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>Green</td>
<td>3.01 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>2.51 to 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>2.01 to 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Red</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>
</table>
|       | **1. What it does** (average of A+B) | **A**: 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?  
**B**: Comparative advantage: does the agency provide an advantage over UK bilateral aid? |
|       | **2. How it Delivers** (average of C+D+E+F) | **C**: Partnership: does the agency work well with others to achieve UK and international development outcomes?  
**D**: Leave No-one Behind: does the agency take action to meet the Global Goal to leave no-one behind?  
**E**: Gender: does the agency ensure a suitable focus on girls and women in its policies, investment choices and partnerships?  
**F**: Climate: does the agency support 'climate smart' development, and resilience to disasters and other climate shocks? |
|       | **3. Where it works** (average of G+H) | **G**: Geography and Resources: does the agency work in the right places for its particular role and mandate, informed by an appropriate graduation strategy?  
**H**: Performance in fragile states: does the agency perform well in fragile and conflict-affected states? |
|       | **4. Results and value** (average of I+J+K+L) | **I**: Results: does the agency demonstrate delivery against results and objectives?  
**J**: Controlling Costs: does the agency take action to drive down costs to secure value for money?  
**K**: Efficiency: does the agency demonstrate efficiency in managing its operations and programme and investment choices?  
**L**: Human Resources: does the agency deploy Human Resources for maximum impact? |
|       | **5. Risk and assurance** (average of M+N) | **M**: Risk and assurance: does the agency promote risk management and assurance in its corporate governance?  
**N**: Fraud: does the agency prevent, detect and take sanctions against fraud and corruption? |
|       | **6. Transparency and accountability** (average of O+P) | **O**: Transparency: does the agency strive to exceed global aid transparency standards?  
**P**: Accountability: Is the agency accountable to partner governments or clients and beneficiaries through all of its work? |
UNITAID

Assessment Summary: UNITAID helps lower income countries to access new, improved technologies to fight HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria.

UNITAID can demonstrate some important successes, leveraging value for other global health-spend, but documented evidence of impact to date is limited. Since late 2014 UNITAID has pursued far-reaching reforms, identifying the value it adds within the global health system, transforming its operating model and delivering impressive progress on efficiency and cost control. A core feature of its new model is close coordination with partners to ensure interventions are sustainable. Further reforms are starting to strengthen measurement and management of impact, value and results, risk, fraud and transparency.

UNITAID now needs to embed these reforms, systematically focus on the greatest unmet public health needs, particularly in low income countries and fragile and conflict-affected states, and develop a more comprehensive approach to gender equality. UNITAID’s reform journey since the 2013 MAR Update has been transformational.

**Match with UK Priorities Index:**

- **Very Good**

**Organisational Strengths Index:**

- **Good**

---

**Performance by Component**

- **What it does**
  - Transparency and Accountability: 4
  - Risk and Assurance: 3
  - Results and Value: 2
  - Where it works: 1
  - How it Delivers: 0

**DFID Funding***

- 2013: 50 (DFID core funding), 30 (DFID bilateral through multilateral funding)
- 2014: 20 (DFID bilateral through multilateral funding)
- 2015: 20 (DFID bilateral through multilateral funding)

---

**UK Engagement:** DFID was one of the five founding countries of UNITAID in 2006, and is one of 12 members on the Executive Board, the decision-making body of UNITAID. The UK is also the Vice Chair of the Executive Board, Chair of the Finance and Accountability Committee and a member of the Policy and Strategy Committee, and has been instrumental in UNITAID’s evolution and major reforms undertaken over the last year. The UK is the second largest funder of UNITAID overall, and provided financial support of £40 million in 2014. The UK burden share was 25% in 2014.

* Support continued to UNITAID during 2015, payments were made in 2016.