


# Aid Transparency Index

2020



Publish What You Fund is the global campaign for aid and development transparency. Launched in 2008, we envisage a world where aid and development information is **transparent, available,** and **used** for effective decision making, public accountability, and lasting change for all citizens.

Publish What You Fund independently researched the 2020 Aid Transparency Index. We produced it with financial support from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and the Aid Transparency Index Supporters' Coalition. The Coalition brings together donor agencies with the shared objective of promoting transparency in aid and development finance by maintaining the Aid Transparency Index as an independent monitoring tool.

This report was researched and written by Alex Tilley with support from Elma Jenkins.

Publish What You Fund is grateful to the many people involved in producing this Index. We would particularly like to thank the 34 independent reviewers who reviewed the individual donor assessments.

Many thanks also to Toby Mendel from the Centre for Law and Democracy who provided invaluable advice on our methodology for assessing access to information and information disclosure policies.



This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union. The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of Publish What You Fund.



This publication was funded by UK Aid from the UK Government. However the views expressed do not necessarily reflect that of official UK Government policy.

## Contents

Executive Summary	4
Overall Scores and Ranking	6
Introduction	7
2020 Aid Transparency Index Results: Key Findings and Highlights	10
Methodology	14
Overview of Rankings and Categories	16
Focus on Development Finance Institutions—Public and Private Portfolios	20
Moving from Data Use to Data Engagement	23
Recommendations	26
Annex 1: 2020 Aid Transparency Index Results and Comparison with 2018 Scores	27
Acronyms	29

### Boxes, Figures, and Graphs

Box 1: The Publish What You Fund Aid Transparency Principles	8
Graph 1: increases in scores of donors that scored 'poor' in 2018	10
Graph 2: comparison between bilateral aid agencies and foreign ministries	11
Graph 3: average scores across donors after the first and final rounds of data collection	13
Box 2: 2020 Aid Transparency Tracker tests consultation	14
Figure 1: the aid transparency components	14
Graph 4: radar chart of average component scores across donors in each category	16
Box 3: How did New Zealand improve its aid transparency?	17
Box 4: United Nations organisations in the 2020 Aid Transparency Index	18
Graph 5: percentage of donors assessed in the Index publishing IATI data on a monthly, quarterly, or less than quarterly basis	19
Graph 6: DFI scores in the 2020 Index	21



# Executive Summary

## The context

We produced the 2020 Aid Transparency Index in the midst of the most serious and devastating pandemic in living memory. The implications of the coronavirus pandemic for the aid sector include major impacts in both donor and partner countries. Bilateral, multilateral, philanthropic donors, and the private sector are pledging, committing, and disbursing billions of dollars in aid.

The transparency of international aid is more important than ever. As countries and international organisations quickly reallocate large quantities of aid to deal with the coronavirus pandemic, the decisions and actions they take should be open to public scrutiny. With resources stretched, they must target and spend aid as accurately as possible. Aid transparency facilitates information sharing among donors and with partner governments. It is key to improve the efficiency of resource allocation, coordination of the response, and for donors to learn from one another's interventions. Proactive, timely, comprehensive, and open data on aid flows is also critical for public oversight and accountability.

## The 2020 Aid Transparency Index

Publish What You Fund's Aid Transparency Index has been assessing the transparency of major aid donors since 2011. Our Index [methodology](#) has evolved over the iterations of the Index. We carried out data collection from December 2019 to April 2020 and focused on 35 indicators. These indicators were grouped into five components: finance and budgets, joining-up development data, organisational planning and commitments, project attributes, and performance. The Index groups donors into five categories based on their overall scores: 'very good', 'good', 'fair', 'poor', and 'very poor'.

## Key findings

The 2020 Aid Transparency Index shows significant improvement in donors' overall transparency compared to 2018. Eleven donors moved into the 'very good' category, an increase of four from 2018. The number in 'good' increased by two, to 15. This means that over half of the 47 donors that we assessed are now in the 'good' or 'very good' categories. This shift towards greater transparency consisted of many donors making incremental improvements in their aid transparency and of individual donors making wholesale changes to their publication practices, leading to significant jumps in their scores.

The improvement in scores reflects that donors are publishing increasingly more, better-quality data in the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) Standard. All of the donors, except those in the 'very poor' category, published IATI data about their activities and policies, meaning their information is open, timely, comparable, and centralised, meeting the international standard for aid transparency. We also saw donors improving the completeness of their IATI data, with 21 of the donors publishing against at least one additional indicator as compared to their 2018 performance, and nine donors starting to publish data against at least five more of the indicators.

The Index continues to drive behaviour towards greater transparency and openness among aid donors. An important element of this is the Index data collection process itself, during which Publish What You Fund engages directly with donors and provides feedback on how they can improve their data, approaches, and policies. The average score based on the first set of collected data was 54.4, which increased to 63.4 in the final data collection round four months later.

The 2020 Index has seen improvements in average scores across all of the five aid transparency components compared with 2018. However, gaps in publication of performance information persist. While more donors published project objectives, only a small minority published the results of their projects. Fewer still published project reviews and evaluations. Without this information, stakeholders monitoring donor projects have no way to gauge the effectiveness and value of aid spending, to assess the impact of projects, or to extract learning from successful and unsuccessful projects. Many donors also continued to lag in publishing procurement information in the IATI Standard.

There are 16 donors in the 'fair' category, including major European bilateral donors and development finance institutions (DFIs). Of these, 11 were in the same category in 2018. It seems that many of these donors did not prioritise their aid transparency or make significant changes to their publishing practices.

We included a wide variety of aid donors in the 2020 Index (bilateral donors, multilateral DFIs, humanitarian agencies, vertical funds, intergovernmental organisations, and a philanthropic foundation) and donors in each category have scored well. DFIs performed very well, taking four of the top five spots in the Index ranking. However, we only assessed several of these for their sovereign lending portfolios since data about their private sector lending was not available. Those DFIs that published information about private sector lending did less well.

Bilateral donors in the Index include both specialised aid agencies and foreign, trade or defence ministries that have aid delivery in their mandate. The specialised aid agencies generally performed better in the Index than the non-specialised ministries (with an average of 59.5 and 47.7 points respectively).

Sixty-two percent of the donors assessed in the Index published IATI data on a monthly basis, compared with 51 percent in 2018. Only 11 percent published on a less than quarterly basis. This means that more up-to-date, forward-looking data is available for better decision making and monitoring of aid activities.


## Building trust in the data through engagement

Publish What You Fund believes that the next frontier in the aid transparency movement is engagement with stakeholders and governments in partner countries. Using data to engage directly with development partners can help to build trust between donors, governments, and communities. This can also be a way to construct feedback loops to continuously improve and build trust in the aid data.

## Recommendations

- Donors should share comprehensive data about the results and impact of their projects.
- Donors should publish project budget documents, project procurement information (contracts and tenders), and sub-national locations.
- Regional development banks should publish their private sector portfolios.
- DFIs should publish financial and performance data about their private sector portfolios.
- Donors remaining in the 'fair' category should prioritise transparency—all donors need to pull their weight.
- Donors should engage directly with stakeholders in partner countries to raise awareness about the available data, build trust, and establish feedback loops for continuous improvement.

# Overall Scores and Ranking



\*For reasons of data availability, we were only able to review the transparency of this development bank's sovereign (government-backed) portfolio and not its private investments. The Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) only manages the IDB Group's sovereign-backed lending. IDB Invest, a separate entity within the group, manages its private sector portfolio.

† For this development bank, data for both its sovereign and non-sovereign portfolios were available and we reviewed both.



# Introduction

## The global aid context and the COVID-19 pandemic

The 2020 Aid Transparency Index was produced in the midst of the most serious and devastating pandemic in living memory. The novel coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, began to spread from Hubei Province, China, at the start of 2020 as data collection for the Index was underway, and cities around the world started imposing lockdown measures in February and March 2020 as the assessment period was drawing to a close.

The implications of the global pandemic for the aid sector include major impacts in both donor and partner countries. Lockdowns with accompanying social protection and fiscal stimulus measures in donor countries are expected to lead to sharp recessions and these are likely to affect levels of aid spending. The effects of the pandemic in partner countries are exacerbating existing problems across societies. This includes adding pressure to weak health systems, as hospitals redirect already stretched resources to deal with influxes of critically ill COVID-19 (the disease caused by SARS-CoV-2) patients, and lockdown and quarantine measures affecting jobs and industry, all results that disproportionately affect vulnerable groups.

International aid will play a major role in the crisis response, to help shore up public health capacity and support partner country efforts to stop the spread of the virus. Bilateral, multilateral, and philanthropic donors, as well as the private sector are pledging, committing, and disbursing billions of dollars. They are making donations in response to humanitarian appeals and through existing aid channels, and additional development finance is being made available for low- and middle-income countries. Some of this is new money, while in other cases funds are being diverted from existing commitments.

The pandemic has serious implications for the wider development agenda. The combination of the immediate impacts of the virus, the additional demands required to tackle it, and the reallocation of both national and international funds from other priorities makes the challenge of meeting the Sustainable Development Goals by 2030 greater than ever. Amid an otherwise bleak picture, there is a hope that in the context of the global threat of the pandemic, the immediate response and measures to prevent another similar event could lead to greater international cooperation in the areas of [public health](#), [global public goods](#), and more concerted international cooperation to [protect the environment](#) and mitigate the risks of ecosystem collapse and the climate crisis.

Prior to the pandemic, there was a mixed picture in the international aid outlook. Preliminary [figures](#) from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) indicate that total official development assistance (ODA) spending by DAC countries rose by 1.4 percent in 2019 compared to 2018—reaching US\$152.8 billion—and bilateral aid to low-income countries [also rose](#). However, of the 29 DAC countries, just five met or exceeded the United Nations target of spending 0.7 percent of gross national income (GNI) on ODA in 2019 (Denmark, Luxembourg, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom). Across the DAC donors, total ODA as a percentage of combined GNI was down from 0.31 percent in 2018 to 0.30 percent in 2019. [Projections for 2020](#) predict a significant fall in total ODA. Depending on the length of the economic downturn, total ODA could fall by between US\$10 and US\$14.4 billion in 2020. These effects could continue into 2021, with either a small uptick towards previous levels or a continued fall if the effects of the recession are compounded by a reduction in countries' ODA to GNI ratios.

Another major concern on the horizon is the prospect of a new developing country debt crisis. Alongside large increases in developing country loans from [private lenders](#), ODA has [increasingly been given as loans](#), particularly to least developed countries (LDCs), many of which are already highly indebted. Bilateral ODA loans increased by 50 percent between 2010 and 2019 and multilateral lending increased by 84 percent. In 2019, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) [identified](#) 33 low-income countries as being at a high risk of debt distress or already in debt distress. The economic impacts of the coronavirus pandemic are further exacerbating this situation as countries take on more debt to pay for their responses to the crisis. The international community is [already beginning to respond](#) with short-term debt service suspensions and cancellations of debt payments, some of which will be paid for with aid money.

## The importance of transparency in this context

In these circumstances, transparency of international aid is more important than ever. As aid organisations quickly reallocate large amounts of funding to deal with the COVID-19 pandemic, the decisions and actions they take should be open to public scrutiny. With resources stretched thin by the additional demands of the pandemic, it is vital that donors target aid accurately and that it is spent as effectively as possible. Aid transparency facilitates information sharing among donors and with partner governments, enabling more efficient allocation of resources, coordination, and learning.

Existing aid transparency commitments, such as those made through the [Open Government Partnership](#) and Publish What You Fund's Aid Transparency Principles (see Box 1), should be applied to the COVID-19 response. As well as leading to better decision making, proactive, timely, comprehensive and open data on aid flows is also critical for public oversight and accountability. Tracking and monitoring of aid flows by civil society and other accountability actors in partner countries can help to detect or dissuade mismanagement or misappropriation of funds. Unfortunately, the record on this has not been good. For example, it was difficult to track the donor response to the 2014–2015 West Africa Ebola outbreak, both in terms of where resources were directed and [how much was spent](#). A lack of transparency during that emergency response [had implications](#) for competing lines of action and duplication of efforts.

### BOX 1: The Publish What You Fund Aid Transparency Principles

The Aid Transparency Principles are at the core of our work. They cover all forms of aid and related development activities. Over 100 civil society organisations endorsed these principles in the 2011 'Make Aid Transparent' campaign.

**Information on aid should be published proactively.** Not just in response to requests.


**Information on aid should be comprehensive, timely, accessible, and comparable.** Not just a glossy brochure.

**Everyone should be able to request and receive information on aid processes.** Not just officials in governments or aid agencies.

**The right of access to information about aid should be promoted.** Not published once and forgotten.

The Principles in full can be [read here](#).





Aid transparency should also inform learning and evaluation both during and after the crisis. By publishing timely results and evaluations—both positive [and negative](#)—aid donors can monitor the progress of interventions and learn from what works, what does not work, and why. As the human impact on the natural world [increases the likelihood](#) of more pandemics in the future, it is imperative that we take full advantage of the learning opportunities from the current mobilisation of international aid so that we may be better prepared to prevent or respond to future outbreaks.

## The importance of engagement with data

The 2020 Aid Transparency Index shows a mixed picture of some donors continuing to perform well, others making significant progress, and some treading water, with few changes or improvements in their aid transparency over the past two years. There are also persistent issues with disclosure of project performance data as well as contracts and tender information and sub-national locations of activities.

Publish What You Fund believes that the next frontier in the aid transparency movement is robust engagement with stakeholders and governments in partner countries. Later in this report, we outline how using data to engage directly with development partners can help to build trust between donors, governments, and communities and empower local development actors. This can also be a way to construct feedback loops to continuously improve and build trust in the aid data itself.


## 2020 Aid Transparency Index Results: Key Findings and Highlights

### Significant improvements in the overall picture compared with 2018

The 2020 Aid Transparency Index shows an overall improvement in donors' transparency across the Index categories. Eleven donors are now in the 'very good' category, an increase of four from 2018. The number in 'good' also increased by two, to 15. This means that 26 donors are now in the 'good' or 'very good' categories, over half of the 47 that we assessed. The number of donors in the 'fair' category is unchanged at 16, while there are five fewer donors in the 'poor' category (just one in this Index, down from six in 2018) and one more in the 'very poor' category (the Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency (TIKA), included in the Index for the first time, is added to the three that previously scored 'very poor' in 2018).

This shift towards greater transparency is made up of many donors making incremental improvements in their aid transparency and of individual donors making wholesale changes to their publication practices, leading to significant jumps in their scores. Particularly noteworthy has been the performance of the six donors that were categorised as 'poor' in 2018. Three of these increased their score in 2020 by between 10 and 25 points to move into the 'fair' category, while three increased their scores by between 30 and 46 points to move straight into the 'good' category—a considerable achievement and an example of what is possible when donors apply attention to transparency.

**GRAPH 1:** increases in scores of donors that scored 'poor' in 2018



Higher up in the rankings, there was also a trend of donors improving their transparency and moving up categories. While four donors moved from 'good' to 'very good', four donors that were in the 'fair' category in 2018 increased their score enough to rank in the 'good' category in 2020.

## Good scores for different donor types


We included a wide variety of aid donors in the 2020 Index and donors of each type have scored well. In addition to traditional bilateral donors, the Index includes multilateral DFIs, humanitarian agencies, vertical funds, intergovernmental organisations, and a philanthropic foundation. The ‘very good’ category includes examples of most of these. The highest scoring humanitarian agency was the United Nation’s Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN OCHA), in the ‘good’ category, and the philanthropic foundation included (the Gates Foundation) scored near the top of the ‘fair’ category.

DFIs performed very well, taking four of the top five spots in the 2020 Index ranking. However, we only assessed several of these for their sovereign lending portfolios because data about their private sector lending was not available. Those DFIs that did publish information about private sector (non-sovereign) lending did less well, with the exception of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), which published information about sovereign and non-sovereign lending and was able to significantly improve its performance in the 2020 Index, compared with 2018 (see **Focus on Development Finance Institutions** section below).

Vertical funds and intergovernmental organisations (IGOs) also performed very well in the Index—all scored in either the ‘very good’ or ‘good’ categories. Gavi (the Vaccine Alliance) and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) joined the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in the ‘very good’ category. As mentioned, UN OCHA made significant improvements to its data in order to climb two categories, from ‘poor’ to the top half of the ‘good’ category. The European Union (EU) institutions, the Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development (DEVCO), the Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO), and the Directorate-General for Neighbourhood and Enlargement Negotiations (NEAR) all kept their spots in the ‘good’ category, with DEVCO improving significantly.

Among the bilateral donors are both specialised aid ministries or agencies and foreign, trade, or defence ministries that include aid delivery in their mandate. The specialised aid agencies generally performed better in the Index than non-specialised ministries. The below graph shows a comparison between the scores of aid agencies and foreign ministries of the countries for which we assessed both types.

**GRAPH 2:** comparison between bilateral aid agencies and foreign ministries



Across the Index, aid-specialised bilateral donor agencies averaged 59.5 points, while non-specialised ministries (foreign/trade/defence) averaged almost 12 points less at 47.7. There were twice as many specialised aid agencies in the ‘good’ and ‘very good’ categories—eight—compared to four non-specialised ministries.

## Improvements across components of aid transparency despite persistent gaps

The 2020 Index has seen improvements in average scores across the aid transparency components as compared to the 2018 Index. We grouped the Index indicators into five components of aid transparency (see the **Methodology** section below), and across donors, the average scores improved for each of these. Donors published more and better-quality data relating to finance and budgets, joining-up development data, organisational planning and commitments, project attributes, and performance.

**“Transparency is a right in the sense that the taxpayers have a right to know where their money is going to and what their money is being used for. And for the recipient countries transparency is also a right for the citizens - if you provide assistance to me I want to be able to know whether that assistance is creating the desired impact.”**

Henry Asor Nkang, Development Assistance Database Manager - Ministry of Finance, Budget and National Planning of Nigeria

Increases in overall averages mask some persistent problems, however. In 2018, we emphasised donors improving their transparency around performance-related data: objectives, results, pre-project impact appraisals, and reviews and evaluations. The 2020 Index has shown slow progress in publication of performance information. While more donors are now publishing objectives, we continue to find only a small minority publishing project results. Fewer still are publishing project reviews and evaluations. Without this information, stakeholders monitoring donor projects have no way to gauge the effectiveness and value of aid spending, to assess the impact of projects, or to extract learning from successful and unsuccessful projects.

Many donors also continued to lag in publishing procurement information—project contracts and tenders—in the IATI Standard. In some cases, procurement information was available through donor websites, however, donors should instead directly link it to the corresponding IATI data to allow easy access and usability. Most donors were also missing project budget breakdowns from their data, making it difficult to monitor the way funds are allocated within projects.

## Some major donors continue to lag behind in providing good quality, regular data

There are still 16 donors in the ‘fair’ category, including major European bilateral donors, US and Asian aid agencies and DFIs. Of these, 11 were in the same category in 2018. While some have improved since 2018, this improvement was not enough to move them into the ‘good’ category. The ‘fair’ category is also where we saw the most backsliding, with some donors scoring lower than they did in 2018 and two donors dropping categories (the United States President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) fell from ‘good’ to ‘fair’ and US Department of Defense moved from ‘fair’ to ‘poor’). Given the improvements seen in the other categories, it appears that many of these donors did not prioritise their aid transparency or make significant changes to their publishing practices. In order to build the public good of a centralised, comparable, and useful aid transparency dataset, it is important that all major aid donors pull their weight by publishing good quality, comprehensive open data in the IATI Standard.


There are also some positive developments in the 'fair' category. Three organisations moved up into 'fair' category from the 'poor' category: the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID), the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), and the United Kingdom's Foreign and Commonwealth Office (UK FCO). AECID in particular made significant strides in this Index improving by 23 points compared to its performance in 2018. Saudi Arabia's King Salman Humanitarian Aid and Relief Centre (KSRelief) also ranked at the bottom of the 'fair' category for the first time.

### The Index continues to drive improvements in aid transparency

There is [persuasive evidence](#) of the Aid Transparency Index's normative power to drive aid donors' behaviour towards greater transparency and openness. An important element of this is the Index data collection process itself, which includes an iterative component through which we provide feedback to donors as they undergo assessment. This feedback provides a regular check on how a donor is scoring against the Index indicators, which creates an incentive to improve in those areas where scores are lagging. Publish What You Fund also engages directly with the donors during the assessment process to provide guidance and suggestions for how they can improve their data, approaches, and policies.

The way scores improve during data collection is evidence of the efficacy of this process. After we share initial results from data collected at the start of the process, donors work to improve their data in time for the final round of data collection. The average score based on the first set of data was 54.4 across all of the donors. This average increased by nine points to 63.4 when we assessed the final set of data four months later. Individually, 14 donors increased their scores by enough to move up at least one category, with a few donors increasing by two categories from one round to the next.

**GRAPH 3:** average scores across donors after the first and final rounds of data collection



### Donors are publishing increasingly more, better-quality aid data

The improvement in scores is reflective of donors increasing the amount of data they publish in open data formats. All of the donors except those in the 'very poor' category published IATI data about their activities and policies, meaning their information is open, timely, comparable, and centralised, meeting the international standard for aid transparency. The total value of transactions published by donors in the current data period assessed in this Index (April 2019 to March 2020) was US\$193.2 billion in commitments and US\$183.6 billion in disbursements and expenditures (this includes both ODA and non-ODA flows and a variety of finance types).

Three of the donors we assessed published good quality IATI data across all of the Index indicators: the Asian Development Bank – Sovereign Portfolio, UNDP, and the World Bank - International Development Association (IDA). Donors also improved the completeness of their IATI data, with 21 of the donors in the Index publishing against at least one additional indicator compared with 2018, and nine donors starting to publish data against at least five more of the indicators.

## Methodology

The Aid Transparency Index has been assessing the transparency of major aid donors on a regular basis since 2011. The Index [methodology](#) has evolved over the iterations of the Index: most recently, the methodology was revised prior to the 2018 Index to keep it up to date with current aid transparency practice and encourage donor agencies to improve the quality and usefulness of their data.

We based the 2020 Aid Transparency Index on the same methodology and approach that we used in 2018. This means that scores are broadly comparable between the two Indexes. Prior to the start of the 2020 Index, we carried out a consultation regarding the automated tests used to assess the quality of IATI data and made some small changes and updates (see Box 2).

### BOX 2: 2020 Aid Transparency Tracker tests consultation

An [open consultation](#) was held with the donors included in the Index during September 2019, through the GitHub development platform. The consultation was an opportunity to check the way the tests work across the diverse datasets published by different donors and to incorporate the latest IATI Standard updates.


We made minor modifications to the tests for four indicators and changed one indicator substantively. We changed the name of indicator 15 from 'capital spend' to 'budget alignment' and appended an additional sector code test to the capital spend test so this indicator now assesses how well a donor's financial data can be mapped against a partner country's own budget.

## Index data assessment approach

The Aid Transparency Index assesses major aid donors' transparency against 35 **indicators**. Each indicator corresponds to an element of a donor's activities, policies, or approach to aid delivery, and we award points for an indicator when a donor makes the corresponding information available and accessible. We weight scores for these indicators based on the perceived importance of the information and a total of 100 points are available across all of the indicators. We group the indicators into **components** of aid transparency that correspond to the type of information they relate to: finance and budgets, joining-up development data, organisational planning and commitments, project attributes, and performance.

**FIGURE 1:** the aid transparency components





We allocate points for each indicator based on the format of publication and, in the case of activity-related indicators, the frequency of publication and coverage across activities. Full points are available if a donor published data in the IATI Standard, while up to 50 percent of the points can be awarded if it published data in another format and made it accessible publicly through a website or aid data portal.

## Iterative data collection process

We collected data for the 2020 Aid Transparency Index from December 2019 to April 2020. There are a number of stages in the data collection and assessment process. We first collect data from the IATI Registry using our bespoke Aid Transparency Tracker software. This runs automated tests on the data to assess the coverage and quality of data published for each indicator. If we can't find data on the IATI Registry for a donor or for a specific indicator, we carry out a manual survey to see if the information is available in another format.

We then carry out [manual sampling](#) of the IATI data. We take a random sample from a donor's activities and review the quality of the data or documents that we find to assess whether they meet our indicator criteria. If the data does not meet our quality standards, the points for that indicator are lost. This is the only existing systematic [manual check of IATI data quality](#) and is a key part of the Index's data quality assessment. It is also labour intensive. Across the donors and indicators in the Index, and including both rounds of data collection, we manually reviewed over 20,000 documents and data points.


The Index assessment is an iterative process that invites participation from the donors under review, so they can provide additional information and evidence. We also score the donors twice—once at the start of the process, and again at the end. We provide feedback during the process so donors can make changes and improvements to their data during the assessment. We have found that this process is a strong driver for improved transparency among the major aid donors we assess (see the **Key Findings and Highlights** section above).

Another way that we enhance the rigour of the assessments is with the support of independent reviewers who check each assessment and provide feedback and additional evidence where relevant. We are very grateful for the help of the 34 independent reviewers who offered their expertise for the 2020 Index on a voluntary basis. The reviewers—who are independent from the donors under review—came largely from civil society organisations, research, or academia and were invited to participate based on their knowledge of the donor they reviewed or general expertise in the aid sector.

## Overview of Rankings and Categories

The Aid Transparency Index groups donors into five categories based on their overall scores. The categories and their criteria remain unchanged from previous years. They are 'very good' (80–100 points), 'good' (60–80 points), 'fair' (40–60 points), 'poor' (20–40 points) and 'very poor' (0–20 points).

**GRAPH 4:** radar chart of average component scores across donors in each category



### Very good


Eleven donors reached the 'very good' category in the 2020 Index, four more than in 2018. We ranked Global Affairs Canada and Gavi 'very good' for the first time. UNICEF and the Global Fund returned to the 'very good' category, having dropped down into 'good' in 2018. Multilateral development banks dominated the top five spots in the Index. The Asian Development Bank – Sovereign Portfolio topped the Index, the World Bank - IDA increased its score by 11 points compared with 2018 to reach second place, while UNDP and the African Development Bank – Sovereign Portfolio took third and fourth place, respectively. The Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) came fifth. The US' Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) and the UK's Department for International Development (DFID), the two highest-ranking bilateral donors, remained in the 'very good' category.

Donors in the 'very good' category generally published comprehensive data in the IATI Standard that is comparable, standardised, machine readable, timely, and forward-looking. Some of the donors in the category did not publish pre-project impact appraisals or consistent sub-national locations, and some did not publish forward-looking budgets consistently at either the project or organisation level. However, others did score full points for these indicators as well.

### Good

A number of donors made significant improvements from 2018 and were able to move up one or two categories to score as 'good' in this Index. New Zealand's Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) was the largest improver in the Index, increasing by 47 points compared to 2018 and moving from the bottom of the 'poor' category to second place in 'good' (see Box 2 for more details on how their team was able to achieve this).





Other big improvers were Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development KfW (BMZ-KfW), which increased by 20 points, moving from 'fair' to third in the 'good' category; UN OCHA which increased by 41 points and moved from 'poor' to 'good'; the Korean International Cooperation Agency (KOICA), which moved from 'poor' to 'good', improving by 34 points; and the EBRD, which moved from the top of the 'fair' category into the middle of 'good'. The US Department of State (State) and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) also made improvements in their scores that brought them both into the 'good' category for the first time.

### **BOX 3: How did New Zealand improve its aid transparency?**

New Zealand's Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) improved significantly in the 2020 Aid Transparency Index, increasing from a score of 31.0 in 2018 to 77.6 in this assessment. According to Joe Davey, Senior Data & Reporting Analyst at New Zealand MFAT, they focused on four areas to achieve this: leadership, technology, resourcing, and data quality.

'The Ministry's leadership recognised the importance of high quality and transparent data, and leadership at all levels clearly communicated to staff that transparency was a priority. A new aid management system set the technological foundation. This provided the mechanism to record, extract and transform the detailed aid information required for IATI publication in a way that was not previously possible.

New Zealand's commitment to aid transparency is set out in its new policy on International Cooperation for Sustainable Development. To support this commitment, and recognising the growing importance of good aid data, the Ministry established a new data and reporting team with the right technical specialists, who were able to produce the required IATI data in an efficient and repeatable way. In addition, the Ministry ensured programming teams had the resources required to produce, review, and approve IATI data for publication. The Data and Reporting team also implemented a robust release process, which focused on data quality and adherence to New Zealand legislative privacy requirements.

An enhanced Aid Transparency Index score is just one of a number of initiatives planned by the Ministry to support clearer, more open communication about New Zealand's Aid. The next step is a work programme to continuously improve transparency to partners, the international development community and the New Zealand public.'

Most of the other donors in the 'good' category made small- to medium-sized improvements to their scores, including NEAR, which topped the category; the US Agency for International Development (USAID), which came fourth; and DEVCO, which improved by 11 points to reach fifth place in the category. Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development - GIZ (BMZ-GIZ) also made significant improvements and increased its score by 11 points.

The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, ECHO, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), and Belgium's Directorate-General for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid (DGD) round off the category with scores that remained largely unchanged from 2018 or dropped slightly to move them down the rankings in the group.

The main difference between donors in this category and those in the 'very good' category is in their publication of performance-related data. Donors in the 'good' category scored almost 10 points lower on average for the performance component compared with those in the 'very good' category. This is largely due to results and evaluations data not being found or failing our IATI quality sampling. Project budget documents were also often missing or failed sampling, as was the case for sub-national locations.

## Fair

Sixteen donors ranked in the 'fair' category for this Index, the same number as in 2018 and 2016. However, this included three donors that moved up from the 'poor' category: AECID, JICA, UK FCO, and one new donor that was not assessed in 2018, KSRelief. All of the donors in the 'fair' category published data in the IATI Standard, however, some published on a quarterly or less than quarterly basis, rather than a monthly basis. They also published less comprehensive information about their activities. Many did not publish any contract or project conditions information or tenders in their IATI data. None of the donors in the 'fair' category published project budget documents and several did not publish any disaggregated country or sector budgets.

Performance-related data is particularly lacking among the donors in this category. We found almost no performance information in their IATI data, and only found two donors that published project level results consistently in any format (PEPFAR and JICA). We likewise found no IATI data that met the criteria for pre-project impact appraisals and reviews and evaluations and we only found two donors that published this information in other formats (Finland Ministry of Foreign Affairs and JICA).

### BOX 4: United Nations organisations in the 2020 Aid Transparency Index

The 2020 Index included three United Nations agencies: UNDP, UNICEF, and UN OCHA. All three performed well. UNDP increased its score marginally compared with 2018, to remain in the 'very good' category, in third place overall. UNICEF increased its score by almost 15 points and moved from the 'good' to the 'very good' category. UN OCHA showed the biggest improvement. Having ranked 'poor' in 2018, it moved directly into 'good' this year—leapfrogging the 'fair' category altogether.

UNDP continued to rank near the top of the Index, with excellent scores for all components. Its increase in score compared with 2018 was largely thanks to improvements made to its information disclosure policy. It also improved slightly in the performance component by increasing the number of evaluations published against relevant activities.

UNICEF made improvements to both its financial- and performance-related data. This included more detailed project budgets, now disaggregated by quarter, and publication of project budget breakdowns. It also improved publication of good quality results and reviews and evaluations.

UN OCHA improved across the board, but particularly in the finance and budgets and joining-up development data components. It scored close to full points for both components this time. It also made significant improvements to its organisational planning and commitments by publishing organisation-level documents in the IATI Standard. However, it continues to score poorly for performance-related data because its project results and reviews and evaluations failed our manual quality checks.

**“With high quality, comprehensive data on both development and humanitarian resources and results already available to the public, UNICEF has built a culture of evidence-based practice and programming, enabling closer cooperation with governments, partners, sister UN agencies and other aid actors, and promotes the use of open data in order to accelerate achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.”**

Vidhya Ganesh, Director, Division of Data, Analytics, Planning and Monitoring, UNICEF

## Poor

## Very poor


Four donors were in the 'very poor' category in this Index, and just one donor, the US Department of Defense, scored in the 'poor' category. Defense dropped from 'fair' in 2018 to 'poor' in this Index largely due to a drop in its publication frequency from monthly to less than quarterly.

The donors in the 'very poor' category did not publish data in the IATI Standard. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of the United Arab Emirates (UAE MOFAIC) increased its score significantly compared with 2018, though this was not quite enough to move it out of the 'very poor' category. More information was available about its current projects through its website, however, this data was not standardised, centralised, or forward-looking. Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) also published some information about its activities, but not in the IATI Standard.

China made very little information available about its aid activities or policies, and so was ranked at the bottom of the Index for the second time running. We included Turkey's TIKA in the Index for the first time this year as a rising international donor that is starting to spend significant quantities of ODA. We found very little publicly available information about its activities and found no corresponding data on the IATI Registry.

## Frequency of IATI Publication

**GRAPH 5:** percentage of donors assessed in the Index publishing IATI data on a monthly, quarterly, or less than quarterly basis



Donors in the Index have continued to publish IATI data on a more regular basis, following a trend identified in 2018. Sixty-two percent of the donors assessed in the Index published IATI data on a monthly basis, compared with 51 percent in 2018, and just 11 percent published on a less than quarterly basis. This shows an increasing systematisation of IATI publication among aid donors and means that more up-to-date, forward-looking data is available for stakeholders to enable better decision making and monitoring of aid activities.

## Focus on Development Finance Institutions— Public and Private Portfolios

DFIs continue to play an increasingly important role in international aid efforts. Multilateral development banks and bilateral development financing instruments mobilise billions of dollars in lending to developing country governments and private sectors with the stated aim of [financing progress towards](#) the Sustainable Development Goals. Public sector lending focuses primarily on infrastructure and social projects, while private sector portfolios include lending and equity investments in companies and funds operating in developing country markets. The development benefits these interventions aim to produce are growing markets, job creation, and leverage for more finance, all of which should contribute to economic growth and increased tax revenues for governments.

### Sovereign and non-sovereign portfolios

We included seven multilateral development banks (MDBs) in the 2020 Aid Transparency Index. Five of these are regional development banks and two are institutions within the World Bank Group. For some of the regional development banks, we were only able to find information about their public sector (sovereign) lending portfolio and because of this, we limited our assessment to this area of the bank's lending only. Others publish both public and private sector (non-sovereign) portfolios so our assessment reflects the transparency of all of the bank's activities. This breaks down as follows:

**African Development Bank (AfDB):** data was only available for AfDB's sovereign portfolio so we limited our assessment to this portfolio only.

**Asian Development Bank (AsDB):** data was only available for AsDB's sovereign portfolio so we limited our assessment to this portfolio only.

**Inter-American Development Bank (IDB):** our assessment was for the IDB, however, IDB is the sovereign lending instrument of the IDB Group; its private sector activities are carried out by IDB Invest, a separate entity within the Group. We only found transparency data for IDB, not IDB Invest, so have only assessed the Group's sovereign portfolio.


**World Bank:** we separately assessed and scored both the **IDA**, which carries out sovereign lending, and the **International Finance Corporation (IFC)**, which carries out private sector lending.

**European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD):** for the EBRD, we found transparency data on both sovereign and private sector portfolios.

**European Investment Bank (EIB):** for the EIB, we found transparency data on both sovereign and private sector portfolios.

## MDB performance in the Index

GRAPH 6: DFI scores in the 2020 Index



DFIs that are publishing only sovereign-backed lending portfolios performed very well in the Index. The AsDB - Sovereign Portfolio came top of the Index with 98.0 points. The World Bank - IDA came second, having increased 11 points from 2018 by making incremental improvements to its publication across the aid transparency components. The AfDB - Sovereign Portfolio came fourth, while the IDB moved up from seventh place, at the bottom of the 'very good' category, to fifth place in this Index.

All of these DFIs are publishing comprehensive information about their activities in the IATI Standard.

The picture of those DFIs that are publishing their private sector portfolios is more mixed. The IFC improved on its performance in the 2018 Index but remains in the 'fair' category with 58.1 points. EIB also made small improvements but remains in 'fair' with 58.9 points. The EBRD, however, was able to increase its score and move from 'fair' to the 'good' category.

These DFIs published good IATI data on their project attributes, organisational planning and commitments, and joining-up development data. They are seriously hampered, however, by a lack of finance and budget information at both the activity and organisation levels, and by a lack of performance-related data, particularly results and reviews and evaluations. They also did not publish adequate procurement information in the IATI Standard for either contracts or tenders.

## Why transparency matters

A lack of transparency data for private sector investments makes it difficult to monitor the progress of these activities, to assess their value or learn from successes and failures. It also impedes information sharing and coordination between institutions.

Private sector development financing has seen precipitous growth over the past two decades, and stood at [US\\$87 billion in annual investments in 2017](#). Public money finances these instruments and so there should be evidence-based means to assess the validity of decisions to direct development funds through these channels. Assessing value for money requires both financial and impact data and we have found these to be incomplete in private sector lending transparency data.


The reasons for withholding this information often relate to commercial confidentiality. Detailed, timely data about the rate of disbursements and up-to-date results of private investments are often market-sensitive and are likely to affect the value of the companies involved. For publicly traded companies, there are legal restrictions on what information can be made available and when. Understanding this, we believe there is a balance they can strike on providing this information, even if they exclude some projects from transparency disclosures given the current restrictions. There are obvious benefits of this approach to DFIs themselves, as it would allow them to demonstrate their own value and impact. Publish What You Fund is currently researching this balance in our [DFI Transparency Initiative](#).



## Moving from Data Use to Data Engagement

The 2020 Aid Transparency Index has shown that more donors than ever are publishing good quality, comprehensive data about their aid projects in the IATI Standard. The current data we reviewed in this Index includes disaggregated transaction and forward-looking budget data covering billions of dollars of aid flows and over 100,000 activities, often including detailed documentation about the project terms, performance, sub-national locations, and implementing partners. While there are still data gaps and variations in quality and comprehensiveness between donors, as is illustrated by the Index scores and rankings, there are huge quantities of detailed data on the IATI Registry about the aid projects being carried out in countries across the world. This data is publicly accessible, standardised, machine-readable, and downloadable for replication and integration with other datasets.

While the aid transparency theory of change is clearly articulated, evidence of impact has been largely anecdotal and [non-generalisable](#). Attempts to demonstrate the theory of change working in practice have to date been case-study based and have tended to focus on data use. At Publish What You Fund, we believe that an important part of the picture has been overlooked—the potential of aid transparency alongside engagement to build trust and empower local actors.



**“For us as a national NGO, transparency is crucial for the aid and development donors and for civil society organisations as well - aid transparency allows us to know what kind of resources are coming to our country, Iraq, and how the resources are used, and also builds trust and makes sure that we are working with a high standard of ethics.”**

Ary Tahir, Deputy Country Director, Public Aid Organization, Iraq

### Building trust

To date, aid transparency engagement has focused on making data more accessible through aid portals. The Aid Transparency Index scores donors on their aid portals for the ‘accessibility’ indicator, which awards points for having disaggregated data, allowing bulk downloads, and for presenting data under an open license. We have seen gradual improvement in this indicator in the 2020 Index compared with 2018, with the number of donors scoring for ‘accessibility’ increasing from 32 to 37 and the average score increasing by 16 percent. However, we believe donors now need to move beyond technical solutions and a [binary and linear approach](#) based on data supply and demand, and to start proactively engaging with partners and stakeholders to raise awareness and build trust and accountability.

By engaging stakeholders through face-to-face meetings, joint exploration of data, and dissemination of information products, donors can [build trust and acceptance](#) in communities where aid delivery is taking place. Trust should underpin the spirit in which a modern aid system operates: development work should be inclusive and built on mutual respect between partners. Trust is also vital for aid donors to operate in many contexts as good relationships with partners and local actors can be prerequisites to successful project delivery.

## Shrinking civic space

There is also a dark side to this equation. The past decade has seen civic space closing in countries across the world. One of the ways in which governments have sought to stifle dissent has been through the introduction of new non-governmental organization (NGO) laws that include stringent disclosure and financial transparency requirements for civil society organisations (CSOs). Penalties for non-compliance include fines, bank account freezes, and [even criminal charges](#). A lack of trust can help to build public acceptance for such measures and governments can use a perceived lack of transparency to sow suspicion of international actors. Information gaps can be used as an opportunity to spread misinformation. The voluntary, proactive provision of aid information and data advocated by Publish What You Fund and the global aid transparency movement could help in some cases. Providing accurate information, building trust in international actors, and dispelling false narratives about their intentions can make it more difficult for authoritarians to gain public acceptance for these types of measures.

## Building trust in the data through engagement and feedback loops


While donors should proactively engage stakeholders with their data to build trust, it is important that this is not undermined by a lack of belief in the aid data itself. Publish What You Fund research has identified [a lack of trust among stakeholders](#) in some of the project data published to the IATI Registry. At the macro level, this can be because of gaps where some donors do not publish or have poorer quality data. This can undermine the dataset as a whole. There can also be problems when looking at more specific data if there are discrepancies between data published centrally and information held locally.

One of the most effective ways to overcome these problems is through data use and the construction of feedback loops for continuous improvement. Publish What You Fund has identified that stakeholders in partner countries have a continued demand for data. Working with our partners, we have seen first-hand the variety of [stakeholders that seek aid data](#) ranging from CSOs and elected representatives to think tanks and central banks. By building feedback loops with these stakeholders, donors can identify what data they need and how it can be usefully organised, fill data gaps, and correct errors and inconsistencies, which will all lead to systematic improvements. This will build trust in the data among stakeholders and help donors to establish the true value of their open data.

A good example of this is partner country governments tracking aid flows going into their countries. Government officials often do this by collecting data directly from donor country offices to populate national level Aid Information Management System (AIMS) databases. They could instead do this using the relevant IATI data. However, there are often discrepancies between data held by donor country offices and data published centrally to the IATI Registry. Some of the reasons behind this issue were highlighted in the '[Open Data, Development Assistance, and Humanitarian Action](#)' chapter in '[The State of Open Data: Histories and Horizons](#)' (Weaver, Powell, and Leson, 2019):

*While innovation in open data has been a top priority of many development agencies at the headquarters level, these innovations often fail to appeal to country office staff, limiting impact and implementation at local levels. For example, while publishing and using IATI has been a top priority of many agencies, country staff are often unaware of IATI and are occasionally resistant to its use, creating inconsistencies between data published locally and that published internationally.*





There is an opportunity to create a feedback loop to overcome these problems by involving donor headquarters, country office staff, and the partner government. When the partner government requests aid data for their database, donor headquarters staff share relevant IATI data with their country office for them to review and compare with their own records. Through dialogue between the donor headquarters and the country office, any systemic reasons for inconsistencies could then be identified leading to continuous and scalable improvement in data quality. Once agreed, the donor would update the data on the IATI Registry and share it with the partner government. Through continual systematic improvement and the building of trust in the data, this process can become automated and donors can use IATI data to directly populate the AIMS database.

There are many other such feedback loops that stakeholders and receptive, accountable donors can create through data use. As well as improving the accuracy and consistency of publicly available IATI data, this can also have the added benefit of helping donors to harmonise and improve their own data held centrally and at country offices.

## Recommendations

Based on the results and findings from the 2020 Index, Publish What You Fund makes the following recommendations to the international aid donor community:

- **Improve performance data**

A lack of performance-related data is a persistent issue among the donors assessed in the Aid Transparency Index and while there were small improvements this year, much more needs to be done. Donors should share comprehensive data about the results and impact of their projects in the IATI Standard to allow oversight actors, partner countries, and other donors to monitor their progress, learn from project performance, and assess the value for money of aid activities.

- **Publish project budgets documents, project procurement information (contracts and tenders), and sub-national locations**

Donors should publish comprehensive information about their activities in the IATI Standard. Publishing budget breakdowns, contracts, and tender information about projects and sub-national locations is important to provide a full picture to accountability actors in partner countries and taxpayers in their own countries.

- **Regional development banks need to publish their private sector portfolios**

For three of the regional development banks we assessed, transparency data was only available for the sovereign lending portfolio. For this reason, we were not able to make an overall assessment of the bank or bank group and were only able to score their sovereign portfolios. In order to receive a full assessment in future, the AsDB and AfDB should publish transparency information about their non-sovereign portfolios. The IDB Group should ensure that transparency information is available for IDB Invest as well as the public sector lending carried out by IDB.

- **DFIs need to publish financial and performance data about their private sector portfolios**

DFIs that are publishing information about their private sector lending should publish more detailed financial information about their activities and should publish activity results and evaluations. Without this information, it is not possible to gauge whether this development modality is providing value for money or leading to impact.

- **Donors remaining in the 'fair' category in the Index need to prioritise transparency— all donors need to pull their weight**

A number of donors are languishing in the 'fair' category in the Index and have not made significant improvements since the last Index in 2018. In order to build the global public good of a transparent international aid system, all donors need to pull their weight and publish comprehensive, good quality, forward-looking data about their projects that is accessible, centralised, and timely. Big improvers this year have shown what can be done if transparency is prioritised and adequately resourced.

- **Engage partners with data to build trust**

The next frontier in aid transparency is to engage stakeholders with data to build trust between actors and in international aid more broadly. Beyond simply making information available, donors should engage directly with stakeholders in partner countries to raise awareness about the data that is now available, build trust with partners, and establish feedback loops for continuous improvement of aid data. As donors carry out this type of engagement, they should share their experiences with the rest of the aid transparency community for peer learning and demonstration effects.

## Annex 1: 2020 Aid Transparency Index Results and Comparison with 2018 Scores

Links to profiles of each organisation are included in the table below.

2020 rank	Donor name	2020 score	2020 category	2018 score	2018 category	Difference 2018 - 2020
1	<a href="#">AsDB - Sovereign Portfolio*</a>	98.0	Very Good	98.6	Very Good	-0.6
2	<a href="#">World Bank, IDA</a>	97.1	Very Good	86.1	Very Good	11.0
3	<a href="#">UNDP</a>	96.6	Very Good	95.5	Very Good	1.2
4	<a href="#">AfDB - Sovereign Portfolio*</a>	95.5	Very Good	88.4	Very Good	7.1
5	<a href="#">IDB*</a>	95.4	Very Good	83.5	Very Good	11.9
6	<a href="#">UNICEF</a>	92.9	Very Good	78.1	Good	14.7
7	<a href="#">US, MCC</a>	92.1	Very Good	87.0	Very Good	5.0
8	<a href="#">Global Fund</a>	86.5	Very Good	74.5	Good	12.0
9	<a href="#">UK, DFID</a>	85.4	Very Good	90.9	Very Good	-5.5
10	<a href="#">Canada, Global Affairs</a>	80.9	Very Good	79.7	Good	1.2
11	<a href="#">GAVI</a>	80.8	Very Good	75.3	Good	5.5
12	<a href="#">EC, NEAR</a>	78.7	Good	76.5	Good	2.3
13	<a href="#">New Zealand, MFAT</a>	77.6	Good	31.1	Poor	46.5
14	<a href="#">Germany, BMZ-KFW</a>	77.3	Good	57.7	Fair	19.6
15	<a href="#">US, USAID</a>	76.7	Good	68.8	Good	7.9
16	<a href="#">EC, DEVCO</a>	76.5	Good	65.9	Good	10.6
17	<a href="#">UN OCHA</a>	74.0	Good	32.7	Poor	41.2
18	<a href="#">Germany, BMZ-GIZ</a>	72.3	Good	60.9	Good	11.4
19	<a href="#">Netherlands, MFA</a>	71.2	Good	70.1	Good	1.1
20	<a href="#">Korea, KOICA</a>	70.7	Good	37.0	Poor	33.8
21	<a href="#">EBRD†</a>	69.1	Good	57.1	Fair	12.0
22	<a href="#">EC, ECHO</a>	68.2	Good	77.6	Good	-9.4
23	<a href="#">Sweden, Sida</a>	63.7	Good	71.2	Good	-7.5
24	<a href="#">Belgium, DGD</a>	63.4	Good	63.4	Good	0.0
25	<a href="#">US, State</a>	63.2	Good	58.3	Fair	5.0
26	<a href="#">Switzerland, SDC</a>	61.1	Good	50.9	Fair	10.2
27	<a href="#">US, PEPFAR</a>	59.8	Fair	63.4	Good	-3.6
28	<a href="#">EIB†</a>	58.9	Fair	57.1	Fair	1.8
29	<a href="#">Finland, MFA</a>	58.6	Fair	54.1	Fair	4.5
30	<a href="#">France, AFD</a>	58.5	Fair	46.5	Fair	12.1
31	<a href="#">World Bank, IFC</a>	58.1	Fair	52.1	Fair	6.0
32	<a href="#">Gates Foundation</a>	57.9	Fair	47.3	Fair	10.6
33	<a href="#">Spain, AECID</a>	57.8	Fair	35.1	Poor	22.7
34	<a href="#">Australia, DFAT</a>	51.8	Fair	57.4	Fair	-5.6

2020 rank	Donor name	2020 score	2020 category	2018 score	2018 category	Difference 2018 - 2020
35	<a href="#">Italy, AICS</a>	49.3	Fair	45.6	Fair	3.8
36	<a href="#">Japan, JICA</a>	49.3	Fair	38.8	Poor	10.5
37	<a href="#">France, MEAE</a>	48.9	Fair	45.9	Fair	3.0
38	<a href="#">UK, FCO</a>	48.6	Fair	34.3	Poor	14.3
39	<a href="#">Denmark, MFA</a>	48.6	Fair	49.3	Fair	-0.7
40	<a href="#">Norway, MFA</a>	43.5	Fair	43.3	Fair	0.2
41	<a href="#">Ireland, Irish Aid</a>	42.6	Fair	42.0	Fair	0.6
42	<a href="#">Saudi Arabia, KSRelief</a>	42.0	Fair			
43	<a href="#">US, Defense</a>	39.8	Poor	48.7	Fair	-8.9
44	<a href="#">UAE, MOFAIC</a>	17.7	Very Poor	1.9	Very Poor	15.9
45	<a href="#">Japan, MOFA</a>	16.3	Very Poor	10.2	Very Poor	6.0
46	<a href="#">Turkey, TIKA</a>	6.3	Very Poor			
47	<a href="#">China, MOFCOM</a>	1.2	Very Poor	1.2	Very Poor	0.0

\*For reasons of data availability, we were only able to review the transparency of this development bank's sovereign (government-backed) portfolio and not its private investments. The IDB only manages the IDB Group's sovereign-backed lending, its private sector portfolio is managed by IDB Invest, a separate entity within the group.

† For this development bank, data for both its sovereign and non-sovereign portfolios were available and we reviewed both.

## Acronyms

<b>AECID</b>	Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo)	<b>IDB</b>	Inter-American Development Bank
<b>AfDB</b>	African Development Bank	<b>IFC</b>	International Finance Corporation (World Bank)
<b>AFD</b>	French Development Agency (Agence Française de Développement)	<b>IGO</b>	Intergovernmental organisation
<b>AICS</b>	Italian Agency for Development Cooperation (Agenzia Italiana per la Cooperazione allo Sviluppo)	<b>IMF</b>	International Monetary Fund
<b>AIMS</b>	Aid Information Management System	<b>JICA</b>	Japan International Cooperation Agency
<b>AsDB</b>	Asian Development Bank	<b>KOICA</b>	International Cooperation Agency (of Korea)
<b>BMZ</b>	German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung)	<b>KSRelief</b>	King Salman Humanitarian Aid and Relief Centre (of Saudi Arabia)
<b>CSOs</b>	Civil Society Organisations	<b>LDCs</b>	Least developed countries (United Nations classification)
<b>Defense</b>	United States Department of Defense	<b>MCC</b>	US Millennium Challenge Corporation
<b>DEVCO</b>	European Commission Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development	<b>MDB</b>	Multilateral Development Bank
<b>DFAT</b>	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (of Australia)	<b>MEAE</b>	French Ministry of Europe and Foreign Affairs (Ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires étrangères)
<b>DFIs</b>	Development Finance Institutions	<b>MFA</b>	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
<b>DFID</b>	Department for International Development (of the United Kingdom)	<b>MFAT</b>	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (of New Zealand)
<b>DGD</b>	Directorate-General for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid (of Belgium)	<b>MOFA</b>	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (of Japan)
<b>EBRD</b>	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development	<b>MOFAIC</b>	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation (of the United Arab Emirates)
<b>EC</b>	European Commission	<b>MOFCOM</b>	Ministry of Commerce (of China)
<b>ECHO</b>	The Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (European Commission)	<b>NEAR</b>	The Directorate-General for Neighbourhood and Enlargement Negotiations (European Commission)
<b>EIB</b>	European Investment Bank	<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organisation
<b>EU</b>	European Union	<b>ODA</b>	Official Development Assistance
<b>FCO</b>	Foreign and Commonwealth Office (of the United Kingdom)	<b>OECD DAC</b>	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Development Assistance Committee
<b>Gates Foundation</b>	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	<b>PEPFAR</b>	US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief
<b>Gavi</b>	Gavi, The Vaccine Alliance	<b>SDC</b>	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
<b>GIZ</b>	German Corporation for International Cooperation (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit)	<b>SDGs</b>	Sustainable Development Goals
<b>Global Fund</b>	The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria	<b>Sida</b>	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
<b>GNI</b>	Gross National Income	<b>State</b>	US Department of State
<b>IATI</b>	International Aid Transparency Initiative	<b>TIKA</b>	Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency
<b>IDA</b>	International Development Association (World Bank)	<b>UAE</b>	United Arab Emirates
		<b>UK</b>	United Kingdom
		<b>UN</b>	United Nations
		<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme
		<b>UNICEF</b>	United Nations Children's Fund
		<b>UNOCHA</b>	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
		<b>US</b>	United States (of America)
		<b>USAID</b>	US Agency for International Development

# Aid Transparency Index

2020

**“Aid transparency based on sharing accurate, timely, comprehensive and comparable data is really important. It should be a non-negotiable commitment. There’s no scope or luxury for us to work in isolation. If we’d like to bring more connectivity, there’s no alternative but publishing the data in the humanitarian and development field.”**

Shahana Hayat,  
Humanitarian Program Manager,  
Christian Aid, Bangladesh