

Correction to Quality of Official Development Assistance (QuODA) Assessment – Transparency and Learning Dimension

Since the publication of this report, we have received several comments about one of our indicators, *TL5: Share of projects reporting disbursements*, and have concluded that we will remove this indicator from the assessment due to problems with the calculation and limitations of available data.

With this indicator, we sought to determine how complete donors are in publicly reporting disbursement information for projects to which they have made aid commitments. To quantify this, we calculated the percentage of project entries (technically “activity” entries in the OECD-DAC Creditor Reporting System) for each donor that had disbursement information reported. However, donor agencies vary considerably in terms of how they code projects and report information; their differing schemes make it difficult – often impossible – to link disbursement information to the original project and its commitment amount. The problem is exacerbated by inconsistency on the part of some donors from year to year. We have consulted with experts at the DAC and AidData (our sources of data for this indicator) and concluded that currently it is not feasible to link project commitments and disbursements in a way that reliably allows us to compare donors.

This finding indicates that the aid community is at a rudimentary stage when it comes to transparency and accessibility of useful information about how much donors spend and how well they perform in meeting their commitments.

Based on this finding, we have dropped TL5 from the analysis as it is published in the QuODA report. The Transparency and Learning dimension is now based on six, not seven, indicators. We are in the process of developing new indicators to improve this dimension of the QuODA assessment in the next edition.

The new rankings for the Transparency and Learning dimension are reflected on our website, www.cgdev.org/QuODA. This change affects the average scores and rankings in the Transparency and Learning dimension as follows:

Country-level analysis: New and Old Rankings for Transparency and Learning Dimension

NEW Average z-score TL dimension	NEW Rank	Donor Name	Old Rank	Change
1.1002	1	IDA	5	4
0.6268	2	Australia	1	-1
0.6208	3	EC	2	-1
0.6162	4	Ireland	3	-1
0.6053	5	Denmark	4	-1
0.5859	6	New Zealand	6	0
0.5191	7	Norway	7	0
0.4130	8	Spain	8	0
0.3794	9	GFATM	10	1
0.3426	10	Netherlands	9	-1
0.2733	11	Germany	11	0
0.2571	12	Finland	12	0
0.2275	13	United Kingdom	13	0
0.2215	14	Austria	14	0
0.0956	15	Sweden	15	0
0.0180	16	UN select agencies	16	0
-0.0093	17	IFAD	23	6
-0.0585	18	AfDF	25	7
-0.0821	19	Canada	17	-2
-0.1541	20	Belgium	18	-2
-0.2247	21	Portugal	19	-2
-0.3486	22	USA	24	2
-0.3715	23	Japan	20	-3
-0.3955	24	Switzerland	26	2
-0.3972	25	France	21	-4
-0.4741	26	Luxembourg	22	-4
-0.4932	27	AsDF	29	2
-0.6122	28	Italy	27	-1
-0.7466	29	Greece	28	-1
-1.0990	30	Korea	30	0
-1.6310	31	IDB Special	31	0

Shading indicates change in ranking by more than 1 place

	Change by more than 3 places
	Change by 2 or 3 places

Agency-level analysis:

Out of 152 agencies, those whose ranking on the Transparency and Learning dimension changed by 10 or more places were, *on the positive side*:

International Development Association (IDA): from 98th to 2nd

Italy, Agency for Disbursement in Agriculture: from 113th to 18th

U.S., Inter-American Foundation: from 99th to 16th

Japan Bank for International Cooperation: from 105th to 28th

U.S., Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC): from 88th to 35th

Switzerland, State Secretariat for Economic Affairs: from 123rd to 80th

African Development Fund, from 127th to 87th

Global Environment Facility (GEF): from 131st to 97th

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD): from 129th to 95th

U.S. Trade and Development Agency: from 140th to 123rd

Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria: from 63rd to 48th

U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID): from 110th to 96th

Asian Development Fund: from 145th to 131st

Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) Special Fund: from 146th to 136th

On the negative side:

Germany, Foreign Office: from 97th to 107th

Greece, Ministry of Foreign Affairs: from 92nd to 102nd

Spain, Ministry of Science and Technology: from 95th to 105th

U.S., Peace Corps: from 93rd to 103rd

Japan, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries: from 96th to 106th