Aid Transparency Index 2020

Turkey, Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency (TIKA)

SCORE: 6.3
POSITION: 46/47
2020 VERY POOR

OVERVIEW
Turkey – TIKA has been included in the 2020 Index because of a large increase in official development assistance (ODA) spending. In 2017, Turkey reported over US$8bn as ODA (0.85 percent of its gross national income). Over 70 percent of this went to the Syria crisis and Syrian refugees, and a further 13 percent (US$1.1bn) went predominantly to sub-Saharan Africa, Eastern Europe, and Asia. Following a 2011 statutory decree, TIKA is the primary agency for Turkish ODA.

ANALYSIS
TIKA did not publish any data to the IATI Registry. It did, however, report to the OECD DAC Creditor Reporting System. TIKA ranks second-to-last in the 2020 Index.

TIKA published some basic information on its website, however, it did not make it systematically available in a searchable format. We found some basic organisational documents including an organisational strategy, allocation policy, and annual report. Some country strategies were available, but TIKA did not provide these consistently. We could not find any audit documents.

TIKA made three-year forward-looking budgets available in its allocation policy, which is available as a PDF document. However, it did not make any other financial data available in other formats. Beyond updating news and communications on their website, TIKA did not make available any regular disaggregated data on project attributes such as project titles, locations, descriptions, or performance-related data.

RECOMMENDATIONS
- As a relatively new large donor entity, TIKA has had a rapid increase in its funding amounts. Consequently, it now needs to make transparency a more central aim in its policies and procedures. It should start by establishing its own searchable aid portal and provide downloadable data in user friendly and comparable formats.
- TIKA should start publishing data about its activities in the IATI standard. It should add the basic organisational data that is available on its website to the IATI Registry with an organisational file.

DEEP DIVE

Organisational planning and commitments

Quality of FOI legislation
Score: 1.25
Commitments

Score: 4.1 / 15

ABOUT COMPONENT

This component looks at the overall aims and strategy of an organisation. We check for any public commitments to aid transparency. We also make sure audits are in place and if planning documents have been published, including by parent organisations (including national governments) where applicable. We make note of any Freedom of Information laws and critically, we make sure that organisations have tried to make their information easy to access and understand. You should not have to be an expert in open data to be able to find and use this information.

Accessibility

Score: 0

Organisation strategy

Score: 0.94

Annual report

Score: 0.94

Allocation policy

Score: 0.94

Procurement policy

Score: 0

Strategy (country/sector) or Memorandum of Understanding

Score: 0

Audit

Score: 0

Finance and budgets

Score: 19 / 25

ABOUT COMPONENT

This component is critical to allow you and anyone else to follow the money. We expect to find the total budget of the organisation being assessed, right down to individual transactions for each development activity. In particular, forward-looking budgets from donors are important for partner country governments to be able to plan their own future finances.

Disaggregated budget

Score: 0.69

Project budget

Score: 0

Project budget document

Score: 0

Commitments

Score: 0.56

Disbursements and expenditures

Score: 0

Budget Alignment

Score: 0

Total organisation budget

Score: 0.69
### Project attributes

**Score: 0.3 / 20**

**ABOUT COMPONENT**

This component refers to descriptive, non-financial data, including basics like the title and description of a project. Information like this is important as it is often the entry point for data users to quickly understand what a project is about. We also look for other information that helps to put a project in context, such as its sub-national location (rather than simply being pinpointed to a capital city or the centre of a country) or the sector that the project deals with, for example, education or agriculture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Score: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Score: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned dates</td>
<td>Score: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual dates</td>
<td>Score: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current status</td>
<td>Score: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact details</td>
<td>Score: 0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectors</td>
<td>Score: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-national location</td>
<td>Score: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>Score: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique ID</td>
<td>Score: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Joining-up development data

**Score: 0 / 20**

**ABOUT COMPONENT**

This component looks at how well a donor’s data is able to be linked and connected with other bits of information. There is a diverse nature of flows, activities and actors within the development sector. Aid and development finance data needs to be effectively linked and connected with the rest to provide a full picture for the user. This can be particularly important for partner country governments, who need to integrate information on aid with their own budgets and systems.

| Flow type | Score: 0 |
| Aid type | Score: 0 |
| Finance type | Score: 0 |
| Tied aid status | Score: 0 |
| Conditions | Score: 0 |
| Project procurement | Score: 0 |
Performance
Score: 0 / 20

ABOUT COMPONENT

This component refers to the essential data and documents that assess whether a project is on track or has been achieved. This includes things like baseline surveys, progress against targets, mid-term reviews and end of project evaluations. This information is important to hold donors to account and also to share knowledge with others on what worked and what did not during a project.