Scorecard: Output reporting and accessibility

WHO
1.42 / 4

0.9 / 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?

3.1 / 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?

3.1 / 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. Stabilize the website. At frequent points through multiple visits to the site over the course of 4 months, the team experienced missing pages and broken links. Certain links misdirect: as of 06/03/2016, for example, the 'Alcohol'

report listed on Ghana's country page links to The Gambia's report (http://www.who.int/countries/gha/en/).

2. Create a centralized portal, database, or site through which all project documentation is made available and upload documentation for all projects to this location
   a. Currently, the main WHO site does not list projects by country. Users must navigate first to the <u>Regional Offices</u> pages, which lack a standardized layout, then navigate to each country page, which are also formatted individually, and finally click through to find <u>project lists</u>. It would be easier to find this information directly on the <u>Ghana page of the main site</u>

3. Clarify monitoring policies and identify responsible parties and timelines for the submission of monitoring data
   a. The <u>M&E manual</u> states, "Transparency will be ensured through the approaches described below. The commissioner of the evaluation will ensure a continuous consultation process with relevant stakeholders at all stages of the evaluation process. The evaluation report shall contain details of evaluation methodologies, approaches, sources of information and costs incurred. In accordance with the WHO disclosure policy, evaluation plans, reports, management responses and follow-up reports will be made public on the WHO evaluation web site." Though this policy makes clear that the public will have access to evaluations, it is unclear to what degree monitoring data must be publically available.

4. Include project-level monitoring data in the <u>Global Health Observatory (GHO)</u>

5. Upload documentation in open formats (e.g. .txt, .docx, .csv)

Subcomponent breakdown and justifications:

Category	Component	Score	Discussion
Monitoring Data Accessibility	Site Stability	2	At certain points through multiple visits to the site over the course of 4 months, the team experienced broken links and pages that did not load properly the first time. Certain links misdirect: as of 5/16/2016, for example, the 'Alcohol' report listed on Ghana's country page links to Gambia's report (http://www.who.int/countries/gha/en/).
	Site Navigability	1	Changes could be made to improve the ease of generating project/program lists. Currently, the main WHO site does not list projects by country; users must navigate first to the Regional Offices pages, which lack a standardized layout, then navigate to each country page, which are also formatted individually, and then click through to find project lists (http://www.afro.who.int/en/ghana/country-programmes.html). It would be far easier to find this information directly on the Ghana page of the main site (http://www.who.int/countries/gha/en/).
	Central Portal or Site	0	WHO lacks a centralized portal, database, or site through which all project documentation is made available
Ease of Automatic	Use of Open Formats	0	Documentation for all projects in sample was only available in .pdf format.

Monitoring Data Extraction	Distribution of Monitoring Template to Project Teams	0	We could not locate any templates on the WHO site. Additionally, none of the projects in our sample make use of a standardized reporting template. As such, we have no evidence that this template exists.
	Use of Standardized Monitoring Template	0	No projects in our total sample (0%) use a standardized monitoring template in their project documentation.
Monitoring and Reporting Clarity	Legibility of Results Documentation	4	All project documentation is offered in .PDF format
	Completeness of Monitoring Reporting	1	Monitoring data were available for 2/10 (20%) of the projects in our sample.
	Internal Consistency with Results Terminology	4	Our sample size for documentation is very small, with only 2 projects offering any documentation. The word "output" does not appear in either of these documents, and the word "outcome" appears a small number of times. We assign a score of 4 on the basis that none of the instances of the word "outcome" are inconsistent with internal definitions.
	Precision of Monitoring Reporting	3	Most WHO results information is quantified and precise. However, some results use vague language, such as "over 133 districts have been provided with incinerators."
Monitoring Dataset Transparency	Availability of Monitoring Datasets	0	Though WHO offers some project data through its Global Health Observatory (GHO) (http://www.who.int/gho/en/), the contained information is limited to outcomes and does not seem to include monitoring data. 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 WHO offers some project data through its Global Health Observatory (GHO) (http://www.who.int/gho/en/), the contained information is limited to outcomes and does not seem to include monitoring data.
	Availability of Monitoring Spatial Data	0	No projects in our total sample of 10 (0%) disaggregate outputs geographically. Further, we could not find any GIS/georeferencing policy on the WHO site, nor any sections in WHO manuals that discuss the need for project managers to track and report spatial data.
	Accessibility of Monitoring Spatial Data	0	None of the projects in our sample (0%) geographically disaggregated monitoring data in the project documentation.
Monitoring and Reporting System	Standardized Terminology	4	Results chains terms defined here (http://www.who.int/about/who_reform/change_at_who/results_framework/en/#.VznqRbxVikp), with more detailed explanations found in program-specific guides, such as the Health Systems Strengthening Glossary (http://www.who.int/healthsystems/hss_glossary/en/index7.html)
	Monitoring and Reporting Policy or Framework	3	WHO provides a comprehensive M&E Guide (http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/96311/1/9789241548687_eng.pdf?ua=1) and a recently updated evaluation workplan for 2016-2017 (http://www.who.int/about/finances-accountability/evaluation/workplan/en/). However, these documents leave some information about monitoring unclear, such as which specific members of field teams are responsible for monitoring and reporting data, and at what specific points in the project cycle.

| | Free Public Access to Monitoring Information Policy | 2 | WHO specifies in its M&E manual that "Transparency will be ensured through the approaches described below. The commissioner of the evaluation will ensure a continuous consultation process with relevant stakeholders at all stages of the evaluation process. The evaluation report shall contain details of evaluation methodologies, approaches, sources of information and costs incurred. In accordance with the WHO disclosure policy, evaluation plans, reports, management responses and follow-up reports will be made public on the WHO evaluation web site." Though this policy makes clear that the public will have access to evaluations, it is unclear to what degree monitoring data must be publically available. |