



Quality of Official Development Assistance: QuODA 2018 Methodology

Contact:
cmckee@cgdev.org

Table of Contents

Part 1: QuODA methodology	4
Overview	4
Dimensions of Aid Quality	5
QuODA Indicators	6
Data sources	7
Country programmable aid (CPA)	10
Changes since last edition of QuODA	10
Interpretation and future steps.....	11
Part 2: QuODA Indicators Descriptions.....	12
Maximizing Efficiency	12
Indicator ME1: Share of Allocation to Poor Countries.....	12
Indicator ME2: Share of Allocation to Well-Governed Countries	13
Indicator ME4: High Country Programmable Aid Share.....	13
Indicator ME5: Focus/Specialization by Recipient Country.....	14
Indicator ME6: Focus/Specialization by Sector	15
Indicator ME7: Support of Selected Global Public Good Facilities.....	16
Indicator ME8: Share of Untied Aid	16
Fostering Institutions	17
Indicator FI1: Share of Aid to Recipients' Top Development Priorities.....	17
Indicator FI3: Share of Aid Recorded in Recipient Budgets.....	18
Indicator FI4: Share of development interventions using objectives from recipient frameworks.....	19
Indicator FI5: Use of Recipient Country Systems	19
Indicator FI7: Share of Scheduled Aid Recorded as Received by Recipients	20
Indicator FI8: Coverage of Forward Spending Plans / Aid Predictability.....	21
Reducing the Burden on Partner Countries.....	22
Indicator RB1: Significance of Aid Relationships	22
Indicator RB2: Fragmentation across Donor Agencies.....	22
Indicator RB3: Median Project Size	23
Indicator RB4: Contribution to Multilaterals	23
Transparency and Learning.....	24
Indicator TL1: Signatory of International Aid Transparency Initiative	24
Indicator TL2: Making information on development funding publicly accessible	25
Indicator TL3: Recording of Project Title and Descriptions.....	25
Indicator TL4: Detail of Project Description	26
Indicator TL5: Reporting of Aid Delivery Channel	26
Indicator TL6: Completeness of Project-Level Commitment Data	27
Indicator TL8: Share of evaluations planned with recipient	27
Annexes	29
Annex 1: Summary of QuODA changes since last edition	29

Annex 2: Summary of QuODA indicators dropped since last edition	30
Annex 3: Summary of QuODA data sources changed since last edition	31
Annex 4: My World survey priorities matched with CRS purpose codes	32
Annex 5: Data sources for global public goods.....	33
References.....	34

Part 1: QuODA methodology

Overview

The 2018 edition of Quality of Official Development Assistance (QuODA)¹ consists of 24 indicators measured across 27 bilateral donors and 13 multilateral agencies. The indicators are grouped into four dimensions that reflect international best practices of aid effectiveness: maximizing efficiency, fostering institutions, reducing the burden on recipient countries, and transparency and learning. The aim of QuODA is to increase the quality of aid by assessing and comparing donor performance against the commitments they have made to improving aid quality. We anticipate the attention and dialogue stimulated by QuODA will improve donor's performance.

This is the fourth edition of QuODA. Previous editions were released by The Center for Global Development and Brookings Institution in [2010](#), [2011](#), and [2014](#) (using latest data available from 2008, 2009, and 2012 respectively).² Some aspects of the methodology were updated from the first to the second edition. These changes were concerned mostly with refining data sources and, in some cases, raising standards when most donors passed minimum threshold levels. The methodology was unchanged from the second to the third editions. This fourth edition of QuODA released in 2018 is based on 2016 data and differs from the previous editions in the selection of indicators and data sources, as outlined in Annexes 1, 2, and 3.

QuODA addresses the question, “How are donors doing on the commitments that they have made to improving aid quality?” QuODA is not an assessment of how effective aid has been; that depends on the combined efforts of both donors and partner countries. It is instead an assessment of donors' efforts to comply with their commitments to those dimension of aid quality that evidence and experience suggest lead to effective aid. With QuODA, we focus only on factors over which donor agencies have control.³

QuODA complements other measures of aid quality in that it makes direct comparisons of donor countries and multilateral agency performance. It brings together measures from various sources like those from the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC), the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) to provide a broader assessment of donor performance.

¹ The 2018 edition of QuODA was produced by the Center for Global Development in Europe. Analysis was done by Caitlin McKee, Research Associate, with oversight from Ian Mitchell, Deputy Director for CGD Europe and Senior Policy Fellow. Research assistance provided by Lee Robinson, Research Associate.

² Authors of the previous editions of QuODA were Homi Kharas of Brookings Institution and colleagues at the Center for Global Development Nancy Birdsall and Rita Perakis.

³ Text in this section from the QuODA Second Edition report by Nancy Birdsall, Homi Kharas and Rita Perakis: <https://www.cgdev.org/userfiles/quoda/QuODA%20Second%20Edition%20Report.pdf>

Dimensions of Aid Quality⁴

The four dimensions measured in QuODA are: maximizing efficiency, fostering institutions, reducing the burden on recipient countries, and transparency and learning. Each of these is an important in measuring the quality of aid.

“Maximizing efficiency” relates to how aid is disbursed across countries and sectors, and its availability for projects and programs in recipient countries. The indicators shed light on the strategic choices made over aid allocations and the extent to which donors implement an efficient division of labor.

“Fostering institutions” is about building the institutional strength in recipient countries by using country systems, priorities and approaches. The indicators point to donors’ willingness to make long-term investments in strengthening partners’ ability to develop and implement their own strategies. They point to the degree to which donors are genuinely prepared to put partners in the driver’s seat, as so often promised.

“Reducing the burden” on partner countries assesses problems of overlap, waste, and fragmentation among donors. It rewards those who explicitly concern themselves with coordination and collaboration with others.

“Transparency and Learning” promotes the power of data and evaluation to generate evidence-based decisions that can improve aid effectiveness. The indicators shed light on whether donors themselves practice the kind of openness in their own activities that they often request of partners.

QuODA is a framework that provides summary information in a quantitative fashion on donor efforts to improve aid effectiveness. The indicators used are all those that donors, aid agencies and academics have concluded are important for aid effectiveness. QuODA is not, however, a complete measure of aid effectiveness or impact. The results of aid depend on the combination of donor effort and the performance of recipient countries or other executors of aid programs, not just on the donor.

⁴ Text in this section from the QuODA Third Edition report by Homi Kharas and Nancy Birdsall: https://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/QUODA_final_revised_september.pdf

QuODA Indicators

The following table summarises the 24 indicators included in the 2018 edition of QuODA:

Table 1: QuoDA 2018 Indicators

Maximising Efficiency	Fostering Institutions	Reducing Burden	Transparency & Learning
1. Share of allocation to poor countries	1. Share of aid to recipients' top development priorities	1. Significance of aid relationships	1. Membership in IATI
2. Share of allocation to well-governed countries	3. Share of aid recorded in recipient budgets	2. Fragmentation across donor agencies	2. Making information on development funding publicly accessible
4. High country programmable aid share	4. Share of development interventions using objectives from recipient frameworks	3. Median project size	3. Recording of project title and descriptions
5. Focus/specialization by recipient country	5. Use of recipient country systems	4. Contribution to multilaterals	4. Detail of project description
6. Focus/specialization by sector	7. Share of scheduled aid recorded as received by recipients		5. Reporting of aid delivery channel
7. Support of select global public good facilities	8. Coverage of forward spending plans/Aid predictability		6. Completeness of project-level commitment data
8. Share of untied aid			8. Share of evaluations planned with recipient

The selection of indicators differs somewhat from the previous edition of QuODA. Therefore the numbering of indicators is not consecutive since some indicators have been dropped since the previous edition. Indicators ME3, FI2, FI6, RB5, RB6, RB7, and TL7 were not included in the 2018 QuODA edition. Please see Annex 2 for discussion of indicators from previous editions that were not included in the 2018 edition.

Two indicators are not calculated for multilateral agencies since by definition they only apply to country donors, ME7 for support of select global public goods facilities and RB4 contribution to multilaterals. When z-scores are calculated for these indicators, the missing observations for multilaterals are excluded.

For each indicator, we calculate the raw score and then the z-score. Raw scores are the measure of the indicator in the original measurement terms (e.g. proportion of total ODA that is tied). Given that these scores are made on different scales, standardising is necessary to enable comparison across indicators and compare performance. Each donor's raw score for each indicator is therefore standardised as a z-score, with a mean of zero and standard deviation of one. Z-scores are calculated across the 27 country donors and 13 multilateral donors jointly as a group of 40 total donors to have a sense of how countries perform relative to multilaterals for each indicator.

Section 2 discusses each indicator in detail and how it is calculated.

Data sources

The following list presents the data sources used for the 2018 edition of QuODA. Unless otherwise noted, all data is from 2016 as the most recent available. Note that the data source for some indicators differs from the previous edition of QuODA. Please see Annex 3 which outlines differences in data sources in the 2018 edition.

Data sources used for multiple indicators:

- [Creditor Reporting System \(CRS\)](#) - Published by the OECD and provides detailed project level information about aid activities provided by 'creditors' (that is, countries providing financial support). Used for nine indicators.
- [DAC Table 2a](#) "Aid (ODA) disbursements to countries and regions". Published by the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and provides donor-level information about aid flows. Used for six indicators.
- Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation⁵ ([GPEDC monitoring data](#)). GPEDC conducts regular monitoring surveys to assess progress on the principles of effective development cooperation, agreed to in several international efforts, following the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005). For more information see the [Monitoring Guide](#). GPEDC monitoring data is used for seven indicators.⁶

Data sources used for single indicators:

- [DAC Table 1](#) is used to assess contributions to multilaterals for indicator RB4.
- World Development Indicators provide the data for [GDP per capita, PPP](#) (constant 2011 international \$) to assess the share of allocation to poor countries for indicator ME1.
- [Worldwide Governance Indicators](#) provide a governance assessment of aid recipient countries for indicator ME2.
- Various reports from international organisations to assess countries' contributions to global public good facilities (see Annex 5 for full list of data sources).
- [United Nations My World 2015 survey](#).⁷ The survey was conducted from 2013-2015 to gather the development priorities of citizens of countries to have their say to feed into the design of the

⁵ The GPEDC is "a multi-stakeholder platform to advance the effectiveness of development efforts by all stakeholders, and to deliver results that are long-lasting and contribute to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals".

⁶ Data availability for GPEDC monitoring surveys: Note that some multilateral agencies - the regional funds - use the data for the development bank they are associated with. This is because funds are not tracked separately, but the assumption that the behaviour of the Fund would be comparable to the Bank. Asian Development Fund = Asian Development Bank, African Development Fund = African Development Bank, IDA = World Bank, IDB Special Fund = Inter-american Development Bank. Country data is unavailable for Greece, Hungary, and Poland.

⁷ While the survey data is not nationally representative, large efforts were undertaken to increase the sample size and reach diverse members of the populations.

Sustainable Development Goals. These priorities are then matched with CRS purpose codes to assess donor alignment with national priorities for indicator FII. See Annex X for matching purpose codes to priorities for FII from MyWorld data.

- [IATI](#) - the International Aid Transparency Initiative - presents current membership (accessed June 2018) for indicator TLI.

Table 2: QuoDA 2018 Data Sources

	Indicator	Data source	
Maximizing Efficiency	ME1	Share of allocation to poor countries DAC Table 2a World Development Indicators	
	ME2	Share of allocation to well-governed countries DAC Table 2a Worldwide Governance Indicators	
	ME4	High country programmable aid share DAC Table 2a	
	ME5	Focus/specialization by recipient country DAC Table 2a	
	ME6	Focus/specialization by sector CRS	
	ME7	Support of select global public good facilities DAC Table 2a Various reports (see XXX)	
	ME8	Share of untied aid CRS	
	Fostering Institutions	FI1	Share of aid to recipients' top development priorities CRS United Nations My World 2015 survey
FI3		Share of aid recorded in recipient budgets GPEDC Indicator 6	
FI4		Share of development interventions using objectives from recipient frameworks GPEDC Indicator 1a, first sub-indicator	
FI5		Use of recipient country systems GPEDC Indicator 9b	
FI7		Share of scheduled aid recorded as received by recipients GPEDC Indicator 5a	
FI8		Coverage of forward spending plans/Aid predictability GPEDC Indicator 5b	
Reducing Burden		RB1	Significance of aid relationships DAC Table 2a
		RB2	Fragmentation across donor agencies CRS
	RB3	Median project size CRS	
	RB4	Contribution to multilaterals DAC Table 1	
Transparency & Learning	TL1	Membership in IATI IATI	
	TL2	Making information on development funding publicly accessible GPEDC Indicator 4	
	TL3	Recording of project title and descriptions CRS	
	TL4	Detail of project description CRS	
	TL5	Reporting of aid delivery channel CRS	
	TL6	Completeness of project-level commitment data CRS	
	TL8	Share of evaluations planned with recipient GPEDC Indicator 1a, fourth sub-indicator	

Note: CRS = Creditor Reporting System; GPEDC = Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation; IATI = International Aid Transparency Initiative; DAC = Development Assistance Committee

Country programmable aid (CPA)

Country programmable aid is one of the core concepts used in our methodology. It is a closer approximation to the actual aid that goes to partner countries, and we therefore use this definition in a number of our indicators. CPA deducts from gross ODA those items that are not programmable at the country level and thus are not available for real development projects and programs in partner countries. These deductions include debt relief, humanitarian aid, administrative costs, developmental food aid, promotion of development awareness, imputed student costs, refugees in donor countries, aid from local governments, core support to nongovernmental organizations, export subsidies, university subsidies, equity investments and aid that is not allocable by country or region.

CPA is a closer approximation to the actual amount of aid that goes to partner countries than total ODA. In calculating QuODA indicators, we use the DAC definition of CPA and apply that all the Creditor Reporting System data we use.⁸ The QuODA indicators that use CPA are noted in the indicator descriptions in Section 2.

Changes since last edition of QuODA

Our intention for the 2018 edition of QuODA was to keep the methodology as consistent as possible with the 2014 edition to allow for maximum comparability. As any index that is calculated over time, some methodological changes are necessary to continue to calculate the index, often reflecting changes in availability of data sources. Earlier editions of QuODA relied heavily on data from the Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration, which was last done in 2011 and data is no longer collected. However the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation has taken its place and continues to collect relevant data on development cooperation. This transition necessitated the majority of methodological changes for the QuODA 2018 edition.

Changes made include reducing the total number of indicators from 31 to 24 and using a different data source on eight of the remaining 24 indicators. Considering these changes, 20 of the 24 indicators in the 2018 edition are comparable to the 2014 edition. Given that there have been changes to all four of the QuODA dimensions, these dimensional scores are not comparable to the previous QuODA editions.

Annex 1 summarises changes to QuODA indicators since last edition to show which indicators have been dropped, which have changed data sources, and which remain comparable to previous editions. Annex 2 summarises the seven QuODA indicators that have been dropped since previous edition and explains the rationale for dropping them. Annex 3 explains the indicator-level changes in data sources since last edition.

QuODA is currently calculated for country donors and selected multilateral agencies.⁹ The multilateral agencies included in the 2018 QuODA edition were selected on the basis of coverage of greatest portion of multilateral spending, data availability, and consistency with previous editions of QuODA. Since the

⁸ For more information see:

<http://www.oecd.org/development/effectiveness/countryprogrammableaidcpafrequentlyaskedquestions.htm>

⁹ Analysis is in progress for agencies within country donors.

previous edition of QuODA, we have added GFATM and GAVI to capture the significant portions of multilateral spending to these institutions. Other agencies with significant disbursements, such as the Green Climate Fund, were not added because data was not available in GPEDC.

The multilateral agencies assessed by the 2018 QuODA include:

- African Development Fund (AfDF)
- Asian Development Fund (AsDF)
- European Development Fund and development funding from EU budget (EU Institutions)
- Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation (GAVI)
- The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM)
- International Development Association (IDA)
- Inter-American Development Bank Fund for Special Operations (IDB Special)
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
- The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)
- United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
- World Food Programme (WFP)

Interpretation and future steps

QuODA is intended to allow donors to assess their performance against peers on multiple dimensions of aid quality to engage in a dialog - not to draw final conclusions. QuODA was not originally intended to be presented as an overall score or ranking. Adding or averaging the QuODA indicators to give a combined score implicitly gives equal weight to each indicator. However, the indicators included arguably do not have equal importance in reflecting aid effectiveness. Each donor has strengths and weaknesses and none of them excel in every indicator.

QuODA is both a stand-alone analysis, and the foundation for the 'aid quality' sub-component of CGD's [Commitment to Development Index](#) (CDI). Donors' scores on the 24 QuODA indicators are then used to calculate an Aid Quality Score, based on proportions of countries' bilateral and multilateral spending.

CGD intends to do a thorough methodological review of QuODA throughout 2018-2019 to incorporate recent developments in thinking and any relevant new data around aid effectiveness.

Part 2: QuODA Indicators Descriptions

The following section describes the rationale and calculation of each of the 24 indicators in the 2018 QuODA edition. The following text draws heavily (sometimes verbatim) upon the descriptions in the second edition of QuODA published in 2009. That report was the work of Homi Kharas of Brooking Institution and colleagues at the Center for Global Development Nancy Birdsall and Rita Perakis.¹⁰

Maximizing Efficiency

Indicator ME1: Share of Allocation to Poor Countries

Though donors provide aid to achieve multiple objectives, one objective they share is improving the lives of poor people around the world. Since the 1970s, many researchers have developed and tested models of donor aid allocations to gain an understanding of the determinants of donors' decisions and to assess the marginal impact of aid on development based on certain factors.¹¹ Few widely-accepted generalizations have emerged from these studies; however, most of them have found a significant positive impact of providing more funding to relatively poorer countries. Donors can make a bigger impact on poverty reduction by providing a larger share of aid to poorer countries.

To assess how much donors give to poor countries, we weight aid flows by the income level in recipient countries. Specifically, we take the the logarithm of the recipient's per capita gross domestic product (at purchasing power parity - CGDP). We multiply this value by the share of each donor's aid given to each recipient, and aggregate across recipients for each donor. We use the logarithm of CGDP in order to emphasize changes at the lower end of the spectrum. In other words, a country would receive a better score for shifting aid from a country with a CGDP of \$1000 to one with CGDP of \$500 than for shifting aid from a country with a CGDP of \$10,000 to one with a CGDP of \$9,500.

Analysis based on:

$$\sum_r \left(\frac{\text{gross ODA}_{d,r}}{\text{gross ODA}_d} * \log \text{CGDP} \right)$$

Source: DAC Table 2a, and World Development Indicators for GDP per capita, PPP

¹⁰ The Second Edition of QuODA report can be accessed:

<https://www.cgdev.org/userfiles/quoda/QuODA%20Second%20Edition%20Report.pdf>

¹¹ McGillivray (1989); Collier and Dollar (2001 and 2002); Hansen and Tarp (2001); Dalgaard and Hansen (2001); and Easterly, Levine and Roodman (2003).

Indicator ME2: Share of Allocation to Well-Governed Countries

Governance is a strong determinant of effective development. There is an extensive literature on the relationship between governance and development that lends support to the notion that aid is more effectively used in better governed partner countries, and a nascent literature on whether conditioning aid on good governance induces better governance in partner countries. Some donors use proxies of governance for aid allocations, for example the Millennium Challenge Corporation incorporates the widely used Worldwide Governance Index into its recipient country eligibility selection.¹² Donors can make a greater impact by providing a larger share of certain types of aid to well-governed partners.

To capture donor orientation toward good governance we compared each donor's disbursement of country programmable aid weighted by the quality of governance of its partner countries.¹³ We did this by multiplying the share of a donor's CPA disbursed to a partner country by the country's governance vulnerability ranking using the Worldwide Governance Indicators (aid recipients included in this indicator are restricted to the 139 countries that are included in the Worldwide Governance Indicators). We then aggregate these values across all the donor's partner countries. The WGI is a comprehensive index of governance that consists of six components: voice and accountability, political stability, government effectiveness, regulatory burden, rule of law, and corruption. We use CPA for this indicator in an attempt to exclude from our analysis the types of aid that would be appropriate in contexts of poor governance, like humanitarian and food aid, so that donors are not penalized for providing this kind of aid to fragile states.

Analysis based on:

$$\sum_r \left(\frac{CPA_{d,r}}{CPA_d} * GVI_r \right)$$

Source: DAC Table 2a and 2016 Worldwide Governance Indicators¹⁴

Indicator ME4: High Country Programmable Aid Share

A substantial portion of what is termed "official development assistance" does not represent actual transfers of funds to partner countries. Donors can make a greater development impact by increasing the share of aid that donors program to support development projects in their partner countries. The DAC, recognizing the need for a metric that reflects the amount of aid that is received and recorded by partner country governments, constructed a measure called country programmable aid.¹⁵ CPA is a measure of development assistance that excludes funding that does not flow to partner countries (e.g. donor

¹² <https://www.mcc.gov/who-we-fund/indicator/government-effectiveness-indicator>

¹³ This methodology was inspired by the work of Kaufmann and Penciakova which can be seen: <https://www.brookings.edu/opinions/how-selective-is-donor-aid-governance-and-corruption-matter-and-donor-agencies-should-take-notice/>

¹⁴ The Worldwide Governance Indicators are produced by Daniel Kaufmann, Natural Resource Governance Institute (NRGI) and Brookings Institution; and Aart Kraay, World Bank Development Research Group.

¹⁵ See Benn, Rogerson and Steensen (2010): <https://www.oecd.org/dac/aid-architecture/45564447.pdf>

administrative costs and imputed student costs), unpredictable flows (e.g. humanitarian assistance), and transfers that are not discussed between donors and partner countries (e.g. food assistance). Although CPA better reflects the resources that are available to partner countries, in some cases it over-represents the figure because of its inclusion of technical cooperation (which is valued at cost rather than in terms of impact, and which therefore is subject to large variations across countries) and interest on loan payments.

To measure the share of aid that is programmable in partner countries, we employed a stricter definition of CPA, which we call sCPA. We calculated sCPA by excluding the interest received and technical cooperation from gross ODA, in addition to excluding everything that the DAC excludes in its definition of CPA. We then measured the share of gross ODA that sCPA represented for each donor. Although this indicator offers a useful comparison of relative donor performance, as with other indicators in the Quality of Official Development Assistance (QuODA) assessment, the relative performance of donors depended on a donor's adherence to the definitions used for self-reporting aid information.

Analysis based on:

sCPA_d / gross ODA_d

Note: sCPAd = gross ODA less debt relief, humanitarian aid, food aid, scholarships, costs for refugees in donor countries, promotion of development awareness, administrative costs, support to nongovernmental organizations, interest received and technical cooperation.

Source: DAC Table 2a

Indicator ME5: Focus/Specialization by Recipient Country

Although partner countries have benefited from the growth of aid, donor proliferation has diluted the impact of development efforts.¹⁶ Concentration of support can help donors foster stronger expertise and strengthen donor accountability to partners. To estimate the division of labor of donors, or the extent to which they specialize, we measured each donor's revealed comparative advantage (RCA)— in this case, the concentration of that donor's aid in a particular recipient country.¹⁷

To find where a donor has RCA, we calculate the ratio for the share of donor's aid to a partner country relative to the donor's share of global aid. When this value is greater than one, the donor is considered to have an RCA in the partner country. We then find the proportion of aid going to recipient countries where a donor has RCA. When donors provided aid to many partners, or provided aid to partners that received relatively large global aid flows, their RCA decreased. These calculations were performed only for aid that could be directly allocated to partner countries in the DAC Creditor Reporting System dataset.

Analysis based on:

¹⁶ Knack and Rahman (2004), Roodman (2006), and Kharas (2009) examine the costs of donor proliferation.

¹⁷ The concept of RCA is used in trade theory (Balassa 1965) to measure the relative advantages and disadvantages of trade partners with respect to traded goods and services.

To calculate RCA:

$$\frac{\left(\frac{CPA_{d,r}}{CPA_r} \right)}{\left(\frac{CPA_d}{CPA_{world}} \right)}$$

To calculate proportion of aid going to countries where a given donor as an RCA:

$$\sum_r \left[\left(\frac{CPA_{d,r,RCA>1}}{CPA_d} \right) \right]$$

Source: DAC Table 2a

Indicator ME6: Focus/Specialization by Sector

Following the same logic used in indicator ME5, and to further examine the existing degree of donor proliferation and fragmentation, we evaluated donors' specialization by sector. Donors can maximize their impact by engaging in sectors based on their RCA. To estimate the level of specialization of donors we measured each donor's RCA—the relative concentration of that donor's aid in a particular sector.

We compared the ratios of the donor's aid in a particular sector relative to global aid to that sector and the donor's total aid flows to all sectors relative to total global aid. When this value is greater than one, the donor is considered to have an RCA in the sector. When donors provided aid in a wide range of sectors, their RCA decreased. These calculations were performed only for aid that could be directly allocated to sectors in the DAC Creditor Reporting System reports.

Analysis based on:

To calculate RCA:

$$\frac{\left(\frac{CPA_{d,r}}{CPA_r} \right)}{\left(\frac{CPA_d}{CPA_{world}} \right)}$$

To calculate proportion of aid going to countries where a given donor as an RCA:

$$\sum_r \left[\left(\frac{CPA_{d,r,RCA>1}}{CPA_d} \right) \right]$$

Source: DAC Creditor Reporting System

Indicator ME7: Support of Selected Global Public Good Facilities

The returns to providing poverty-reducing global public goods (GPGs) are often higher than the cost of addressing their shortfall in the future, yet they are often underfunded.¹⁸ One way donors have mitigated these challenges of underfunding is by establishing multilateral initiatives to fund specific GPGs.

To capture donor support for major poverty-reducing GPG initiatives we measured the share of donors' gross CPA offered as contributions to nine multilateral initiatives established to promote GPGs.¹⁹ Although more resources for GPGs are desirable, there are concerns that support for GPGs will displace support for other important development objectives. The objective of this indicator is to capture donor support for collaborative efforts to provide GPGs that could otherwise receive suboptimal support. Although it is not easy to compute the optimal level of support for GPGs, we believe they are significantly underfunded at present, so greater support is a positive aspect of donor aid quality. On the basis of publicly available data, we used figures for 2017 commitments for most of the facilities included in this indicator.

Analysis based on:

Contributions to nine GPG facilities_d / (gross ODA_d + UN peacekeeping support)

Source: DAC Table 2a; the websites for each of the facilities included

Indicator ME8: Share of Untied Aid

Some aid resources are offered under the condition that the goods and services they fund be procured from suppliers based in the donor country. Because the same goods and services may be available at lower cost from other countries, these resources are used more efficiently in the partner country if they are untied. For five decades the international community has condemned the practice of tying aid.²⁰ In 2001 DAC

¹⁸ Poverty-reducing global public goods are goods that offer benefits that extend beyond a single nation, are largely nonrival and nonexcludable, and are critical for poverty alleviation and sustainable development.

¹⁹ The ten initiatives are: Advance Market Commitments (AMC), Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), Global Environmental Facility (GEF), International Finance Facility for Immunizations (IFFIm), International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie), Montreal Protocol Fund (MPF), the Clean Technology Fund (CTF) and Strategic Climate Fund (SCF). We excluded multilateral donors from this indicator because they often manage but do not contribute to these facilities. Based on the available data, in some cases we used disbursement amounts, and in some cases we were limited to using commitment amounts. For details on figures used for each GPG facility, see Annex 5.

²⁰ In 1968, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development released a paper identifying and discussing the impact of tied aid. This report was followed by a condemnation of the practice by the Pearson Commission. Jepma (1991) found that the value of aid was reduced 13 to 23 percent by the practice of tying. Despite recent progress, the OECD continues to push for untying aid. See <http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/untied-aid.htm>.

members committed to untie 100 percent of aid to the least developed countries, and in the Paris Declaration donors committed to further reduce the share of tied aid they provide to recipient countries. Since then, donors have made continual progress on reducing their share of tied aid.

We used data reported in the DAC Creditor Reporting System on the tying status of aid to compute the share of total aid that is untied for each donor. Partially tied aid is given a weight of 0.5 in calculating the share of untied aid. Multilateral agencies are assumed to have 100 percent untied aid, with the exception of the European Institutions, which report tied and partially tied aid. While donors receive guidance on how to classify which aid is tied, partially tied, or untied,²¹ this status is self-reported by donors and not always consistent.

Analysis based on:

Untied aid_d / Total ODA_d

Source: DAC Creditor Reporting System

Fostering Institutions

Indicator F1: Share of Aid to Recipients' Top Development Priorities

The international community has called for increased partner country ownership of development and for donors to support and respect partner country priorities for development. To measure donor support to recipient country priorities we calculated the share of each donor's total gross ODA in 2016 that was allocated to development priorities of partner country citizens, as assessed by the United Nations My World 2015 survey.²² In the My World survey, respondents were invited to select six development priorities that were most important to them and their family out of a selection of 16 options.

We identified aid purposes²³ coded in the DAC Creditor Reporting System that matched the submissions of individuals in partner countries. For each donor-partner pair we aggregated the amount of aid the donor provided for the partner's priority purposes, and we measured the share that amount represented of the ODA from the donor to that partner. We aggregated across all donor-partner pairs for which we had partner country purpose preference data.²⁴

²¹ See Reporting Directive for the Creditor Reporting System, Annex 11 "Types of aid and tying status" (p.63): [https://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/documentupload/DCD-DAC\(2013\)15-ADD1-FINAL-ENG.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/documentupload/DCD-DAC(2013)15-ADD1-FINAL-ENG.pdf)

²² The United Nations My World 2015 survey was conducted from 2013-2015 to gather the development priorities of citizens of countries in an effort to make the design of the Sustainable Development Goals an inclusive process. Therefore it is a good source for measuring the development priorities of individuals citizens. My World 2015 does not use nationally representative samples. However it received almost ten million responses from 194 countries. See <http://data.myworld2015.org/>

²³ To see how DAC Creditor Reporting System purpose codes match with My World survey response options, see Annex 4. Survey participants did not rank their responses, so we treat aid to any of a country's top six selected priorities as equal.

²⁴ The results of this indicator are not considered to be comparable to the previous edition of QuODA since the data source for country preferences has changed and preferences are matched to DAC Creditor Reporting System *purpose* codes instead of less detailed *sector* codes as was done in the previous edition.

Analysis based on:

Gross ODA disbursements to recipients' priority sectors_d / total gross ODA disbursements_d

Source: DAC Creditor Reporting System, United Nations My World 2015 survey²⁵

Indicator FI3: Share of Aid Recorded in Recipient Budgets

A country's ownership of aid is dampened by its partner governments' uncertainty about the amount of aid flowing into their countries. Donors can better align their efforts with partner policies and systems by increasingly reporting aid commitments to partners for inclusion in their budgets. The share of aid recorded in partner budgets is reduced when donors do not provide information on their support to the government in a timely and comprehensive manner.

At the Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness which took place in Busan in 2011, donors committed to "...strengthen the role of parliaments in the oversight of development processes"; and also in the Accra Agenda for Action in 2008 donors committed to "facilitate parliamentary oversight by implementing greater transparency in public financial management, including public disclosure of revenues, budgets, expenditures..."

This indicator measures the percentage of development cooperation funding scheduled for disbursement by development partners that is recorded in the annual budgets approved by the legislature of a given country. The data comes from the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) 2016 monitoring round.

Analysis based on:

Numerator: Development co-operation funding recorded in annual budget for year n.

Denominator: Development cooperation funding scheduled for disbursement in year n by cooperation providers and communicated to developing country government at the outset of year n.

Source: 2016 GPEDC Monitoring report, Indicator 6²⁶

²⁵ Previous editions of QuODA used other data sources to assess recipient country priorities (World Values Survey, the World Bank Gallup World Poll, Afro-barometer, Asian-barometer, Euro-barometer, and Latinobarometer). Priorities in previous QuODA editions were matched with CRS sector codes which are not as specific as CRS purpose codes. Due to these methodological improvements, the results of this indicator are not considered comparable with previous editions of QuODA.

²⁶ Greece, Hungary and Poland were excluded from this indicator because of missing data.

Indicator FI4: Share of development interventions using objectives from recipient frameworks²⁷

If donors use their own objectives from results frameworks to design and plan development interventions, then the goals of the donors may be prioritised instead of those of the recipient country, undermining the frameworks and institutions of recipient country governments. Instead, donors should seek to use recipient country-owned results frameworks to align with recipient government priorities. These may include any form of government-led planning instrument where development priorities and goals are clearly defined such as long-term vision documents, national development plans or sector plans. The idea that donors should use recipient country results frameworks to increase the focus on development results that meet developing country priorities was set forth in the Paris Declaration and reaffirmed in the Accra commitments and Busan High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness.

To measure the alignment of donors with recipient frameworks, we rely on data from the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) 2016 monitoring round.²⁸ We use one element of Indicator Ia that measures the proportion of new development interventions that draw their objectives from country-led results frameworks. For each development intervention of significant size (US\$ 1 million and above) approved during the year of reference, the indicator calculates the degree to which development partners rely on objectives, drawn from government sources.

Analysis based on:

Percentage of donors' new interventions that draw their objectives and development focus from recipient country-owned results frameworks.

Source: 2016 GPEDC Monitoring report, Indicator Ia first sub-indicator²⁹

Indicator FI5: Use of Recipient Country Systems

Despite a commitment to increase partner country ownership of development, donors continue to make only limited use of partner country public financial management systems. Increased use of these systems will enable donors to support the institutions critical for long-run development. Donors committed in the Paris Declaration to working with partner countries to improve their public financial management (PFM) systems and channeling more aid through those systems. Despite considerable improvements in the quality of partner systems,³⁰ donor policies have been slow to respond to improvements of PFM systems. To increase aid channeled through these systems, donors should adopt clear policies on the use of PFMs,

²⁷ In previous versions of QuODA, this indicator was called "Share of Aid to Partners with Good Operational Strategies" since it drew from Paris Monitoring Survey data. Due to the difference in how this indicator is measured using GPEDC data, the results of this indicator are not considered comparable with previous editions of QuODA.

²⁸ For more information on the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC), see <http://effectivecooperation.org/>. For detailed methodology of the indicators in the 2016 monitoring round see <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/2015-2016-GPEDC-Monitoring-Guide.pdf>

²⁹ Greece, Hungary and Poland were excluded from this indicator because of missing data.

³⁰ See OECD (2011).

address incentives within their agencies to use partner systems, and work with partners to operationalize plans for improving their systems.

To capture donor use of recipient country systems, we rely on data from the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) 2016 monitoring round.³¹ We use Indicator 9b that measures the proportion of development cooperation disbursed to the government using the recipient country's own financial management and procurement systems. This includes using the country's own rules and procedures – versus those of the development partner – for budget execution, financial reporting, auditing and procurement of goods and services.

Analysis based on:

Numerator: Development cooperation flows using country systems (average of budget execution, financial reporting, auditing and procurement systems).

Denominator: Total development cooperation flows for the government sector.

Source: 2016 GPEDC Monitoring report, Indicator 9b³²

Indicator F17: Share of Scheduled Aid Recorded as Received by Recipients

Aid that is predictable and recorded as received by partner governments in a timely manner enables governments to manage their resources better, use aid for long-term development initiatives, and inform their citizens about the resources and development projects the government is undertaking.³³

Disbursements can be delayed for reasons including political concerns, administrative challenges, and procedures associated with project conditionalities. The Paris Declaration calls on donors to disburse funds within the year they are scheduled and to inform partner countries of these disbursements.

To capture the short-term predictability of donor aid commitments, we rely on data from the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) 2016 monitoring round.³⁴ We use Indicator 5a that measures the share of development cooperation funding that is disbursed to the recipient government within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled by the donor. It captures both the reliability of donors in delivering the promised resources within the relevant year and their capacity to accurately forecast and disburse this funding (i.e. implement their development co-operation activities) within a 12-month period.

³¹ For more information on the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC), see <http://effectivecooperation.org/>. For detailed methodology of the indicators in the monitoring 2016 round see <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/2015-2016-GPEDC-Monitoring-Guide.pdf>

³² Greece, Hungary and Poland were excluded from this indicator because of missing data.

³³ For more on this issue, see Mokoro (2008).

³⁴ For more information on the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC), see <http://effectivecooperation.org/>. For detailed methodology of the indicators in the 2016 monitoring round see <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/2015-2016-GPEDC-Monitoring-Guide.pdf>

Analysis based on:

*Numerator: Development cooperation flows reported by provider as disbursed in year n.
Denominator: Development cooperation flows scheduled for disbursement by provider in year n and communicated to developing country government.*

Source: 2016 GPEDC Monitoring report, Indicator 5a³⁵

Indicator FI8: Coverage of Forward Spending Plans / Aid Predictability

Poor information on a donor's future aid commitments limits partner countries' and other donors' ability to incorporate that donor's support into long-term plans about funding needs and aid allocations. When donors publicly provide forward spending information, they enable partner countries and other donors to improve their long-term planning and decision-making.

Recognizing the importance of information on forward spending, we draw on data from the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) 2016 monitoring round.³⁶ We use Indicator 5b which measures the estimated proportion of development cooperation covered by indicative forward expenditure and/or implementation plans for one, two and three years ahead. The forward spending plan must meet all of the following criteria in order to be included in the results: Be made available by the development partner in written or electronic form; Set out clearly indicative information on future spending and / or implementation activities in the country; Present funding amounts (at least) by year, while using the partner country's own fiscal year; Be comprehensive in its coverage of known sectors, types and modalities of support; and Clearly state the amount and currency of funding.

Analysis based on:

The average proportion of development cooperation funding covered by indicative forward expenditure or implementation plans at the country level, for one, two and three years ahead.

Source: 2016 GPEDC Monitoring report, Indicator 5b³⁷

³⁵ Greece, Hungary and Poland were excluded from this indicator because of missing data.

³⁶ For more information on the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC), see <http://effectivecooperation.org/>. For detailed methodology of the indicators in the 2016 monitoring round see <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/2015-2016-GPEDC-Monitoring-Guide.pdf>

³⁷ Greece, Hungary and Poland were excluded from this indicator because of missing data.

Reducing the Burden on Partner Countries

Indicator RB1: Significance of Aid Relationships

Operations costs associated with development projects and programs can substantially reduce the value of aid to recipients. By reducing the fragmentation of their aid programs in partner countries, donors can reduce the administrative burdens imposed on their partners. We use a measure which rewards donors with a high proportion of their aid in a partner country relative to other donors in that country.

We measured the significance of aid relationships by computing the marginal contribution of each donor to its partner countries, based concentration of donors in a each recipient country using the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI).³⁸ The marginal contribution of donors to recipient countries' HHI is the sum across partners of the squared share of donor aid to a partner weighted by the donor's total gross CPA. In other words, we reward donors that have significant aid relationships with their partners.

Analysis based on:

$$\log \left(1 + \sum_r \frac{2 * \text{gross CPA}_{d,r}^2}{\text{gross CPA}_d * \text{gross CPA}_r^2} \right)$$

Sources: DAC table 2a

Indicator RB2: Fragmentation across Donor Agencies

Some donors deliver aid through several agencies affiliated with their government or agency. To reduce the number of donor-partner relationships and the administrative burdens associated with them, donors can limit the institutional channels through which they deliver aid.

We use a measure which rewards donors who use fewer agencies to disperse their aid in the partner country. We measured the concentration of aid delivery³⁹ across donor agencies using the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI).⁴⁰ We used the HHI to sum the squares of each agency's share of total aid from a donor. If a donor delivered aid through one agency, it had a HHI equal to one. As the number of agencies delivering a donor's aid increased, the share of each individual agency decreased, and the HHI for the donor approached zero. Because we were interested in fragmentation within specific partners, we did not treat bilateral aid delivered through multilateral donors as an additional channel. For these calculations the agency of record is the one that actually disburses aid to recipient countries—so aid budgeted through

³⁸ The Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI) is used to measure competition by calculating the market share of firms within an industry.

³⁹ As with previous indicators, using the gross CPA measure

⁴⁰ The Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI) is used to measure competition by calculating the market share of firms within an industry.

different ministries but executed through a development agency would count as being disbursed through a single agency channel.

Analysis based on:

$$\sum_{agency} \left(\frac{grossCPA_{d,agency}}{grossCPA_d} \right)^2$$

Source: DAC Creditor Reporting System

Indicator RB3: Median Project Size

The costs of many small aid projects can limit the value of aid to a partner country. Each aid project has fixed costs of identification, appraisal, negotiation, approval, implementation, and monitoring—and these weigh more heavily on small projects. Although there is no single optimal project size, fewer and larger projects reduce the administrative burden on recipients.

To capture the burden on the recipient country from managing many projects we used data from the DAC Creditor Reporting System and limited ODA to country programmable aid. Donors report individual activities to the CRS and we consolidated activities into projects by combining activities that had the same reported recipient country, title, and expected starting date. We dropped from the analysis small projects valued at less than \$250,000. There were approximately 16,850 projects valued at least at \$250,000 reported to the CRS in 2016. We rewarded donors that had a larger median project size. Scores were computed based on the log of median project size, to de-emphasize high outliers in the distribution.

Analysis based on:

log (Median commitment size of projects)

Source: DAC Creditor Reporting System

Indicator RB4: Contribution to Multilaterals

By channeling more aid through multilaterals, country donors can reduce the transaction costs incurred by partner countries and support countries and sectors for which they have less expertise. Multilateral agencies typically have large, streamlined operations in their partner countries and use of multilateral channels implies up-front harmonization with other donors.

For country donors, we captured contributions to multilaterals by measuring the share of total gross ODA disbursements channeled through core support to multilateral agencies.⁴¹ Although many countries provide additional non-core funds to multilateral agencies, we do not include these because they have varying degrees of constraints on their use, making them non-comparable to core multilateral support.⁴² Multilateral agencies are excluded from this indicator.

Analysis based on:

Multilateral ODA_d / Total gross ODA_d

Source: DAC Table 1

Transparency and Learning

Indicator TL1: Signatory of International Aid Transparency Initiative

Transparency is a fairly low-cost means for increasing the effectiveness of aid and limiting the scope for corruption associated with aid activities. A lack of information about aid spending makes it difficult for recipient countries to plan their budgets, for donors to see where their money is being spent, and for anyone to assess the impact of aid.⁴³ Participation in global efforts to increase aid transparency, such as the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), demonstrates donors' commitment to improve access to information on their activities. IATI is a multi-stakeholder initiative through which members—donors, partner countries, and civil society organizations—commit to work together to establish a common standard for making aid more transparent. It emerged during the Accra High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in 2008 and has as its objective not the creation of another set of databases, but the establishment of a set of standards for reporting information on aid activities.⁴⁴ Such standards are expected to improve the quality of public information on aid, and consequently initiatives such as QuODA that use those data. While being an IATI signatory is not a measure in and of itself of effective practice, it provides a signal that members are committed in principle to increasing the transparency of their activities. This indicator gives credit to donors who were signatories to IATI as of June 2018. At this time, 25 out of the 40 donors in our sample were IATI signatories.

Analysis based on:

MEMBER or NOT member

Source: International Aid Transparency Initiative website

⁴¹ A spreadsheet that contains the names of the multilateral agency channels that can be reported to the DAC can be found: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/annex2.htm>

⁴² Non-core funds are earmarked for specific sectors, themes, countries or regions.

⁴³ See Publish What You Fund (2018).

⁴⁴ For more information on IATI, see <https://iatistandard.org>

Indicator TL2: Making information on development funding publicly accessible⁴⁵

Signing up to transparency initiatives signals good intention, but donors should follow through with these commitments to publicly publish their data in order for recipient countries to plan their budgets, for donors to see where their money is being spent, and for anyone to assess the impact of aid.

Recognizing the importance of transparency of development funding data, we use on data from the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) 2016 monitoring round to give an overview of how well donors publish to different sources.⁴⁶ We use Indicator 4 and take an average of their assessment of how well donors publish to three sources: the OECD-DAC's Creditor Reporting System (CRS) used for backward-looking accountability; and OECD-DAC's Forward-Spending Survey (FSS) used for forecasting purposes; and the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) used for aid management and planning purposes. GPEDC's assessment of each of these three sources examines dimensions of timeliness, comprehensiveness, and forward-looking nature.

Analysis based on:

Average score of donor performance on publication to three sources with a conversion of qualitative assessments to quantitative scores where 1=Needs improvement, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Excellent.

Source: 2016 GPEDC Monitoring report, Indicator 4⁴⁷

Indicator TL3: Recording of Project Title and Descriptions

Donors that are members of the DAC commit to provide specific information about each of their aid projects to the CRS database. The DAC statistics currently provide the most comprehensive information about aid disbursements available. Donors should strive to provide complete records of this information for the benefit of a range of stakeholders. In the CRS database there are three fields in which donors disclose information about projects: title, short description, and long description.

To measure the disclosure of key project information, we averaged the percentage of each of these fields that was completed for each aid activity, by donor in 2016. In other words, a value of 70 percent means that 70 percent of the three fields across all of a donor's aid activities in 2016 were populated in the CRS database.

⁴⁵ In previous versions of QuODA, this indicator was called "Implementation of IATI Data Reporting Standards" since it only assessed whether donors had begun to publish information in the IATI registry. Due to greater comprehensiveness of the GPEDC data, the results of this indicator are not considered comparable with previous editions of QuODA.

⁴⁶ For more information on the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC), see <http://effectivecooperation.org/>. For detailed methodology of the indicators in the 2016 monitoring round see <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/2015-2016-GPEDC-Monitoring-Guide.pdf>

⁴⁷ Greece, Hungary and Poland were excluded from this indicator because of missing data.

Analysis based on:

Populated key field entries_d / Total key field entries_d

Source: DAC Creditor Reporting System

Indicator TL4: Detail of Project Description

The long description entry for aid projects reported in the CRS offers donors an opportunity to communicate more details than are captured in the other project fields. In addition to providing key information on all aid projects, donors can contribute to better aid management by providing thorough descriptions of all their aid projects.

We capture this aspect of donor transparency by measuring average character counts in the long description fields in their database for each donor's project-level aid activities. We measured the logarithm of the average character counts to emphasize changes at the lower end of the spectrum of character counts. This measure, like the previous measure on disclosure of key project information, does not capture the difference in quality of response across donor agencies, but does provide us with a sense of how much information is available for use by stakeholders.

Analysis based on:

Log (Number of characters in long description entries_d / Number of long description entries_d)

Source: DAC Creditor Reporting System

Indicator TL5: Reporting of Aid Delivery Channel

Donor support to a partner country can be channeled through partner government agencies, international NGOs, domestic NGOs, multilateral agencies, and other entities. By providing specific information on delivery channels for their aid projects, donors can enable better tracking of the movement of donor aid flows. Donors are asked to report to the CRS the name of the channel of delivery for each of their aid projects.⁴⁸

Our indicator measured the share of projects by donor for which a specific channel name was reported, weighted by the size of the projects. Entries that were not sufficiently informative—such as a response of other, unknown, or not available, or categories without specific names—were excluded.⁴⁹ A higher share of projects reporting a specific channel name was considered more transparent.

⁴⁸ Examples of channel names reported include Ministry of Finance or Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa.

⁴⁹ Channel name entries were considered insufficient if they were blank, nondescript, or labeled multilateral. We also considered to be insufficient the projects for which the recipient name field was unanswered and the channel name reported was public sector.

Analysis based on:

Aid flows with sufficient reporting_d / Total ODA_d

Source: DAC Creditor Reporting System

Indicator TL6: Completeness of Project-Level Commitment Data

Access to key information about individual aid projects can better inform planning and monitoring by partner countries, donors, researchers, and civil society organizations worldwide. Despite official DAC donor commitments to publicly disclose specific information about all of their project-level aid activities in the DAC's CRS database, the share of total aid for which they disclose project-level information varies.

To measure the completeness of project-level reporting we computed the share of total ODA commitments reported to the DAC that were accounted for in donor project-level reporting to the CRS in the same year.⁵⁰ For example, a donor that reported to the DAC that it committed \$1 billion in aid and provided information for projects that amounted to \$500 million of aid in that same year would receive a score of 50 percent on this indicator. Though this indicator measures the share of donor aid for which any project-level records are available, it does not measure the completeness of the fields that contain valuable information on the project-level activities of donors.

Analysis based on:

$$\left| 1 - \frac{ODA_{d,proj}}{ODA_{d,aggr}} \right|$$

Source: DAC Creditor Reporting System

Indicator TL8: Share of evaluations planned with recipient⁵¹

If a donor evaluates development interventions without involvement of the recipient country, then the perspective of the donor may be prioritised instead of that of the recipient country. Instead, donors should seek to engage with the recipient country to define the scope of evaluations and jointly implement them.

⁵⁰ We took the absolute value of one minus the share of aid reported at the project-level to incorporate outliers in the data set.

⁵¹ In previous versions of QuODA, this indicator was called "Aid to partners with good M&E frameworks" since it rewarded donors for giving aid to countries with high quality monitoring and evaluation frameworks as determined by the Paris monitoring survey data, using as assessment from the World Bank. Using a different data source with GPEDC data, we now reward donors for evaluation engagement with recipients at the project level. Therefore due to the change in data availability, the results of this indicator are not considered comparable with previous editions of QuODA.

The idea that donors should use recipient country frameworks to increase the focus on development results that meet developing country priorities was set forth in the Paris Declaration and reaffirmed in the Accra commitments and Busan High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness.

To measure donor engagement with recipient countries for evaluating development interventions, we rely on data from the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) 2016 monitoring round.⁵² We use one element of Indicator 1a that measures the proportion of new development interventions with a final evaluation that engages the recipient country government in evaluating the results. For each development intervention of significant size (US\$ 1 million and above) approved during the year of reference, the indicator calculates the share of interventions that undergo a final evaluation with recipient country government involvement.

Analysis based on:

Percentage of new interventions that plan a final (ex post) evaluation funded by the government, or jointly by the government and the provider.

Source: 2016 GPEDC Monitoring report, Indicator 1a, fourth sub-indicator⁵³

⁵² For more information on the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC), see <http://effectivecooperation.org/>. For detailed methodology of the indicators in the 2016 monitoring round see <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/2015-2016-GPEDC-Monitoring-Guide.pdf>

⁵³ Greece, Hungary and Poland were excluded from this indicator because of missing data.

Annexes

Annex 1: Summary of QuODA changes since last edition

		Indicator	Change	Comparable?
Maximizing Efficiency	ME1	Share of allocation to poor countries		Yes
	ME2	Share of allocation to well-governed countries		Yes
	ME3	Low administrative unit costs	Dropped	n/a
	ME4	High country programmable aid share		Yes
	ME5	Focus/specialization by recipient country		Yes
	ME6	Focus/specialization by sector		Yes
	ME7	Support of select global public good facilities		Yes
	ME8	Share of untied aid		Yes
Fostering Institutions	FI1	Share of aid to recipients' top development priorities	Data source changed to MyWorld	No
	FI2	Avoidance of Project Implementation Units	Dropped	n/a
	FI3	Share of aid recorded in recipient budgets	Data source changed to GPEDC	Yes
	FI4	Share of development interventions using objectives from recipient frameworks	Data source changed to GPEDC	No
	FI5	Use of recipient country systems	Data source changed to GPEDC	Yes
	FI6	Coordination of technical cooperation	Dropped	n/a
	FI7	Share of scheduled aid recorded as received by recipients	Data source changed to GPEDC	Yes
	FI8	Coverage of forward spending plans/Aid predictability	Data source changed to GPEDC	Yes
Reducing Burden	RB1	Significance of aid relationships		Yes
	RB2	Fragmentation across donor agencies		Yes
	RB3	Median project size		Yes
	RB4	Contribution to multilaterals		Yes
	RB5	Coordinated missions	Dropped	n/a
	RB6	Coordinated analytical work	Dropped	n/a
	RB7	Use of programmatic aid	Dropped	n/a
Transparency & Learning	TL1	Membership in IATI		Yes
	TL2	Making information on development funding publicly accessible	Data source changed to GPEDC	No
	TL3	Recording of project title and descriptions		Yes
	TL4	Detail of project description		Yes
	TL5	Reporting of aid delivery channel		Yes
	TL6	Completeness of project-level commitment data		Yes
	TL7	Quality of Evaluation policy	Dropped	n/a
	TL8	Share of evaluations planned with recipient	Data source changed to GPEDC	No

Annex 2: Summary of QuODA indicators dropped since last edition

Indicator	Reason for dropping
ME3 Low administrative unit costs	No comparable source of data for multilaterals; recent literature suggests low administrative costs not reflective of effective organisations.
FI2 Avoidance of Project Implementation Units	Data from Paris Monitoring Survey no longer collected; independent evaluation criticized the indicator as “too simplistic and dogmatic”
FI6 Coordination of technical cooperation	Data from Paris Monitoring Survey no longer collected; concept covered by different GPEDC replacement in FI4 now.
RB5 Coordinated missions	Data from Paris Monitoring Survey no longer collected; too specific for broader aid effectiveness measures.
RB6 Coordinated analytical work	Data from Paris Monitoring Survey no longer collected; too specific for broader aid effectiveness measures.
RB7 Use of programmatic aid	Data from Paris Monitoring Survey no longer collected; concept covered by different GPEDC replacement in FI4 now.
TL7 Quality of Evaluation policy	No comparable source of data; was based on subjective interpretation of text of various policy documents.

Annex 3: Summary of QuODA data sources changed since last edition

Indicator	Previous data source	Data source 2018	Notes
FI1 Share of aid to recipients' top development priorities	Various regional Barometer surveys from various years	United Nations My World 2015 survey	This is different because the Barometer and My World surveys ask about respondents' development priorities in different ways. Previously, priorities identified by Barometer surveys were matched to CRS sector codes. We now match My World priorities with CRS purpose codes which are more specific.
FI3 Share of aid recorded in recipient budgets	Paris Indicator 3 - Aid flows are aligned on national priorities: proportion of aid for the government sector recorded in the annual budgets of partner countries	GPEDC Indicator 6 - Do partner countries' legislatures have oversight over development funding? Measures the share of funding included in the partner country's budget	Comparable
FI4 Share of development interventions using objectives from recipient frameworks <i>(Previously: Share of aid to partners with good operational strategies)</i>	Paris Indicator 1 - Operational Development Strategies: measures the extent to which partner countries have national development strategies with clear strategic priorities.	GPEDC Indicator 1a, i - Do development partners use partner countries' own results frameworks? Measures the extent that objectives of new interventions are drawn from country-led results frameworks, plans and strategies.	This is different because previously donors were rewarded for allocating more money to recipient COUNTRIES with HIGH QUALITY operational strategies (as assessed by the World Bank). We now reward donors for the proportion of their PROJECTS that ALIGN WITH country-led results frameworks.
FI5 Use of recipient country systems	Paris Indicators 5a and 5b - Use of country public financial management and procurement systems: percentage of aid provided in a way that makes use of recipient country's own PFM and procurement systems.	GPEDC Indicator 9b - Are development partners using country systems? Measures the share of funding disbursed using the countries' own systems.	Comparable
FI7 Share of scheduled aid recorded as received by recipients	Paris Indicator 7 - Aid is more predictable: measures the extent to which aid was disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled.	GPEDC Indicator 5a - How reliable is the disbursement of funding by development partners? Measures the share of funding disbursed within scheduled fiscal year. GPEDC Indicator 5b - Are development partners sharing forward-looking information on planned funding? Measures the share of funding covered by development partners' forward expenditure plans.	Comparable
FI8 Coverage of forward spending plans/Aid predictability	DAC Report on Aid Predictability	GPEDC Indicator 4 - Are development partners making high-quality information on development funding publicly accessible? How robust are donors' activity-level records of funding (CRS)? How strong are donors' forward spending plans? (FSS) Are donors' reporting information in a timely, comprehensive and forward looking manner? (IATI)	Comparable
TL2 Making information on development funding publicly accessible <i>(Previously: Implementation of IATI data reporting standards)</i>	IATI website		This is different because previously donors were awarded either a 0 or 1 for publishing any data to the IATI website. Now that reporting has increased overall, we raise the bar for publishing information to demonstrate a donor's commitment to transparency. We now use GPEDC data which provides a qualitative assessment of reporting to three key sources of development data: CRS, FSS, and IATI. We then assign a score where 1=Needs improvement, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Excellent and take the average of a country's performance across the three sub-indicators.
TL8 Share of evaluations planned with recipient <i>(Previously: Aid to partners with good M&E frameworks)</i>	Paris Indicator 11 - Results-oriented frameworks: measures the extent to which partner countries have established transparent and monitorable performance assessment frameworks.	GPEDC Indicator 1a, iv - Do development partners use partner countries' own evaluation processes? Measures the share of new interventions with a final evaluation that engages the partner country government in evaluating the results.	This is different because previously donors were rewarded for giving money to COUNTRIES with HIGH QUALITY M&E frameworks (as assessed by the World Bank). We now reward donors for evaluation ENGAGEMENT with recipients at the PROJECT level.

Annex 4: My World survey priorities matched with CRS purpose codes

Used for indicator FII - Share of aid to recipients' top development priorities

MyWorld priority code and description	CRS purpose code and description
100 Action taken on climate change	41010 Environmental policy and administrative management; 41020 Biosphere protection; 41030 Bio-diversity; 41040 Site preservation; 41050 Flood prevention/control; 41081 Environmental education/training
101 Better transport and roads	21010 Transport policy and administrative management; 21020 Road transport; 21030 Rail transport; 21040 Water transport; 21050 Air transport
102 Support for people who can't work	16010 Social/welfare services; 16050 Multisector aid for basic social services
103 Access to clean water and sanitation	14030 Basic drinking water supply and basic sanitation; 14031 Basic drinking water supply; 14032 Basic sanitation
104 Better healthcare	12191 Medical services; 12220 Basic health care; 12261 Health education
105 A good education	110 I.I. Education; 114 I.I.d. Post-Secondary Education; 11110 Education policy and administrative management; 11120 Education facilities and training; 11130 Teacher training; 11182 Educational research; 11220 Primary education; 11230 Basic life skills for youth and adults; 11240 Early childhood education; 11320 Secondary education; 11330 Vocational training; 11420 Higher education; 11430 Advanced technical and managerial training
106 A responsive government we can trust	15113 Anti-corruption organisations and institutions; 15110 Public sector policy and administrative management; 15130 Legal and judicial development; 15150 Democratic participation and civil society
107 Phone and internet access	22020 Telecommunications; 22040 Information and communication technology (ICT)
108 Reliable energy at home	23110 Energy policy and administrative management; 23630 Electric power transmission and distribution; 23640 Gas distribution
109 Affordable and nutritious food	31161 Food crop production
110 Protecting forests, rivers and oceans	31210 Forestry policy and administrative management; 31291 Forestry services; 41010 Environmental policy and administrative management; 41020 Biosphere protection; 41040 Site preservation
112 Political freedoms	15151 Elections; 15150 Democratic participation and civil society; 15153 Media and free flow of information
111 Protection against crime and violence	15220 Civilian peace-building, conflict prevention and resolution
113 Freedom from discrimination and persecution	15160 Human rights
114 Equality between men and women	15170 Women's equality organisations and institutions; 15180 Ending violence against women and girls
115 Better job opportunities	16020 Employment policy and administrative management

Annex 5: Data sources for global public goods

Facility	Year	Source	Note
Advance Market Commitments (AMC)	2017, contributions	GAVI Annual Contributions & Proceeds, 31 March 2018	Taken from GAVI annual contributions
Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)	2016, contributions	2016 Financial Report	Total column of table A2.1, page 40
Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI)	2018, contributions	2017 EITI Annual Accounts and Q1 2018 forecast Report on the sixth replenishment of the GEF trust fund	Table 3: 2017 Revenue, pp.4-5 Page 238; sixth replenishment is four year period from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 so we report 1/4 of total contribution here
Global Environmental Facility (GEF)	2018, contributions		
International Finance Facility for Immunizations (IFFIm)	2017, contributions	GAVI Annual Contributions & Proceeds, 31 March 2018	Taken from GAVI annual contributions
International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie)	2017, contributions	2017 Financial Report	Appendix D, page 50, income for 2016-17
Montreal Protocol Fund (MPF)	2017, contributions	2018 Status of Contributions and Disbursements 2018	TABLE 5 : Status of Contributions for 2015-2017, page 9 Drawn from sources: IISS, Military Balance, various years; SIPRI; UNDPKO; GDP figures from IMF World Economic Outlook
United Nations Peacekeeping	2016, contributions	Commitment to Development Index	Page 9. CTF 2017 figures gained by subtracting total contributions as of 2016 from total contributions as of 2017
Clean Technology Fund (CTF)	2017, contributions	2016 and 2017 Financial Reports	Page 8. SCF 2017 figures gained by subtracting total contributions as of 2016 from total contributions as of 2017
Strategic Climate Fund (SCF)	2017, contributions	2016 and 2017 Financial Reports	

References

- Balassa, B. 1965. "Trade Liberalization and Revealed Comparative Advantage." *The Manchester School*, 33, 99-123. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1467-9957.1965.tb00050.x>
- Barder, O., Krylova, P. and Talbot, T. 2016. "How Much and How Well: Revisiting the Aid Component of the Commitment to Development Index." CGD Policy Paper 085. Washington DC: Center for Global Development. <http://www.cgdev.org/publication/how-much-and-how-well-revisiting-aid-component-commitmentdevelopment-index>
- Benn, J., A. Rogerson and S. Steensen. 2010. "Getting Closer to the Core-Measuring Country Programmable Aid." OECD Development Brief Issue 1. Paris: OECD. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/aid-architecture/45564447.pdf>
- Collier, P. and D. Dollar. 2001. "Can the World Cut Poverty in Half? How Policy Reform and Effective Aid Can Meet International Development Goals." *World Development* 29 (11): 1787-802. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/203981468766226654/Can-the-world-cut-poverty-in-half-how-policy-reform-and-effective-aid-can-meet-international-development-goals>
- Collier, P., and D. Dollar. 2002. "Aid Allocation and Poverty Reduction." *European Economic Review* 46 (8): 1475-500. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0014292101001878>
- Dalgaard, C.J., and H. Hansen. 2001. "On Aid, Growth and Good Policies." *Journal of Development Studies* 37 (6): 17-41. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/713601081>
- Easterly, W., R. Levine, and D. Roodman. 2003. "New Data, New Doubts: Revisiting 'Aid, Policies, and Growth.'" Center for Global Development Working Paper 26. Washington, DC. <https://www.cgdev.org/publication/new-data-new-doubts-revisiting-aid-policies-and-growth-working-paper-26>
- Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC). 2015. "Monitoring Guide 2015-2016 - Monitoring the effective development co-operation commitments". <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/2015-2016-GPEDC-Monitoring-Guide.pdf>
- Hansen, H. and F. Tarp. 2001. "Aid and Growth Regressions." *Journal of Development Economics* 64 (2): 545-68. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304387800001504>
- Jepma, C. 1991. *The Tying of Aid*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. <http://www.worldcat.org/title/tying-of-aid/oclc/23359461>
- Kaufmann, D., and V. Penciakova. 2012. "Aid Selectivity Revisited: Governance and Corruption Matter." Washington, DC: Brookings Institution. <https://www.brookings.edu/opinions/how-selective-is-donor-aid-governance-and-corruption-matter-and-donor-agencies-should-take-notice/>

- Kharas, Homi. 2009b. "Development Assistance in the 21st Century." Contribution to the VIII Salamanca Forum: The Fight Against Hunger and Poverty. 2-4 July. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/11_development_aid_kharas-1.pdf
- Knack, S. and A. Rahman. 2004. "Donor Fragmentation and Bureaucratic Quality in Aid Recipients." World Bank Research Working Paper 3186. Washington, DC: World Bank. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/791171468140034190/Donor-fragmentation-and-bureaucratic-quality-in-aid-recipients>
- McGillivray, M. 1989. "The Allocation of Aid Among Developing Countries: A Multi-Donor Analysis Using Per Capita Aid Index." World Development 17 (4): 561-8. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0305750X89902623>
- Mokoro Ltd. 2008. "Putting Aid on Budget: A Study for the Collaborative Africa Budget Reform Initiative (CABRI) and the Strategic Partnership with Africa (SPA)." Oxford, UK. https://www.cabri-sbo.org/uploads/files/Documents/report_2008_cabri_transparency_and_accountability_use_of_country_systems_english_putting_aid_on_budget_-_good_practice_note_-_using_country_systems.pdf
- OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development). 2011. "Aid Effectiveness 2005 – 2010: Progress in Implementing the Paris Declaration." Paris. <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/2011%20Report%20on%20Monitoring%20the%20Paris%20Declaration%20ENGLISH.pdf>
- Publish What You Fund. 2018. "Aid Transparency Index 2018." London. <http://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/reports/2018-Aid-Transparency-Index.pdf>
- Roodman, David. 2006. "Aid Project Proliferation and Absorptive Capacity." Center for Global Development Working Paper 75. Washington: Center for Global Development. <https://www.cgdev.org/publication/aid-project-proliferation-and-absorptive-capacity-working-paper-75>
- Wood, B; Betts, J; Etta, F; Gayfer, J; Kabell, D; Ngwira, N; Sagasti, F; Samaranayake, M. 2011. "The Evaluation of the Paris Declaration, Final Report." Danish Institute for International Studies. Copenhagen. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/197482/evaluation-paris-declaration.pdf