Key to the MDR One Page Assessment Summaries

The MDR Assessment framework

The MDR Assessment Framework is made up of 16 separate Assessment Questions, which are grouped into 6 different areas, known as Components. The first three components together make up the 'Match with UK Priorities Index'. Components four to six collectively make up the 'Organisational Strengths Index'. The different parts of the MDR assessment framework are shown below.

Multilateral agencies were awarded a score between 0.5 and 4 for each of the 16 assessment questions, with scores taking half point values beginning at 0.5 and going up to 4 (i.e. 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4). Questions were assessed and scored using the labels shown below, chosen to suggest progression of performance.

Assessment Question Scores and Descriptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory +</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak +</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory +</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>1 or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment question scores were averaged together to produce scores for each agency for each of the six components; for its match with UK priorities; and for its organisational strengths. The formula used for calculating these component and index scores is shown within the MDR Assessment Framework diagram below. Unlike the assessment question scores, component and index scores were categorised using a four colour traffic light categorisation. The table below shows the thresholds chosen for each traffic light rating, along with the descriptor used.

Component and Index Scores and Descriptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Traffic Light</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.01 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.51 to 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.01 to 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 to 2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DFID Funding Chart

The funding chart included on each summary assessment page shows DFID's latest published multilateral core and bilateral through multilateral Official Development Assistance (ODA) to the organisation, as included in our National Statistics release, 'Statistics on International Development'. This data is based on payments made in each calendar year.

UK Burden Share

This is the UK’s latest burden share, and represents our core funding to the agency as a proportion of all of the core funding it received. Depending on the frequency with which we provide funding to the agency, the burden share could relate to a specific year, a biennium or to a particular replenishment. This has been made clear in the text.
## MDR Assessment Framework Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Assessment Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>What it does (average of A+B)</td>
<td><strong>A</strong>: Critical role: does the agency have a critical role in delivering DFID’s Strategic Objectives, including achieving the Global Goals and improving resilience and response to crises? <strong>B</strong>: Comparative advantage: does the agency provide an advantage over UK bilateral aid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>How it Delivers (average of C+D+E+F)</td>
<td><strong>C</strong>: Partnership: does the agency work well with others to achieve UK and international development outcomes? <strong>D</strong>: Leave No-one Behind: does the agency take action to meet the Global Goal to leave no-one behind? <strong>E</strong>: Gender: does the agency ensure a suitable focus on girls and women in its policies, investment choices and partnerships? <strong>F</strong>: Climate: does the agency support 'climate smart' development, and resilience to disasters and other climate shocks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Where it works (average of G+H)</td>
<td><strong>G</strong>: Geography and Resources: does the agency work in the right places for its particular role and mandate, informed by an appropriate graduation strategy? <strong>H</strong>: Performance in fragile states: does the agency perform well in fragile and conflict-affected states?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Results and value (average of I+J+K+L)</td>
<td><strong>I</strong>: Results: does the agency demonstrate delivery against results and objectives? <strong>J</strong>: Controlling Costs: does the agency take action to drive down costs to secure value for money? <strong>K</strong>: Efficiency: does the agency demonstrate efficiency in managing its operations and programme and investment choices? <strong>L</strong>: Human Resources: does the agency deploy Human Resources for maximum impact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Risk and assurance (average of M+N)</td>
<td><strong>M</strong>: Risk and assurance: does the agency promote risk management and assurance in its corporate governance? <strong>N</strong>: Fraud: does the agency prevent, detect and take sanctions against fraud and corruption?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Transparency and accountability (average of O+P)</td>
<td><strong>O</strong>: Transparency: does the agency strive to exceed global aid transparency standards? <strong>P</strong>: Accountability: Is the agency accountable to partner governments or clients and beneficiaries through all of its work?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**International Organisation for Migration (IOM)**

**Assessment Summary:** IOM’s mission is to help to meet the growing operational challenges of migration management. It has specific expertise in migration legal instruments and policies.

IOM’s flexibility has allowed it to operate on a large scale and at speed including in recent migration emergencies. IOM is working towards establishing a portfolio based on needs and humanitarian principles. It has a wide geographical reach in fragile and conflict-affected states and is continuing to invest in its rapid response capacity. IOM must continue to aim for outstanding transparency standards. It needs to clarify how value for money can be best achieved and better demonstrate how it incorporates accountability to affected populations in all its programming.

IOM has made progress since the 2013 MAR Update in developing frameworks to guide its programmes, however work on results-based programme management needs to go further.

**Match with UK Priorities Index:** [Good]  
**Organisational Strengths Index:** [Adequate]

**Performance by Component**

**DFID Funding**

**UK Engagement:** IOM is an intergovernmental, non-normative organisation with its own constitution and governance system. IOM has 162 Member States including the UK. The UK Government participates in IOM Council meetings and the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance. The UK burden share in 2014 was 6.6%. The total UK assessed contribution in 2014 was £1.6 million, of which DFID paid £0.8 million.