

Evaluation of MOPAN

Paul Balogun

This presentation mainly builds on the findings, conclusions and recommendations from the 2013 Evaluation of MOPAN

But also includes additional observations and suggestions from the team leader of that evaluation

MOPAN is used to varying degrees by the members, but the scope and demand to increase its value to the individual members exists.

We were struck by the extent of buy-in for MOPAN from members, including from the D-G level. That's a real asset, something to build on.

Both the D-Gs and those directly associated with MOPAN within the membership want it to address a greater number of the issues that are of greatest concern in member decision making on multilaterals.

Members see both the symbolic (not free-riding) and potential practical (better evidence with lower transaction costs) benefits of membership.

They also join because they want to influence what it does.

But continuing the status quo will make MOPAN increasingly **less** relevant.

It will miss out on the great opportunity to build on ownership and demand for MOPAN to address a broader set of questions.

It will also mean that MOPAN doesn't really add value for the multilaterals.

Moving forward, there are five issues I wish to high-light for your consideration.

Issue 1

Addressing usefulness to the individual members means embedding MOPAN (a technical response) within a broader strategic approach within and across individual members

To date, MOPAN has been mostly run as a technical exercise that provides analysis.

It has de facto been a supply driven process

Will things change if only MOPAN changes?

NO

Can MOPAN and its focal points drive the broader strategic change? **NO**

Issue 2

- Can people know what they want until they see what is possible?
- This applies particularly to benchmarking and cost-effectiveness

Therefore how do you really assess needs?

Before assessing demand, members may need an internal process to clarify what would be really useful in the future for the individual members.

In practical terms, this means reflecting on how evidence is really used within the individual members (it will be different) and therefore what is really needed, and when.

Issue 3

We talked of MOPAN being supply, rather than demand, driven and mentioned utilisation focused evaluation lessons

Need to reflect on lessons from:

- Realist (Pawson) and UFE (Patton) evaluation approaches

- Experience of evidence based policy making more broadly (see for instance Cartwright and Hardie (2012) Evidence-Based Policy: A Practical Guide to Doing It Better)

The first big lesson of these approaches is that:

Use is independent of the assessment methodology used, or the purpose of the assessment.

The second big lesson of these approaches is that:

Enhancing use is about the process for making decisions about these issues in collaboration with an identified group of primary users and focusing on their intended needs

A reference for realist evaluation approaches:

Pawson and Tilley (2004, appendix A) -
[www.ccsr.ac.uk/methods/publications/documents/
RMPmethods2.pdf](http://www.ccsr.ac.uk/methods/publications/documents/RMPmethods2.pdf)

A checklist of issues to consider in UFE
approaches-

[http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/archive_checklists/u
fe.pdf](http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/archive_checklists/u
fe.pdf)

Issue 4

A constructive approach to the costing of assessment

- accuracy and precision and the concepts of 'good enough' and risk
- money available
- feasibility and capacity

Issue 5

Evidence of results is the key demand

Evidence of performance against results frameworks can't deliver credible evidence of this across a portfolio (the challenges of aggregation and also the lack of a counterfactual)

- Could the members commission evaluations to meet this demand?
- Yes, but only at great cost (Global Fund example)
- Governance implications and concerns on TCs

- Strengthening the ability of MOs to provide credible evidence is the only cost-effectiveness approach.
- But why not leave it to EvalNet?
- Because not a priority of EvalNet