Initial meetings of the TAG – Brussels, 2nd-3rd June 2009

Meeting Record

Session One – TAG Workstream 1 – Led by Brian Hammond and Simon Parrish (DIPR)
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General action points

1. Find a lead for workstream 1 (Brian)
2. Produce flowcharts to demonstrate the project cycle for different aid modalities
   - Need to define what a start date and end date is, different status definitions
   - This should be colour coded to represent what is info collected by DAC and what isn't
3. Reorganise the table in Appendix C of Scoping paper to reflect:
   - rationalized info categories
   - frequency
   - validation
   - data collection point(s)
   - consider re-ordering by type of info (e.g. donor info, country info, project info)
4. Define the types of project documentation required
5. Organise partner country participation in the TAG and try to increase official donor participation
Information specific action points:

1. Set up a procurement group to consider tied aid, import content, procurement and contract information as defined in appendix C.
   - We need to involve the relevant person from the DAC who will help inform this discussion
2. Do work to examine role, if any, of Chart of accounts.
3. Set up a traceability group (to also cover unit of analysis and project id, financial info required such as pledges, commitments, disbursements).
4. Output and outcome to liaise with DAC WP-EFF Cluster E & conditions Cluster C
5. The donor pilots should look further at existing donor, aggregator and in-country systems:
   - Where info is known and collected (e.g. is future info known only at country office).
   - What processes are there for recording a change in status?
   - How early in the project lifecycle do data exist? Where do they exist (e.g. in donor central systems or country offices)?
   - What documentation exists?

Introduction – Brian Hammond

The TAG workstreams are:

1. **Scope, Definitions and Classifications.** To cover:  
   a. what information donors will publish (pt 1 of the standard), and  
   b. agreed definitions and classifications (pt 2 of the standard), and unit of analysis:
2. **Data Formats, Technical Architecture & Systems:** to cover part 3 of the standard (data format and technical architecture) and support existing and new information providers in assessing impact and implementing the IATI standard
3. **Code of Conduct & IATI standard:** to define the code of conduct (pt 4 of the standard), and the approach and process for setting the IATI standard
4. **Donor Assessments & Support:** to assess impact, feasibility and costs of IATI proposals,
5. **Accessibility & Capacity Building for Information users:** to consider ways of building capacity and making aid information more accessible, particularly for users in developing countries

These initial meetings focused on workstreams 1 and 3 of the TAG plan

Other ongoing IATI activities:

- Partner consultations in Ghana, Rwanda, East Asia, Middle East and Latin America.
- Donor fact finding missions

IATI Timetable:

- Wider TAG meeting beginning of September
- IATI Steering Committee virtual meeting at the end of September
- Side event at IMF and World Bank’s annual meetings on 8th October
- IATI conference in The Hague 20th – 21st October
A face-to-face Steering committee meeting is due to take place at the beginning of December to agree on part 1 and 4 of the IATI standard (what info IATI will cover and code of conduct).

Overview of IATI Scoping Paper – Owen Barder

- Scoping paper is available at [www.aidinfo.org](http://www.aidinfo.org) and sets out the shape of the problem we are trying to solve and scope questions that we are trying to resolve.

- There is a distinction between official aid statistics and information. DAC systems provide mechanism for publishing and sharing statistics, but our research has shown many diverse stakeholders (partner countries, citizens, parliamentarians, academics, researchers, international NGOs, CSOs) would like to access a wider range of information that is more timely. All have different objectives for needing information but there is a commonality of what they need.

- There are case studies on aid information on the aidinfo website. These highlight the fact that people want broad information not just statistics that are available through the DAC/CRS. There is a desire to be able to trace aid through the system and to be able to access information at each stage of transactions.

- Overcoming additional costs to publishing information will be essential in order to maintain the political will to adhere to the IATI standard. Technical and political needs must be addressed in order for IATI to succeed. A cost benefit analysis has begun which will investigate the feasibility and proportionality for donors to meet the IATI standard.

- A concern was raised that more timely publication would compromise the quality and level of validation of the information; what value could info have if it is neither validated or quality assured data? Owen suggested there are different times and contexts when validated official data are needed compared to information. Sometimes having good enough non-validated information is better than waiting a year for officially validated data. The non validated information is useful for private sector companies and NGOs to know what is intended before deciding what to invest in. We need to make sure we define official and non-official metadata to make its provenance and status clear.

General Discussion

The discussion was based around a table expanded from the IATI scoping paper, which outlines the proposed categories of information, whether it is currently available and what the likely issues and questions are. As a result of the partner country and CSO consultations, there may be other things that partner countries and CSOs would like to add to the tables and the weight of importance given to each category. In general it was felt that the TAG should focus what is most important in aid dependant countries. We will also update the table as a result of the meeting’s discussions. (Table appendix A)

Note: we use the term project as a generic term for unit of aid

Basic Project aid flow data

1. **Project ID**
Discussion and Clarification:

- An agreed method of identifying projects and other units of aid is essential to enable the traceability of aid flows.

- This will not be easy as many different units can be part of the same flow of aid and different organizations use different definitions. We need a common understanding of what the different units of aid are and how they relate to each other – the unit of analysis.

- The DAC uses the ID donors allocate a project and generates an additional separate CRS project ID. There is a problem with consistency of donor ids (and therefore CRS ids) from year to year, and even within the same year – so commitments and disbursements from the same project can have different ids. There is also no way at present to show the linkage between a project that is funded by a number of donors.

- There was a suggestion of using a multi-part project code with meaning built into the code. However, it was felt that IDs that are meaningful are more costly as a body is needed to maintain these codes since evolution is inevitable and adjustments will be required as codes run out and exceptions to the rules are introduced.

Issues for consideration: The TAG needs to be mindful of effort needed as multi-funded projects and basket funding also raise issues of identification.

Action point: Further work needed to define what is required for traceability to work – this should also consider a model for agreeing unit of analysis

2. Title and Description

Discussion and Clarification:

- Project titles and long descriptions are very useful but the TAG needs to agree what languages this information should be published in.

- The DAC currently require donors to publish in either English for French, however numerous challenges in getting DAC donors to report this information – some report in own language and descriptions can be poor or missing.

- English, Spanish and French are used by the EC and UN, however data should not be limited to the central systems, but take into account information held in country offices, which is more likely to be in local languages. Look specifically at the language used by partner country budgets as a minimum.

- We should also recognise that different fields need a different level of language availability (project title, long descriptions)

Issues for consideration: What languages should information be published in? Should this be mandatory or recommended?

3. Project Dates and Status
**Discussion and Clarification:**

There are two issues to be considered around dates:

- Format of dates (dd/mm/yy vs mm/dd/yyyy, etc.)
- What dates are we talking about (date approval was given, date funds available from, etc.)

The date format is recorded differently in different donor systems and so causes ambiguity.

- It was felt that status of projects is also very helpful as often it is probably more accurate than end date. The data could show the status of pre-commitment stages which will allow partner countries to see the intentions of donors.

**Issues for consideration:** How useful is the status of a project?

**Action points:**

- Need to define what a start date and end date is, different status definitions (e.g. pipeline has different meaning in humanitarian field, what are the different levels of approval).
- Also need to look at existing donor, aggregator and in-country systems.
- What processes are there for recording a change in status?
- How early in the project lifecycle do data exist? Where do they exist (e.g. in donor central systems or country offices)?

4. **Project Contacts**

**Discussion and Clarification:**

- Project contact is a concern for donors relating to sensitivity – it was suggested that IATI should keep the project contact generic (not a specific individual) but ensure that there is somebody in aid agency who is able to answer queries and provide further information as necessary.

**Issues for consideration:** The code of conduct should specify a timeframe for replies to queries

**Project/aid flow classification**

5. **Country/Destination**

**Discussion and Clarification:**

- There are guidelines in OECD DAC reporting for country names (using ISO3).
- Standard is to allocate to country but if not appropriate regions.

6. **Detailed Geographic information**

**Discussion and Clarification:**

There are two aspects to more detailed geographic information:
- Geo coding – to be able to plot something to a specific place in a map
- An administrative region associated with budget classifications, town, district etc.

Geo coding is likely to be a best practice but not mandatory. It was suggested that donors could map to the administrative units of the country (e.g. as used in budget), as need to know the town or district level as a minimum.

**Action point:** PLAID to report back on the geo coding pilot that they had carried out using long descriptions.

7. **Detailed Sector information**

**Discussion and Clarification:**

- COFOG might be too high level to use.
- The PLAID experience is that having more granularity within sector codes makes it easier to map. High level coding is often more difficult and we need to find a level of granularity that balances the cost of implementation and the level of information needed.
- There is a cost benefit issue, and the DAC experience is that as you go further down there is often not that much information available therefore it is not beneficial to add more codes.
- Coding systems can never anticipate all requirements. More productive to pursue detailed descriptions that are searchable with keywords (in multiple languages).
- Multiple codes – the World Bank and a number of donors have multi sector coding and allocate a percentage to each sector code to avoid double counting. The DAC Working Party on Statistics recently decided not to cater for multiple codes in CRS reporting. There was a suggestion that IATI should make provision for multi sector coding, perhaps as a best practice.
- IATI focus will be on providing a data format for exchange, rather than setting a classification framework for sectors.
- Modern Charts of Accounts are multi dimensional and there may be information available through some of these that provide more detailed sector information.

**Action points:**

- Work needed to look further at the Chart of Accounts
- Look at sector related standards that already exist and how they are being complied with.
- How is COFOG being implemented, and how IMF deals with sector coding in public finance statistics.
- Rob Hicks to send out information on how PLAID deals with sector coding.
- Anjula Garg to share EC Joint Research Centre’s examples.

8. **Funding Type/ type of aid flow**

**Discussion and Clarification:**

The DAC Working Party on Statistics (WP-STAT) has reviewed and changed the aid type typology. Now donors are changing their reporting systems to reflect the new categories. The categories of aid are:
• Financial contributions to recipient government
• Financial contributions to NGO multilateral and private agencies
• Project type interventions – financial and non financial flows
• Technical cooperation
• Donor personnel
• Local personnel
• Training research
• Debt relief
• Other donor expenditures

This new system of reporting will be used by DAC/CRS from 2011.

**Issues for consideration:** For IATI there is still a need to distinguish between aid that reaches the country and aid that does not. Include the IMF in these discussions to meet their balance of payments requirements.

9. **Tied aid status**

**Discussion and Clarification:**

- The debate about tied aid has moved on to ask the question of 'who is in control of procurement'. This information category is related to procurement information category.

**Action point:** We need to involve the relevant person from the DAC who will help inform this discussion. This needs to be considered as part of the wider procurement group

10. **Other policy markers**

**Discussion and Clarification:**

- The DAC experience with policy markers is that they are often not completed and can be inaccurate
- Best approach is likely to be for donors to publish their existing policy markers, rather than set up a new classification scheme.
- There are other options that IATI might consider, e.g. enabling a community (crowd sourcing) as a way to suggest more policy markers or to help with key wording.

**Action point:** donor fact finding missions need to find out what policy markers other donors are using

**Financial**

11. **Funding organisation**

This is important for traceability

12. **Total project cost**

**Discussion and Clarification:**
This could be derived by aggregating costs of all donors. To extract the total project cost IATI would have to ensure unique project IDs that are effective and consistently applied.

**Issue for consideration:** TAG needs to clarify definitions of total cost

### 13. Commitments & Disbursements

**Discussion and Clarification:**

- Note that pledges are different than commitments.
- Commitments need to be updated to make sure the data are current.
- Along with the implementing agency, this is key information to be able to trace aid through the system. Traceability is important to CSOs both northern and southern. Further work is needed to define what is required for this to work (see action point 1).
- Be useful to be able to append a document linked to projects, which includes details of project beneficiaries.
- Some types of information are relevant only for certain types of aid or are captured at different points of the lifecycle.

**Issues for consideration:** Need to look at the difference in definitions between disbursement, commitment and expenditure at different points of measurement.

**Action point:** TAG to create a flow chart to show a typical 'project' cycle for different types of aid and highlight what the information flows and recording points are. IATI should consider whether pledges should be included.

### 14. Implementing agency and channel of delivery

**Discussion and Clarification:**

- Both name and type of organisation are important information. Analysis will be carried out during donor fact finding on what each country/donor is able to record.

**Action point:** Brian and Simon to look into this in the donor and in-country fact finding missions, also to be considered by the traceability group

### 15. Import content

**Issues for considerations:** does import content relate to just money or does it also include non-financial flows? This needs to be linked to questions about procurement.

**Action point:** The wider procurement group needs to carry out more work to define the need better.

### 16. Annual forward planning budgets

**Discussion and Clarification:**

- Looking at predictability of aid from donors in important for forward budget planning.
**Issues for consideration:** Need to raise this issue at the IATI political level event in October. Remind the donors that ‘they promised to be more predictable but are not. Partner countries need the information for forward planning’

**Action point:** Donor fact finding missions need to investigate this to see where the information is captured and stored (at country level or at HQ level or both).

**Alignment Indicators**

17. **Paris Declaration Targets**

**Discussion and Clarification:**

- It is not known what targets there will be beyond 2010, so it is difficult to define this at this stage – although info such as ‘Aid flows on budget’ are likely to continue.
- IATI should avoid collecting information that can be derived from other data (e.g. procurement info).

**Action point:** Go through Paris Declaration and decide on indicators that will be captured

**Aid agreements and conditions**

18. **Conditions**

**Discussion and Clarification:**

- Some donors already record whether or not conditions are attached.

**Issues for consideration:** Need to check what was discussed at Accra relating to conditionality.

**Action point:** Brian to Check with Ronald Meyer whether there is someone available in Cluster C to look into conditions and also ask Romilly Greenhill as she has some background on this.

19. **Terms for concessional loans**

**Discussion and Clarification:**

- The financial terms for concessional loans are present in CRS.
- This led to a discussion of the coverage of IATI. The scoping paper explicitly refers to development assistance including private aid, so IATI should cover private flows and foundations and be useable for other flows.

**Issues for consideration:** How do we encourage private donors to report? An issue for the Code of Conduct.

**Documentation**

20. **Project design docs/logframes**
Discussion and Clarification:

- IATI will outline a standard way of providing links to documents.
- The Country Analytical Website is a voluntary way of posting documents for evaluation. (http://lnweb90.worldbank.org/Caw/CawCover.nsf/homepage?)

Issues for consideration: Questions about how to manage updated documents and a whether to keep a log of historical documents? How to handle documents part confidential/part public?

Action point: Need to define types of documentation required. Country and donor pilots to investigate access to project documentation.
21. Results/output indicators

Discussion and Clarification:

- As a minimum the current indicators used by projects should be disclosed to enable transparency.
- Development of a set of standardised indicators is likely to be extremely challenging.
- Conditionality can be linked to results

**Action point:** This should be covered by the code of conduct. Need to work closely with DAC WP-EFF Cluster E on Managing for Development Results and with Cluster C on conditionality.

22. Contract/procurement information

Discussion and Clarification:

- Most donors have detailed procurement information but the information is hard to find.
- What information is needed/available on procurement managed by the partner?
- Future funding opportunities information is wanted by companies and NGOs.

**Action point:** More investigation is needed by TAG in the procurement group.

23. New information categories

Discussion and Clarification:

New information categories were suggested:

- Beneficiary – who does the project benefit (what category of people – e.g. children)?
- Outputs - details of specific outputs and services that resulted from the project (e.g. a health service, a school)

It was decided that these would not be included at this stage, subject to further consultations.

24. Public participation

Discussion and Clarification:

- CSOs want to be able to participate in the project cycle in donor countries. We need to make notification of consultations more accessible.

**Action Point:** include this information on the flow chart
### Appendix A

**IATI TAG Workstream 1 - Background note for initial discussion of scope of IATI**

Zero Draft dated 28 May 2009

**Note:** the term *project* is used as a general term to describe a unit of aid, encompassing: projects, budget support programmes, contributions to basket funds, humanitarian aid, technical co-operation experts, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Description (what does this mean?) Inc. examples</th>
<th>Donor Systems</th>
<th>Online Database</th>
<th>Available elsewhere</th>
<th>Drivers for Publication</th>
<th>Who wants it?</th>
<th>Cost/Benefit (Est. Low/Med/High cost)</th>
<th>Issues and questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic project / aid flow data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project ID</strong></td>
<td>A consistent method of identifying projects &amp; aid flows is essential. Either a global common identifier for each project (or unit of aid) or a mechanism to link between locally generated ID systems (to be address under workstream 2)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>DAC / Partner Country AIMS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>For comparability and traceability of data</td>
<td>Basic need</td>
<td>L-H (depends on traceability requirements )</td>
<td>1) Each system has its own id 2) Further work on the unit of analysis is required – what unit of aid is the id identifying (donor project? NGO project? Both?) 3) Would we implement a single ID or map IDs from different systems? 4) How would we administer a centralized ID system?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Title &amp; Purpose/Description</strong></td>
<td>A short title to describe the unit of aid and a more detailed description of the purpose and approach of the project</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>DAC / AIMS</td>
<td>project docs</td>
<td>To provide an overview</td>
<td>DAC &amp; Basic need</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1) Current systems have variable quality 2) Language 3) Promote good practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Dates</strong></td>
<td>Start and end dates</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>DAC AIMS</td>
<td>project docs</td>
<td>DAC &amp; Basic need</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Could be multiple dates for sub-project/contract elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Status / Stage</strong></td>
<td>e.g. pipeline, active, closed.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>AIDA AIMS</td>
<td>project docs</td>
<td>Basic need</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project contacts</strong></td>
<td>Names and contact details of key personnel involved in projects</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>AIMS</td>
<td>Project docs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>This can be sensitive, and many donors are not keen on making public. Change frequently, but use generic contact points?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Description (what does this mean?)</td>
<td>Donor Systems</td>
<td>Online Database</td>
<td>Available elsewhere</td>
<td>Drivers for Publication</td>
<td>Who wants it?</td>
<td>Cost/Benefit (Est. Low/Med/High cost)</td>
<td>Issues and questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project / aid flow classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country / Destination</td>
<td>Where is the aid targeted?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Basic Need</td>
<td>DAC &amp; Basic need</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Standard ISO coding exists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed geographic info</td>
<td>For certain types of aid (e.g. region, town, village: preferably geo coded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project docs</td>
<td>Better planning and coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AIMS (not geo coded)</td>
<td>Improve local monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government policy makers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizens and community groups (CBOs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) what type of aid should this cover; e.g. not possible for budget support/SWaPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) How will this be defined – how detailed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) how will we geocode if, for example, there are 35 schools being paid for by one project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) How to link to domestic spend?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General / Detailed Sector</td>
<td>Sector classifications</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Planning and coordination finding info, comparable stats</td>
<td>Government budget &amp; aid mgt, CSO, academics &amp; DAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>must be aligned with partner country budgets, other requirements include more detailed, and allow multiple codes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment with budget &amp; MTEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Meeting the needs of 100+ donors, 100+ countries, 100+ stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) There are many existing classification systems: DAC/CRS; COFOG; sectoral taxonomies (e.g. HIV/AIDS). How different are these? Will it be possible to create a superset?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Tension of detail vs. practicality vs. double-counting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Description (what does this mean?) Inc. examples</td>
<td>Donor Systems</td>
<td>Online Database</td>
<td>Available elsewhere</td>
<td>Drivers for publication</td>
<td>Who wants it?</td>
<td>Cost/Benefit (Est. Low/Med/High cost)</td>
<td>Issues and questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Type / Type of aid flow</td>
<td>What type of aid is being delivered e.g. to cover • Non-transfer ODA (e.g. debt relief, imputed student cost, etc.) • Non-financial transfer: Transfer of consumables (e.g. food aid), physical capital, Technical Cooperation • Financial transfer: Aid outside government control (e.g. direct payments to implementing partner); Aid for a specified purpose but within government control (e.g. on-budget project support); Budget Support</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>DAC / AIMS</td>
<td>Project docs</td>
<td>Essential for meaningful analysis</td>
<td>Government budget &amp; aid mgmt, CSO, academics &amp; DAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Are the existing methods of classifying types of aid flows adequate? 2) Take account of DAC work (nearing completion) to update aid typology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tied Aid Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>DAC/Paris Declaration monitoring</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Is the DAC definition adequate? What of procurement source?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Policy Markers</td>
<td>To be defined. e.g. CRS has Gender/ Environment and Rio markers: Biodiversity/ climate change / desertification</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>DAC UN Conventions</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Do we need other policy markers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Country/Agency / Organisation &amp; Type</td>
<td>Who funds the project?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>DAC / AIMS</td>
<td>Government Multilateral organisations</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Possible link to traceability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project cost</td>
<td>The total cost of the project, including commitments from all donors</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>AIMS</td>
<td>Project docs</td>
<td>Donor coordination Governments</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Description (what does this mean?)</td>
<td>Donor Systems</td>
<td>Online Database</td>
<td>Available elsewhere</td>
<td>Drivers for Publication</td>
<td>Who wants it?</td>
<td>Cost/Benefit (Est. Low/Med/High cost)</td>
<td>Issues and questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount committed</td>
<td>The total amount committed by donor to the project over the period of the project</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government s</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Related to project ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual project budgets</td>
<td>Amount planned to spend during each year of the project. Including planned disbursement dates</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min of Finance</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>See predictability below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments</td>
<td>Individual Commitment dates &amp; value. &amp; planned disbursement dates</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Traceability</td>
<td>Partner country Finance ministries &amp; budget depts CSO</td>
<td>L-M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursement</td>
<td>Details of each transaction: the date, the value and organization the money went to. Also, the dates of expected disbursements. Must be mapped to recipient budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traceability More effective planning &amp; accounting processes BoP analysis Dates enable mapping to partner country cycles</td>
<td></td>
<td>L-H (depends on traceability requirements )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Agency / channel of delivery</td>
<td>Name of organization(s) that are delivering the project</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Traceability Mutual accountability</td>
<td>Partner countries CSO CBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Further work is required to assess how traceability could work. It is linked to questions around the unit of analysis and IDs

2) For traceability, an additional field of ‘source of funding’ for implementing agencies may be required

3) Clarify definition of disbursements & commitments and distinguish disbursed by donor and expenditure by government

4) We need to link disbursements to commitments (which commitment is each disbursement against?)

5) Clarify any differences between implementing agency & channel of delivery
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Description (what does this mean?) Inc. examples</th>
<th>Donor Systems</th>
<th>Online Database Available elsewhere</th>
<th>Drivers for Publication Who wants it?</th>
<th>Cost/Benefit (Est. Low/ Med /High cost)</th>
<th>Issues and questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Import Content</td>
<td>What proportion of the spending is used buying local currency (e.g. for wages etc) and what proportion is used to buy goods and services from abroad. For example, for an immunisation project, what proportion of the spending will be used to import vaccines and what proportion will be used to pay the salaries of nurses and health workers to vaccinate?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Misnomer? Is Import content impossible to measure in globalised world? Link to tying and procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual forward planning budgets</td>
<td>How much are donors expecting to spend during the next year (preferably multiyear): By country; sector; partner country budget code</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Annual DAC aid allocation Survey</td>
<td>Predictability Planning for complementa ry programmes</td>
<td>Partner governments CSOs</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) For many donors this is difficult for constitutional reasons or due to specifics of budget process. 2) How do we link this to planned future project level disbursements (e.g. are these forward plans double counting the commitments given above?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris Declaration Targets</td>
<td>Not captured within most donor systems</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>In some AIMS Annual PD Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1) Which indicators can be collected on a project-by-project basis? 2) Role of targets beyond 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid agreements &amp; Conditions</td>
<td>e.g. MOUs with partner countries, suspension criteria</td>
<td>Available but not</td>
<td>Government MoF Accountability</td>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Description (what does this mean?) Inc. examples</td>
<td>Donor Systems</td>
<td>Online Databases</td>
<td>Available elsewhere</td>
<td>Drivers for Publication</td>
<td>Who wants it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Conditions  | The terms of aid: includes synonymous terms such as benchmarks, priors  
- Are conditions attached,  
- What they are, and  
- Has funding been withdrawn because of conditions | linked to project/finance systems | N               | Project docs       | Collected as part of PAFs |              | M                                   | 1) At project or country programme level?  
2) Consider methodological/presentational issues  
3) This should be structured information (e.g. in a database) as well as unstructured information (e.g. publication of docs) |
| Terms for concessional ODA loans | the parameters associated with loans (maturity, interest rate, grace period, fees etc) |                | N               | Docs                |                        |              | L                                   |                                    |
| Documentation | Project design docs / logframes | Available but not linked to project/finance systems.  
On some donor websites | Available in some AIMS | | | | Need to standardize classifications  
Language  
Partial confidentiality of documents  
Documents must be searchable |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Description (what does this mean?) Inc. examples</th>
<th>Donor Systems</th>
<th>Online Database</th>
<th>Available elsewhere</th>
<th>Drivers for Publication</th>
<th>Who wants it?</th>
<th>Cost/Benefit (Est. Low/Med/High cost)</th>
<th>Issues and questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outputs and outcomes indicators</td>
<td>Indicators for expected project outputs and outcomes 1) Availability of indicators with links to budgets 2) Standardisation of indicators</td>
<td>Known info, but not in systems</td>
<td>Some AIMS</td>
<td>Project docs – logframe MTEF</td>
<td>More efficient output monitoring Benchmarking Info to make the case for aid</td>
<td>NGOs Taxpayers Donors Parliamentarians</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>1) Is standardization desirable and practical 2) Would this undermine country ownership? (include both country’s own indicators, and the common set of output indicators?) 3) Look at HDI (who have thought about this) and World Bank PRS manuals (what is a good indicator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract / procurement information</td>
<td>Contracts awarded for project Details of contracts awarded. Name of organization, value, dates, terms</td>
<td>Available but not linked to project/finance systems. On some donor websites</td>
<td>Websites</td>
<td>Accountability CSOs Parliamentarians</td>
<td>Open, transparent competition for contracts Coordination Integrity</td>
<td>NGOs Parliamentarians Donors</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Needs to be mapped to the flow Needs common sector coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future funding opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other information not related to specific aid flows</td>
<td>Aid policies and procedures Including: - criteria for the allocation of aid - administrative structure of the donor - integrity procedures - policies on disclosure - institutional information (statues, structures staff)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>DAC peer review</td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrity lobby</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Consider how we can standardize access to this information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Description (what does this mean?) Inc. examples</td>
<td>Donor Systems</td>
<td>Online Database</td>
<td>Available elsewhere</td>
<td>Drivers for Publication</td>
<td>Who wants it?</td>
<td>Cost/Benefit (Est. Low/Med/High cost)</td>
<td>Issues and questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement procedures</td>
<td>criteria, tenders and decisions, contracts, and reporting on contracts, including information about and from contractors and sub-contracting agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>See above under import content and tying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments of aid and aid effectiveness</td>
<td>Including monitoring, evaluation and audit reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluations Info to make the case for aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How can we link audits and evaluations to the aid flows (e.g. linking to country evaluation from a project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paris declaration</td>
<td>World Bank projects database</td>
<td>IEG</td>
<td>Internal evaluation depts</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional, country, sectoral strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We need link strategies to the aid flows (e.g. linking to country strategy from a project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sector strategy must be mapped to sector codes – standardization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on opportunities for public participation in decision making and evaluation</td>
<td>Consultative documentation etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more meaningful public participation and engagement in donor and recipient countries</td>
<td>Citizens Parliamentarians</td>
<td>CSOs Taxpayers</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Regional, country, sectoral strategies | | | | CSOs | | | We need link strategies to the aid flows (e.g. linking to country strategy from a project) |
| | | | | | | | | Sector strategy must be mapped to sector codes – standardization |