

## Scorecard: Output reporting and accessibility

MCC

**2.62** / 4

### 3.4 / 4 – Output accessibility

- Is project-level data centralized and accessible?

### 1.2 / 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?

### 1.5 / 4 – Output Dataset Transparency

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

### 4.0 / 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>
<b>PEPFAR</b>	<b>3.32</b>
<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>
<i>IFAD</i>	<i>2.16</i>
<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. Make all submitted [Information Tracking Tables \(ITT\)](#) publicly available. Though the [ITT Guidance Document states](#), "As part of the Open Data Initiative, MCC will post Indicator Tracking Tables to the public website. The

- ITTs will be posted in a machine readable format," we could not locate any ITTs on MCC's site to confirm that they contain outputs.
2. Similarly, publicly publish all the Quarterly Disbursement Request and Reporting Package (QDRP) submitted through MCC MIS.
  3. Report geospatial information for all projects at the most local level possible; currently, none of the projects in our sample report geographic information at the subnational level.
  4. Continue to submit datasets to the [Open Data portal](#), and begin to publish project level monitoring data to this portal.
  5. Upload documentation in open formats (e.g. .txt, .docx, .csv)

### Subcomponent breakdown and justifications:

Category	Component	Score	Discussion
Monitoring Data Accessibility	Site Stability	3	At very infrequent points through multiple visits to the site over the course of 4 months, the team experienced server errors and extremely slow load times
	Site Navigability	3	The Evaluation Catalog is easy to search, sort, and filter. Unfortunately, this Evaluation Catalog is not linked through one of the main menu/subsection dropdowns, but rather only in far smaller print on the bottom banner of the site. Improvements could be made to make subsections more intuitive, such as providing the subsections of "News & Events" and "Blogs" different names so as to eliminate confusion about the specific information to be found in each.
	Central Portal or Site	4	All documentation available through the Evaluation Catalog ( <a href="https://data.mcc.gov/evaluations/index.php/catalog">https://data.mcc.gov/evaluations/index.php/catalog</a> )
Ease of Automatic Monitoring Data Extraction	Use of Open Formats	0	Project documentation is only offered in .pdf and .dta formats, both of which are not open
	Distribution of Monitoring Template to Project Teams	4	MCC's ITT ( <a href="https://www.mcc.gov/resources/doc/guidance-on-the-indicator-tracking-table">https://www.mcc.gov/resources/doc/guidance-on-the-indicator-tracking-table</a> ) is a standardized output template that, as of 2013, all teams are required to submit through the MCC MIS. The template is here, ( <a href="https://assets.mcc.gov/data/sample-indicator-tracking-table.xls">https://assets.mcc.gov/data/sample-indicator-tracking-table.xls</a> ), and a detailed manual on how to fill out and submit the ITT is here ( <a href="https://www.mcc.gov/resources/doc/guidance-on-the-indicator-tracking-table">https://www.mcc.gov/resources/doc/guidance-on-the-indicator-tracking-table</a> )
	Use of Standardized Monitoring Template	0	Though we have evidence that a standardized template does exist in the form of the ITT, project documents do not include any standardized or semi-standardized output tables or datasets.
Monitoring and Reporting Clarity	Legibility of Results Documentation	4	Output documents for all projects are available as .pdf or .dta files; no scanned forms exist
	Completeness of Monitoring Reporting	2	Though MCC lays out a policy of data openness and IATI submission in its Transparency Policy ( <a href="https://assets.mcc.gov/reports/paper-2015001163301-principles-transparency.pdf">https://assets.mcc.gov/reports/paper-2015001163301-principles-transparency.pdf</a> ), in practice, only 1 out of 2 projects (50%) contains output information.
	Internal Consistency with Results Terminology	4	Though our sample size is small for MCC, reported outputs seem to conform to the internal definition of "These indicators directly measure Project Activities. They describe and quantify the goods and services produced directly by the implementation of an Activity."

	Precision of Monitoring Reporting	2	Though many outputs are precisely quantified, in 1 out of our 2 included projects, the final evaluation, which was written after the actual project implementation period, contains no quantified outputs, instead reporting results using vague like "about 336 km of feeder roads in eight (8) districts in two intervention zones are to be rehabilitated."
Monitoring Dataset Transparency	Availability of Monitoring Datasets	3	MCC's Disaggregated Results Data dataset ( <a href="https://inventory.data.gov/dataset/b7e0d1e8-489d-4d73-a46a-3952b86945ca/resource/6d5aee6f-d1ba-4391-8025-caaba9e9bf0b/download/indicators-disagg-20160309.csv">https://inventory.data.gov/dataset/b7e0d1e8-489d-4d73-a46a-3952b86945ca/resource/6d5aee6f-d1ba-4391-8025-caaba9e9bf0b/download/indicators-disagg-20160309.csv</a> ) is a full dataset of results, disaggregated by quarter, year, country, and project. However, it is unclear how comprehensive the output data are, and if all teams are required to report their data for display in this dataset. Further, according to the Guidance on the Indicator Tracking Table (ITT) ( <a href="https://www.mcc.gov/resources/doc/guidance-on-the-indicator-tracking-table">https://www.mcc.gov/resources/doc/guidance-on-the-indicator-tracking-table</a> ), all project teams must use the standardized ITT dataset to report results to HQ along with the Quarterly Disbursement Request and Reporting Package (QDRP) through MCC MIS. Though the policy states that "Additionally, as part of the Open Data Initiative, MCC will post Indicator Tracking Tables to the public website. The ITTs will be posted in a machine readable format," we could not locate any ITTs on MCC's site to confirm that they contain outputs.
	Accessibility of Monitoring Datasets	2	MCC's Disaggregated Results Data dataset ( <a href="https://inventory.data.gov/dataset/b7e0d1e8-489d-4d73-a46a-3952b86945ca/resource/6d5aee6f-d1ba-4391-8025-caaba9e9bf0b/download/indicators-disagg-20160309.csv">https://inventory.data.gov/dataset/b7e0d1e8-489d-4d73-a46a-3952b86945ca/resource/6d5aee6f-d1ba-4391-8025-caaba9e9bf0b/download/indicators-disagg-20160309.csv</a> ) is a full dataset of results, disaggregated by quarter, year, country, and project. However, it is unclear how comprehensive the output data are, and if all teams are required to report their data for display in this dataset. Further, according to the Guidance on the Indicator Tracking Table (ITT) ( <a href="https://www.mcc.gov/resources/doc/guidance-on-the-indicator-tracking-table">https://www.mcc.gov/resources/doc/guidance-on-the-indicator-tracking-table</a> ), all project teams must use the standardized ITT dataset to report results to HQ along with the Quarterly Disbursement Request and Reporting Package (QDRP) through MCC MIS. Though the policy states that "Additionally, as part of the Open Data Initiative, MCC will post Indicator Tracking Tables to the public website. The ITTs will be posted in a machine readable format," we could not locate any ITTs on MCC's site to confirm that they contain outputs.
	Availability of Monitoring Spatial Data	0	No projects (0%) disaggregate outputs geographically. Further, we could not find any GIS/georeferencing policy on the MCC site, nor any sections in MCC manuals that discuss the need for project managers to track and report spatial data.
	Accessibility of Monitoring Spatial Data	0	No projects (0%) disaggregate outputs geographically.
	Standardized Terminology	4	Terminology listed in M&E policy ( <a href="https://assets.mcc.gov/guidance/policy-050112-monitoring-and-evaluation.pdf">https://assets.mcc.gov/guidance/policy-050112-monitoring-and-evaluation.pdf</a> )
Monitoring and Reporting System	Monitoring and Reporting Policy or Framework	4	General tracking and reporting guidelines found in the M&E policy ( <a href="https://assets.mcc.gov/guidance/policy-050112-monitoring-and-evaluation.pdf">https://assets.mcc.gov/guidance/policy-050112-monitoring-and-evaluation.pdf</a> ), with country-specific plans here ( <a href="https://www.mcc.gov/our-impact/m-and-e">https://www.mcc.gov/our-impact/m-and-e</a> ). These documents explain the who, what, how, and when of output monitoring and reporting
	Free Public Access to Monitoring Information Policy	4	MCC lays out a policy of data openness and IATI submission in its Transparency Policy ( <a href="https://assets.mcc.gov/reports/paper-2015001163301-principles-transparency.pdf">https://assets.mcc.gov/reports/paper-2015001163301-principles-transparency.pdf</a> )