Scorecard: Output reporting and accessibility

UNICEF
1.92 / 4

3.1 / 4 – Output accessibility
- Is project-level data centralized and accessible?

0.3 / 4 – Ease of extraction
- Are project-level reports standardized and available in open formats?

3.0 / 4 – Output reporting clarity
- How frequently and consistently are outputs reported?

0.4 / 4 – Output Dataset Transparency
- Are tabular and/ or spatial datasets gathered and available?

2.8 / 4 – Output Reporting System
- Are there project-level reporting policies in place?

* Scores based on one-country sample (Ghana)

Comparison with other scored organizations

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

Next steps/ suggested improvements:
1. 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 [Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System (GEROS) scorecard](#) or the tools and templates referenced in [Table III-1 of the M&E guide](#)

2. Foment closer relationships with implementing partners for the planning and execution of results reporting
    a. UNICEF states that government officials and UNICEF staff are to agree on a monitoring plan at the inception/planning phase of each program or project. This flexibility means the public does not have a good sense of the who, when, and how of the UNICEF monitoring system. By engaging more actively with implementing partners to monitor projects, UNICEF would uphold its dedication to accountability in its [transparency policy](#)
3. Use more precise language to report results
    a. UNICEF sometimes uses vague, unquantified language, such as "approximately 12.8 million long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs) were distributed" or "The RHT moved forward training materials were developed and nearly every volunteer (approximately 3,600) received training.
    b. The most useful outputs are exactly quantified and leave no doubt about the actor or actors responsible for their achievement.
4. Upload documentation of for all project materials in open formats (e.g. .txt, .docx, .csv)

Subcomponent breakdown and justifications:

Category	Component	Score	Discussion
Monitoring Data Accessibility	Site Stability	3	At infrequent points through multiple visits to the site over the course of 4 months, the team experienced slow load times and broken resource links in policies and guides.
	Site Navigability	2	UNICEF's website is somewhat difficult to navigate due to the splitting of information between a top banner that contains subpage dropdown categories and a bottom banner that maintains hard links. In addition, we cannot locate a page or portal through which users can generate a list of all programs and projects. Instead, the user must make this list based on which evaluations are in the UNEG Evaluation Database (http://www.uneval.org/evaluation/reports) or the individual country pages (http://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/index_13510.html). This leads to a concern that we may have missed certain activities, whether currently open or closed, which have not undergone an evaluation yet.
	Central Portal or Site	4	All project documents are available through the UNEG Evaluation Database (http://www.uneval.org/evaluation/reports) or the individual country pages (http://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/index_13510.html)
Ease of Automatic Monitoring Data Extraction	Use of Open Formats	0	All projects in our sample offer documentation exclusively in .pdf format.
	Distribution of Monitoring Template to Project Teams	1	We found no monitoring datasets for any projects in our sample. However, from Table III-1 in the M&E guide (http://preval.org/documentos/00473.pdf), it appears certain country offices may have developed and distributed monitoring templates and tools. This evidence is weak, however, as we cannot find these templates and tools on the UNICEF site, nor are they used in the documentation of the projects and programs in our sample

	Use of Standardized Monitoring Template	0	None of the projects in our sample used a standardized monitoring template.
Monitoring and Reporting Clarity	Legibility of Results Documentation	4	All documents are available on websites or in .pdf format; no scanned forms exist
	Completeness of Monitoring Reporting	4	Monitoring data found for all (100%) of the projects in our sample.
	Internal Consistency with Results Terminology	2	Though UNICEF's use of the terms "output" and "outcome" often aligns with the definitions in the RBM guide, UNICEF sometimes misues language, such as naming in the same document "20,000 teachers trained" as an outcome, and "% of schools certified as HIV alert" as an output.
	Precision of Monitoring Reporting	2	Though UNICEF's monitoring data are often precise, UNICEF frequently uses imprecise or unquantified language that left exact values and responsible parties unclear, such as, "approximately 12.8 million long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs) were distribute" or "The RHT moved forward training materials were developed and nearly every volunteer (approximately 3,600) received training."
Monitoring Dataset Transparency	Availability of Monitoring Datasets	0	We found no monitoring datasets for any projects in our sample. Though UNICEF does release some information in database format through its Transparency Portal (http://open.unicef.org/), this information is largely budgetary in nature, and does not contain project-level monitoring data.
	Accessibility of Monitoring Datasets	0	We found no monitoring datasets for any projects in our sample.
	Availability of Monitoring Spatial Data	1	Of the projects in our sample 2/8 (25%) geographically disaggregate results. Of these 2, 1 (50%) disaggregates at the regional level, and 1 (50%) at the district level. We could not find any GIS/georeferencing policy on the WFP site, nor any sections in WFP 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 2/8 (25%) geographically disaggregate results. Of these 2, 1 (50%) disaggregates at the regional level, and 1 (50%) at the district level.
Monitoring and Reporting System	Standardized Terminology	4	UNICEF outlines its results terminology in the "Understanding Results Based Programme Planning and Management" guide (http://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/RBM_Guide_20September2003.pdf). Complimentary definitions and further explanations can be found in the "UNICEF Guide for Monitoring and Evaluation" (http://preval.org/documentos/00473.pdf)
	Monitoring and Reporting Policy or Framework	2	According to the M&E guide (http://preval.org/documentos/00473.pdf), "During programme and project planning, government officials and UNICEF staff should ensure that each programme and project has specific objectives and time frames and that adequate provision is made for monitoring progress. The monitoring plan should specify who will collect what information, for what purpose, in what form, when and how it will be used, and ensure that it should strengthen existing monitoring systems." Though we cannot fault UNICEF for its project-by-project monitoring policy, UNICEF makes it difficult to assess the inner workings of its monitoring system by providing no further information about the who, how, and when of its monitoring mechanisms.

	Free Public Access to Monitoring Information Policy	2	UNICEF asserts its commitment to transparency in its Information disclosure policy (http://www.unicef.org/about/legal_disclosure.html). Though this document asserts that evaluative materials are to be made public, the policy does not explain what monitoring information or data, if any, must also be made public.