

Scorecard: Output reporting and accessibility

DANIDA

2.02 / 4

3.1 / 4 – Output accessibility

- Is project-level data centralized and accessible?

1.5 / 4 – Ease of extraction

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

2.6 / 4 – Output reporting clarity

- How frequently and consistently are outputs reported?

0.4 / 4 – Output Dataset Transparency

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

2.5 / 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>
<i>AfDB</i>	<i>2.04</i>
DANIDA	2.02
<i>WHO</i>	<i>1.42</i>
<i>FAO</i>	<i>0.94</i>

Next steps/ suggested improvements:

1. Upload more monitoring reports (currently, only 33% of listed projects have documentation)
2. Use more precise language in results reporting

- a. Some monitoring results are quantified but imprecise, such as, "More than 30 scientific papers have been published by teams of DNSA on fermented foods, some of them being part of the research carried out using the facilities provided by the project." Others are completely ambiguous, such as, "Training of PostDocs, PhDs, MSc and BSc students as well as laboratory technicians has been carried out."
3. Foment closer relationships with implementing partners for the planning and execution of results reporting
 - a. DANIDA [states](#) that monitoring is the responsibility of the implementation partner, and that DANIDA's role is to evaluate programs. Searching for results information through the implementing partner's documentation instead of DANIDA's own documentation makes it difficult for users to gather results information quickly. By engaging more actively with implementing partners to monitor projects, DANIDA would uphold its dedication to accountability in its [transparency policy](#)
4. 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	2	DANIDA's Open Aid portal (http://openaid.um.dk/en/projects/) could be reformatted to allow for better search and sort functionality. As it stands now, users can only see results for one year at a time, so generating comprehensive project lists involves searching for each year, merging those records, and then deleting duplicates. Additionally, results are displayed 20 at a time, forcing the user to scroll through pages of 20 record chunks to obtain a full set of information.
	Central Portal or Site	4	All project documentation available through the DANIDA Open Aid portal (http://openaid.um.dk/en/projects/)
Ease of Automatic Monitoring Data Extraction	Use of Open Formats	3	While documentation is often available in open formats directly on websites, monitoring data for 4/17 (24%) of projects that do report monitoring data only offer documentation in .pdf format
	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 DANIDA site, nor in any DANIDA 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	2	No monitoring data found for 34/51 (67%) of the projects in our sample .
	Internal Consistency with Results Terminology	2	Though results listed through the individual project pages on the DANIDA site tend to follow the official terminology, oftentimes the results reports of implementing partners do not use the terms "output" and "outcome" in a way consistent with this terminology.
	Precision of Monitoring Reporting	2	DANIDA often uses vague and imprecise language in its monitoring reporting. Some monitoring results are quantified but imprecise, such as, "More than 30 scientific papers have been published by teams of DNSA on fermented foods, some of them being part of the research carried out using the facilities provided by the project." Others are completely ambiguous, such as, "Training of PostDocs, PhDs, MSc and BSc students as well as laboratory technicians has been carried out."
Monitoring Dataset Transparency	Availability of Monitoring Datasets	0	We found no monitoring datasets for any projects in our sample. DANIDA's Common Standard Implementation Schedule (http://um.dk/en/~media/UM/English-site/Documents/Danida/Activities/Aid%20effectiveness%20work/Denmark%20Common%20Standard%20Implementation%20Schedule%20Dec%202012.xls) shows that DANIDA is not currently publishing "generic frameworks for the reporting of indicator-based targets and outcomes. Please note that there are no restriction on the choice of indicators, measures or baselines."
	Accessibility of Monitoring Datasets	0	We found no monitoring datasets for any projects in our sample. DANIDA's Common Standard Implementation Schedule (http://um.dk/en/~media/UM/English-site/Documents/Danida/Activities/Aid%20effectiveness%20work/Denmark%20Common%20Standard%20Implementation%20Schedule%20Dec%202012.xls) shows that DANIDA is not currently publishing "generic frameworks for the reporting of indicator-based targets and outcomes. Please note that there are no restriction on the choice of indicators, measures or baselines."
	Availability of Monitoring Spatial Data	1	Of the projects in our sample that have monitoring data, 4/17 (24%) geographically disaggregate results. This accounts for 4/51 (8%) of total projects in our sample. Three of these projects disaggregate at the city level, and one at the region level. The project that disaggregates one monitoring data point at the region level uses imprecise geographic language in reporting more results, such as claiming that a project took place in "20 communities in 11 districts." Further, we could not find any GIS/georeferencing policy on the DANIDA site, nor any sections in DANIDA manuals that discuss the need for project managers to track and report spatial data.
	Accessibility of Monitoring Spatial Data	1	Of the projects in our sample that have monitoring data, 4/17 (24%) geographically disaggregate results. This accounts for 4/51 (8%) of total projects in our sample. Three of these projects disaggregate at the city level, and one at the region level. The project that disaggregates one monitoring data point at the region level uses imprecise geographic language in reporting more results, such as claiming that a project took place in "20 communities in 11 districts."
Monitoring and Reporting System	Standardized Terminology	4	DANIDA outlines its terminology on its Results Based Management (RBM) site (http://um.dk/en/danida-en/results/results-based-management/)
	Monitoring and Reporting Policy or Framework	1	DANIDA states on its "Monitoring" portion of its website that monitoring is the responsibility of the implementation partner, and that DANIDA's role is to evaluate programs (http://introductiontodanida.um.dk/en/danida-at-work/how-danida-works/measuring-results/monitoring/). Though we cannot fault DANIDA for its partner-centric monitoring policy, DANIDA makes it difficult to assess the inner workings of its monitoring system by

			providing no further information about the who, how, and when of its monitoring mechanisms.
	Free Public Access to Monitoring Information Policy	2	DANIDA outlines its access to information policy on its Transparency page (http://um.dk/en/danida-en/about-danida/danida-transparency/data-from-programmes-and-projects/). DANIDA leaves it unclear exactly what information about projects must be made publically available, and what data are exempt from the open standard.