focuses on the organisation's strategic plan and the objectives contained therein. Possible dependency, particularly if/when strategic plan includes objectives requiring major organisational changes. MI 1.1. also incorporates a view of the extent to which the Strategic Plan is regularly reviewed to ensure continued relevance and attention to risks. MI 1.3 focuses on the organisation's structure and operating model and incorporates a focus on changes to these features. Likely dependency, and this MI should consider major changes to the organisation's structure and/or operating model, as relevant.
	<i>E 1.5.3 – The organisation allocates sufficient human and financial resources to implement organisational change initiatives and related action plans.</i>	New	Definitions - N/A Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - N/A
	<i>E 1.5.4 – The organisation monitors organisational change initiatives and adapts them as needed.</i>	New	Definitions Organisational change: see 1.5.1 Adaptation: the modification of strategies, interventions, or operations based on evidence, feedback, or contextual change

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			<u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • MI 1.1 focuses on the organisation's strategic plan and the objectives contained therein. Possible dependency, particularly if/when strategic plan includes objectives requiring major organisational changes. MI 1.1. also incorporates a view of the extent to which the Strategic Plan is regularly reviewed to ensure continued relevance and attention to risks. • MI 1.3 focuses on the organisation's structure and operating model and incorporates a focus on changes to these features. Likely dependency, and this MI should consider major changes to the organisation's structure and/or operating model, as relevant. • MI 3.2 focuses on HR management and incorporates a focus on staff engagement. Likely performance dependency, as overall engagement likely to be influenced by the quality of engagement during organisational change processes.

KPI 2: Corporate strategy, key functions and mechanisms in place, aligned and applied to support normative frameworks for cross cutting issues at all levels

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
MI 2.1 – Organisational strategies support the achievement of intended results of normative frameworks for gender equality and women's empowerment	<i>E 2.1.1 – The organisation's policy framework (or equivalent) establishes structures and processes to mainstream gender equality and achieve related results.</i>	2.1 – E1	<u>Definitions</u> • Policy framework: set of policies, guidelines/standards, and institutional arrangements that set out how an organisation will address a specific issue. • Mainstreaming: a strategic, systematic approach to embed a specific perspective throughout policy and institutional processes, supported by governance, accountability, data, and evaluation mechanisms. <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • MI 1.2 focuses on the organisation's contributions to global commitments. To prevent duplication, the organisation's contribution to wider normative frameworks for gender equality (i.e. UN-SWAP) should be considered here rather than in 1.2.
	<i>E 2.1.2 – The organisation's strategies at different levels set out credible actions to contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment.</i>	2.1 – E1	<u>Definitions</u> • Organisational strategies: documents that define the organisation's purpose and priorities with respect to a given issue, often presented as a plan that outlines how resources and activities will support a long-term goal. <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • MI 1.2 focuses on the organisation's contributions to global commitments. To prevent duplication, the organisation's contribution to wider normative frameworks for gender equality (i.e. UN-SWAP) should be considered here rather than in 1.2.
	<i>E 2.1.3 – The organisation allocates sufficient human and</i>	2.1 – E5	<u>Definitions</u> • Capacity development here is intended as capacity

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
	<i>financial resources and provides capacity development across the organisation to support the implementation of its policy framework for gender equality and women's empowerment.</i>		development and training for staff Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 3.1. on financial management and incorporates an element that focuses on internal resource allocation. Likely performance dependency, as capacity in this area may be influenced by resources allocation priorities and processes. • MI 4.1 focuses on the organisation's overall financial framework and incorporates elements that focus on the mobilisation and alignment of resources with strategic priorities. Likely performance dependency, as capacity in this area is likely to be influenced by wider resource mobilisation and availability. General guidance • Aspects to consider may include the following: • Dedicated expertise and network of expertise beyond the "gender-experts-only" approach and presence of gender unit • Training and capacity development for staff • Resourcing adequacy • Reflection in organisational budget • Relevant 'markers' for tracking allocations
	<i>E 2.1.4 – The organisation's monitoring and evaluation systems (including corporate reporting) support accountability and learning related to its contributions to gender equality and women's empowerment.</i>	2.1 – E3	Definitions • Monitoring: A continuing process that involves the systematic collection or collation of data (on specified indicators or other types of information). Provides the management and other stakeholders of an intervention with indications of the extent of implementation progress, achievement of intended results, occurrence of unintended results, use of allocated funds and other important intervention and context-related information. • Evaluation: The systematic and objective assessment of a planned, ongoing or completed intervention, its design, implementation and results. Links to other MIs • KPI 7 focuses on the organisation's approach to managing management and development/humanitarian/peace results. Likely performance dependencies, as the ability to monitor contributions to gender equality may be influenced by the broader quality of the organisation's monitoring systems. • KPI 8 focuses on the organisation's evaluation function. Likely performance dependencies, as the learning on gender equality and women's empowerment may be influenced by the focus and quality of evaluations, as well as systems and structures for supporting the dissemination and uptake of evaluation findings.
MI 2.2 – Organisational strategies support the achievement of intended results	<i>E 2.2.1 – The organisation's policy framework (or equivalent) establishes structures and processes to mainstream environmental sustainability and</i>		Same structure and definition as 2.1.1

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
of normative frameworks for environmental sustainability and climate change	<i>climate change and achieve related results.</i>		
	<i>E 2.2.2 – The organisation's strategies at different levels set out credible actions to contribute to environmental sustainability and climate change.</i>		Same structure and definition as 2.1.2
	<i>E 2.2.3 – The organisation allocates sufficient human and financial resources and provides capacity development across the organisation to support the implementation of its policy framework for environmental sustainability and climate change.</i>		Same structure and definition as 2.1.3
	<i>E 2.2.4 – The organisation's monitoring and evaluation systems (including corporate reporting) support accountability and learning related to its contributions to environmental sustainability and climate change.</i>		Same structure and definition as 2.1.4
MI 2.3 – Organisational strategies support the achievement of intended results of normative frameworks for human rights, including the protection of vulnerable people	<i>E 2.3.1 – The organisation's policy framework (or equivalent) establishes structures and processes to mainstream human rights and achieve related results.</i>		Same structure and definition as 2.1.1 The applicability and interpretation of this element vary across organisations and will be treated differently, in line with their specific mandates
	<i>E 2.3.2 – The organisation's strategies at different levels set out credible actions to contribute to human rights.</i>		Same structure and definition as 2.1.2 The applicability and interpretation of this element vary across organisations and will be treated differently, in line with their specific mandates
	<i>E 2.3.3 – The organisation allocates sufficient human and financial resources and provides capacity development across the organisation to support the effective implementation of its policy framework for human rights.</i>		Same structure and definition as 2.1.3 The applicability and interpretation of this element vary across organisations and will be treated differently, in line with their specific mandates
	<i>E 2.3.4 – The organisation's monitoring and evaluation systems (including corporate reporting) support accountability and learning related to its contributions to human rights.</i>		Same structure and definition as 2.1.4 The applicability and interpretation of this element vary across organisations and will be treated differently, in line with their specific mandates
MI 2.4 – Organisational strategies support the achievement of intended results of normative frameworks for working in conditions of fragility, conflict and violence	<i>The organisation's policy framework (or equivalent) establishes structures and processes to address fragility, conflict and violence and achieve related results.</i>		Same structure and definition as 2.1.1
	<i>E 2.4.2 – The organisation's strategies at different levels set out credible actions to address fragility, conflict and violence.</i>		Same structure and definition as 2.1.2
	<i>E 2.4.3 – The organisation allocates sufficient human and financial resources and provides</i>		Same structure and definition as 2.1.3

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
MI 2.5 – Organisational strategies support the achievement of intended results of normative frameworks for other cross-cutting issues	<i>capacity development across the organisation to support the implementation of its policy framework to address fragility, conflict and violence.</i>		
	<i>E 2.4.4 – The organisation's monitoring and evaluation systems (including corporate reporting) support accountability and learning related to how it addresses fragility, conflict and violence.</i>		Same structure and definition as 2.1.4
	<i>E 2.5.1 – The organisation's policy framework (or equivalent) establishes structures and processes to mainstream other cross-cutting issues and achieve related results.</i>		Same structure and definition as 2.1.1 "other cross-cutting issues" are MO-specific and will be identified in individual assessments
	<i>E 2.5.2 – The organisation's strategies at different levels set out credible actions to contribute to other cross-cutting issues.</i>		Same structure and definition as 2.1.2 "other cross-cutting issues" are MO-specific and will be identified in individual assessments
	<i>E 2.5.3 – The organisation allocates sufficient human and financial resources and provides capacity development across the organisation to support the implementation of its policy framework for other cross-cutting issues.</i>		Same structure and definition as 2.1.3 "other cross-cutting issues" are MO-specific and will be identified in individual assessments
HUM MI 2.6 – Appropriate safeguards are in place, and respected, to ensure the respect of humanitarian principles (HP) in all aspects of operations	<i>E 2.5.4 – The organisation's monitoring and evaluation systems (including corporate reporting) support accountability and learning related to its contributions to other cross-cutting issues.</i>		Same structure and definition as 2.1.4 "other cross-cutting issues" are MO-specific and will be identified in individual assessments
	<i>E 2.6.1 – The organisation's policy framework (or equivalent) establishes structures and processes to mainstream humanitarian principles in relevant strategies, policies and procedures.</i>	2.1.1 (Adapted framework)	Definitions • Humanitarian Principles include: • Humanity: meaning the principle motivation between humanitarian action is to save lives and alleviate suffering while upholding and restoring personal dignity • Impartiality: meaning that humanitarian action is based solely on need, with priority given to the most urgent cases irrespective of factors such as race, nationality, gender, religious belief, political opinion, or class • Neutrality: meaning humanitarian actors refrain from taking sides in hostilities or engaging in political, racial, religious, or ideological controversies • Independence, meaning humanitarian actors should be autonomous, and not subject to control, subordination, or influence by political, economic, military or other non-humanitarian objectives. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 4.1. focuses on enterprise risk management. Possible thematic link, insofar as challenges

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			associated with upholding humanitarian principles may feature in an MO's analysis of strategic/political risk • MI 4.3. focuses on internal safeguards, including measures to prevent, investigate and sanction misconduct. Possible performance dependency, particularly where internal controls/safeguards aim to ensure respect for humanitarian principles among staff • MIs 4.5 and 4.6 focus on PSEAH and SH. Possible performance dependency, insofar as there may be shared challenges associated with upholding humanitarian principles and preventing/responding to PSEAH and SH
	<i>E 2.6.2 – The organisation's guidelines and codes of conduct, aligned with system-wide standards, set out staff and partners' responsibilities to uphold humanitarian principles in all aspects of operations.</i>	New	Definitions • Humanitarian principles: see 2.6.1 • Partner: see 1.2.3 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements NA
	<i>E 2.6.3 – The organisation provides mandatory capacity development to support staff understanding and uphold humanitarian principles in all aspects of operations.</i>	2.1.2	Definitions Humanitarian principles: see 2.6.1. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 3.2 focuses on human resource management, and includes a focus on learning activities to support the maintenance and development of skills required for delivery of an organisation's strategic objectives. Possible thematic/performance dependency
	<i>E 2.6.4 – The organisation's monitoring and evaluation systems (including corporate reporting) support accountability and learning related to how it upholds humanitarian principles.</i>	2.1.4	Definitions Humanitarian principles: see 2.6.1. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 4.1. focuses on enterprise risk management, and incorporates a focus on systems for managing and mitigating risks. Possible performance dependency, particularly when challenges associated with upholding humanitarian principles across different contexts feature in organisation's risk assessments • KPI 7 focuses on the organisation's approach to managing performance in general. Potential thematic link/performance dependency, particularly if monitoring of humanitarian principles features as a focus of the organisation's wider results system
IFI MI 2.6 – Organisational strategies support the achievement of intended results of normative frameworks for regional cooperation and integration	<i>E 2.6.1 – The organisation's policy framework (or equivalent) establishes structures and processes to mainstream regional cooperation and integration and achieve related results.</i>	Adapted framework	Definitions • Regional cooperation and integration: activities, policies, operations, or institutional arrangements that are designed, governed, or implemented across a defined geographic region and involve multiple countries within that region. Regional scope is distinguished from global or country-specific engagement by its focus on cross-border issues, shared regional priorities, and collective regional outcomes. Regional integration include for example looking at issues of market integration (e.g., approach to a regional market rather than a collection of country markets, etc).

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			Same structure and definition as 2.1.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements Different from MI 6.3 on use of collaboration frameworks, such as country led and owned platforms
	<i>E 2.6.2 – The organisation's strategies at different levels set out credible actions to contribute to regional cooperation and integration.</i>	Adapted framework	Definitions - Regional cooperation: see 2.6.1 Same structure and definition as 2.1.2 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - Different from MI 6.3 on use of collaboration frameworks, such as country led and owned platforms
	<i>E 2.6.3 – The organisation allocates sufficient human and financial resources and provides capacity development across the organisation to support the implementation of its policy framework for regional cooperation and integration.</i>	Adapted framework	Definitions - Regional cooperation: see 2.6.1 Same structure and definition as 2.1.2 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - Different from MI 6.3 on use of collaboration frameworks, such as country led and owned platforms
	<i>E 2.6.4 – The organisation's monitoring and evaluation systems (including corporate reporting) support accountability and learning related to its contributions to regional cooperation and integration.</i>	Adapted framework	Definitions - Regional cooperation: see 2.6.1 Same structure and definition as 2.1.2 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - Different from MI 6.3 on use of collaboration frameworks, such as country led and owned platforms

KPI 3: Resource management and internal collaboration support relevance, cost-efficiency, and agility

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
MI 3.1 – Financial management and accountability policies and practices are sound, transparent and geared toward the efficient achievement of results	<i>E 3.1.1 – The organisation's budgeting processes ensures the alignment of available resources with strategic priorities.</i>	4.1 – E1 3.1 – E3	Definitions Budgeting: formal process by which budget estimates for programmes and operations are developed, approved, and implemented. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 5.7 focuses on efficiency in operational processes, whereas this MI focuses on financial management at the institutional level. Likely performance dependencies, as operational efficiencies are likely to be influenced by the strength of financial management practices at the institutional

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			level. • MI 1.4 focuses on the organisation's overall financial framework, and this element incorporates a focus on the allocation of available resources with strategic priorities. Likely performance dependency, as allocation is likely to be influenced by the flexibility of available resources.
	<i>E 3.1.2 – The organisation's budgeting processes, including costing, and financial management systems are transparent.</i>	New	Definitions • Financial systems: policies, tools, and information systems used for financial planning, monitoring, and reporting • Costing includes direct and indirect costing (overheads) and, where appropriate, reflect the operational requirements of local and national partners
	<i>E 3.1.3 – The organisation's budgeting processes ensure that key organisational functions are sufficiently resourced.</i>	3.1 – E3	Definitions • Budgeting: see 3.1.1 • Key organisational functions include important management and administrative functions enabling the organisation to carry out its activities/interventions. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 5.7 focuses on efficiency in operational processes, whereas this MI focuses on financial management at the institutional level. Likely performance dependencies, as operational efficiencies are likely to be influenced by the strength of financial management practices at the institutional level. • MI 1.4 focuses on the organisation's overall financial framework, and this element incorporates a focus on the allocation of available resources with strategic priorities. Likely performance dependency, as allocation is likely to be influenced by the flexibility of available resources. • MI 3.1 focuses on the extent to which the organisation's structure and operating model supports the implementation of strategic objectives. Likely performance dependency, as the effectiveness of the organisation's structure may be influenced by the extent to which its constituent components are sufficiently resourced.
	<i>E 3.1.4 – The organisation's financial systems support the reliable tracking of expenditures to outputs and outcomes.</i>	4.3 – E2; 4.3 – E3	Definitions • Financial systems: policies, tools, and information systems used for financial planning, monitoring, and reporting • Outputs: The products, capital goods and services that result from an intervention. Outputs may also include changes resulting from the intervention that contribute to the achievement of outcomes. Outputs include changes in knowledge, skills, or abilities produced by the activities. Outputs are within the control of the MO. • Outcomes: The short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 3.5 focuses on information management and

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			includes an element that focuses on the extent to which information management systems provide reliable data about key business processes to decision makers. Likely performance dependency as ability of information management systems to support this with respect to financial data likely to be influenced by quality of financial systems • MI 5.7 focuses on efficiency in operational processes, whereas this MI focuses on financial management at the institutional level. Likely performance dependencies, as operational efficiencies are likely to be influenced by the strength of financial management practices at the institutional level.
	<i>E 3.1.5 – The organisation uses flexible and context-sensitive disbursement modalities, executes its budget in a timely manner and monitors disbursement.</i>	4.2 – E1; 4.2 – E2; 4.2 – E3; 4.2 – E4	Definitions • Budget: see 3.1.1. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 5.7 focuses on efficiency in operational processes, whereas this MI focuses on financial management at the institutional level. Likely performance dependencies, as operational efficiencies are likely to be influenced by the strength of financial management practices at the institutional level.
MI 3.2 – Human Resource Management policies, systems and practices are aligned with the strategic plan and geared toward the achievement of results	<i>E 3.2.1 – The organisation's human resources strategy and workforce planning identify the staffing needs and skills required to meet its strategic objectives.</i>	3.1 – E2	Definitions • Workforce planning: defined by ISO as the systematic identification, analysis and planning of organisational needs in terms of people. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 6.2 focuses on the harmonisation of policies between MOs. Human resources management is a key potential policy area for harmonisation. • MI 6.3 focuses on shared services, and human resources management is a key potential shared service. • MI 1.3 focuses on the extent to which the organisation's structure supports the implementation of strategic objectives. Likely performance dependency, as the effectiveness of structure may be influenced by the adequacy of staffing levels/skills in constituent units and functions
	<i>E 3.2.2 – The organisation's human resources policies, procedures and systems (including contractual modalities) support timely and flexible recruitment, mobility and termination of staff.</i>	3.1 – E2; 5.7 – E4	Definitions • HR policies, procedures and systems: , policies, procedures and systems for managing recruitment, staff mobility, and separation Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 5.7 focuses on operational efficiency. Possible performance dependency as the efficiency of HR practices may influence broader operational efficiency • MIs 6.2 and 6.3 focus on harmonisation of policies and use of shared services. HR systems and practices are a potential focus area of harmonisation and shared services.

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
	<i>E 3.2.3 – The organisation's recruitment and learning processes support the acquisition and maintenance of the skills required for its organisational needs.</i>	3.1 – E2	Definitions - N/A Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 1.3 focuses on the extent to which the organisation's structure supports the implementation of strategic objectives. Likely performance dependency, as the effectiveness of structure may be influenced by the adequacy of staffing levels/skills in constituent units and functions
	<i>E 3.2.4 – The organisation's systematic human resource performance management processes incentivise staff at all levels to work towards organisational and system-wide objectives.</i>	3.4 – E1; 3.4 – E2; 3.4 – E3; 3.4 – E4	Definitions Performance management: A structured and ongoing process through which organisations set expectations for individual staff performance, monitor and assess performance against agreed objectives and competencies, provide feedback and development support, and use performance information to inform professional development, rewards, and organisational improvement. (OECD definition) Incentives: rewards, recognition, compensation (financial or otherwise) contingent on the achievement of a predetermined level of performance or the demonstration of a specific behaviour Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 5.5. incorporates a focus on incentives for staff to apply the organisation's knowledge base to operations. Possible performance dependency, as performance assessment processes may be a key source of these incentives. - MI 3.6 focuses on internal collaboration across organisational units. Possible performance dependency, as performance assessment processes may be a key source of incentives for internal collaboration
	<i>E 3.2.5 – The organisation systematically engages staff to identify and respond to issues relating to organisational culture.</i>	New	Definitions - N/A Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - N/A
	<i>E 3.2.6 – The organisation monitors human resources management transparently (supported by processes and systems) which facilitates reporting to governing bodies.</i>	New	Definitions - N/A Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - N/A
MI 3.3 – Asset management: strategic planning, utilisation and maintenance of an organisation's physical assets to maximise value, ensure	<i>E 3.3.1 – The organisation's strategic planning for physical asset management (including budgeting) supports the achievement of its strategic objectives.</i>	New	Definitions Budgeting: see 3.1.1 Asset management: identification, acquisition and maintenance of physical assets Physical assets: tangible assets such as buildings/premises, equipment, vehicles, etc. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 3.1. incorporates a focus on transparent budgeting more generally. Possible performance

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
sustainability, and support the achievement of its objectives			dependency. • MI 5.7 focuses on efficiency in operational processes, whereas this MI focuses on financial management at the institutional level. Likely performance dependencies, as operational efficiencies are likely to be influenced by the strength of financial management practices at the institutional level. • MI 6.3. focuses on use/provision of shared services. Acquisition of physical assets likely to be a potential area for shared service provision/use
	<i>E 3.3.2 – The organisation defines clear roles, responsibilities and systems to support the transparent management and utilisation of physical assets.</i>	New	Definitions • Physical assets: see 3.3.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 5.7 focuses on efficiency in operational processes, whereas this MI focuses on financial management at the institutional level. Likely performance dependencies, as operational efficiencies are likely to be influenced by the strength of financial management practices at the institutional level. • MI 6.3. focuses on use/provision of shared services. Acquisition of physical assets likely to be a potential area for shared service provision/use
	<i>E 3.3.3 – The organisation assesses and improves the efficiency of the acquisition, maintenance and sustainability of physical assets throughout their lifecycles.</i>	New	Definitions • Physical assets: see 3.3.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 5.7 focuses on efficiency in operational processes, whereas this MI focuses on financial management at the institutional level. Likely performance dependencies, as operational efficiencies are likely to be influenced by the strength of financial management practices at the institutional level. • MI 6.3. focuses on use/provision of shared services. Acquisition of physical assets likely to be a potential area for shared service provision/use
MI 3.4 – Procurement and logistics: strategic and transparent management of procurement and logistics activities align with organisational objectives and achieve value for money	<i>E 3.4.1 – The organisation's procurement and logistics strategy (or equivalent) clearly articulates how procurement and logistics support its strategic objectives.</i>	New	Definitions • Procurement: the purchase of goods and services • Logistics: arrangements for storage, maintenance and transportation of procured goods to the destination where needed Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 5.7 focuses on operational efficiency. Likely performance dependencies, as procurement practices may be a key driver of operational efficiency • MI 6.2 incorporates a focus on harmonisation in key policy areas. Procurement is a key potential area for harmonisation of policies. • MI 6.3 incorporates a focus on use or provision of shared services and the use of country systems. Procurement is a key potential area for shared service provision and/or the use of country systems.

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
	<i>E 3.4.2 – The organisation's procurement and logistics framework supports the use and strengthening of country systems.</i>	New	Definitions: • Framework: strategy, policies, and guidelines that govern procurement and logistics in the organisation. • Country systems: nationally owned systems for public sector management, including for example national financial systems, procurement frameworks, social and environmental safeguards, etc. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 6.3 incorporates a focus on use or provision of shared services and the use of country systems. Procurement is a key potential area for shared service provision and/or the use of country systems.
	<i>E 3.4.3 – The organisation's procurement and logistics framework incentivises sustainable practices across the supply chain.</i>		Definitions • Procurement: see 3.4.1 • Logistics: see 3.4.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 5.7 focuses on operational efficiency. Likely performance dependencies, as procurement practices may be a key driver of operational efficiency • MI 6.2 incorporates a focus on harmonisation in key policy areas. Procurement is a key potential area for harmonisation of policies. • MI 6.3 incorporates a focus on use or provision of shared services and the use of country systems. Procurement is a key potential area for shared service provision and/or the use of country systems.
	<i>E 3.4.4 – The organisation's procurement and logistics systems and practices support the timely and efficient mobilisation of goods and services for the implementation of interventions.</i>	5.7 – E1; 5.7 – E2; 5.7 – E4; 3.3 – E1; 3.3 – E2; 3.3 – E4; 6.1 – E3	Definitions: • Procurement and logistics framework: see 3.4.1 • Logistics: see 3.4.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 5.7 focuses on operational efficiency. Likely performance dependencies, as procurement practices may be a key driver of operational efficiency • MI 6.2 incorporates a focus on harmonisation in key policy areas. Procurement is a key potential area for harmonisation of policies. • MI 6.3 incorporates a focus on use or provision of shared services and the use of country systems. Procurement is a key potential area for shared service provision and/or the use of country systems.
	<i>E 3.4.5 – The organisation's procurement and logistics framework clearly defines how it supports value for money in procurement and logistics.</i>	New	Definitions: • Procurement framework: see 3.4.2 • Value for money: Definitions may be inconsistent and will vary across organisations, and it is therefore important this element includes an explicit focus on the extent to which the organisation has a clear definition. In broad terms and in the specific case of procurement and logistics it is meant the offers that presents the optimum combination of factors such as quality, life cycle costs, environmental and social considerations, and other parameters.

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			<u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • MI 5.7 focuses on operational efficiency. Likely performance dependencies, as procurement practices may be a key driver of operational efficiency • MI 6.2 incorporates a focus on harmonisation in key policy areas. Procurement is a key potential area for harmonisation of policies. • MI 6.3 incorporates a focus on use or provision of shared services and the use of country systems. Procurement is a key potential area for shared service provision and/or the use of country systems
MI 3.5 – Information management: the systematic and secure collection, organisation, sharing, and use of information to ensure transparency, accountability, and informed decision making aligned with organisational goals	<i>E 3.5.1 – The organisation has a clear digitalisation strategy which supports the availability of data for key business processes.</i>	New	<u>Definitions</u> • Key business processes: these will vary across organisations, depending on their business models. However, relevant business processes are likely to include those relating to other areas assessed by the MOPAN indicator framework, including: ○ Finance ○ Human resources ○ Procurement ○ Risk management ○ Internal controls ○ Intervention design/implementation <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • KPI 5: includes MIs that focus on the extent to which systems provide useful information for intervention management, including in relation to operational risks (5.2), implementation status (5.4.), and application of knowledge base to intervention design. Possible performance dependencies, as these issues are likely to be influenced by broader information management practices. • MI 7.5 focuses on the use of performance data to support decision making at the strategic and operational level. Likely performance dependencies, as this may be influenced by the quality of broader information management practices • MI 8.5. incorporates a focus on systems for disseminating evaluation findings internally and externally. Likely performance dependencies, as this may be influenced by the quality of broader information management practices.
	<i>E 3.5.2 – The organisation defines clear roles and governance structures to support data collection, data protection and safeguarding, integration and accessibility.</i>	New	<u>Definitions</u> • Key business processes: See 3.5.1. • Integration: Combining data from multiple sources into a unified and coherent format and system. <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • KPI 5: includes MIs that focus on the extent to which systems provide useful information for intervention management, including in relation to operational risks (5.2), implementation status (5.4.), and application of knowledge base to intervention design. Possible performance dependencies, as these issues are likely to be influenced by broader information management practices. • MI 7.5 focuses on the use of performance data to support decision making at the strategic and

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			operational level. Likely performance dependencies, as this may be influenced by the quality of broader information management practices • MI 8.5. incorporates a focus on systems for disseminating evaluation findings internally and externally. Likely performance dependencies, as this may be influenced by the quality of broader information management practices.
	<i>E 3.5.3 – The organisation's management tools draw on data and digital systems to support evidence-based decision-making, including risk management.</i>	New	Definitions: • Management tools: software systems, methods, platforms etc. to support staff to manage a specific dimension of the organisation Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • KPI 5: includes MIs that focus on the extent to which systems provide useful information for intervention management, including in relation to operational risks (5.2), implementation status (5.4.), and application of knowledge base to intervention design. Possible performance dependencies, as these issues are likely to be influenced by broader information management practices. • MI 7.4 focus on useful, timely quality data and will influence this element. • MI 7.5 focuses on the use of performance data to support decision making at the strategic and operational level. Likely performance dependencies, as this may be influenced by the quality of broader information management practices • MI 8.5. incorporates a focus on systems for disseminating evaluation findings internally and externally. Likely performance dependencies, as this may be influenced by the quality of broader information management practices.
	<i>E 3.5.4 – The organisation's information management systems support the transparent and accessible sharing of information with relevant stakeholders.</i>	New	Definitions • Information management systems: platforms or tools designed to handle the entire lifecycle of information, from creation and storage to retrieval, sharing, and archiving. These systems ensure that data and documents are organised, accessible, and secure within an organization. Ideally these systems should be digital and integrated. • Stakeholders: Agencies, organisations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the interventions of the organisation. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 8.5. incorporates a focus on systems for disseminating evaluation findings internally and externally. Likely performance dependencies, as this may be influenced by the quality of broader information management practices. • MI 6.4 focuses on the organisation's approach to accountability to affected populations. Likely performance dependency as information sharing is a key dimension of accountability • MI 7.4 includes a focus on the sharing of information on results with governing bodies and external partners. Likely performance dependency, as this may be influenced by broader information

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			management practices.
MI 3.6 – Internal collaboration, i.e., the systematic alignment and integration of activities, processes, and communication across various departments, teams, and functions to achieve shared goals efficiently and effectively	<i>E 3.6.1 – The organisation defines clear roles, responsibilities and decision-making processes which support internal collaboration.</i>	1.2 – E4; 1.2 – E5	Definitions • Collaboration: Individuals or groups working jointly to achieve a shared goal, often engaging in co-creative efforts where each participant's unique contributions are essential to the outcome. Collaboration typically involves a deeper level of engagement, where actors work together with shared interests to achieve common goals that cannot be achieved independently, often with shared resources, structures, and accountability. In this case related to internal collaboration. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 5.3 focuses on internal coherence and incorporates a focus on the extent to which internal collaboration across units occurs during intervention design. Likely performance dependency, as this may be influenced by clarity of roles, relationships and decision-making frameworks. • MI 5.5. focuses on feedback loops and incorporates a focus on the extent to which internal collaboration in intervention design supports the integration of diverse organisational knowledge into interventions. Likely performance dependency, as this may be influenced by clarity of roles, relationships and decision-making frameworks.
	<i>E 3.6.2 – The organisation's internal coordination mechanisms and incentives support information sharing, coordinated planning and decision-making across the organisation.</i>	New	Definitions: • Coordination: The organised arrangement of activities and resources to ensure that separate actions align efficiently toward a common objective. Coordination mechanisms are typically defined as organisational arrangements that facilitate individual or group efforts to complete work, such as planning or scheduling exercises. • Incentives: rewards, recognition, compensation (financial or otherwise) contingent on the achievement of a predetermined level of performance or the demonstration of a specific behaviour deemed desirable by the organisation Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 5.3 focuses on internal coherence and incorporates a focus on the extent to which internal collaboration across units occurs during intervention design. Likely performance dependency, as this may be influenced by clarity of roles, relationships and decision-making frameworks. • MI 5.5. focuses on feedback loops, and incorporates a focus on the extent to which internal collaboration in intervention design supports the integration of diverse organisational knowledge into interventions. Likely performance dependency, as this may be influenced by clarity of roles, relationships and decision-making frameworks.
	<i>E 3.6.3 – The organisation systematically monitors and assesses the efficiency and</i>	New	Definitions Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
	<i>effectiveness of its internal collaboration efforts to achieve shared goals.</i>		• MI 3.2 focuses on HR management and includes a focus on the staff performance assessment system. • MI 5.3 focuses on internal coherence and incorporates a focus on the extent to which internal collaboration across units occurs during intervention design. Likely performance dependency, as this may be influenced by clarity of roles, relationships and decision-making frameworks. • MI 5.5. focuses on feedback loops and incorporates a focus on the extent to which internal collaboration in intervention design supports the integration of diverse organisational knowledge into interventions. Likely performance dependency, as this may be influenced by clarity of roles, relationships and decision-making frameworks.
MI 3.7 – Agility and ability to respond to changing conditions	<i>E 3.7.1 – The organisation systematically identifies emerging challenges and opportunities and uses this to formulate its strategic response.</i>	6.1.2	Definitions: • Systematic identification could be for instance at its best done through strategic foresight, including analysis/anticipation of plausible future scenarios and to identify and plan for opportunities, risks, and disruptions that may arise. Here the focus is at the overall corporate level. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 4.1. focuses on the organisation's approach to enterprise risk management. Likely performance dependencies, as quality of ERM may be influenced by effectiveness of strategic foresight mechanisms. • MI 1.1 includes a focus on the extent to which the organisation's strategic plan is regularly reviewed to ensure continued relevance and attention to risks. Likely performance dependencies, as this may be influenced by the availability/quality of strategic foresight mechanisms. • MI 3.1 includes a focus on the organisation's structure and changes to this to ensure alignment with strategic plan. Possible performance dependencies. • MI 1.5 focuses on change management. Likely performance dependencies.
	<i>E 3.7.2 – The organisation's strategic framework supports the flexible and timely adjustment of interventions when conditions change.</i>	6.1 – E1; 6.1 – E2	Definitions: • Strategic framework: policies procedures and instruments for preparing for potential emergencies, disruptions, or unexpected events. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 1.4 focus on financial framework. This element is linked to E 1.4.5 on the extent to which financial framework allows for org. agility. • MI 4.1. focuses on the organisation's approach to enterprise risk management. Likely performance dependencies, as quality of ERM may be influenced by effectiveness of contingency planning • MI 5.2 focuses on the organisation's approach to operational risk management. Likely performance dependencies, as quality of operational risk management be influenced by effectiveness of contingency planning • MI 5.5 focuses on feedback loops and incorporates a focus on adjustments and or adaptations to

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			interventions. Likely performance dependency, as scope for adjustment and adaptation is likely to be influenced by operational policies and procedures.
	<i>E 3.7.3 – The organisation systematically monitors and assesses the agility of its institutional responses to changing conditions.</i>	3.3 – E4	Definitions: • Agility: The organisation's ability to make timely adjustments to decisions, processes, or resource allocations in response to changing circumstances or needs. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 3.1 includes a focus on the organisation's structure and changes to this to ensure alignment with strategic plan. Possible performance dependencies. • MI 1.5 focuses on change management. Likely performance dependencies.

KPI 4: Enterprise risk management, internal and external controls, and safeguards ensure a comprehensive framework for proactively identifying, assessing, and mitigating risks while promoting accountability, compliance, and the protection of organisational assets

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
MI 4.1 – Proactive identification, assessment, and mitigation of risks to ensure organisational resilience and the achievement of strategic objectives	<i>E 4.1.1 – The organisation has an oversight framework which clearly identifies the different oversight functions within the three lines model (or equivalent) and defines their roles and responsibilities.</i>		Definitions • Oversight framework: a structured system of policies, procedures, and guidelines that an organisation uses to manage its oversight function. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • All MIs under KPI 4 are linked
	<i>E 4.1.2 – The organisation clearly communicates staff roles and responsibilities within the three lines model (or equivalent), and staff understand and apply them consistently.</i>		Definitions • Three lines of defence: commonly understood as comprising ○ The first line of defence: Operational Management (owns and manages risk) ○ the second line of defence: Internal monitoring and oversight functions (monitors risk and control in support of management) ○ the third line of defence: Internal Audit (provides independent assurance to board / senior management on the effectiveness of management of risk and control).(See COSO) Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • All MIs under KPI 4 are linked
	<i>E 4.1.3 – The organisation has oversight committees with clear terms of reference and reporting structures to the head of the organisation and governing boards.</i>		Definitions • Oversight committee: independent oversight body, established by governing board or executive head, that provides objective advice and assurance on the organisation's governance, risk management, internal control, financial reporting, and oversight functions – including internal and external audit. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			All MIs under KPI 4 are linked
	<i>E 4.1.4 – The organisation's oversight functions, including internal and external audit functions, provide independent and objective advice and assurance, and the organisation implements their recommendations.</i>		Definitions Audit: An independent, systematic, objective quality assurance assessment designed to document and improve the effectiveness of risk management, control and governance processes. - Other definitions to be added Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - All MIs under KPI 4 are linked
	<i>E 4.1.5 – The organisation has an organisation-wide enterprise risk management system with clear processes and tools to identify, assess and escalate different types of risks and to cascade related guidance.</i>		Definitions Enterprise Risk Management (ERM): An organization-wide process of structured, integrated and systematic identification, analysis, evaluation, treatment and monitoring of risks towards the achievement of organizational objectives. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - All MIs under KPI 4 are linked MI 5.2 focuses on operational risk management specifically. E 4.1.5 should look at the overall organisational approach to different types of risks at different levels. MI 5.2 should deep dive on operational risks specifically.
MI 4.2 – Control policies and practices effectively prevent, detect, investigate and sanction cases of fraud, corruption, conflict of interest, or other financial irregularities	<i>E 4.2.1 – The organisation's has a policy and governance framework which defines clear roles, structures and accountabilities for upholding fiduciary and integrity standards, including explicit protection against retaliation.</i>		Definitions Upholding standards includes preventing, detecting, reporting, investigating and sanctioning misconduct. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 4.3 focuses on internal safeguards. Potential performance dependencies, as internal safeguards frameworks likely to cover prevention and sanction of financial misconduct.
	<i>E 4.2.2 – The organisation undertakes systematic risk assessments to identify, prevent and address fiduciary misconduct, mismanagement and corruption, supporting appropriate mitigation and capacity-development actions.</i>		Definitions Fiduciary risk: The risk that funds are not used for their intended purposes, are not properly accounted for, or are exposed to fraud, corruption, misuse, or financial mismanagement. Risk analysis considers whether performance incentives, delivery pressures, or funding modalities may create unintended incentives that weaken integrity safeguards. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements Mis 4.5 and 4.6: Since we speak specifically about SEAH in 4.5 and 4.6, this aspect can be left out here. MI 4.3 focuses on internal safeguards. Potential performance dependencies, as internal safeguards frameworks likely to cover prevention and sanction of financial misconduct.
	<i>E 4.2.3 – The organisation establishes clear and trusted mechanisms for preventing and reporting fraud, misconduct, mismanagement and related irregularities, and ensures these</i>		Definitions - Partner: see 1.2.3 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 4.3 focuses on internal safeguards. Potential performance dependencies, as internal safeguards frameworks likely to cover prevention and sanction

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
	<i>mechanisms are well-communicated, known and used by staff and partners.</i>		of financial misconduct.
	<i>E 4.2.4 – The organisation implements impartial, fair and timely processes to address fraud, corruption, conflicts of interest and related misconduct, and applies sanctions consistently.</i>		Definitions - N/A Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 4.3 focuses on internal safeguards. Potential performance dependencies, as internal safeguards frameworks likely to cover prevention and sanction of financial misconduct.
	<i>E 4.2.5 – The organisation has mechanisms in place to report on the implementation of its governance framework and to support corrective measures.</i>		Definitions - N/A Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 4.3 focuses on internal safeguards. Potential performance dependencies, as internal safeguards frameworks likely to cover prevention and sanction of financial misconduct.
MI 4.3 – Internal Safeguards: Implementation of internal policies and practices to protect individuals, resources, and the organisational environment while promoting a healthy, ethical, and inclusive culture	<i>E 4.3.1 – The organisation's policy and governance framework clearly outlines roles, responsibilities and measures to prevent, detect, investigate and address misconduct while protecting whistleblowers.</i>		Definitions Misconduct definitions vary across organisation types, specific guidance to be added. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 4.4 and 4.5 cover PSEAH which should not be addressed here
	<i>E 4.3.2 – The organisation's staff and management clearly understand and carry out their responsibilities for reporting and addressing misconduct, supported by adequate resources and capacity development.</i>		Definitions - See 4.3.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 4.4 and 4.5 cover PSEAH which should not be addressed here
	<i>E 4.3.3 – The organisation provides clear, safe and context-sensitive reporting channels (both formal and informal, and with appropriate safeguards to protect whistleblowers) and ensures these are well-communicated, known and used by staff and external stakeholders.</i>		Definitions Stakeholders: see 3.5.4 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 4.4 and 4.5 cover PSEAH which should not be addressed here
	<i>E 4.3.4 – The organisation's case management system supports the timely tracking, documentation and management of misconduct cases, and enables appropriate survivor support and respect for respondent rights.</i>		Definitions Respondent rights: respondent rights refer to the procedural guarantees and protections afforded to the person accused (the respondent) while ensuring fairness, due process, and integrity of the investigation. These rights exist alongside survivor-centred approaches and whistleblower protection Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 4.4 and 4.5 cover PSEAH which should not be addressed here

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
	<i>E 4.3.5 – The organisation's public reports disclose disaggregated case numbers, resolution timeframes and actions taken (including corrective and disciplinary actions) to address identified issues and support engagement with governing bodies.</i>		Definitions - N/A Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 4.4 and 4.5 cover PSEAH which should not be addressed here
MI 4.4 – Prevention of and response to sexual exploitation and abuse	<i>E 4.4.1 – The organisation sets, communicates and upholds clear PSEA policies and procedures.</i>	4.7 – E1; 4.7 – E2	Definitions (Definitions are taken from Common Approach to Protection from Sexual Exploitation, Sexual Abuse and Sexual Arrassment (CAPSEAH)) Sexual Exploitation (SE): any actual or attempted abuse of a position of vulnerability, differential power or trust for sexual purposes, including, but not limited to, profiting monetarily, socially or politically from the sexual exploitation of another. For example, coercing individuals into engaging in sexual activities in exchange for aid, services, employment opportunities, or other benefits. Sexual Abuse (SA): the actual or threatened physical intrusion of a sexual nature, whether by force or under unequal or coercive conditions. This includes sexual assault, rape, molestation, and other forms of non-consensual sexual activity. Protection from SEAH (PSEAH): to prevent and actively manage and mitigate the risk of SEAH and respond appropriately when it occurs. This means taking all reasonable actions to: protect people, populations and personnel; proactively reduce SEAH risk and prevent SEAH incidents; create or strengthen ways in which concerns can be raised; and to respond robustly to concerns and cases in a way which prioritises the rights, dignity and needs of victim-survivors. PSEAH is sometimes also called 'safeguarding against SEAH'. In IFIs, be aware of the distinction between internal and external sexual misconduct. SEA can be happen in the form of internal misconduct (where the perpetrator is staff / personnel / board member etc.but the victim external) and external misconduct (where both the perpetrator and victim are external. i.e. perpetrator is an borrower/client or a contractor of the borrower/client and the victim a community member). Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - Closely links to 4.4.2 and 4.4.3
	<i>E 4.4.2 – The organisation sets and upholds clear PSEA standards for implementing partners and all others who work on its behalf.</i>	4.7 – E5	Definitions - See 4.4.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - See 4.4.1

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
MI 4.5 – Prevention of and response to sexual harassment	<i>E 4.4.3 – The organisation allocates sufficient human and financial resources to prevent and respond to SEA.</i>	4.7.3 (general PSEA); 4.7.8 (for victim centred approach specifically)	<u>Definitions</u> - See 4.4.1 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> - See 4.4.1
	<i>E 4.4.4 – The organisation demonstrates leadership by prioritising and embedding a culture of zero tolerance for inaction on SEA.</i>	4.7 – E3	<u>Definitions</u> - See 4.4.1 - Zero tolerance is understood in terms of “zero tolerance of inaction” (not, of cases). <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> - See 4.4.1
	<i>E 4.4.5 – The organisation consults, informs and coordinates with communities and partners on SEA.</i>	4.7 – E7 (general) 4.7 – E2 (for status checking w/ partners)	<u>Definitions</u> - See 4.4.1 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> - See 4.4.1
	<i>E 4.4.6 – The organisation assesses SEA risks and takes action to prevent SEA across all activities.</i>	4.7 – E6 <u>5.4 – E5</u>	<u>Definitions</u> - See 4.4.1 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> - See 4.4.1 - E 4.4.3 on communication
	<i>E 4.4.7 – The organisation responds to SEA by encouraging the reporting of complaints, ensuring accountability and applying a victim-survivor-centred approach.</i>	4.7 – E3 <u>4.7 – E5 (for IPs)</u> <u>4.7 – E8</u>	<u>Definitions</u> - See 4.4.1 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> - See 4.4.1 - E 4.4.3 on communication - Elements covering the reporting of financial misconduct
	<i>E 4.4.8 – The organisation monitors and assesses the effectiveness of its efforts to protect against SEA.</i>	4.7 - E2 4.7 – E5	<u>Definitions</u> - See 4.4.1 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> - See 4.4.1
	<i>E 4.5.1 – The organisation sets, communicates and upholds clear SH policies and procedures.</i>	4.8 – E1; 4.8 – E3; 4.8 – E5	<u>Definitions</u> - See 4.5.1 Sexual Harassment (SH): a range of unacceptable and unwelcome behaviours and practices of a sexual nature that may include, but are not limited to, sexual suggestions or demands, requests for ‘sexual favours’, sexual, verbal or physical conduct, or gestures that are or might reasonably be perceived as offensive or humiliating. This includes jokes, comments or messages of a sexual nature; suggestive looks, staring or leering; display of or circulation of pornographic material. It is sometimes used to describe behaviour in a work environment but can also occur in communities and public spaces - SH in the UN, “blue on blue” to be added - In IFIs, distinguish between internal SH - part of

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			internal sexual misconduct - i.e. where both the perpetrator and the victim-survivor are members of personnel; and external SH – where both the perpetrator and the victim-survivor are external actors (e.g. within an implementing partner company).; <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> Linked to MI 4.4
	<i>E 4.5.2 – The organisation sets and upholds clear standards to protect against SH for implementing partners and all others who work on its behalf.</i>	New for SH (present only for SEA)	<u>Definitions</u> - See 4.5.1 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> 4.5.1 and 4.5.3 both speak to CAPSEAH Minimum Action 1: “1. POLICIES: Set, communicate, uphold and implement clear PSEAH policies” - Linked to MI 4.4
	<i>E 4.5.3 – The organisation allocates sufficient human and financial resources to prevent and respond to SH.</i>	4.8 – E3	<u>Definitions</u> - See 4.5.1 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> - Other forms of misconduct covered in MIs 4.2 and 4.3. - Linked to MI 4.4
	<i>E 4.5.4 – The organisation demonstrates leadership by prioritising and embedding a culture of zero tolerance for inaction on SH.</i>	4.8 – E3	<u>Definitions:</u> See 4.5.1 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> Linked to MI 4.4
	<i>E 4.5.5 – The organisation consults, informs and coordinates with internal bodies, offices, personnel and partners on SH.</i>	4.8 – E1 (policy) 4.8 – E7 (complaint) 4.8 – E4 (training)	<u>Definitions:</u> - See 4.5.1 - Partner: see 1.2.3 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> - Linked to MI 4.4
	<i>4.5.6 – The organisation assesses SH risks and takes action to prevent SH across all activities.</i>	New for SH (but already present for SEA in 3.1)	<u>Definitions:</u> - See 4.5.1 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> - Linked to MI 4.4
	<i>4.5.7 – The organisation responds to SH by encouraging the reporting of complaints, ensuring accountability and applying a victim-centred approach.</i>	4.8 -E3	<u>Definitions:</u> See 4.5.1 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> Linked to MI 4.4
	<i>4.5.8 – The organisation monitors and assesses the effectiveness of its efforts to protect against SH.</i>	4.8 – E2 (status tracking) 4.8 – E6 (learning)	<u>Definitions:</u> See 4.5.1 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> Linked to MI 4.4

KPI 5: Operational programming, planning, and design systems and procedures support the development and delivery of quality interventions

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
MI 5.1 – Operational processes and systems for intervention design support relevance	E 5.1.1 – The organisation uses credible assessments of needs and gaps to inform intervention objectives and prioritisation.	5.1 – E3; E1 (crises framework)	Definitions: • Intervention: organisational activities with identifiable objectives, resources, and accountability arrangements, designed to contribute to specific results. Interventions will vary both within and across organisations. Examples include, but are not limited to: ○ For operations involving policy support, capacity building, and direct implementation, interventions may include projects, programmes, portfolios, technical assistance, etc. ○ For normative support and data analysis, interventions may include standard-setting or monitoring initiatives, policy guidance frameworks, stakeholder convening efforts, advocacy campaigns, or technical assistance programmes ○ For development financing, interventions may include different types of loans, grants, and investments • Assessments: a systematic process for identifying the needs and gaps of relevant stakeholders to inform the objectives/priorities of an intervention Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 6.3 focuses on the extent to which interventions support and use collaboration frameworks. The focus of MI 6.3 is at the level of a country strategy/programme, while the level of analysis for MI 5.1 is individual interventions • MI 6.3 focuses on accountability to affected populations and includes an element that focuses on engagement with relevant stakeholders to inform intervention design and implementation. Possible performance dependency here, as credible assessments of needs and gaps likely to require systematic engagement with relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries
	E 5.1.2 – The organisation uses credible assessments of the operating context to inform key intervention design choices.	5.2 – E1	Definitions: • Assessments: See 5.1.1 • Operating context: the external environment in which an implementation is implemented. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 6.4 focuses on accountability to affected populations and includes an element that focuses on engagement with relevant stakeholders to inform intervention design and implementation. Possible performance dependency here, as credible assessments of needs and gaps likely to require systematic engagement with relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries • MI 5.2 focuses on operational risks management. Likely performance dependencies as credible assessments of operating context may incorporate assessments of key risks to intervention delivery.

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
MI 5.2 – Operational risks are proactively identified, managed, and monitored	<i>E 5.1.3 – The organisation engages systematically with relevant stakeholders at different levels to inform intervention design.</i>	New	Definitions: • Stakeholders see 3.5.4, it include both partners and beneficiaries. The definition of stakeholders will vary across organisations. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • N/A
	<i>E 5.2.1 – The organisation's policy framework (or equivalent) defines a credible approach to identifying, assessing and managing operational risk.</i>	New	Definitions: • Policy framework: see 2.1.1 • Operational risk: internal or external factors that may negatively impact the implementation of an interventions and its results Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 4.1 focuses on the organisation's approach to enterprise risk management. Likely performance dependencies, as the management of operational risk is a key component of enterprise risk management. • MI 3.1. on financial management and incorporates an element that focuses on internal resource allocation. Likely performance dependency, as capacity in this area may be influenced by resources allocation priorities and processes.
	<i>E 5.2.2 – The organisation allocates sufficient human and financial resources and provides capacity development to support the consistent application of its operational risk management framework across different organisational levels.</i>	New	Definitions: • Operational risk: see 5.2.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 4.1 focuses on the organisation's approach to enterprise risk management. Likely performance dependencies, as the management of operational risk is a key component of enterprise risk management.
	<i>E 5.2.3 – The organisation's management systems support the timely and reliable identification, monitoring and management of operational risks at different organisational levels.</i>	New	Definitions: • Management systems: software systems, platforms etc. to support staff to manage a specific dimension of the organisation. • Operational risk: see 5.2.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 4.1 focuses on the organisation's approach to enterprise risk management. Likely performance dependencies, as the management of operational risk is a key component of enterprise risk management. • MI 3.5 focuses on information management. Likely performance dependencies, as information management systems may support the identification, management, escalation of risks etc.
	<i>E 5.2.4 – The organisation systematically applies social and environmental safeguards to prevent or mitigate the adverse impacts of interventions on people and the environment.</i>	4.5 – E1	Definitions: • Safeguards: Policies, mechanisms, and procedures designed to prevent, mitigate, or manage potential adverse impacts of development projects on people, communities, and the environment Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			MI 6.3 focuses on accountability to affected populations. Likely performance dependencies here as social and environmental safeguards are a key component of ensuring accountability to affected populations.
	<i>E 5.2.5 – The organisation has managed operational risks appropriately and undertaken corrective action.</i>	New	Definitions: Operational risk: see 5.2.1 Appropriate: The suitability of actions or decisions to the needs, priorities, and context of affected populations or parties Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - N/A
MI 5.3 – Operational processes and systems in place for ensuring interventions are internally and externally coherent	<i>E 5.3.1 – The organisation's intervention design processes and systems align interventions with its strategic objectives.</i>	1.2 – E4	Definitions: Intervention design processes: policies, procedures and structures used to support the design of interventions Intervention: see 5.1.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 1.1. focuses on the organisations overall strategic plan and objectives. Likely performance dependency, as alignment may be influenced by the clarity of objectives in the strategic plan
	<i>E 5.3.2 – The organisation's internal collaboration processes support the design of internally coordinated interventions, including across the HDP nexus when applicable.</i>	New	Definitions: Collaboration: Individuals or groups working jointly to achieve a shared goal, often engaging in co-creative efforts where each participant's unique contributions are essential to the outcome Intervention: see 5.1.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 3.6 focuses on internal collaboration at the corporate level. Likely dependencies in performance, as the factors which support internal collaboration at the corporate level may influence the possibilities for/quality of internal collaboration at the operational level
	<i>E 5.3.3 – The organisation's intervention design processes include systematic engagement with external partners to support coordinated and complementary action, including across the HDP nexus when applicable.</i>	New	Definitions: Intervention design process: see 5.3.1 Partner: see 1.2.3 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 6.2 looks at joint planning, joint financing and other joint processes and mechanisms - MI 6.3 focuses on use of collaboration frameworks, including engagement in nationally led coordination platforms. Likely performance dependency, as engagement in coordination platforms is one channel of engagement with external partners
MI 5.4 – Operational processes and systems for intervention design support	<i>E 5.4.1 – The organisation's intervention design processes support the articulation of clear objectives and credible intervention logics to achieve them.</i>	7.3 – E1	Definitions: Intervention design processes: see 5.3.1 Interventions: see 5.1.1. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - KPI 7 focuses on various aspects of the organisation's approach to performance

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
effectiveness			management. Likely performance dependencies, as the quality of intervention logics may influence the quality of data and insights produced by performance management systems
	<i>E 5.4.2 – The organisation's approval and review mechanisms support the systematic assessment of intervention design quality.</i>	New	Definitions: • Approval/review mechanisms: processes and procedures associated with the review and approval of proposed interventions. Often referred to with different terms such as Quality Assurance at Design (QAD), Quality Review at Entry, Programme/Project Appraisal etc. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • N/A
	<i>E 5.4.3 – The organisation's project management systems (or equivalent) support the reliable monitoring of intervention status.</i>	New	Definitions: • Project management systems: software systems, methods, platforms etc. to support staff to manage specific interventions • Intervention status: this refers to the extent to which the intervention is being implemented as planned • Intervention: see 5.1.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • KPI 7 focuses on various aspects of the organisation's approach to performance management. Likely performance dependencies, as the extent to which project management systems support the reliable monitoring of intervention status may be influenced by the quality of wide performance management systems • MI 3.5 focusses on information management. Likely performance dependencies, as information management systems may support the monitoring of intervention status.
MI 5.5 – Effective feedback loops ensure the organisational knowledge base informs new and ongoing interventions	<i>E 5.5.1 – The organisation's knowledge management system (or equivalent) captures and stores useful evidence and lessons learned to inform intervention design and adaptation.</i>	8.5 – E1; 8.5 – E2	Definitions • Knowledge management: The process or approach through which institutions capture, distribute, retain and effectively use knowledge to achieve their goals. • Adaptation: the modification of strategies, interventions, or operations based on evidence, feedback, or contextual change • Intervention: see 5.1.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 3.5 focusses on information management. Likely performance dependencies, as information management systems likely to play an important role in knowledge management • MI 7.4 focuses on the use of performance data for decision making. Likely performance dependencies • MI 7.5 focuses on knowledge use, while the elements under this MI mostly focus on knowledge capturing and dissemination • MI 8.5 focuses on systems to support communication and knowledge management of evaluative evidence. Possible performance dependencies

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			• MIs-5.1 – 5.4 focus on different aspects of intervention design. Likely performance dependencies, as strong knowledge management systems may contribute to improved accessibility of institutional knowledge for informing intervention design.
	<i>E 5.5.2 – The organisation's internal collaboration processes between organisational units or departments (or equivalent) support the capture and dissemination of organisational knowledge.</i>	N/A	Definitions: • Collaboration: Individuals or groups working jointly to achieve a shared goal, often engaging in co-creative efforts where each participant's unique contributions are essential to the outcome. • Interventions: see 5.5.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 3.6 focuses on internal collaboration at the corporate level. Likely dependencies in performance, as the factors which support internal collaboration at the corporate level may influence the possibilities for/quality of internal collaboration at the operational level • MI 3.5 focusses on information management. Likely performance dependencies, as information management systems likely to play an important role in knowledge management. • MIs-5.1 – 5.4 focus on different aspects of intervention design. Likely performance dependencies, as strong internal collaboration may contribute to improved accessibility of institutional knowledge for informing intervention design.
	<i>E 5.5.3 – The organisation systematically reviews intervention status with relevant partners at different levels to support knowledge capture and inform adjustments and adaptations.</i>	5.3 – E5; 5.2 – E2; 6.8 – E1; 6.8 – E2; 6.8 – E3	Definitions: • Intervention: see 5.5.1 • Adaptation: see 5.5.1 • Intervention status: see 5.4.2 • Partner: see 1.2.3 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 6.4, which focuses on accountability to beneficiaries, and includes a focus on engagement with beneficiaries in the review of interventions. Likely dependencies in performance, though the focus of this element (5.5.3) is broader, as it includes stakeholders beyond beneficiaries (i.e. national partners, implementing partners etc.) • MI 6.5, which focuses on support to locally led, and includes a focus on stakeholder engagement in decision making. Likely dependencies in performance
	<i>E 5.5.4 – The organisation provides incentives for operational and technical staff to apply organisational knowledge to intervention design and management.</i>	3.4. – E2	Definitions: • Incentives: rewards, recognition, compensation (financial or otherwise) contingent on the achievement of a predetermined level of performance or the demonstration of a specific behaviour deemed desirable by the organisation • Intervention: see 5.5.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 3.5 focusses on information management. Possible performance dependencies, as the ability to

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			apply an organisational knowledge base to intervention design and management may be influenced by the broader quality and focus of the organisation's approach to information management. • MI 3.2 focuses on human resources management and includes a dimension which assesses the extent to which HR systems support staff to work towards organisational goals. Possible performance dependencies, as performance appraisal processes may be an important source of incentives for the application of the organisation's knowledge base to intervention design and management. • MI 8.5. focuses on systems to support the communication and knowledge management of evaluations. Possible performance dependencies, as the ability of staff to apply an organisational knowledge base to intervention design and management may be influenced by the quality of systems for communicating evaluation findings and lessons.
MI 5.6 – Operational processes and systems for intervention design support sustainability	<i>E 5.6.1 – The organisation's intervention design processes involve early and structured engagement with national partners and stakeholders to support sustainability.</i>	5.6 – E4	Definitions: • Interventions: see 5.1.1. • Partner: see 1.2.3 • Stakeholder: see 3.5.4 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • N/A
	<i>E 5.6.2 – The organisation's intervention design and appraisal processes include capacity analyses of key partners to support sustainability.</i>	5.3	Definitions: • Intervention design processes: See 5.3.1 • Intervention appraisal processes: See 5.4.1 • Partners: See 1.2.3 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 5.2 focuses on operational risk management. Possible performance dependency, as operational risk management should involve assessment of risks relating to the capacity of key partners
	<i>E 5.6.1 – The organisation's intervention design and appraisal processes include measures to support sustainability.</i>	5.6 – E1; 5.6 – E2	Definitions: • Intervention design processes: See 5.3.1 • Intervention appraisal processes: See 5.4.1 • Sustainability include whether the benefits of an intervention will last in the long term, but also whether financial, institutional, environmental, and social conditions are in place to sustain them. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • N/A
	<i>E 5.6.3 – The organisation's monitoring and evaluation frameworks provide a credible basis for monitoring measures to support sustainability.</i>	5.6. – E3	Definitions: • Monitoring systems: see 2.1.3 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • KPI 7 focuses on the organisations approach to performance management and incorporates a focus on systems for monitoring. Possible performance dependencies, as ability of monitoring systems to support reliable monitoring of risks likely tied to broader quality of the organisation's approach to

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			performance management
MI 5.7 – Operational processes and systems support efficiency	<i>E 5.7.1 – The organisation defines a clear and credible strategy (or equivalent) to enhance operational efficiency.</i>	New	Definitions Efficiency: the extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way. This MI and related set of indicators focuses on efficiency of operations in particular. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 3.4 focuses on procurement and logistics, and includes a focus on value delivered in this area MI 5.3 looks at operational processes and systems supporting internal and external coherence of interventions MI 6.2 focuses on efficiency through collaboration with other organisations specifically. This may be a dimension of the organisation's strategy for operational efficiency MI 11.1 and MI 11.2 which measures interventions efficiency (timeliness, cost-efficiency)
	<i>E 5.7.2 – The organisation's intervention design and appraisal processes include measures to improve efficiency.</i>	New	Definitions: Intervention design processes: See 5.3.1 Intervention appraisal processes: See 5.4.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - N/A
	<i>E 5.7.3 – The organisation's administrative processes and systems incorporate measures to support the timely and cost-efficient delivery of interventions.</i>	New	Definitions Administrative processes and systems: processes and systems pertaining to administrative service lines such as HR, procurement, logistics, IT etc. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 3.1. on financial management and incorporates an element that focuses on internal resource allocation. Likely performance dependency, as capacity in this area may be influenced by resources allocation priorities and processes MI 3.4 focuses on procurement and logistics MI 6.2 looks at efficiency through collaboration, systemwide engagement and harmonisation. In particular inter-agency shared services such as CBO and Global Shared Services are assessed under MI 6.2 - Also see E 5.7.1
	<i>E 5.7.4 – The organisation monitors and assesses progress related to operational efficiency.</i>	New	Definitions Monitoring: see 2.13 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements KPI 7 focuses on the organisations approach to performance management and incorporates a focus on systems for monitoring. Possible performance dependencies, as ability of monitoring systems to support reliable monitoring of efficiency likely tied to broader quality of the organisation's approach to performance management MI 3.1 focuses on financial management and incorporates a focus on the extent to which financial systems support the tracking of expenditures

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			through to outputs and outcomes. Likely performance dependencies, as the ability of monitoring systems to support useful assessments of operational efficiency may be influenced by the quality and interoperability of broader financial system.
HUM MI 5.8 – There are systems in place for anticipatory humanitarian responses	<i>E 5.8.1. – The organisation's early warning systems and structures support the reliable forecasting of humanitarian hazards and shocks.</i>	5.6.1 (adapted framework)	Definitions - Anticipatory action; acting ahead of predicted hazards to prevent or reduce acute humanitarian impacts before they fully unfold. - Early warning system: Integrated system of hazard monitoring, forecasting and prediction, disaster risk assessment, communication and preparedness activities systems and processes that enables individuals, communities, governments, businesses and others to take timely action to reduce disaster risks in advance of hazardous events (UNDRR) Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 3.7 focuses on agility and responsiveness, and includes a focus on the organisation's strategic foresight function/efforts. Likely performance dependency, as strategic foresight efforts in humanitarian organisation's likely to form a key component of early warning systems
	<i>E 5.8.2 – The organisation's contingency plans, including pre-agreed triggers and activities, support anticipatory action when needed.</i>	5.6.2 (adapted framework)	Definitions: Anticipatory action: See 5.8.1 Pre-agreed triggers: thresholds and decision making rules based on reliable, timely, and measurable forecasts Pre agreed activities: effective and efficient actions to be implemented to support vulnerable communities in the window of opportunity between the trigger moment and the full impact of a shock Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 3.7 focuses on agility and responsiveness. Likely performance dependency.
	<i>E 5.8.3 – The organisation's pre-arranged instruments and mechanisms support the timely mobilisation of financial and human resources for anticipatory action when needed.</i>	5.6.3 (adapted framework)	Definitions Anticipatory action: see 5.8.2. Pre-arranged instruments/mechanisms: financial mechanisms e.g. funding that is guaranteed and available to be released on the pre-agreed trigger to finance pre-arranged activities; human resources mechanisms e.g. surge/common rosters Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 1.4 focuses on the organisation's financial framework. Likely performance dependency. - MI 3.1. focuses on financial management, and incorporates a focus on resource allocation and budgeting. Likely performance dependency
IFI MI 5.8 – The MO's processes for investment appraisal and	<i>E 5.8.1 – The organisation assesses the potential financial and non-financial additionality of its operations.</i>		Definitions Financial additionality: official sector financing enables or mobilises private sector investment that would not have taken place on the same scale, at the same terms, or within the same timeframe without

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
monitoring identify relevant country-level considerations, including promoting principles of sound banking and creating an enabling environment for investment			the intervention. (OECD definition) • Non-financial additionality refers to the unique, non-monetary contributions an investor brings that improve a project's outcome <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • N/A
	<i>E 5.8.2 – The organisation identifies and manages potential investment risks specific to different sectors, clients and instruments.</i>		<u>Definitions</u> • In this case, instruments mean specific financial instruments used to finance a project <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • N/A
	<i>E 5.8.3 – The organisation identifies and responds to country-specific risks and opportunities to promote investment.</i>		<u>Definitions</u> • See 5.8.2 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • N/A
	<i>E 5.8.4 – The organisation provides advice and technical assistance to clients to support investment, address risk and enhance corporate governance.</i>		<u>Definitions</u> • N/A <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • N/A
	<i>E 5.8.5 – The organisation identifies and addresses legal, regulatory and policy barriers to expand opportunities for investment in its countries of operation.</i>		<u>Definitions</u> • N/A <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • N/A
HUM MI 5.9 – The organisation is set up to prevent, respond to and achieve durable solutions for internally displaced people (IDPs)	<i>5.9.1 – The organisation's policy framework (or equivalent) sets out clear objectives to support durable solutions for internally displaced people.</i>	5.8.1 (Adapted framework)	<u>Definitions</u> • Internally displaced people: persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalised violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognised state border <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • NA
	<i>5.9.2 – The organisation's policy framework (or equivalent) establishes credible structures and processes to support durable solutions for internally displaced people.</i>	5.8.1 (Adapted framework)	<u>Definitions</u> • Internally displaced people: persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalised violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognised state border. Note that all the elements under this MI will also look at refugees. <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • NA

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
	<i>5.9.3 – The organisation has systems to support the participation of internally displaced people in decision-making on issues that concern them.</i>	5.8.2	Definitions - Internally displaced people: see 5.9.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 6.4. focuses on the organisation's approach to ensuring accountability to affected populations. Likely performance dependency. - MI 5.1. incorporate a focus on meaningful engagement with stakeholders during intervention design. Likely performance dependency.
	<i>5.9.4 – The organisation allocates sufficient resources to address situations affecting internally displaced people.</i>	5.8.5	Definitions - Internally displaced people: see 5.9.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 1.4 focuses on the organisation's financial framework. Likely performance dependency. - MI 3.1. focuses on financial management and incorporates a focus on resource allocation and budgeting. Likely performance dependency
	<i>5.9.5 – The organisation's monitoring and evaluation systems (including corporate reporting) support accountability and learning related to its efforts to achieve durable solutions for internally displaced people.</i>	5.8.6	Definitions - Internally displaced people: see 5.9.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements KPI 7 focuses on the organisation's approach to managing management and development/humanitarian/peace results. Likely performance dependencies, as the ability to monitor contributions to durable solutions for IDPs may be influenced by the broader quality of the organisation's monitoring systems. KPI 8 focuses on the organisation's evaluation function. Likely performance dependencies, as the learning on durable solutions for IDPs may be influenced by the focus and quality of evaluations, as well as systems and structures for supporting the dissemination and uptake of evaluation findings.

KPI 6: Collaboration, harmonisation and enabling local leadership support shared outcomes

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
MI 6.1 – Planning and programming facilitate and encourage collaboration and collaborative initiatives	<i>E 6.1.1 – The organisation's institutional documents articulate a clear and credible vision for collaboration and the division of labour with external partners, taking into account its mandate and comparative advantage.</i>	New	Definitions Collaboration: Individuals or groups working jointly to achieve a shared goal, often engaging in co-creative efforts where each participant's unique contributions are essential to the outcome Partner: see 1.2.3 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 1.2 contains an element on whether the strategic plan outlines how the organisation will collaborate with partners in support of global commitments. This element has a broader focus and does not limit the scope of collaboration to joint work on global

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			commitments only
	<i>E 6.1.2 – The organisation's collaboration strategy or strategies align with multilateral commitments on partnership and describe how it will contribute to collective results.</i>	New	Definitions • Collaboration: see 6.1.1 • Multilateral commitments around partnership to be defined in each assessment Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 1.2 contains an element on whether the strategic plan outlines how the organisation will collaborate with partners in support of global commitments. This element has a broader focus and does not limit the scope of collaboration to joint work on global commitments only
	<i>E 6.1.3 – The organisation's operational planning and implementation frameworks include measures to support collaboration with external partners.</i>	New	Definitions • Operational planning frameworks: these set out operational standards and procedural guidelines for core business processes. Policies typically mandate or prohibit the affairs of an organisation and must be complied with. Procedures set out the processes that should be followed to implement policies. Most organisations have a policy and procedure manual/framework which contains all operational policies and procedures Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 5.3 focuses on the extent to which intervention design processes involve collaboration and coordination with relevant partners with a view to ensuring that actions in a country are coherent and complementary with one another. Likely performance dependencies, as this element focuses on the internal enabling environment for collaboration, and in particular on whether the organisation's operational policies and procedures are designed in such a manner as to facilitate and encourage collaboration with external partners
	<i>E 6.1.4 – The organisation provides internal incentives for staff to pursue collaboration with external partners.</i>	New	Definitions • Incentives: see 5.5.4 • Collaboration: see 6.1.1 • Partner: see 1.2.3 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 3.2 focuses on human resources management, and includes a dimension which assesses the extent to which HR systems support staff to work towards organisational goals. Possible performance dependencies, as performance appraisal processes may be an important source of incentives for collaboration with external partners.
MI 6.2 – The MO actively strives for	<i>E 6.2.1 – The organisation actively engages in and uses joint</i>	6.4 – E1; 6.5 – E3	Definitions • Joint mechanisms: including joint planning, joint

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
efficiency through collaboration, systemwide engagement, and harmonisation	<i>mechanisms and processes to reduce fragmentation and improve efficiency.</i>		financing, joint frameworks, joint reporting and related mechanisms and processes, interagency collaboration platforms (this refers to cross-agency working groups, networks etc. at the global level such as the CEB, MDB working groups, UNSDG, IASC etc.) Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 5.7 contains several elements focusing on different aspects of efficiency, but does explicitly cover efficiency gains pursued through collaboration with other organisations
	<i>E 6.2.2 – The organisation harmonises its operational policies and procedures with those of relevant peer organisations.</i>	3.1 – E6	Definitions Operational policies and procedures: Policies typically mandate or prohibit the affairs of an organisation and must be complied with. Procedures set out the processes that should be followed to implement policies. Most organisations have a policy and procedure manual/framework which contains all operational policies and procedures Harmonisation: The process by which development agencies and donor organisations coordinate their policies, procedures, and practices to improve the effectiveness of aid delivery. The coordination aims to reduce duplication, lower transaction costs for partner countries, and ensure that aid efforts are complementary and aligned with the development objectives of recipient nations. - Procurement (Common LTAs, vendor databases, review processes, etc.) - Human resources (harmonised/joint recruitment processes, staff services such as counselling and training) - ICT (cyber security, shared ICT infrastructure and support, etc.) - Finance (banking services, foreign exchange, cash transfers, accounting standards, payments, investments) - Logistics and fleet management (i.e. vehicle management, freight and transit, warehousing and distribution) - Facility services (i.e. common premises, service centres) <i>This element is deliberately broad to support applicability to different organisation's types. Guidance will specify dimensions to be looked at for different types of organisations.</i> Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 5.7. focuses on operational efficiency. Possible performance dependency, as harmonisation and use of shared services may be a key driver of operational efficiency. - KPI 3 includes MIs that focus on procurement, asset management, human resources, and information management. As outlined above, these are all areas where there is potential for harmonisation of associated policies.

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
MI 6.3 – Interventions support and use collaboration frameworks, such as country led and owned platforms and shared services protocols	<i>E 6.3.1 – The organisation's country strategies (or equivalent) credibly articulate pathways for its outcome-level contributions to national development objectives and related results frameworks.</i>	6.5 – E1	Definitions: Country Strategies: documents that set out the organisation's key priorities and objectives at the country level, often including specification of the resources/activities that will be used to support these Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 5.3 focuses on systems for supporting the effectiveness of interventions, including the extent to which intervention design processes support the articulation of credible intervention logics for achieving intended results. The focus of this element (6.3.1.) is at the country strategy level, rather than the level of individual interventions.
	<i>E 6.3.2 – The organisation systematically engages in and uses country-led or country-owned collaboration frameworks to identify opportunities for complementary action.</i>		Definitions Country-led results/collaboration frameworks: the frameworks that define a country's approach to results and the systems for monitoring and evaluating their achievement. In most cases, country-led multi-stakeholder collaboration frameworks will provide a useful point of departure for assessing performance against this indicator. For UN agencies for instance, this includes the UNSDCF, which is a nationally owned framework, anchored in national development priorities, and which sets out the UN development systems sought by national stakeholders to reach the SDGs in an integrated manner. Multi-stakeholder collaboration frameworks also include Humanitarian Response Plans (HRP), which set strategic objectives and indicators, and cluster plans consisting of objectives, activities and accompanying projects, which detail implementation and costing of the strategy Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 5.3 focuses on processes for ensuring external coherence at the intervention level. The focus of this element (6.3.2.) is at the country strategy level, rather than the intervention level.
	<i>E 6.3.3 – The organisation's operational policies support the use and strengthening of national systems and coordination platforms.</i>	6.3 – E3; 6.3 – E4	Definitions Operational policies: see 6.2.2 National systems: nationally owned systems for public sector management, including for example national financial systems, procurement frameworks, social and environmental safeguards, etc. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - N/A
	<i>E 6.3.4 – The organisation systematically uses (and provides when relevant) quality shared services, mutual recognition or similar approaches.</i>	3.1 – E6	Definitions Common services: refers to support functions that are developed jointly or delivered by one organisation on behalf of others. The purpose of common services can include reducing duplication, leveraging common bargaining power, and maximising economies of scale. Common service areas may include, but are not necessarily limited to: - Procurement (common LTAs, vendor databases, review processes, etc.)

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			- Human resources (harmonised/joint recruitment processes, staff services such as counselling and training) - ICT (cyber security, shared ICT infrastructure and support, etc.) - Finance (banking services, foreign exchange, cash transfers, accounting standards, payments, investments) - Logistics and fleet management (i.e. vehicle management, freight and transit, warehousing and distribution) - Facility services (i.e. common premises, service centres) Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 6.2. focuses on harmonisation of operational policies with other peer organisations. Likely performance dependencies, as harmonisation at the policy level may be a pre-requisite for the use or provision of shared services. MI 5.7. focuses on operational efficiency. Possible performance dependencies, as the use of common services may be a key driver of operational efficiency.
MI 6.4 – The organisation is set up to deliver accountability to beneficiaries/affected populations	<i>E 6.4.1 – The organisation has a dedicated policy (or equivalent) which promotes accountability to recipients/affected populations in line with recognised standards.</i>		Definitions: Accountability to beneficiaries/affected populations: this refers to a commitment by development and humanitarian actors to use power responsibly, by taking account of, giving account to, and being held to account by the people they seek to assist. It requires development and humanitarian actors to involve beneficiaries/affected populations in key decisions and processes that impact them, and to have effective communication and feedback channels that engage all affected people, inclusive of their gender, age, disability status and other diversities. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 5.2. focuses on operational risk management and incorporates a focus on social and environmental safeguards. Possible performance dependencies, because safeguards may play a key role in establishing the organisation's approach to accountability to affected populations
	<i>E 6.4.2 – The organisation has a dedicated implementation system to ensure accountability to recipients/affected populations.</i>	6.7 – E1	Definitions: Accountability to beneficiaries/affected populations: see 6.4.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - See 6.4.1
	<i>E 6.4.3 – The organisation has mechanisms for engaging recipients/affected populations which support participation in decision-making on intervention design, implementation and evaluation.</i>	6.7 – E1	Definitions: - N/A Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 5.1: The elements under MI 5.1 focus on assessments of need, and the extent to which these are inclusive of relevant stakeholders such as government counterparts, civil society, other

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
MI 6.5 – Support to locally led development and humanitarian action ensures that development and humanitarian efforts are driven by local stakeholders who best understand the needs, priorities and context of their country and communities			development partners, and beneficiaries. This element focuses specifically on mechanisms for engaging beneficiaries affected by interventions, and the extent to which these permit meaningful participation in actual decision making with respect to intervention design and implementation. There are likely to be dependencies between performance in this area and performance in 5.1.
	<i>E 6.4.4 – The organisation has mechanisms in place to support the safe and accessible reporting of grievances and timely responses to them.</i>	New	Definitions: • Safe: in this context, safety means that mechanisms for raising grievances do not place users at potential risk of harm, including retaliation. • Accessible: in this context, inclusivity means that mechanisms for raising grievances are accessible to all persons of concern, and promote non-discrimination, taking into account age, gender, disability, and other diversities Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • KPI 4 covers safeguards for different forms of misconduct, including financial misconduct, ethical misconduct, and sexual misconduct. Strong conceptual link here and likely performance dependency. Effective oversight/safeguards likely to require strong reporting mechanisms for many contexts.
	<i>E 6.4.5 – The organisation collaborates with relevant operational partners to support collective accountability to recipients/affected populations.</i>	New	Definitions: • Collective accountability: this refers to promoting a coordinated approach among development/humanitarian partners to ensuring the engagement and participation of beneficiaries/affected populations in decision making, implementation, and evaluation of interventions. • Partner: see 1.2.3 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • N/A
	<i>E 6.5.1 – The organisation has a policy framework (or equivalent) which provides credible definitions and principles for locally led development cooperation and humanitarian action.</i>	New	Definitions: • Policy framework: see 2.1.1. • Locally led development: an ongoing development process where diverse local actors exercise agency across development policy and programme dimensions (framing, design, delivery, learning, accountability) in given local operating contexts. • Locally led development co-operation: development co-operation that supports locally led humanitarian and development assistance by recognising and enabling diverse local actors' agency in i) framing; ii) design; iii) delivery, including resourcing; and iv) accountability and learning. • Local actors: individuals and entities based and operating within the local context of reference, subject to local laws, whose actions are centred on local issues. Local actors can include governmental (national and subnational entities), parliaments, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), grassroots associations, community-based organisations, traditional and spiritual leaders, academia, media,

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			and the private sector. They can also include regional organisations, confederations, coalitions, and networks if member organisations maintain independent fundraising and governance systems. Local actors do not include international NGOs including country offices, multilateral organisations, and international private sector organisations <i>MOPAN 4 framework uses the working definitions proposed by OECD (2024), Pathways Towards Effective Locally Led Development Co-operation: Learning by Example, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/51079bba-en.</i> Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements N/A
	<i>E 6.5.2 – The organisation has mechanisms in place to leverage or strengthen local capacities.</i>	New	Definitions: Local actors: see 6.5.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 5.6 focuses on sustainability, and incorporates a focus on assessment and strengthening of capacities of key partners. Likely performance dependencies MI 6.3 incorporates a focus on the use of country systems. Possible performance dependencies, as the use of country systems <i>may</i> involve associated capacity strengthening support
	<i>E 6.5.3 – The organisation's mechanisms for engaging local partners support participation in decision-making on intervention design, implementation and evaluation.</i>	New	Definitions: - see 6.5.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - N/A
	<i>E 6.5.4 – The organisation's financial framework supports or incentivises direct funding to local actors as appropriate.</i>	New	Definitions: Financial framework: see 1.4.1 Local actors: see 6.5.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 1.4. focuses on the organisation's broader financial framework. Possibility for funding local/national actors likely to be influenced by this MO-type specific guidance - IFIs - Would be more MoUs and how to establish and channel trust funds through other actors.
	<i>E 6.5.5 – The organisation monitors and reports transparently on progress towards locally led development outcomes, demonstrating improvements in those outcomes.</i>	New	Definitions: - see 6.5.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - N/A
MI 6.6 – The organisation engages in	<i>E 6.6.1 – The organisation's institutional documents provide a credible articulation of how it will</i>	6.9 – E1; 6.5 – E1; (crises)	Definitions Advocacy: actions undertaken by an organisation to influence/shape decisions, policies, norms, or

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
effective global policy efforts and advocacy, including towards ending need	<i>engage in global policy efforts and advocacy in line with its mandate and related functions.</i>	framework)	standards relating to its mandate • Global policy efforts: actions undertaken by an organisation to influence/shape global policies, norms, or standards relating to its mandate <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • MI 1.1 focuses on the organisation's strategic plan. Articulation of the organisation's role in global policy efforts may be included in the strategic plan
	<i>E 6.6.2 – The organisation's knowledge management systems provide useful evidence to inform engagement in global policy dialogue and advocacy.</i>	6.9 – E2; 6.9 – E3	<u>Definitions:</u> • Knowledge management: The process or approach through which institutions capture, distribute, retain and effectively use knowledge to achieve their goals. <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • MI 3.5 focuses on information management more broadly. Performance dependencies likely, as the ability of the organisation to use its knowledge base to inform • MI 5.5.1 focuses on country operations. The focus here is on the use of organisational knowledge informing global advocacy/policy efforts instead. • MI 8.5. focuses on systems for supporting the communication of knowledge from evaluations, which may be useful for informing advocacy/policy efforts
	<i>E 6.6.3 – The organisation allocates sufficient human and financial resources to support engagement in global policy efforts and advocacy.</i>	New	<u>Definitions:</u> • Global policy efforts and advocacy: see 6.6.1 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • MI 3.1. on financial management and incorporates an element that focuses on internal resource allocation. Likely performance dependency, as capacity in this area may be influenced by resources allocation priorities and processes. • MI 4.1 focuses on the organisation's overall financial framework and incorporates elements that focus on the mobilisation and alignment of resources with strategic priorities. Likely performance dependency, as capacity in this area is likely to be influenced by wider resource mobilisation and availability
	<i>E 6.6.4 – The organisation shares knowledge products with partners, and partners use them.</i>	6.9 – E2; 6.9 – E4; 6.9 – E5; 6.9 – E6	<u>Definitions:</u> • Knowledge products: publications that seek to offer new insights and analysis to advance learning and/or understanding of an issue • Partners: see 1.2.3 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • KPI 8 focuses on the organisation's evaluation function. Possible thematic link, as evaluations constitute one type of knowledge product
IFI MI 6.7 – Systems promote private sector development and private capital	<i>E 6.7.1 – The organisation has tailored financing instruments or approaches in place to support investment in challenging markets.</i>	Adapted framework	<u>Definitions</u> • N/A <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • N/A

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
mobilisation, particularly in challenging markets	<i>E 6.7.2 – The organisation has risk-sharing instruments in place to support investment in challenging markets.</i>	Adapted framework	<u>Definitions</u> - To be added <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> - N/A
	<i>E 6.7.3 – The organisation has tailored financing instruments and approaches in place to support access to finance for underserved groups.</i>	Adapted framework	<u>Definitions</u> - N/A <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> - N/A
	<i>E 6.7.4 – The organisation has a strategy or approach to expand local currency lending.</i>	Adapted framework	<u>Definitions</u> - N/A <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> - N/A
	<i>E 6.7.5 – The organisation has mechanisms in place to convene potential investors and share knowledge with them to support investment pipeline development.</i>	Adapted framework	<u>Definitions</u> - N/A <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> - N/A

KPI 7: Systems and processes are in place for managing external and internal results to support learning, decision making, accountability, and communications

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
MI 7.1 – The organisation has a clearly articulated and consistently implemented approach to performance management	<i>E 7.1.1 – The organisation has a policy framework (or equivalent) which provides a credible approach to measuring and managing for results (including management, development, humanitarian and peace results).</i>	7.1 – E2	<u>Definitions:</u> Policy framework: see 2.1.1 Management results: organisational/institutional level results, typically focusing on metrics of internal process efficiency/effectiveness Dev/hum/peace results: development results, impacting beneficiaries and external stakeholders <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> - MI 1.1. focuses on the organisation's strategic plan, including its definition of intended results.
	<i>E 7.1.2 – The organisation allocates sufficient human and financial resources and provides capacity development to staff and implementing partners to support measuring and managing for results.</i>	7.1 – E6; 7.1 – E3	<u>Definitions:</u> - N/A <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> - MI 3.1. on financial management and incorporates an element that focuses on internal resource allocation. Likely performance dependency, as capacity in this area may be influenced by resources allocation priorities and processes - MI 4.1 focuses on the organisation's overall financial framework and incorporates elements that focus on the mobilisation and alignment of resources with strategic priorities. Likely performance dependency, as capacity in this area is likely to be influenced by wider resource mobilisation and availability
	<i>E 7.1.3 – The organisation's tools</i>	7.1 – E4	<u>Definitions:</u>

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
	<i>and systems support management for results.</i>		- N/A <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> - See E 7.1.1
MI 7.2 – Results architecture aligns with country, regional and/or global results	<i>E 7.2.1 – The organisation's results framework (or equivalent) supports the credible monitoring of the contributions of different intervention types to results at country, regional and global levels.</i>	7.2 – E1	<u>Definitions:</u> Results frameworks: see 1.1.3 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or elements:</u> MI 1.1 incorporates a focus on the extent to which the corporate results framework supports reliable tracking of progress towards strategic objectives. This MI focuses on the extent to which results frameworks at different levels, and the linkages between them, support monitoring of the contributions of country and intervention level results to strategic objectives.
	<i>7.2.2 – The organisation aligns results indicators and targets across country, regional and global levels when appropriate.</i>	New	<u>Definitions:</u> Results frameworks: see 1.1.3
MI 7.3 – Results are communicated transparently	<i>E 7.3.1 – The organisation's corporate reporting provides a detailed and reliable review of results achieved over time.</i>	7.2 – E5	<u>Definitions</u> Management results: see 7.1.1 Dev/hum/peace results: see 7.1.1. Corporate reporting: published reports on corporate performance, including annual reports, updates to corporate results frameworks, mid-term reviews, etc <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> MIs 1.1 and 1.2 focus on the corporate results framework of the organisation, and the extent to which these support reliable and useful monitoring of progress against strategic objectives and contributions to global commitments. This element is broader in scope and focuses on the annual reporting of results by organisations to their governing bodies and other stakeholders. There may be dependencies between this element and those in MIs 1.1 and 1.2, given that a high-quality results framework is likely to contribute to detailed and reliable annual reporting.
	<i>E 7.3.2 – The organisation shares information on results with governing bodies in a useful and timely manner.</i>	7.2 – E3	<u>Definitions:</u> Information on results: data on results, obtained through the organisation's RBM system and/or evaluations, reported on a regular basis through annual reports, quarterly updates, etc. Governing bodies: Formal intergovernmental structures composed of representatives of member states or shareholder countries, responsible for providing strategic direction, oversight, and accountability for an organisation's work. These bodies may include executive boards, assemblies, conferences, boards of governors, or similar entities.
	<i>E 7.3.3 – The organisation shares information on results transparently with partners, which</i>	6.1 – E1	<u>Definitions:</u> Information on results: data on management and development/humanitarian/peace results, obtained

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
	<i>supports informed dialogue.</i>		through the organisation's RBM system and/or evaluations, reported on a regular basis through annual reports, quarterly updates, etc. • Partners: see 1.2.3 <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • Element 5.5.3 and 7.5.3 • MI 5.5: which assesses feedback loops and includes an element that focuses on the extent to which the organisation systematically reviews interventions with relevant partners to inform adjustments/changes. The communication of results to partners is likely to be key to enabling meaningful joint reviews of interventions, and there may therefore be dependencies between this element and performance against MI 5.5. • MI 6.4: which assesses the extent to which the organisation is set up to deliver accountability to beneficiaries and affected populations. As above, the transparent communication of results to beneficiaries/affected populations may be a key ingredient of accountability, and there are therefore likely to be dependencies between these areas of the assessment framework.
MI 7.4 – Monitoring systems generate useful, timely quality data	<i>E 7.4.1 – The organisation's results management systems provide timely and relevant data at the output and outcome levels.</i>	7.4 – E2	Definitions: • Outputs: The products, capital goods and services that result from an intervention. Outputs may also include changes resulting from the intervention that contribute to the achievement of outcomes. Outputs include changes in knowledge, skills, or abilities produced by the activities. Outputs are within the control of the MO. • Outcomes: The short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • MI 5.5 focuses on effective feedback loops. Likely performance dependency, as the effectiveness of feedback loops may be influenced by the quality of systems for measuring results
	<i>E 7.4.2 – The organisation's digital tools and systems support staff in measuring and managing for results effectively.</i>	New	Definitions: • N/A <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • N/A
	<i>E 7.4.3 – The organisation's quality assurance systems ensure the reliability of all results data.</i>	7.4 – E4	Definitions: • Quality assurance systems: processes and other arrangements for ensuring that required quality standards are met with respect to a specific issue <u>Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements</u> • MI 1.1, 1.2, and 7.2. all focus on the extent to which results frameworks at different levels provide a reliable overview of progress. Likely performance dependencies, as the effective quality assurance likely to influence reliability of results frameworks.
	<i>E 7.4.4 – The organisation's reporting processes ensure that</i>	7.4 – E3	Definitions: • Reporting: published reports performance,

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
	<i>data is available in a timely manner to support key corporate reporting and planning, including internal change processes.</i>		including annual reports, updates to results frameworks at different levels, mid-term reviews, etc Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 1.1, 1.2, and 7.2. all focus on the extent to which results frameworks at different levels provide a reliable overview of progress. Likely performance dependencies, as the effective quality assurance likely to influence reliability of results frameworks.
MI 7.5 – Performance data transparently applied in planning and decision making	<i>E 7.5.1 – The organisation uses results data to inform strategic planning and decision-making.</i>	7.5 – E1	Definitions: - Strategic plan: see 1.1.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 1.1. incorporates a focus on the extent to which strategic plans are regularly reviewed to ensure relevance and attention to risks.
	<i>E 7.5.2 – The organisation uses results data to inform operational planning and decision-making.</i>	7.5 – E1	Definitions: - Operational plans: annual (or otherwise) work plans/programmes at different levels within the organisation, intervention design documents, etc. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 5.3 focuses on effective feedback loops. Likely performance dependency. - Linked to E 5.5.1 Knowledge management systems (or equivalent) provide useful evidence to inform intervention design and adaptation
	<i>E 7.5.3 – The organisation uses results data to identify poorly performing interventions and make related adjustments.</i>	7.5 – E2; 7.5 – E3	Definitions: - Interventions: see 5.1.1 - Management results: see 7.1.1 - Dev/hum/peace results: see 7.1.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 5.3 focuses on effective feedback loops. Likely performance dependency.

KPI 8: Incentives and accountability systems encourages use of evaluative findings and lessons learned

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
MI 8.1 – A corporate, independent evaluation function supports impartial and credible evaluative evidence	<i>E 8.1.1 – The organisation has a corporate evaluation function which is structurally and functionally independent.</i>	8.1 – E1; 8.1 – E2; 8.1 – E3	Definitions: - Corporate evaluation function to be added. Structural independence: The evaluation function is independent from other management functions, and the head of the evaluation departments to report directly to the Governing Body of the organisation. Functional independence: The evaluation office has full discretion in deciding the evaluation programme, and evaluators are able to conduct their work throughout the evaluation without undue interference by those involved in implementing the unit of analysis being evaluated. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			N/A
	<i>8.1.2 – The organisation's evaluation policy (or equivalent) effectively supports the impartiality, quality and use of evaluative findings, including in decentralised evaluations where relevant.</i>	8.1 – E1; 8.1 – E2; 8.1 – E3	Definitions: Evaluation policy: A policy dedicated to clarifying the purpose, scope and applicability, principles and standards as well as procedures and overall implementation requirements when conducting evaluations. - See 8.1.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - N/A
	<i>E 8.1.3 – The organisation allocates sufficient human and financial resources to the evaluation function to implement the evaluation plan.</i>	8.1 – E4	Definitions: - See 8.1.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 3.1. on financial management and incorporates an element that focuses on internal resource allocation. Likely performance dependency, as capacity in this area may be influenced by resources allocation priorities and processes. MI 4.1 focuses on the organisation's overall financial framework and incorporates elements that focus on the mobilisation and alignment of resources with strategic priorities. Likely performance dependency, as capacity in this area is likely to be influenced by wider resource mobilisation and availability
	<i>E 8.1.4 – The organisation conducts regular internal or external reviews of the evaluation function to support improvement and corrective action.</i>	New	Definitions: Internal or external reviews: these include self-assessments of the evaluation function/policy (internal), and assessments undertaken by external bodies (i.e. external evaluators, peer evaluation functions, independent oversight bodies) Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - N/A
MI 8.2 – Consistent, independent evaluation of performance supports broad coverage of evaluative evidence	<i>E 8.2.1 – The organisation's evaluation policy (or equivalent) supports broad thematic and geographical coverage aligned with its strategic objectives.</i>	8.2 – E1	Definitions: - See 8.1.2 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - N/A
	<i>E 8.2.2 – The organisation consistently implements its evaluation plans (or equivalent) to support broad thematic and geographical coverage aligned with its strategic objectives.</i>	8.2 – E5	Definitions: Annual evaluation plans: published plans which identify the evaluations that the evaluation function intends to conduct and/or be involved in (for example joint or regional evaluations) in a given year. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - N/A
	<i>E 8.2.3 – The organisation's corporate and thematic evaluations provide useful and timely evidence related to its strategic priorities.</i>	8.2 – E4	Definitions: Corporate/thematic evaluations: evaluations that focus on strategic areas that are considered critical to sustain development/humanitarian results. These usually span multiple countries or the entire

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			organisation, and may focus on corporate policies, thematic areas, partnerships, programmes, business models, operations, etc. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 1.1. incorporates a focus on the extent to which the strategic plan is regularly reviewed to ensure continued relevance. Possible performance dependency, as availability of evidence from corporate and thematic evaluations may influence these reviews. • MI 7.5 incorporates a focus on the extent to which performance data is used to inform strategic planning. Possible performance dependency, as the availability of evidence from corporate and thematic evaluations may influence this
MI 8.3 – Systems applied to ensure the quality of evaluations	<i>E 8.3.1 – The organisation's evaluation procedures (or equivalent) support the use of robust methodologies and practices to ensure the rigour and credibility of evaluations.</i>	8.3 – E1	Definitions: • Evaluation policy: see 8.2.1 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • N/A
	<i>E 8.3.2 – The organisation's quality assurance system is applied consistently which ensure a sufficient level of quality across all evaluations.</i>	8.3 – E5	Definitions: • Quality assurance: see 7.4.3 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 8.1 incorporates a focus on staff perceptions of impartiality and credibility of evaluations. Likely performance dependency. • MI 7.5. focuses on the use of performance data for informing strategic planning. Possible performance dependency, as this is likely to be influenced in part by the availability of high-quality evaluations • MI 1.1. incorporates a focus on the extent to which the organisation's strategic plan is regularly reviewed. Possible performance dependency, as this is likely to be influenced in part by the availability of high-quality evaluations
	<i>E 8.3.3 – The organisation consults management in evaluation planning and implementation to support the relevance of evaluations.</i>	N/A	Definitions: • N/A Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 8.1 incorporates a focus on staff perceptions of impartiality and credibility of evaluations. Likely performance dependency. • MI 7.5. focuses on the use of performance data for informing strategic planning. Possible performance dependency, as this is likely to be influenced in part by the availability of relevant evaluations. • MI 1.1. incorporates a focus on the extent to which the organisation's strategic plan is regularly reviewed. Possible performance dependency, as this is likely to be influenced in part by the availability of relevant evaluations
MI 8.4 – Clear accountability system ensures	<i>E 8.4.1 – The organisation's management responses to evaluations respond to all</i>	8.6 – E2	Definitions: • Management response: documented, official responses by management to evaluation

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
responses, follow-up and use of evaluation recommendation	<i>recommendations.</i>		conclusions and recommendations. These should indicate the extent to which management accepts (fully or partially) or not accepts all the recommendations, motivate why if partially or not accepting any recommendation, and provide an action plan for implementing the recommendations that have been accepted. The Action plan should clearly state what is to be done, responsibilities and accountabilities as well as a timeline for implementation. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 3.5 focuses on information management. Potential linkage as information management systems may support communication of recommendations and tracking of uptake
	<i>E 8.4.2 – The organisation establishes an action plan to implement accepted recommendations and clearly defines outcome-focused actions, accountabilities, responsibilities and timelines for implementation.</i>		
	<i>E 8.4.3 – The organisation regularly monitors the evaluation action plan and makes it public.</i>	8.6 – E4	Definitions: Recommendations: specific and explicit proposals (most often in the form of actions/changes) by an evaluation, derived from findings and conclusions. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements - MI 3.5 focuses on information management. Potential linkage as information management systems may support communication of recommendations and tracking of uptake
MI 8.5 – Systems in place to support communication and knowledge management of evaluations	<i>E 8.5.1 – The organisation's has structures and systems in place to support the communication of evaluation findings internally and externally.</i>	8.7 – E2; 8.7 – E3	Definitions: Structures and systems: include units, roles, processes, and tools with a specific purpose of supporting the communication of evaluation findings within and outside the organisation. Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements MI 7.5. focuses on the use of performance data for informing strategic and operational planning. Possible performance dependency, as this is likely to be influenced in part by the quality of structures and systems for communicating evaluation findings internally MI 8.2 incorporates a focus on the extent to which evaluations provide useful and timely evidence on the organisation's strategic priorities. Possible performance dependency, as this is likely to be influenced by the quality of structures and systems for communicating evaluation findings internally MI 1.1. incorporates a focus on the extent to which the organisation's strategic plan is regularly reviewed. Possible performance dependency, as this is likely to be influenced in part by the quality of structures and systems for supporting the communication of evaluation findings internally

Approved MI	Draft Element	Link to MOPAN 3.1	Partial Guidance
			• MI 5.3. focuses on feedback loops in intervention implementation. Possible performance dependency, as this is likely to be influenced in part by the quality of structures and systems for supporting the communication of evaluation findings internally • MI 3.5 focuses on broader information management within the organisation. Possible performance dependencies, as systems for supporting communication of evaluation findings may be influenced by the quality of broader information management practices and structures
	<i>E 8.5.2 – The organisation disseminates evaluation products and conduct communication outreach activities to stakeholders.</i>	New	Definitions: • Evaluation products and communication outreach activities: include evaluation reports, briefs and other documents, films etc describing the findings and conclusions of the conducted evaluation, and presentations, webinars, workshops, posts etc. to spread the results and recommendations • Stakeholders: see 3.5.4 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • MI 7.5. focuses on the use of performance data for informing strategic and operational planning. Possible performance dependency, as this is likely to be influenced in part by the quality of structures and systems for communicating evaluation findings internally
	<i>E 8.5.3 – The organisation communicates and applies lessons, including best practices.</i>	8.7 – E4	Definitions: • Lessons: see 5.4.5 Links to other KPIs, MIs, or Elements • See 8.5.1

Final endorsed and language-edited KPI 9-12 MI-level Criteria

*Evaluative evidence: This may include internal and external evaluations conducted at different levels and review of interventions based on the method selected, as well as results reported through an organisation's corporate results system (i.e. its corporate results framework, or scorecard).

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
<i>KPI 9 Effectiveness: Through its interventions, the MO has achieved its stated goals and objectives</i>		
9.1 - Interventions assessed as having contributed to achieved results across different beneficiary and target groups	4. Highly satisfactory: The organisation achieves all or almost all intended significant development, normative and/or humanitarian objectives at the output and outcome level. Results are differentiated across target groups. 3. Satisfactory: The organisation either achieves at least a majority of stated output and outcome objectives (more than 50% if stated) or the most important of stated output and outcome objectives is achieved 2. Unsatisfactory: Half or less than half of stated output and outcome level objectives is achieved 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Less than half of stated output and outcome objectives has been achieved, including one or more very important output and/or outcome level objectives	4. Highly satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that almost all outputs have been achieved and that interventions have made significant contributions to targeted outcomes, with results that are mostly consistent across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 3. Satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that most outputs have been achieved and that interventions have made significant contributions to targeted outcomes, but with noticeable inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 2. Unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates significant gaps in output achievement and generally limited contributions to targeted outcomes, with significant

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
		inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates little or no achievement of outputs and little or no contribution to targeted outcomes across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups.
9.2. Interventions assessed as having contributed to the improvement of gender equality and women's empowerment across different beneficiary and target groups	4. Highly satisfactory: Interventions achieve all or nearly all of their stated gender equality objectives. 3. Satisfactory: Interventions achieve a majority (more than 50%) of their stated gender objectives 2. Unsatisfactory: Interventions either lack gender equality objectives or achieve less than half of their stated gender objective equality objectives. (Note: where a programme or activity is clearly gender-focused (maternal health programming for example) achievement of more than half its stated objectives warrants a rating of satisfactory 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Interventions are unlikely to contribute to gender equality or may in fact lead to increases in gender inequalities	4. Highly satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that almost all outputs have been achieved and that interventions have made significant contributions to gender equality and women's empowerment, with results that are mostly consistent across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 3. Satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that most outputs have been achieved and that interventions have made significant contributions to gender equality and women's empowerment, but with noticeable inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 2. Unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates significant gaps in output achievement and generally limited contributions to gender equality and women's empowerment,

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
		with significant inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates little or no achievement of outputs and little or no contribution to gender equality and women's empowerment across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups.
9.3. Interventions assessed as having contributed to the improvement of the environmental sustainability and/or climate change across different beneficiary and target groups	4. Highly satisfactory: Interventions include substantial planned activities and project design criteria to achieve environmental sustainability and contribute to tackle the effects of climate change. These plans are implemented successfully and the results are environmentally sustainable and contribute to tackling the effects of climate change 3. Satisfactory: Interventions include some planned activities and project design criteria to ensure environmental sustainability and help tackle climate change. Activities are implemented successfully and the results are environmentally sustainable and contribute to tackling the effects of climate change 2. Unsatisfactory: EITHER Interventions do not include planned activities or project design criteria intended to promote environmental sustainability and help tackle the effects of climate change. There is, however, no direct	4. Highly satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that almost all outputs have been achieved and that interventions have made significant contributions to environmental sustainability and climate change, with results that are mostly consistent across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 3. Satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that most outputs have been achieved and that interventions have made significant contributions to environmental sustainability and climate change, but with noticeable inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 2. Unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates significant gaps in output achievement and generally limited contributions to environmental sustainability and climate change, with significant inconsistency across

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
	indication that project or programme results are not environmentally sustainable. AND/OR The intervention includes planned activities or project design criteria intended to promote sustainability but these have not been implemented and/ or have not been successful 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Interventions do not include planned activities or project design criteria intended to promote environmental sustainability and help tackle climate change. In addition changes resulting from interventions are not environmentally sustainable/do not contribute to tackling climate change.	thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates little or no achievement of outputs and little or no contribution to environmental sustainability and climate change across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups.
9.4. Interventions assessed as having contributed to the improvement of human rights and the protection of vulnerable people and groups across different beneficiary and target groups	4. Highly satisfactory: Interventions include substantial planned activities and project design criteria to promote or ensure human rights and reach those most at risk of being left behind. These plans are implemented successfully and the results have helped promote or ensure human rights demonstrating results for the most vulnerable groups. 3. Satisfactory: Interventions include some planned activities and project design criteria to promote or ensure human rights. These activities are implemented successfully and the results have promoted or ensured human rights.	4. Highly satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that almost all outputs have been achieved and that interventions have made significant contributions to human rights, with results that are mostly consistent across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 3. Satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that most outputs have been achieved and that interventions have made significant contributions to human rights, but with noticeable inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups.

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
	2. Unsatisfactory: EITHER Interventions do not include planned activities or project design criteria intended to promote or ensure human rights or demonstrate their reach to vulnerable groups. There is, however, no direct indication that project or programme results will not promote or ensure human rights, AND/OR The intervention includes planned activities or project design criteria intended to promote or ensure human rights but these have not been implemented and/or have not been successful 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Interventions do not include planned activities or project design criteria intended to promote or ensure human rights. In addition changes resulting from interventions do not promote or ensure human rights. Interventions do not focus on reaching vulnerable groups.	2. Unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates significant gaps in output achievement and generally limited contributions to human rights, with significant inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates little or no achievement of outputs and little or no contribution to human rights across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups.
9.5 Interventions assessed as having contributed to the improvement of other cross-cutting issues	4. Highly satisfactory: Interventions include substantial planned activities and project design criteria to promote or ensure any other cross-cutting issue. These plans are implemented successfully and the results have helped promote or ensure any other cross-cutting issue. 3. Satisfactory: Interventions include some planned activities and project design criteria to	4. Highly satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that almost all outputs have been achieved and that interventions have made significant contributions to other cross-cutting issues, with results that are mostly consistent across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 3. Satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that most outputs have been

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
	promote or ensure any other cross-cutting issue. These activities are implemented successfully and the results have promoted or ensured any other cross-cutting issue. 2. Unsatisfactory: EITHER Interventions do not include planned activities or project design criteria intended to promote or ensure any other crosscutting issue. There is, however, no direct indication that project or programme results will not promote or ensure any other cross-cutting issue, AND/OR Intervention include planned activities or project design criteria intended to promote or ensure any other cross-cutting issue but these have not been implemented and/or been successful 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Interventions do not include planned activities or project design criteria intended to promote or ensure any other cross-cutting issue. In addition changes resulting from interventions do not promote or ensure any other cross-cutting issue.	achieved and that interventions have made significant contributions to other cross-cutting issues, but with noticeable inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 2. Unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates significant gaps in output achievement and generally limited contributions to other cross-cutting issues, with significant inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates little or no achievement of outputs and little or no contribution to other cross-cutting issues across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups.
9.6. Beneficiary/Client satisfaction	NEW	4. Highly satisfactory: Evaluative evidence clearly demonstrates that beneficiaries/clients are highly satisfied with the organisation's support, and that this is mostly consistent across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups.

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
		3. Satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that beneficiaries/clients are generally satisfied with the organisation's support, but with noticeable inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 2. Unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that beneficiaries/clients have limited or highly uneven satisfaction with the organisation's support, with evidence of frequent dissatisfaction or concern, and/or that the organisation has made no systematic effort to seek their views. 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates widespread dissatisfaction among beneficiaries/clients with the organisation's support, and/or that the organisation has made no effort at all to seek their views.

KPI 10: Relevance and Coherence: The organization is doing the rights things, and its interventions are coherent with other interventions

10.1. Interventions are responsive to the beneficiaries' needs and priorities and continue to do so when circumstances change	4. Highly satisfactory: Systematic methods are applied in intervention design (including needs assessment for humanitarian relief operations) to identify target group needs and priorities,	4. Highly satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions respond to the needs and priorities of beneficiaries and clients to a high degree, including when circumstances
---	--	---

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
	including consultation with target groups, and intervention design explicitly responds to the identified needs and priorities 3. Satisfactory: Interventions are designed to take into account the needs of the target group as identified through a situation or problem analysis (including needs assessment for relief operations) and the resulting activities are designed to meet the needs of the target group 2. Unsatisfactory: No systematic analysis of target group needs and priorities took place during intervention design or some evident mismatch exists between the intervention's activities and outputs and the needs and priorities of the target groups 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Substantial elements of the intervention's activities and outputs were unsuited to the needs and priorities of the target group	change, and that this is mostly consistent across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 3. Satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions respond to the needs and priorities of beneficiaries and clients to a high degree, including when circumstances change, but with noticeable inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 2. Unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions show generally limited responsiveness to the needs and priorities of beneficiaries and clients, including when circumstances change, with significant inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions show a widespread lack of responsiveness to the needs and priorities of beneficiaries and clients, including when circumstances change.
10.2 Interventions are coherent with other interventions in a country, sector or institution	NEW	4. Highly satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions show a high level of external coherence with other relevant

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
		interventions across most thematic and geographical areas. 3. Satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions show a moderate level of external coherence with other relevant interventions across several thematic and geographical areas. 2. Unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions show generally limited external coherence with other relevant interventions across most thematic and geographical areas. 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions show a widespread lack of external coherence with other relevant interventions across most thematic and geographical areas.
10.3 Operations demonstrate financial and non-financial additionality	IFI specialised Indicator	4. Highly satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that almost all private sector operations achieve significant financial and non-financial additionality, and that this is mostly consistent across thematic and geographical areas. 3. Satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that most private sector operations achieve significant financial and non-

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
		financial additionality, but with noticeable inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas. 2. Unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates significant gaps in the extent to which private sector operations achieve financial and non-financial additionality, with significant inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas. 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that private sector operations achieve little or no financial and non-financial additionality across thematic and geographical areas.

KPI 11: Efficiency: Through its interventions, the organization delivers results in an economic and timely way

11.1 Interventions are resource/cost-efficient	4. Highly satisfactory: Interventions are designed to include activities and inputs that produce outputs in the most cost/resource efficient manner available at the time 3. Satisfactory: Results delivered when compared to the cost of activities and inputs are appropriate even when the programme design process did not directly consider alternative delivery methods and associated costs	4. Highly satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions are highly resource and cost efficient, and that this is mostly consistent across thematic and geographical areas. 3. Satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions are generally resource and cost efficient, but with noticeable inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas.
--	--	--

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
	2. Unsatisfactory: Interventions have no credible, reliable information on the costs of activities and inputs and therefore no data is available on cost/resource efficiency 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Credible information is provided which indicates that interventions are not cost/resource efficient	2. Unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions are resource and cost efficient only to a limited extent, with significant inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas. 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions show widespread resource and cost inefficiency.
11.2 Interventions are completed and results achieved on time	4. Highly satisfactory: All or nearly all the objectives of interventions are achieved on time or, in the case of humanitarian programming, a legitimate explanation exists for delays in achieving some outputs/outcomes 3. Satisfactory: More than half of the intended objectives of interventions are achieved on time, and this level is appropriate to the context that existed during implementation, particularly for humanitarian interventions. 2. Unsatisfactory: Less than half of the intended objectives are achieved on time but interventions have been adjusted to take account of the difficulties encountered and can be expected to improve the pace of achievement in the future. In the case of humanitarian programming, a legitimate explanation exists for delays	4. Highly satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that almost all intervention outputs and outcomes are achieved within agreed timeframes, and that any delays are attributable primarily to external factors rather than to internal administrative processes. 3. Satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that most intervention outputs and outcomes are achieved within agreed timeframes, with some delays attributable to both external factors and internal administrative processes. 2. Unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates widespread deviation from agreed intervention timeframes, attributable to both external factors and internal administrative processes.

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
	1. Highly unsatisfactory: Less than half of stated objectives of interventions are achieved on time, and no credible plan or legitimate explanation is identified that would suggest significant improvement in achieving objectives on time	1. Highly unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates widespread deviation from agreed intervention timeframes, attributable primarily to internal administrative processes rather than to external factors.
11.3 Performance in private capital mobilization and efficient use of capital	IFI specialised Indicator	4. Highly satisfactory: The organisation consistently meets or exceeds relevant institutional targets for private capital mobilisation across the assessment period, and evidence demonstrates a clear impact on additional lending capacity and the crowding-in of private finance. 3. Satisfactory: The organisation meets most relevant institutional targets for private capital mobilisation across the assessment period, and evidence demonstrates some impact on additional lending capacity and the crowding-in of private finance. 2. Unsatisfactory: The organisation frequently misses relevant institutional targets for private capital mobilisation across the assessment period without sufficient justification, and evidence demonstrates minimal on additional lending capacity and the crowding-in of private finance. 1. Highly Unsatisfactory: The organisation consistently fails to meet relevant institutional

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
		targets for private capital mobilisation across the assessment period without sufficient justification, and evidence demonstrates no meaningful impact on additional lending capacity or the crowding-in of private finance.
11.4 Work Quality and Supervision Quality	IFI specialised indicator	4. Highly Satisfactory: The organisation operates a clear and institutionally embedded system to assess work quality, supervision quality and performance against ESG requirements and associated risk management. Almost all investments are rated Satisfactory or better in all three dimensions across the assessment period. 3. Satisfactory: The organisation applies clear and generally well-implemented methodologies to assess work quality, supervision quality and ESG performance, although a few elements remain under refinement or are implemented unevenly. The organisation conducts assessments regularly, and sufficient evidence supports the resulting ratings. Most investments are rated Satisfactory or better in each dimension, with limited pockets of weaker performance that the organisation is addressing. The organisation largely meets ESG requirements, and any gaps are generally

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
		minor and resolved within reasonable timeframes. 2. Unsatisfactory: The organisation applies incomplete or inconsistent methodologies to assess work quality, supervision quality and ESG performance across departments or regions. Assessments often lack sufficient depth, evidence or systematic follow-up, leading to unclear or unreliable performance judgements. A significant share of investments falls below Satisfactory in one or more dimensions, with recurrent issues in upstream design quality, supervision effectiveness or ESG compliance. The organisation does not identify or mitigate ESG risks consistently, and compliance gaps persist for extended periods. 1. Highly unsatisfactory: The organisation has no credible or consistently applied system to assess work quality, supervision quality or ESG performance. Where performance assessments exist, the organisation conducts them in a fragmented, undocumented or non-evidence-based manner, making results unreliable. Most investments are rated Unsatisfactory, or the organisation does not conduct ratings at all, thereby masking poor performance. The organisation regularly fails to meet ESG requirements, manages ESG risks poorly, and

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
		shows evidence of material or systemic non-compliance.

KPI 12: Sustainability: The net benefits of the organisation's interventions continue or are likely to continue after completion of the interventions

12.1 Benefits assessed as continuing, or likely to continue, after completion of the interventions	4. Highly satisfactory: Evaluations assess as likely that the intervention will result in continued benefits for the target group after completion. For humanitarian relief operations, the strategic and operational measures to link relief to rehabilitation, reconstruction and, eventually, development are credible. Moreover, they are likely to succeed in securing continuing benefits for the target group. Sustainability may be supported by building institutional capacity and/or strengthening the enabling environment for development. 3. Satisfactory: Evaluations assess as likely that the intervention will result in continued benefits for the target group after completion. For humanitarian relief operations, strategic and operational measures link relief to rehabilitation, reconstruction 2. Unsatisfactory: Evaluations assess as a low probability that the intervention will result in continued benefits for the target group after	4. Highly satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions are highly likely to sustain outputs and outcomes after completion, and that this is mostly consistent across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 3. Satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions are likely to sustain outputs and outcomes after completion, but with some inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 2. Unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions have a generally low likelihood of sustaining outputs and outcomes after completion, with significant inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions have very low
--	--	--

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
	completion. For humanitarian relief operations, efforts to link the relief phase to rehabilitation, reconstruction and, eventually, to development are inadequate. (In some circumstances such linkage may not be possible due to the context of the emergency. If this is stated in the evaluation, a rating of satisfactory is appropriate) 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Evaluations find a very low probability that the programme programme/project will result in continued intended benefits for the target group after project completion. For humanitarian relief operations, evaluations find no strategic or operational measures to link relief, to rehabilitation, reconstruction and, eventually, to development	or no likelihood of sustaining outputs and outcomes after completion.
12.2 Results help build resilience to shocks and stressors and lay the groundwork for stability and development	HUM Specialised Indicator	4. Highly satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions make strong, sustained and strategic contributions to long-term resilience and preparedness to shocks and stressors, and that these contributions are mostly consistent across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups and reflect an anticipatory approach. 3. Satisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions make

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
		meaningful contributions to resilience, including some contributions to long-term preparedness to shocks and stressors, but that reactive responses remain prominent in some areas, with some inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 2. Unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions make generally limited and predominantly reactive contributions to resilience, with only occasional or fragmented results in long-term preparedness to shocks and stressors, and with significant inconsistency across thematic and geographical areas and recipient groups. 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Evaluative evidence demonstrates that interventions make little or no contribution to resilience to shocks and stressors.
12.2 the MOs portfolio is financially sustainable including the financial performance of non-sovereign operations.	IFI specialised Indicator	4. Highly satisfactory: Rating agencies assess the organisation's capital position as strong, with a stable or positive outlook. 3. Satisfactory: Rating agencies assess the organisation's capital position as adequate or solid, with a stable or occasionally mixed outlook, and they flag no material concerns.

Approved Micro Indicator	Equivalent MOPAN 3.1 Criteria	Proposed Adjustments in MOPAN 4
		2. Unsatisfactory: Rating agencies signal that the organisation's capital position is weakening or that its outlook is negative or softening, and they flag concerns about earnings resilience, asset quality or liquidity. 1. Highly unsatisfactory: Rating agencies indicate that the organisation's capital position is weak, that its outlook is negative, that it has been downgraded or faces a credible risk of further deterioration, and that serious questions arise about its going-concern resilience.