

Scorecard: Output reporting and accessibility

IFAD

2.16 / 4

2.5 / 4 – Output accessibility

- Is project-level data centralized and accessible?

0.7 / 4 – Ease of extraction

- Are project-level reports standardized and available in open formats?

3.5 / 4 – Output reporting clarity

- How frequently and consistently are outputs reported?

1.0 / 4 – Output Dataset Transparency

- Are tabular and/ or spatial datasets gathered and available?

3.1 / 4 – Output Reporting System

- Are there project-level reporting policies in place?

* Scores based on one-country sample (Ghana)

Comparison with other scored organizations

<i>First round of scores complete</i>	
<i>World Bank</i>	<i>3.36</i>
<i>PEPFAR</i>	<i>3.32</i>
<i>DFID</i>	<i>3.26</i>
<i>MCC</i>	<i>2.62</i>
<i>USAID</i>	<i>2.6</i>
<i>DFATD</i>	<i>2.4</i>
<i>Global Fund</i>	<i>2.3</i>
<i>UNDP</i>	<i>2.28</i>
<i>WFP</i>	<i>2.22</i>
IFAD	2.16
<i>JICA</i>	<i>2.14</i>
<i>AfDB</i>	<i>2.04</i>
<i>DANIDA</i>	<i>2.02</i>
<i>UNICEF</i>	<i>1.92</i>
<i>WHO</i>	<i>1.42</i>
<i>FAO</i>	<i>0.94</i>

Next steps/ suggested improvements:

1. Stabilize the website. At frequent points through multiple visits to the site over the course of 4 months, the team experienced missing pages and broken links. This is especially problematic because as of 06/01/2016, both the

- [Ghana page](#) and the [Operations page](#) have been down for an extended period, so the team cannot access any IFAD project documentation
2. Create standardized monitoring templates and encourage all project teams to use these templates in their project reporting to encourage standardization across the organization. A good start to creating this template would be the dataset-style "Physical progress measured against AWP&B, including RIMS indicators," section found in Supervision Reports.
 3. Report geospatial information for all projects at the most local level possible; currently, only 8% of the projects with monitoring data geographically disaggregate results. This accounts for just 6%) of total projects in our sample.
 4. Upload documentation in open formats (e.g. .txt, .docx, .csv)

Subcomponent breakdown and justifications:

Category	Component	Score	Discussion
Monitoring Data Accessibility	Site Stability	1	At frequent points through multiple visits to the site over the course of 4 months, the team experienced missing pages and broken links. This is especially problematic because as of 5/24/2016, both the Ghana page (https://operations.ifad.org/web/ifad/operations/country/home/tags/ghana) and the Operations page (https://www.ifad.org/operations) are broken, so the team cannot access any IFAD project documentation
	Site Navigability	2	IFAD's site is somewhat difficult to navigate because its subpages do not work on a series of dropdown links, but rather direct links to the most popular resources in each section (the resources in the grey box at the bottom of each subpage). That is, users can only find these resources, but not navigate directly to the specific resources for which they are searching.
	Central Portal or Site	4	IFAD does usually have a central page for project documentation (https://www.ifad.org/operations), but the page remains broken as of 05/24/2016.
Ease of Automatic Monitoring Data Extraction	Use of Open Formats	0	Documentation for all projects is available only in .pdf format.
	Distribution of Monitoring Template to Project Teams	1	The only semi-standardized section found throughout project documentation is a dataset-style "Physical progress measured against AWP&B, including RIMS indicators," found in the Supervision Reports. These Supervision Reports are available for 3/16 (19%) of the projects in our sample. Due to the low rate of use of this template, we cannot be sure that projects teams ever directly receive the template form.
	Use of Standardized Monitoring Template	2	Of the projects in our sample that have monitoring data, 3/12 (25%) include a standardized monitoring table in their documentation, in the form of the "Physical progress measured against AWP&B, including RIMS indicators" table in Supervision Reports. This accounts for 3/16 (19%) of total projects in our sample. This project geographically disaggregates information at the district level.
Monitoring and Reporting Clarity	Legibility of Results Documentation	4	All documents are available in .pdf format; no scanned forms exist
	Completeness of Monitoring Reporting	3	Monitoring data not found for 4/16 (25%) of the projects in our sample.

	Internal Consistency with Results Terminology	4	Project documentation follows the terminology norms noted in the Glossary of M&E Concepts and Terms (https://www.ifad.org/documents/10180/a3273cac-71e5-497b-a363-8fff046a6fa6).
	Precision of Monitoring Reporting	3	Though IFAD often uses precise language to report results, IFAD sometimes uses vague, unquantified language. Examples include, "Cocoa output rose from less than 200,000 tonnes per annum at project start-up (1988) to well over 350,000 by project completion in 1998" and "A few farmers have experienced increased income through entry into certified seed production, though gains are unsure because of marketing constraints."
Monitoring Dataset Transparency	Availability of Monitoring Datasets	1	The only semi-standardized section found throughout project documentation is a dataset-style "Physical progress measured against AWP&B, including RIMS indicators," found in the Supervision Reports. These sheets are used for the actual tracking and reporting of monitoring data, but exist only as sections in the Supervision Report, and not as standalone documents. This provides some evidence that somewhere along the project chain, monitoring data may be recorded in dataset format. However, we could not find any references to such datasets in IFAD's policies and guidelines.
	Accessibility of Monitoring Datasets	1	The only semi-standardized section found throughout project documentation is a dataset-style "Physical progress measured against AWP&B, including RIMS indicators," found in the Supervision Reports. These sheets are used for the actual tracking and reporting of monitoring data, but exist only as sections in the .pdf Supervision Report, and not as standalone documents. Therefore, they are a step towards a dataset, but cannot be called a dataset. Further, Supervision Reports are available for 3/16 (19%) of the projects in out sample.
	Availability of Monitoring Spatial Data	1	Of the projects in our sample that have monitoring data, 1/12 (8%) geographically disaggregates results. This accounts for 1/16 (6%) of total projects in our sample. This project geographically disaggregates information at the district level. Further, we could not find any GIS/georeferencing policy on the IFAD site, nor any sections in IFAD manuals that discuss the need for project managers to track and report spatial data.
	Accessibility of Monitoring Spatial Data	1	Of the projects in our sample that have monitoring data, 1/12 (8%) geographically disaggregates results. This accounts for 1/16 (6%) of total projects in our sample. This project geographically disaggregates information at the district level.
Monitoring and Reporting System	Standardized Terminology	4	IFAD offers results definitions in its Glossary of M&E Concepts and Terms (https://www.ifad.org/documents/10180/a3273cac-71e5-497b-a363-8fff046a6fa6)
	Monitoring and Reporting Policy or Framework	3	IFAD offers a variety of M&E policies and guides that the monitoring of projects. These documents include "An overview of managing for development results at IFAD" (https://www.ifad.org/documents/10180/f53ed4cb-d4fe-42f6-b162-81beff5dddb24), "IFAD10 Results Measurement Framework (2016-2018)" (https://webapps.ifad.org/members/repl/10/3/docs/IFAD10-3-R-3.pdf), the "Evaluation Manual" (https://www.ifad.org/documents/10180/bfec198c-62fd-46ff-abae-285d0e0709d6), the "Evaluation Policy" (https://www.ifad.org/documents/10180/3360f12f-4750-4df4-93c3-7af62d8ee0e0), and "IFAD's Action Plan to improve its development effectiveness" (https://ifad.org/documents/10180/bc5cfd29-bf7b-45f4-af2d-9207d721f0f1). Though these resources provide thorough information about the why, when, and how of monitoring project results, they do not clearly delineate who is responsible for the actual tracking and reporting of data.
	Free Public Access to Monitoring	2	IFAD's Evaluation Policy (https://www.ifad.org/documents/10180/3360f12f-4750-4df4-93c3-7af62d8ee0e0) states that, "IOE shall ensure that all evaluation reports and

	Information Policy		other evaluation products are disclosed to the public and disseminated widely using electronic and other media." Though all of the evaluations in our sample do contain some monitoring data, it is not written in IFAD's policy that evaluation reports must contain specific monitoring data. Furthermore, the majority of monitoring data for our sample comes from Supervision Reports, which are not required to be made publically available.
--	--------------------	--	---