

Scorecard: Output reporting and accessibility

DFATD

2.4 / 4

2.5 / 4 – Output accessibility

- Is project-level data centralized and accessible?

3.2 / 4 – Ease of extraction

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

3.3 / 4 – Output reporting clarity

- How frequently and consistently are outputs reported?

0.2 / 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

<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>
DFATD	2.4
<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. Upload more monitoring reports (e.g. [Performance Measurement Frameworks](#) and [Logic Models](#)) to the site (currently none of the documentation for any of the projects in our sample included a PCR)

2. Include precise, quantified monitoring data in project reporting; currently, only 22% of all projects include monitoring data in their documentation.
 - a. Even projects that include monitoring data sometimes use vague language. For example: "Over 3,300 community groups attended maternal, newborn and child health and gender equality sessions."
3. Upload monitoring data to the [Open Data Portal](#). Currently, the contained information in the portal does not seem to include monitoring datasets.
4. Include geospatial information in project documentation. Only one project of our total sample of 131 (0.8%) disaggregates outputs geographically.

Subcomponent breakdown and justifications:

Category	Component	Score	Discussion
Monitoring Data Accessibility	Site Stability	1	At many points through multiple visits to the site over the course of 4 months, the team experienced broken links. Hyperlinks to project pages would stop working suddenly, only to resume functionality days later. The team also experienced improper rerouting and slow load times at times. These issues may be due to the fact the site is currently transitioning to another domain.
	Site Navigability	2	The central project documentation portal is not searchable or sortable (http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/cidaweb/cpo.nsf/fWebCSAZEn?ReadForm&idx=00&CC=GH#countryonly), making it difficult to find some project documentation.
	Central Portal or Site	4	All documentation is available through a central portal (http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/cidaweb/cpo.nsf/fWebCAZEn?ReadForm)
Ease of Automatic Monitoring Data Extraction	Use of Open Formats	4	All project information found through separated pages on the DFATD site is offered in .html format.
	Distribution of Monitoring Template to Project Teams	4	DFATD offers a standardized monitoring template in the form of the Performance Measurement Framework (PMF) (http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/INET/IMAGES.NSF/vLUIImages/Results-basedManagement/\$file/RBM_PMF-DEF-eng.pdf). They also offer a Logic Model template (http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/INET/IMAGES.NSF/vLUIImages/Results-basedManagement/\$file/RBM-LM-TEMPLATE-eng.rtf). DFATD also provides a non-output oriented template in the form of an Investment Risk Register template (http://www.international.gc.ca/development-developpement/assets/office_docs/partners-partenaires/bt-oa/RBM-RISK-TOOL-eng.rtf).
	Use of Standardized Monitoring Template	0	Though DFATD offers 2 templates, the PMF and the Logic Model, none of the projects in our sample (0%) use this same format to report results.
Monitoring and Reporting Clarity	Legibility of Results Documentation	4	All project information found through separated pages on the DFATD site is offered in .html format.
	Completeness of Monitoring Reporting	2	No outputs were found in the documentation for 102/131 (78%) of all projects in our sample.

	Internal Consistency with Results Terminology	4	Though our sample size of reported results for DFATD is small because results are usually described in documentation generally as "results" and not disaggregated as "outputs" and "outcomes," in the cases in which those terms are used, reported outputs and outcomes seem to conform to their internal definition.
	Precision of Monitoring Reporting	3	Monitoring data are mostly precisely quantified, but sometimes, DFATD uses vague terminology, such as reporting that, "over 3,300 community groups attended maternal, newborn and child health and gender equality sessions."
Monitoring Dataset Transparency	Availability of Monitoring Datasets	0	Though DFATD offers some project data through its Open Data Portal (http://open.canada.ca/en/open-data), the contained information does not seem to include monitoring datasets. Further, we could not locate any policies indicating that project managers must track and/or report monitoring information in dataset format.
	Accessibility of Monitoring Datasets	0	Though DFATD offers some project data through its Open Data Portal (http://open.canada.ca/en/open-data), the contained information does not seem to include monitoring datasets.
	Availability of Monitoring Spatial Data	0	Only one project of our total sample of 131 (0.8%) disaggregate outputs geographically. Further, we could not find any GIS/georeferencing policy on the DFATD site, nor any sections in DFATD manuals that discuss the need for project managers to track and report spatial data.
	Accessibility of Monitoring Spatial Data	1	Only 1 project in our sample of 131 (0.8%) geographically disaggregated outputs. This is 1/29 (3%) of projects that do report outputs. For another 4 (14% of the output-reporting subsample, or 3% of the entire sample) report only the count of geographic units, but not their specific names. For example, one project page notes that, "265 beneficiary communities in 24 districts, comprising 205,000 people including school children, were selected in the three Northern Regions for the provision of sanitation and water facilities." No information about which specific communities or districts these are can be found, which means we cannot count these as geographically disaggregated.
Monitoring and Reporting System	Standardized Terminology	4	Logic Model Terms and Definitions here (http://www.international.gc.ca/development-developpement/assets/pdfs/partners-partenaires/bt-oa/RBM-Logic_Model_Def-Eng.pdf). Examples here (http://www.international.gc.ca/development-developpement/partners-partenaires/bt-oa/rbm_tools-gar_outils.aspx?lang=eng)
	Monitoring and Reporting Policy or Framework	2	DFATD offers a variety of reporting guidelines. However, many of the guidelines that provide the most information were published nearly a decade ago, and therefore will not reflect any organizational changes made in accordance with the new open data commitment. Take, for example, the "RBM Tools at CIDA: How-to Guide," published in 2008, which is among the most comprehensive of documents. Further, these documents lack clear division of duties and a setting of an organization-wide standard. Passages are ambiguous and leave us with questions about who should monitor and report data, and when. From this same guide: "For most CIDA investments, CIDA staff will share this responsibility with a variety of other actors including partners, executing agencies (EAs) and even beneficiaries. It is important to note, however, that CIDA is ultimately responsible for tracking the overall performance of an investment and for reporting on that performance on an annual basis. Often, the EA will be responsible for collecting the information on performance indicators and providing it in the form of reports to CIDA. The CIDA project officer will be responsible for the review and validation of those reports." A second guide, "Results-based Management in CIDA: An Introductory Guide to the Concepts and Principles," published in 1999, notes that, "It is the responsibility of the CIDA Program/Project Manager and his/her team to define the most appropriate approach to measure and monitor program/project performance."

			(http://cida-ecco.org/CIDARoadMap/RoadMapEnvoy/documents/RBM%20Intro%20Guidenew.html)
	Free Public Access to Monitoring Information Policy	2	DFATD makes some commitments to transparency and public data access through a series of policies (http://www.international.gc.ca/development-developpement/aidtransparency-transparenceaide/index.aspx?lang=eng) including its joining of IATI and launch of the Open Data Portal (http://open.canada.ca/en). However, we could not find an official document that clearly establishes which specific monitoring data DFATD must make publically available, and which data may not be released to the public.