

Scorecard: Output reporting and accessibility

AfDB

2.04 / 4

2.8 / 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?

2.8 / 4 – Output reporting clarity

- How frequently and consistently are outputs reported?

0.0 / 4 – Output Dataset Transparency

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

3.4 / 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>
<i>IFAD</i>	<i>2.16</i>
<i>JICA</i>	<i>2.14</i>
AfDB	2.04
<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. Streamline operations information contained in the “Project Portfolio” and “Projects and Operations” subsections of the site
 - a. At the present, information in these subsections is inconsistent

- b. For example, searching for agriculture projects in Ghana through the "Project Portfolio" database of the "Projects & Operations" subsection returns only 3 results, but searching for the same through the "Projects & Operations" database of the "Documents" subsection
2. Upload more monitoring reports (e.g. [Project Completion Reports](#)) to the site (currently none of the documentation for any of the projects in our sample included a PCR)
3. 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 server errors and extremely slow load times
	Site Navigability	1	Basic search and filter functionality, such as the ability to select multiple sectors, statuses, and financial sources is missing from the central portal. Further, the information for projects and operations is inconsistent through the site. Searching for agriculture projects in Ghana through the "Project Portfolio" database of the "Projects & Operations" subsection returns only 3 results, but searching for the same through the "Projects & Operations" database of the "Documents" subsection returns many more. Project and operations documents are scattered through the site in 3 subsections with non-intuitive titles: "Projects & Operations", "Documents", and "Knowledge." Spreading seemingly related documentation through 3 subsections makes it difficult to gather all needed information in one search, and can result in researchers accidentally missing key information.
	Central Portal or Site	4	All project documents available through central portal (http://www.afdb.org/en/projects-and-operations/project-portfolio/)
Ease of Automatic Monitoring Data Extraction	Use of Open Formats	0	No projects (0%) offer documentation in open formats; all project documents available only in PDF format
	Distribution of Monitoring Template to Project Teams	4	AfDB offers a toolkit of standardized output templates including the project completion report (http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Project-and-Operations/PCR%20Format%20for%20Policy%20Base%20Operations.pdf), and annual review document. AfDB also provides a manual on how to fill out PCRs (http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Policy-Documents/PCR_-_Staff_Guidance_3_.pdf)
	Use of Standardized Monitoring Template	0	None of the documentation for any of the 8 projects in our sample (0%) included a PCR, AfDB's standardized output template
Monitoring and Reporting Clarity	Legibility of Results Documentation	4	Output documents for all projects are available as .pdf files; no scanned forms exist
	Completeness of Monitoring Reporting	1	In spite of AfDB's stated commitment to transparency laid out in the Disclosure and Access to Information policy (http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Policy-Documents/DAI%20Staff%20Handbook.pdf), only 2/8 (25%) of all projects contain output information. Of these, one project only has one output, "Number of strategy forum attendees," and the other project's outputs are mostly simple counts of operations components. This limited output information does not tell much about the actual ongoing of the projects.

	Internal Consistency with Results Terminology	4	The official definition of output in the M&E Glossary (http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Evaluation-Reports-_Shared-With-OPEV_/Arabic%20Glossary%20of%20the%20Key%20Terms%20in%20Ev..pdf) is "The products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes." Though the word "output" is rarely used in project documentation, when it is used, it conforms to this definition.
	Precision of Monitoring Reporting	2	Though sometimes outputs are precisely reported, in other cases, AfDB relies on vague language, such as "reaching around 2000 hectares" and "efficacy is unsatisfactory."
Monitoring Dataset Transparency	Availability of Monitoring Datasets	0	Project documents do not include any standardized or semi-standardized output tables or datasets that could serve as evidence that AfDB records outputs in dataset format. Further, no AfDB policies include mention that project teams should report outputs in dataset format.
	Accessibility of Monitoring Datasets	0	Project documents do not include any standardized or semi-standardized output tables or datasets.
	Availability of Monitoring Spatial Data	0	No projects (0%) disaggregate outputs geographically. Further, we could not find any GIS/georeferencing policy on the AfDB site, nor any sections in AfDB 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. Further, we could not find any GIS/georeferencing policy on the AfDB site, nor any sections in AfDB manuals that discuss the need for project managers to track and report spatial data.
Monitoring and Reporting System	Standardized Terminology	4	Glossary of M&E Terms (http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Evaluation-R)
	Monitoring and Reporting Policy or Framework	2	The Revised Note on PCRs and PPERs (http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Evaluation-Reports-_Shared-With-OPEV_/00157887-EN-2001-REVISED-EVALUATION-GUIDELINES.PDF) includes some information about who should fill out these two M&E documents, and how. However, it is missing key information about when in the project cycle results data are tracked and reported.
	Free Public Access to Monitoring Information Policy	4	AfDB's states its commitment to transparency in the Disclosure and Access to Information policy (http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Policy-Documents/DAI%20Staff%20Handbook.pdf)