

Scorecard: Output reporting and accessibility

DFID

3.26 / 4

3.7 / 4 – Output accessibility

- Is project-level data centralized and accessible?

3.7 / 4 – Ease of extraction

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

2.7 / 4 – Output reporting clarity

- How frequently and consistently are outputs reported?

2.2 / 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>
<i>PEPFAR</i>	<i>3.32</i>
DFID	3.26
<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. Brief project management teams on official results terminology to ensure consistency in project documentation

- a. DFID [defines outcomes](#) as "the specific, direct deliverables of the project. These will provide the conditions necessary to achieve the Outcome." In project documentation, agriculture outputs are often listed as policy changes or progress made by Ministries, Departments, and Agencies (MDAs), for example the percent of MDAs from each region that produced APRs, though DFID would define any such policy change as an "outcome" because it is not a direct deliverable of the project team. Similarly, reported health outputs are often actually patient- or clinic-driven outcomes such as "improved mental health" or "increased contraceptives uptake," which would not be considered outputs by DFID's definition.
2. Use standardized output reporting templates such as the [Logical Framework](#). According to [DFID's policies](#), output information is to be reported in this standardized database format for all projects whose budgets exceed 1m GBP. However, in practice, only 15/24 (63%) of projects have any publicly available documentation, and only 9/24 (38%) have logframes publicly available. Of the 9 logframes, only 7 (78%) contain output information as defined by RDI. That means that only 7/24 (29%) of projects report outputs in dataset format.
3. Include geospatial information in project documentation. Only 2/24 (8.3%) of total projects disaggregate at least one output geographically. Of these 2, one is disaggregated at the regional level, and the other at the town/city level.

Subcomponent breakdown and justifications:

Category	Component	Score	Discussion
Monitoring Data Accessibility	Site Stability	4	At no point through multiple visits to the site over the course of 4 months did the team experience an interruption like server error or missing page
	Site Navigability	3	The central DFID site does not operate on a standalone basis, but rather as a subsection of the general UK.gov site (https://www.gov.uk/). This can lead to some confusion when using the site to search for DFID-specific information, as the search bar returns results from the entire UK.gov site, and not just the DFID section. Searching for project reporting guidelines, for example, returned hundreds of irrelevant results from non-DFID subsections. Further, the "Publications" page only allows for limited filter options. Project documentation is relatively easy to search through the Development Tracker portal (https://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/location/country), though this portal lacks year filter functionality. While the DFID website is largely clean and its subsections well labeled, there is room for improvement of the search and filter functionalities.
	Central Portal or Site	4	All project documents available through central portal (https://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/countries/GH/projects)
Ease of Automatic	Use of Open Formats	4	Nearly all project documentation exists in .odt or .xlsx format. Some documentation only available in .pdf

Monitoring Data Extraction	Distribution of Monitoring Template to Project Teams	4	DFID offers a toolkit of standardized output templates includes including the logical framework, project description document, project completion report, and annual review document.
	Use of Standardized Monitoring Template	2.5	We failed to find any documentation for 9/24 total projects (38%); however, all projects that do have documentation make use of the standardized documents in the toolkit.
Monitoring and Reporting Clarity	Legibility of Results Documentation	4	Output documents for all documents are available as .odt, .xlsx, or .pdf files; no scanned forms exist
	Completeness of Monitoring Reporting	2	In spite of an institutional commitment to releasing output information to enhance agency-wide accountability (https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/360906/DFID-external-results-Sep_2014.pdf , https://data.gov.uk/sites/default/files/DFID%20Open%20Data%20Strategy_10.pdf), and a Research for Development (R4D) portal that should house databases and a reported 30,000 outputs (http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/Output/212674/Default.aspx), outputs only found in the documentation for 10/24 (42%) of all projects
	Internal Consistency with Results Terminology	1	DFID defines outcomes as "the specific, direct deliverables of the project. These will provide the conditions necessary to achieve the Outcome." In project documentation, agriculture outputs are often listed as policy changes or progress made by Ministries, Departments, and Agencies (MDAs), for example the percent of MDAs from each region that produced APRs, though DFID would define any such policy change as an "outcome" because it is not a direct deliverable of the project team. Similarly, reported health outputs are often actually patient- or clinic-driven outcomes such as "improved mental health" or "increased contraceptives uptake," which would not be considered outputs by DFID's definition.
	Precision of Monitoring Reporting	3	Outputs are mostly reported using exact, precise terms including counts and percentages. Sometimes, project documentation reports outcomes using ambiguous, unquantified language. A project involving LLIN distribution, for example, notes that 89% of households in one region received a net, without including a count of total number of households in the sample nor a count of total number of houses that received a net.
Monitoring Dataset Transparency	Availability of Monitoring Datasets	4	DFID makes public project output datasets in the form of the "Logical Framework," whose template is publically available (https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwjfuLqe8prMAhWEND4KHdEiDdUQFggqMAI&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.gov.uk%2Fgovernment%2Fuploads%2Fsyste%2Fuploads%2Fattachment_data%2Ffile%2F267196%2FGPAF-logical-framework-template-1.xls&usq=AFQjCNEkQS6w5gSKT5nPAhdyj7WrWZw&bvm=bv.119745492,d.cWw). DFID also provides a thorough guide for project managers on how to fill out this dataset (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dfid-how-to-note-guidance-on-using-the-revised-logical-framework). This guide notes that project managers must complete a full Logframe for any project whose budget exceeds 1m GBP, and a shortened logframe for projects under 1m GBP. Full evidence exists that output datasets exist, and are even required for all projects.
	Accessibility of Monitoring Datasets	2	According to DFID's policies, output information is to be reported in standardized database format for all projects through the "Logical Framework." However, in practice, only 15/24 (63%) of projects have any publically available documentation, and only 9/24 (38%) have logframes publically available. Of the 9 logframes, only 7 (78%) contain output information as defined by RDI. That means that only 7/24 (29%) of projects

			report outputs in dataset format.
	Availability of Monitoring Spatial Data	1	Only 2/24 (8.3%) of total projects disaggregate at least one output geographically. Further, we could not find any GIS/georeferencing policy on the DFID site, nor any sections in DFID M&E manuals that discuss the need for project managers to track and report spatial data.
	Accessibility of Monitoring Spatial Data	1	Only 2/24 (8.3%) of total projects disaggregate at least one output geographically. Of these 2, one is disaggregated at the regional level, and the other at the town/city level.
Monitoring and Reporting System	Standardized Terminology	4	Results terminology (https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/253889/using-revised-logical-framework-external.pdf)
	Monitoring and Reporting Policy or Framework	4	Results Framework (https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/360906/DFID-external-results-Sep_2014.pdf)
	Free Public Access to Monitoring Information Policy	4	DFID made an institutional commitment to releasing output information to enhance agency-wide accountability in 2014 (https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/360906/DFID-external-results-Sep_2014.pdf , https://data.gov.uk/s