Scoring Guide

2014 Aid Transparency Index indicators

Methodology

The 2014 Aid Transparency Index uses [39 indicators](http://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/index/2014-ati/), grouped into weighted categories, to assess how transparent donor organisations are about their aid activities. These categories cover overall **commitment to aid transparency** and **publication** of information at both **organisation** and **activity level.** In 2013, we piloted a new methodology to reflect the increasing importance of the format of published aid information. This methodology uses a graduated scoring approach for some indicators. Information published to the IATI Registry is automatically assessed by the data quality tool of the [Aid Transparency Tracker](http://tracker.publishwhatyoufund.org/) and information published in all other formats is collected via a survey. **We intend to keep the methodology stable in 2014**. **All 39 indicators used in the 2013 Index will be retained in 2014.**

Please note that IATI XML data needs to be available via the IATI Registry for it to be taken into account. IATI XML data that is not on the Registry will be scored the same as other machine-readable data.

Data collection process

Data for the 2014 Index will be collected using the [Aid Transparency Tracker](http://tracker.publishwhatyoufund.org/), which brings together three tools:

* An automated data quality assessment tool
* An online survey tool
* An implementation schedules tool

Information for the commitment indicator “implementation schedules” is derived from the scores contained in the IATI implementation schedules tool. For the remaining commitment indicators, the data will be collected via the survey based on the sources described in table 2 below. If the organisation is not an IATI publisher then all the information is collected via the survey. For organisations that are publishing to the IATI Registry, data collection follows a two-step process:

* First, their data is run through the data quality tool, which is designed to run automated checks and tests on each organisation’s data, providing both a comparative view across organisations and granular details on each organisation’s data. These tests are aggregated to produce scores for indicators which they relate to.
* Next, for those indicators for which information is not published in to the IATI Registry or does not pass the necessary tests, the data is collected via the survey.

Indicators, scoring approach and weighting

**A graduated scoring methodology is used for some of the publication indicators**.The scoring takes into account the format that the data is provided in, depending how accessible and comparable the information is. For example, data published in PDFs scores lower than data published in machine-readable formats. Data that is published in the most open, comparable format of IATI XML and is included on the IATI Registry can score up to 100% for most indicators depending on the quality and frequency of publication. More detail on scoring different format is provided on p. 4.

Indicators are divided into those that measure commitment to aid transparency and those that measure publication of aid data. The publication indicators are grouped into organisation level and activity level. These two groups are further divided in subgroups, based largely upon the subgroups used in the [Common Standard implementation schedules template](http://www.oecd.org/dac/aid-architecture/acommonstandard.htm). The commitment category indicators account for 10% of the overall weight. Publication accounts for 90% of the overall weight. Within the publication category, the organisation level indicators account for 25% of the overall weight, while the activity level indicators account for 65%. Within these categories, the subgroups are equally weighted.

Table 1 below provides a summary of the indicator sub-groups, the scoring approach used and the weight assigned to each indicator.

## **Table 1. Scoring methodology and indicator weighting in 2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Sub-group** | **Indicator** | **Scoring Approach** | **Weight** |
| Commitment to aid transparency | Commitment | 1. Quality of FOI legislation | Graduated based on the score given in Right To Information (RTI) Rating.[[1]](#footnote-1) | 3.33% |
| 1. Implementation schedules | Graduated based on the total score received out of 100 based on analysis of Busan common standard/IATI implementation schedules. | 3.33% |
| 1. Accessibility | Graduated based on three criteria: allows free bulk export of data; provides disaggregated, detailed data on activities; and data is released under an open licence. | 3.33% |
| Publication – Organisation level | Planning | 1. Strategy | Graduated based on accessibility | 2.50% |
| 1. Annual report | Graduated based on accessibility | 2.50% |
| 1. Allocation policy | Graduated based on accessibility | 2.50% |
| 1. Procurement policy | Graduated based on accessibility | 2.50% |
| 1. Strategy (country / sector) | Graduated based on accessibility | 2.50% |
| Financial | 1. Total organisation budget | Graduated based on format and number of years for which data is provided | 4.17% |
| 1. Disaggregated budget | Graduated based on format and number of years for which data is provided | 4.17% |
| 1. Audit | Graduated based on accessibility | 4.17% |
| Publication – Activity level | Basic activity information | 1. Implementer | Graduated based on format | 1.63% |
| 1. Unique ID | Graduated based on format | 1.63% |
| 1. Title | Graduated based on format | 1.63% |
| 1. Description | Graduated based on format | 1.63% |
| 1. Planned dates | Graduated based on format | 1.63% |
| 1. Actual dates | Graduated based on format | 1.63% |
| 1. Current status | Graduated based on format | 1.63% |
| 1. Contact details | Graduated based on format | 1.63% |
| Classifications | 1. Collaboration type | Graduated based on format | 1.86% |
| 1. Flow type | Graduated based on format | 1.86% |
| 1. Aid type | Graduated based on format | 1.86% |
| 1. Finance type | Graduated based on format | 1.86% |
| 1. Sectors | Graduated based on format | 1.86% |
| 1. Sub-national location | Graduated based on format | 1.86% |
| 1. Tied aid status | Graduated based on format | 1.86% |
| Related documents | 1. Memorandum of Understanding | Graduated based on accessibility | 2.17% |
| 1. Evaluations | Graduated based on accessibility | 2.17% |
| 1. Objectives | Graduated based on accessibility | 2.17% |
| 1. Budget docs | Graduated based on accessibility | 2.17% |
| 1. Contracts | Graduated based on accessibility | 2.17% |
| 1. Tenders | Graduated based on accessibility | 2.17% |
| Financial | 1. Budget\* | Graduated based on format | 3.25% |
| 1. Commitments | Graduated based on format | 3.25% |
| 1. Disbursements & expenditures | Graduated based on format | 3.25% |
| 1. Budget ID | Graduated based on format | 3.25% |
| Performance | 1. Results | Graduated based on format | 4.33% |
| 1. Impact appraisals | Graduated based on accessibility | 4.33% |
| 1. Conditions | Graduated based on accessibility | 4.33% |

\* This indicator is more rigorously measured in 2014 for IATI publishers (information published to IATI is scored higher than information published in other formats). The information must be both forward-looking and broken down by quarter for the first year ahead to score the maximum available points on the indicator. For more on why this change has been made, see the Index [FAQs](http://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/index/2014-ati/).

Note: The source of information for indicators 4–39 is the IATI Registry, organisations’ own websites or other sources to which the organisation publishes information on its current aid activities.

# General scoring guidelines

* **Survey data collection**: All manual surveys are completed using information pertaining to the country receiving the largest amount of aid by value from the development organisation. The value of aid to recipients is determined by the 2012 OECD DAC CRS figures. If this information is not available in the CRS, then the largest recipient is determined using the latest annual report for the organisation or related ministry. To establish that information is consistently, i.e. “always”, published at the activity level, a minimum of five activities are selected within the largest recipient country or thematic sector (if the organisation structures its work along thematic areas or sectors rather than by countries). If the organisation does not have at least five current activities in its largest recipient country, information is cross-checked against activities in four other randomly selected countries. For three indicators – disaggregated budget, country/sector strategy and memorandum of understanding – the information is cross-checked for four other randomly selected countries in addition to the largest recipient country in order to establish that the information is “always” published. Only information that is found to be “always” published is scored in the ATI. Information that is published inconsistently or only for some activities is recorded but not scored.
* **Current data:** Data for each indicator must be current for an organisation to be able to score on the indicator. “Current” is defined as published within the 12 months immediately prior to the data collection period (1 April–30 June 2014), so information published on 1 April 2013 or later and that relates to that date or later is accepted as current. Information published after 1 April 2013 but relating to a period prior to then, for example 2012 DAC CRS data, is not accepted as current. Documents that are not current under this definition are accepted only if they are up to date with their regular cycle of publication, for example, annual audits and evaluation reports, or if they have explicit extensions into the current period written into them.
* **Date information:** For indicators with a date component (e.g. actual dates, planned dates), both the month and the year are required in order to score.
* **Sampling:** A total of 14 indicators refer to documents. These documents are manually checked to verify that they contain the required information to score for the indicator. A minimum of five documents need to meet the required criteria to score for the indicator.[[2]](#footnote-2) For IATI publishers, the documents will be randomly selected from those projects that pass the tests for the relevant indicator. Data published to the IATI Registry on results, sub-national location and conditions will also be sampled to ensure it meets the criteria for those indicators.
* **Multiple sources:** For organisations which publish information to multiple databases or websites, information from all sources is accepted. For example, data for the EC’s Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department (ECHO) is published to two humanitarian databases, the European Disaster Response Information System (EDRIS) and the Financial Tracking Service (FTS), and to IATI. All three sources are accepted. If there are differences between the three information sources, priority is given to the most recent information in the most accessible format.
* **Development focused**: For the handful of organisations whose primary mandate is not providing development assistance, the assessment of their aid transparency relates only to the development assistance aspect of their operations and not the transparency of the organisation more broadly.
* **Parent or subsidiary organisations:** Information for some organisations is held or managed by other organisations. In such cases, we look at both organisations for the information, i.e. the primary organisation under assessment as well as the organisation holding/publishing the information. For example, in the case of Norway, the majority of development assistance is administered by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) but most activity-level information is found on the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad) website. In such cases, information published by both the MFA and Norad is accepted.

# Details of scoring approach

* All indicators can score a maximum of 100 points.
* For all indicators for which scores are “**graduated on the basis of format**”, the information is scored as follows:
  + PDF = 16.67 points
  + Website = 33.33 points
  + Machine-readable (CSV, Excel, etc.) = 50.00 points
  + IATI XML = 50–100 points depending on data quality and frequency
* For organisation-level indicators for which the scores are “**graduated based on accessibility**”, information published to the IATI Registry is awarded the total score for the indicator, while information published in all other formats is awarded 50 points of the total possible score of 100. These indicators relate to organisation documents which may be provided in IATI in the form of links to documents with the correct document code from the IATI ‘Organisation Documents Codelist’ specified. This makes them easier to locate and identify than documents available just on the organisation’s website, as they have been categorised according to a common standard; hence they are scored more highly.
* For activity-level indicators for which the scores are “**graduated on the basis of accessibility**”, information published in to the IATI Registry can score between 50–100 points for that indicator based on data quality and frequency of publication. Information published in all other formats is awarded 50 points for the indicator.
* The scoring for the two forward budget indicators at the organisation level is “**graduated on the basis of both format and the number of years**” for which information is published. Publishing a budget for 2014 counts as one year forward looking, 2015 as two years and 2016 as three years. Budgets need to run up to a minimum of December 2016 to score for three years. Lump sum budgets are treated the same as a one year forward-looking budget, i.e. a lump sum budget for 2012–2016 is treated the same as a one year budget for 2014. If an organisation publishes a budget for 2014 and then a lump sum budget for 2015–2016, then the budget is considered to be two years forward looking. The scores are graduated as follows:
  + PDF = 16.67 points \* y/3 where y is the number of years – up to a maximum of 3 years – for which forward looking budget information is published
  + Website = 33.33 points \* y/3
  + Machine-readable = 50.00 points \* y/3
  + IATI XML = 50–100 points depending on data quality and frequency \* y/3
  + Aggregate budgets of between 2–3 years will be scored the same as 1 year forward budgets

# Measuring quality and frequency for IATI XML data

**Quality:** The quality of data published in IATI XML is assessed by running a series of tests on all activity and organisation data packages being published to the IATI Registry. These tests have been designed to assess the availability, comprehensiveness and comparability of aid information and to determine whether an organisation’s IATI data conforms to the IATI standard appropriately. Most of the tests have been derived directly from the IATI schemas which provide formats for reporting data on various fields to the IATI Registry. Some additional tests have been designed to check that data published in IATI XML is presented in a manner which allows for comparison across organisations. Tests are run against the following:

1. Ongoing activities;
2. Activities with planned or actual end dates within the previous 12 months; and
3. Activities with commitment, disbursement or expenditure transaction dates within the previous 12 months.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Example: The following data quality tests are run to determine the quality of information for the indicator 18 “current status”:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Test** | **Test Description** |
| activity-status exists? | Does the activity status exist? |
| activity-status/@code is on list ActivityStatus? | Is the activity status code on the ActivityStatus codelist? |

The tests return a “pass” or “fail” result for each activity (or organisation file depending on the indicator being measured) included in organisations’ data packages that meet the current data requirement. A complete list of the tests run against data published to the IATI Registry for the 2014 Index is available in the [technical paper](http://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/index/2014-ati/). These tests have been developed in consultation with Index peer reviewers, the IATI Secretariat and current IATI publishers. We welcome feedback on them.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Data quality is determined by the percentage of an organisation’s total data on current activities published to IATI which pass these data quality tests. Organisations are awarded the first 50 points of the total possible score of 100 for at least one “pass” result on the data quality tests for the indicator and the remaining 50 points based on data quality and frequency of publication.

**Frequency:**Frequency refers to how often organisations publish activity level information to IATI. For the activity level indicators, IATI publishers are awarded the first 50 points for at least one “pass” result on the data quality tests and the remaining 50 points based on the coverage and frequency of publication. Publishing monthly allows an organisation to achieve the maximum indicator score of 100 points; publishing quarterly up to 95 points; and publishing less than quarterly up to 75 points.

Example: An organisation that publishes current data to IATI every quarter, with 80% of that current data passing the tests for an indicator, will receive the following score for that indicator: 50 points + (80\*0.9)/2 = 86 points. (If the organisation publishes monthly, it would receive a score of 50 + 80/2 = 90 points.)

The frequency of publication is calculated based on the average number of days between updates in the previous six month period as recorded in the IATI Registry logs. To score as a monthly publisher, an organisations needs to update its files in each of the previous six months (January–June 2014, at the end of data collection). For quarterly, the organisation needs to have updated its files in two of the previous six months. The frequency of publication used for organisations included in the Index can be found in the [IATI Updates](http://tracker.publishwhatyoufund.org/iatiupdates/publisher/) section of the Aid Transparency Tracker.

Note that only IATI data is scored on frequency. Publishing information to IATI allows an organisation to score more points than publishing information in other formats. Because there are clear machine-readable logs of when this data changed, it is also possible to assess frequency – which is rarely possible for data published in other formats because the information is not always time-stamped.

The IATI data collected via the Tracker will be updated at least three times during the data collection period – in April, May and end of June. The relevant organisations will have access to the assessment throughout this period.

# Table 2: Indicator definitions

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sub-group** | **Indicator** | **Survey question** | **Definition** | **Additional definitions and notes** |
| **Commitment level** | | | | |
| Commitment | 1. Quality of FOI legislation | Quality of Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) or disclosure policy | The definition used in the Global RTI Rating is that it has to be a law in the strict sense, it must include the right of access to information, this right has to be enforceable and there must be complaint, court and high court appeal possibilities. Decrees are included if they meet the same standards. In addition, the FOIA must be in use for at least the executive part of the government; therefore, FOIAs which are only adopted, approved or still in draft form are not counted. | For multilateral donors, international finance institutions (IFIs) and private foundations, a disclosure or transparency policy is accepted as equivalent to a FOIA. Publish What You Fund completes an assessment of the quality of these disclosure policies based on the overarching approach taken in the Global RTI Rating. |
| 1. Implementation schedules | Quality of Implementation Schedules | The Busan Partnership agreement required schedules for implementing the common standard to be published by December 2012. Publish What You Fund conducted an assessment of the schedules completed by development providers and submitted to the OECD common standard implementation website. Schedules are scored on the level of ambition shown by organisations in implementing the IATI component of the common standard. | The complete assessment can be found on Publish What You Fund’s [Aid Transparency Tracker](http://tracker.publishwhatyoufund.org/plan/organisations/) website.  IATI implementation schedules are also accepted. |
| 1. Accessibility | Does this organisation promote access and use of its aid information? | The overall accessibility of aid information through the organisations’ portals, project databases or searchable data sources. These are scored using three criteria: 1) the portal allows free, bulk export of data; 2) it contains detailed disaggregated data; 3) the data is published under an open licence. | Data sources are the organisations’ own aid portals, publicly accessible databases or websites – accessed in that order. The portal or database must include information on current activities for the countries or sectors the organisation is working in rather than just one individual country/sector. It should contain information on at least five of the activity-level indicators, at least one of which should cover financial information.  The same data source is used for all three checks. For example, if the aid portal does not state that the data is published under an open licence, this will not be checked elsewhere on the organisation’s project database or website. If the organisation’s website is the data source then it cannot score on the “free bulk export” criterion.  If a portal allows bulk export through its API but not through its web-user interface, this is accepted as allowing free, bulk export of data. |
| **Publication – organisation level** | | | | |
| Planning | 1. Strategy | Does this organisation publish an overarching strategy document? | An overarching strategy document explains the general approach and policies of the organisation towards international development. This should be forward looking.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Institutional strategy paper (document code = B02). | For organisations whose primary mandate is not development, a document clarifying that its overarching development strategy is accepted. This information needs to be forward looking. |
| 1. Annual report | Does this organisation publish an annual report? | Annual reports outline basic (normally aggregate) information about how aid was spent in the previous year, broken down by sector and/or country. This should be backward looking.  Annual reports which are up to date within their regular cycle, i.e. the organisation publishes an annual report a year behind, the most recent document within this time frame are accepted.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Annual report (document code = B01). | To score for this indicator, the annual report needs to include details of where the organisation is spending its resources and the information needs to be forward looking, i.e. cover current activity period. |
| 1. Allocation policy | Does this organisation publish its aid allocation policy? | Aid allocation policies are the detailed policy documents by which the organisation chooses where to spend its resources, i.e. on which countries or themes rather than others. Relatively general documents or web pages outlining which countries, themes and institutions the agency will fund are accepted, as long as this is forward looking and not wholly retrospective.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Aid allocation policy (document code = B04). | For organisations such as IFIs and private foundations which do not have an “aid allocation” policy, equivalent documents are accepted; for example, “investment strategy/policy” or “grant-making policy”. |
| 1. Procurement policy | Does this organisation publish its procurement procedures? | An organisation’s procurement procedures explain the process used to tender and contract (invite bids for) goods and services. This must fully explain the criteria on which decisions are made, and could be in a single procurement policy document or attached to each tender.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Procurement policy and procedure (document code = B05). | For IFIs which are often demand-driven, this is understood as their investment policy. For private foundations, this is their grant making policy.  For organisations that do not undertake procurement related to aid projects (e.g. if procurement is undertaken by grantees or other implementing agencies), a statement explicitly clarifying this is required, as well as the overall policy for procuring goods and services at the headquarter level. |
| 1. Strategy (country/ sector) | Does this organisation publish the country strategy paper for this recipient country? | A country strategy paper sets out the organisation’s planned approach and activities in the recipient country. For it to be accepted it needs to be a detailed document, rather than just a paragraph on the organisation’s website.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Country strategy paper (document code = B03). | For organisations such as IFIs, philanthropic organisations and vertical funds which may not have country-level strategies, mid-level documents between organisation and activity-level are accepted, e.g. thematic or sectoral level documents.  If the organisation follows the strategy of a parent or related organisation, a statement clarifying this is needed on the website along with a link to the relevant strategy document. Similarly, if the organisation supports a country-led or developed strategy, this must be explicitly stated on the website and the link to the relevant strategy document needs to be provided. |
| Financial | 1. Total organisation budget | Does this organisation publish the total organisation budget per year for the next three years, up to 2016? | The total organisation budget is the total amount that the organisation will be allocated by the government or its funders per year for the next three years. This is money going to the organisation and can be indicative. Each year ahead is worth one third of the total possible score for this indicator. Aggregate budgets of between 2–3 years will be scored the same as 1 year forward budgets.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Annual forward planning budget (total-budget). | IFIs and DFIs do not have budgets allocated to them as traditional aid agencies do. In many cases, total budgets are established annually, once total financial figures of all investments are taken into account. However, they do have projected total spend figures that they sometimes publish. If published, these projected figures are accepted for this indicator.  Similarly, for private foundations and humanitarian agencies, indicative figures of available funds are accepted. |
| 1. Disaggregated budget | Does this organisation publish their annual forward planning budget for assistance to different countries and institutions per year for the next three years, up to 2016? | The organisation’s annual forward planning budget for assistance is the disaggregated budget that the organisation or agency will spend on different countries, programmes and institutions per year, for at least the next three years. The figure could be indicative.  Scores are awarded on the basis of the number of years (up to three years) for which organisations are publishing budget information. Each year ahead is worth 33.33 points out of a total possible score of 100. Aggregate budgets of between 2–3 years will be scored the same as 1 year forward budgets.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Annual forward planning budgets for recipient countries (recipient-country-budget). | Both country budgets or thematic budgets are accepted for organisations that prioritise their work by countries. Projected figures disaggregated along thematic and sectoral priorities, at a near similar level of detail to total organisation budgets are accepted. IFIs and DFIs sometimes publish “road maps” which contain this information.  The start and end date for forward budgets are calculated based on organisations' fiscal years for information collected via the survey. Budgets need to run up to a minimum of December 2016 to score for 'three years forward'. Organisations at the end of their fixed budget cycles and therefore without a published budget for the next three years do not receive points for this indicator.  Forward Spending Survey data reported to the OECD DAC is taken into account only if it is available for the specific organisation under assessment. |
| 1. Audit | Does this organisation publish an annual audit of its aid programmes? | The organisation’s annual audit of its activities is an official inspection of the accounts and activities of this organisation, typically by an independent body.  Audits up to date with regular audit cycles are accepted, i.e. if the organisation publishes biennial audits, the most recent document within this time frame is accepted.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Institutional audit report (document code = B06). | A formally approved audit of annual accounts is required to score on this indicator. Audits conducted by official government agencies such as State Audit Offices or Controller General Reports are accepted for this indicator. |
| **Publication – activity level** | | | | |
| Basic activity information | 1. Implementer | Does this organisation publish which organisation implements the activity? | The implementer of the activity is the organisation which is principally responsible for delivering this activity.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Implementing organisation (participating-org role = implementing). | This information may not be available in all cases due to “legitimate exclusions”. For example, humanitarian agencies may not be able to reveal who the implementing agencies are due to security reasons. Such exclusions are accepted but need to be explicitly stated (in order to distinguish these from cases of simple omission). |
| 1. Unique ID | Does this organisation publish a unique activity identifier? | The activity identifier is a unique reference ID for the activity, e.g. a project number. It allows an activity to be referred to and searched for by a code, which can be used to retrieve the project from a database or filing system.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: IATI identifier. | The project ID must be stated clearly on the page. It is not sufficient if it is only stated in the URL. It must be numeric or alpha-numeric. |
| 1. Title | Does this organisation publish the title of the activity? | The title of the activity is the name of the activity. This is preferably the formal name of the activity, but does not have to be.  The title needs to be complete with any abbreviations or acronyms explained. |  |
| 1. Description | Does this organisation publish a description of the activity? | The description of the activity is a descriptive text, longer than the title, explaining what the activity is. Sometimes it is just a short sentence but could also be more detailed. Either is accepted. | The description of the activity needs to contain a minimum of 10 words in order to be considered a description rather than just a title. |
| 1. Planned dates | Does this organisation publish the planned start and end dates? | The planned dates are the dates that the activity is scheduled to start and end on. If there are one set of dates but they are not explicitly planned or actual dates, given that these are for activities which are current (i.e. being implemented at the time of data collection) it is assumed that they are planned dates.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Activity date (activity date type = start-planned and end-planned). | Both month and year are required to score on this indicator in recognition of recipient countries needing to be able to map activities to their own financial year rather than the calendar year.  If the activity has started or has finished, the original planned start and end dates must be retained in addition to the actual dates in order to score on this indicator. |
| 1. Actual dates | Does this organisation publish the actual start and end dates? (If they are not explicitly stated as actual dates then it is assumed that they are planned dates.) | These are the dates that the activity actually started (and ended on, if the activity has finished). If there is only one set of dates but they are not explicitly stated as planned or actual dates, then it is assumed they are planned dates. Actual dates are accepted where specific events occurred, e.g. the date the project/programme agreement is signed, a board presentation or an appraisal date.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Activity date (activity date type = start-actual and end-actual). | Both month and year are required to score on this indicator in recognition of recipient countries needing to be able to map activities to their own financial year rather than the calendar year. |
| 1. Current status | Does this organisation publish the current status of the aid activity (e.g.in pipe line, implementation, completion, post-completion or cancelled)? | This shows whether the activity is currently under design, being implemented, has finished or has been cancelled.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Activity status. |  |
| 1. Contact details | Are contact details provided for the activity? | This shows who can be contacted in relation to this activity. This does not have to be the contact information for an individual or project manager and could refer to a central contact or information desk. Contacts for either the funding organisation or the implementing organisation were accepted.  This has to be stated alongside the activity or on an obvious “contact us” link alongside the activity. |  |
| Classifications | 1. Collaboration type | Does this organisation publish the “Collaboration Type”, i.e. whether the activity is funded bilaterally or multilaterally, as a core contribution to NGOs and other private bodies/Public-Private Partnerships, multilateral outflow or private sector outflow? | The collaboration type shows how the activity is funded – whether directly from one government to another (bilaterally), through institutions such as the World Bank or UN (multilaterally), or otherwise. This needs to be explicitly stated.  To be accepted, responses need to be stated per activity, or once in a country strategy paper or a clear place on the website, if there is only one collaboration type for the whole organisation, e.g. “all aid is funded bilaterally” or “we work exclusively with the private sector/non profits” or “all our activities are funded through pooled funds”. |  |
| 1. Flow type | Does this organisation publish the “Flow Type”, i.e. whether the activity is categorised as Official Development Assistance (ODA), Other Official Flows (OOF), private grants, private market flows, non-flows (e.g. GNI) or any other flows? | The flow type shows whether the organisation states this activity counts as ODA, OOF, climate finance or any other type of flow. This has to be explicitly stated per activity, or once in a country strategy paper or a single place on the organisation’s website if there is only one flow type for all activities, e.g. “all aid is ODA”, or “we only provide private grants/technical assistance”. |  |
| 1. Aid type | Does this organisation publish the type of aid given (e.g. budget support, pooled funds, project-type interventions, experts, scholarships, debt relief, or administrative costs)? | The type of aid shows whether the activity is classed as budget support, a project, technical assistance, debt relief, administrative costs, and so on. This needs to be explicitly stated per activity, or once in a country strategy paper or on a clear place on the organisation’s website if there is only one aid type for the whole organisation, e.g. “all aid is project-type interventions”. | The advisory services business line/type of intervention (investment climate, public-private partnership, etc.), can be seen as broadly equivalent.  Statements clarifying business line/intervention type published anywhere on the organisation’s website count towards publishing aid type in the web format. |
| 1. Finance type | Does this organisation publish the type of finance given (e.g. grant, loan, export credit, debt relief)? | The type of finance shows whether the activity is a grant, loan, export credit or debt relief. This needs to be explicitly stated per activity, or once in a country strategy paper or clearly on the organisation’s website if there is only one finance type for the whole organisation, e.g. “all aid is grants”. | Investment type (loan, equity, etc.) can be interpreted as equivalent.  Statements clarifying investment type published anywhere on the website count towards publishing finance type in the web format. |
| 1. Sectors | Does this organisation publish the specific areas or “sectors” of the recipient’s economic or social development that the activity intends to foster, e.g. education, health and infrastructure? | The sectors of the activity explain whether this is, for example, a health or education project. It does not count if it is just mentioned incidentally within the title, description, etc. It needs to be stated separately and explicitly. | If projects are presented by sector on an organisation’s website, it must be clearly stated whether the organisation works only in those sectors that are listed. |
| 1. Sub-national location | Does this organisation publish the sub-national geographic location for this activity? | The sub-national geographic location is information about where the activity is located within a country. This may be a province or city, or it could be geo-coded (whereby the precise longitude and latitude is published). It needs to be stated separately and explicitly.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Location. | For activities that are relevant at a country or regional level, information on the location where the funds are sent to or where the recipient is located will be accepted for this indicator. For example, capital city for a country, or location information of the implementing organisation. This includes private sector investment, loans or debt relief payments, where the location of the relevant bank or organisation is accepted. |
| 1. Tied aid status | Does this organisation publish whether the aid is tied or not? | The tied aid status shows whether the organisation states that this activity counts as “tied” (procurement is restricted to the donor organisation country) or “untied” (open procurement).  Specifying location requirements in activity documents such as procurement policies or tenders is accepted as publishing tied aid status.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Default tied status. | For organisations’ lending directly to national investment agencies, an explicit statement demonstrating their aid is not tied is required. For IFIs and DFIs, investment codes clarifying their position are accepted. For private foundations, grant-making policies are accepted. If these are not available, the organisation’s procurement policy must clearly state if there are any eligibility requirements for contracts based on country of origin. |
| Related documents | 1. Memorandum of Understanding | Is the Memorandum of Understanding published? | A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) is a document which details the agreement usually between the organisation and recipient government for the provision of aid in the country.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Memorandum of understanding (document code = A09). | Some organisations do not sign MoUs, so jointly developed documents governing the relationship between the organisation and the recipient are accepted as equivalent, e.g. investment codes or partnership/country agreements that have been developed in conjunction with recipient governments. |
| 1. Evaluations | Are evaluation documents published for all completed activities in this recipient country? | Evaluation documents consider what the activity achieved, whether the intended objectives were met, what the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives were and an assessment of the impact, effect and value of the activity. This information may be on a specific evaluation section of the organisation’s website.  If the activity under assessment is not completed but evaluation documents are available for other completed activities, the organisation can score for this indicator.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Review of project performance and evaluation (document code = A07). | Not all organisations carry out evaluations for all of their activities. Organisations can score on this indicator as long as they publish evaluations within their regular evaluation cycles, i.e. the organisation publishes country evaluations every three years, the most recent documents within this time frame are accepted. |
| 1. Objectives | Are the objectives or purposes of the activity published? | The objectives or purposes of the activity are those that the activity intends to achieve.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Objectives / Purpose of activity (document code = A02) or Description (description type = 2). | The objectives need to include the detailed description of the activity, the target sector/group and expected outcomes. |
| 1. Budget docs | Is the budget of the activity published? | This is a specific budget detailing what the intended spending is for the different lines of the individual activity. It is often a document published on the organisation’s website.  Budget documents cannot simply be at the country level. If an activity budget is included in a larger country-level document, it is only accepted if the budget for the activity is broken down line by line.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Budget (document code = A05). | For organisations where budget documents might be considered commercially sensitive, documents with redactions of the commercially sensitive pieces of information are accepted but the specific reasons for the redactions need to be explicitly stated in detail and must clarify why the information is commercially sensitive and would cause material and direct harm if published. |
| 1. Contracts | Is the contract for the activity published? | The individual contract(s) which is signed with a company, organisation or individual that provides goods and services for the activity. This could be on a procurement section of the organisation’s website, on a separate website or on a central government procurement website.  Contract documents cannot simply be at the country level. If an activity contract is included in a larger country-level document, it is only accepted if the contract mentions the activity specifically and in detail.  Basic information about the activity contract is accepted if it contains three of the following five information items: awardee, amount, overview of services being provided, start/end dates, unique reference to original tender documents.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Contract (document code = A11 or A06). | This indicator is retained for all organisations in the Index. In cases where organisations consider such information to be commercially sensitive, sections within the contract can be redacted but the reason for the redactions needs to be explicitly stated.  Due to the difficulty in checking contracts manually, rather than looking for the specific activity and the contract linked to it, a review of the organisation’s overall contracts will be completed in line with the organisation’s procurement policy.  For vertical funds, equivalent documents are accepted, such as approved country proposals or agreements between the recipient and the funder. |
| 1. Tenders | Does this organisation publish all tenders? | Tenders are the individual contracts or proposals that have been put out to invite bids from companies or organisations that want to provide goods and services for an activity. They may be on a separate website, possibly on a central government procurement website.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Tender (document code = A10). | Investment codes or policies for IFIs and DFIs are accepted. For private foundations, calls for grant submissions are accepted. For humanitarian agencies, documents that provide guidance on securing funding are accepted.  Due to the difficulty with manually finding tenders linked to current activities, rather than looking for the specific tender, a review of the organisation’s overall calls for tenders will be completed to check it is publishing them consistently and in-line with their procurement policy.  For organisations that do not issue tenders related to aid projects (e.g. if procurement is undertaken by grantees or other implementing agencies), a statement explicitly clarifying this is required. |
| Financial | 1. Budget | Does this organisation provide a breakdown of the budget of the activity by year and/or quarter? | The budget of the activity is the breakdown of the total financial commitment to the activity into annual or quarterly chunks.  In order to score for this indicator, the budget for at least the next year ahead (i.e. until 31 December 2014) or until the end of the activity – whichever is sooner – should be available.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Budget or Planned Disbursement. | For organisations where this may be deemed as commercially sensitive information, total estimated cost of fund/grant/loan amount is accepted or sections within a document can be redacted. The specific reasons for the redactions need to be explicitly stated in detail and must clarify why the information is commercially sensitive and would cause material and direct harm if published.  The weighting of the indicator has not changed but it is more rigorously measured in 2014 for IATI publishers (information published to IATI is scored higher than information published in other formats). Providing annual forward budgets will allow an IATI publisher to score up to half the total available data quality points, while a quarterly breakdown for the first year ahead will enable them to score the remaining half. This change has been made in recognition of recipient countries needing to be able to map activities to their own financial year rather than the calendar year.  Note: The difference between indicators 33 and 30 is that indicator 30 requires the overall activity budget to be broken down by individual line items for the activity. To score on indicator 33, the funds allocated to the activity must be broken down by year and quarter for at least the next year ahead. Spending by individual line items is not required. If the required information for both indicators 30 and 33 is available in a single document, it can be considered for both indicators. |
| 1. Commitments | Does this organisation provide details of the overall financial commitment made to the activity? | This refers to the financial commitment for the activity as a whole for the lifetime of the activity. This is generally a high level commitment rather than a detailed breakdown of the activity budget.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Transaction (transaction type = commitment). |  |
| 1. Disbursements & expenditures | Does this organisation provide transaction-level details of individual actual financial disbursements / expenditures for this activity? | Individual actual financial disbursements must be related to individual activities and must be on a per-transaction basis. Each activity is likely to have several transactions.   The IATI reference for this indicator is: Transaction (transaction type = disbursement and expenditure). | While such information might be considered to be commercially sensitive by some organisations, Publish What You Fund’s view is that actual expenditure information is less sensitive once the money has been spent. Hence all organisations are scored on this indicator. For IFIs and DFIs, the total fund/loan amount is accepted and details of the loan repayment costs and related charges can be redacted. The specific reasons for the redactions need to be explicitly stated in detail and must clarify why the information is commercially sensitive and would cause material and direct harm if published. |
| 1. Budget ID | Does this organisation provide information about the activity that can link the activity to the recipient government’s relevant budget classifications? | The budget classification is a way of linking the activity to the recipient country government’s own budget codes. There are two parts to this indicator. The administrative classification can either be provided as the budget codes themselves, or as a common code that can map from a donor organisation’s detailed purpose codes to the recipient country’s functional or administrative budget classifications. In addition, the economic classification provides the percentage of the budget that is capital versus current expenditure.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Country budget items and capital spend. | This indicator is retained for all organisations in the Index.    The budget identifier helps to explain aid flows in the context of the recipient government's own budget. It does not relate only to those flows that are direct to the government ("on budget"), but also to other flows which may relate to the government's own budget. In cases where the organisation is only providing private sector investment, budget classifications are still possible. Such activities could, for example, be classified as current expenditure under the microfinance and financial services function. |
| Performance | 1. Results | Are results, outcomes and outputs published for all completed activities in this recipient country? | The results show whether activities achieved their intended outputs in accordance with the stated goals or plans. This information often refers to logframes and results chains and may be within a specific results or evaluation section of the organisation’s website.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Result and results, outcomes and outputs (Document code = A08). | Both current and completed activities will be considered for this indicator. If the activity is ongoing then the expected results should be available. If the activity has ended then the actual results should be available within 12 months of ending. |
| 1. Impact appraisals | Are pre-project impact appraisals published? | Pre-project impact appraisals explain the totality of positive and negative, primary and secondary effects expected to be produced by a development intervention.  Environmental impact assessments as well as impact assessments which explain what objectives the project itself intends to provide are accepted.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Pre and post-project impact appraisal (document code = A01). | IFIs and DFIs tend only to publish impact appraisals if regulations require them to, but given the link they have to the eventual impact and results of the activity, all organisations included in the Index are scored on this indicator.  For loans or private sector investment, risk assessments and the fiscal objectives detailed in the loan document are accepted. These need to be sufficiently detailed and include any criteria used to assess eligibility for receiving the loan.  Humanitarian Implementation Plans (HIPs) and project plans are accepted for humanitarian agencies. |
| 1. Conditions | Are the terms and conditions attached to the activity published? | The terms and conditions of the activity may also be referred to as benchmarks, priors, or involve words such as “subject to...”. They are specific to an individual activity and explain what the recipient must do in order to be eligible for the funds to be released.  The conditions should include loan repayment terms if the activity is financed by a loan.  The IATI reference for this indicator is: Conditions and conditions document (document code = A04). | For IFIs and DFIs, this includes loan repayment conditions or special terms and conditions. In cases where the loan repayment terms are considered commercially sensitive, this information can be redacted. The reason for the redactions needs to be explicitly stated in detail and must clarify why the information is commercially sensitive and would cause material and direct harm if published.  For private foundations and humanitarian agencies, statements setting out what the grant can be spent on are accepted.  Templates for general terms and conditions are not accepted for scoring this indicator. If there are no policy, performance or fiduciary conditions associated with an activity, this must be explicitly stated. |

1. The complete approach to assessing and scoring FOIA and disclosure policy quality is detailed in the [technical paper](http://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/index/2014-ati/) (see box 2 on p.19). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Apart from for organisation level documents covered by indicators 5, 6, 7 and 11, where only a single document is expected. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Activities that finish more than 12 months prior to data collection but are still receiving loan or interest repayments are therefore excluded from the tests. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Publish What You Fund ran a public consultation on the tests used in January 2014. More information is available at: <https://github.com/pwyf/index-data-quality-tests/> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)