**Scorecard: Output reporting and accessibility**

| WFP |
| :---: |
| **2.22** / 4 |

**2.8** / 4 – Output accessibility
  - Is project-level data centralized and accessible?

**0.0** / 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?

**0.8** / 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**

| *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. Consolidate project information in the Operations Database and the Evaluation Library

a. Currently, the contained information does not match; as such, one or both of these pages must be out of date.  This inconsistency makes it difficult to generate an accurate and comprehensive project list
b. The site as a whole is difficult to navigate, with similar but not identical "Our Work" content split between a top and bottom banner.  The main page also lacks a clear path to the Evaluation Library
2. Encourage all project teams to follow the established monitoring policies and observe reporting timelines
    a. Monitoring and reporting procedures are laid out in detail in resources such as the "WFP M&E guidelines: What is RBM oriented M&E" manual and the "Purchase for Progress Monitoring Manual"
    b. In spite of this, only 60% of the projects in our sample contained monitoring information
3. Create standardized monitoring templates and encourage all project teams to use these templates in their project reporting to encourage standardization across the organization.  Currently, no projects in our sample use any standardized monitoring or reporting format
4. Track and publish geospatial information for all projects at the most local level possible.  Of the projects in our sample that have monitoring data, only one (33%) geographically disaggregates results.  This accounts for 20% of total projects in our sample.  This project disaggregates at the regional level.
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 infrequent points through multiple visits to the site over the course of 4 months, the team experienced missing pages and slow load times. |
| | Site Navigability | 1 | Similar to UNDP's and FAO's sites, WFP project lists and documentation systems are somewhat fragmented, making it difficult for users to quickly access agency-wide information in a quick, comprehensive matter.  The projects listed through the Operations Database and through the Evaluation Library do not match; as such, one or both of these pages must be out of date.  This inconsistency makes it difficult to ensure we have generated an accurate and comprehensive project list.  Furthermore, the WFP site as a whole is difficult to navigate, with similar but not identical "Our Work" content split between a top and bottom banner.  The main page also lacks a clear path to the Evaluations library.  Clear improvements could be made to the site to help users navigate to their intended information more efficiently, and to generate clearer information summaries once they arrive to those sections. |
| | Central Portal or Site | 4 | Project listings can be found in the Operations Database (https://www.wfp.org/operations/database), and evaluations may be found in the Evaluation Library (https://www.wfp.org/evaluation/list) |
| Ease of Automatic | Use of Open Formats | 0 | All projects in our sample offer documentation exclusively in .pdf format. |

| Monitoring Data Extraction | Distribution of Monitoring Template to Project Teams | 0 | No projects in our sample (0%) use any standardized monitoring or reporting format. Further, we could not locate any monitoring templates on the WFP site, nor in any WFP manuals |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Use of Standardized Monitoring Template | 0 | No projects in our sample (0%) use any standardized monitoring or reporting format |
| 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 | 3 | No monitoring data found for 2/5 (40%) of the projects in our sample. |
| | Internal Consistency with Results Terminology | 4 | WFP's language throughout project documentation is consistent with the language found in its terminology in its Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines (http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/ko/mekb_glossary.pdf).  The same information is found on the Glossary section of the WFP site (http://www.wfp.org/evaluation) |
| | Precision of Monitoring Reporting | 3 | Though monitoring data are often precise, WFP does occasionally use imprecise, vague, or unquantified language, such as "The RBM Impact Evaluation of the activity in 200454 noted that low coverage of the activity (about 6 per cent of pregnant and lactating women and 5 per cent of children under five years were reached) had resulted in negligible impact on malnutrition rates at district and regional level and recommended a rapid expansion of the programme in the most deprived districts." |
| Monitoring Dataset Transparency | Availability of Monitoring Datasets | 0 | Though WFP offers some general M&E report templates in its Guidelines for Operations Evaluations (http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/reports/wfp272112.pdf), none of these materials are specific to the tracking and reporting of monitoring data. Further, we found no monitoring datasets for any projects in our sample. |
| | Accessibility of Monitoring Datasets | 0 | We found no monitoring datasets for any projects in our sample. |
| | Availability of Monitoring Spatial Data | 2 | Of the projects in our sample that have monitoring data, 1/3 (33%) geographically disaggregates results.  This accounts for 1/5 (20%) of total projects in our sample.  This project disaggregates at the regional level. Further, 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 | 2 | Of the projects in our sample that have monitoring data, 1/3 (33%) geographically disaggregates results.  This accounts for 1/5 (20%) of total projects in our sample.  This project disaggregates at the regional level. |
| Monitoring and Reporting System | Standardized Terminology | 4 | WFP defines its terminology in its Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines (http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/ko/mekb_glossary.pdf).  The same information is found on the Glossary section of the WFP site (http://www.wfp.org/evaluation/methods-and-tools/glossary#o-en) |

| | Monitoring and Reporting Policy or Framework | 4 | WFP offers a plethora of information about monitoring and reporting procedures through its "WFP M&E guidelines: What is RBM oriented M&E" manual (http://seachangecop.org/node/3226). WFP further delineates the who, how, and when of monitoring and reporting in project-specific manuals, such as the "Purchase for Progress Monitoring Manual" (http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/reports/wfp229261.pdf) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Free Public Access to Monitoring Information Policy | 4 | WFP clearly outlines its access to information policy in its "Directive on Information Disclosure" (http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/newsroom/wfp220973.pdf). This document highlights both the information that will and will not made publicly available. |