



## Initial meetings of the TAG – Brussels, 2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> June 2009

### Meeting Record

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

##### Attendees:

Aaron Gladders	2Paths*	*Remote link up
Alex Gerbrandij	EuropeAid	
Anjula Garg	EC Joint Research Centre	
Brian Hammond (TAG Chair)		
Eric Lief	Stimson*	
Eric Swanson	World Bank	
Eva Garzon Hernandez	Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs*	
Gabriel Ferrero	Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs*	
Hannah Glanville	Development Initiatives Poverty Research	
Henri Valot	CIVICUS	
Karin Christiansen	Publish What You Fund	
Jonathan Addleton	USAID	
Marcelo Tricarico	UNCTAD*	
Owen Barder	Development Initiatives Poverty Research*	
Rob Hicks	PLAID	
Rob Tew	Development Initiatives Poverty Research	
Simon Parrish	Development Initiatives Poverty Research	
Stephen Davenport	Development Gateway Foundation	
Vincent Carton	EU/EuropeAid	
Willem Lujkx	Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs*	
Yasmin Ahmad	OECD/DAC	

##### General action points

1. Find a lead for workstream 1 (Brian)
2. Produce flowcharts to demonstrate the project cycle for different aid modalities
  - o Need to define what a start date and end date is, different status definitions
  - o 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:
  - o rationalized info categories
  - o frequency
  - o validation
  - o data collection point(s)
  - o 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 8<sup>th</sup> October
- IATI conference in The Hague 20<sup>th</sup> – 21<sup>st</sup> October



- A face-to face Steering committee meeting is due to take place at the beginning 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 is 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 or 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 is 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



**IATI** INTERNATIONAL  
AID  
TRANSPARENCY  
INITIATIVE

**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.**

Information	Description (what does this mean?) Inc. examples	Donor Systems	Online Database	Available elsewhere	Drivers for Publication	Who wants it?	Cost/Benefit (Est. Low/Med/High cost)	Issues and questions
Basic project / aid flow data								
<i>Project ID</i>	A consistent method of identifying projects & 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)	Y	DAC / Partner Country AIMS	n/a	For comparability and traceability of data	Basic need	L-H (depends on traceability requirements)	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?
<i>Project Title &amp; Purpose/ Description</i>	A short title to describe the unit of aid and a more detailed description of the purpose and approach of the project	Y	DAC / AIMS	project docs	To provide an overview	DAC & Basic need	L	1) Current systems have variable quality 2) Language 3) Promote good practice?
<i>Project Dates</i>	Start and end dates	Y	DAC AIMS	project docs		DAC & Basic need	L	Could be multiple dates for sub-project/contract elements
<i>Project Status / Stage</i>	e.g. pipeline, active, closed.	Y	AIDA AIMS	project docs		Basic need	L	
<i>Project contacts</i>	Names and contact details of key personnel involved in projects	Y	AIMS	Project docs			L	This can be sensitive, and many donors are not keen on making public. Change frequently, but use generic contact points?

Information	Description (what does this mean?) Inc. examples	Donor Systems	Online Database	Available elsewhere	Drivers for Publication	Who wants it?	Cost/Benefit (Est. Low/Med/High cost)	Issues and questions
Project / aid flow classification								
Country / Destination	Where is the aid targeted?	Y	ALL		Basic Need	DAC & Basic need	L	Standard ISO coding exists
Detailed geographic info	For certain types of aid (e.g. region, town, village: preferably geo coded)	Known info, but not in systems and not for all aid types	AIMS (not geo coded)	Project docs	Better planning and coordination  Improve local monitoring	Government policy makers  Citizens and community groups (CBOs)	M/H	1) what type of aid should this cover; e.g. not possible for budget support/SWaPS  2) How will this be defined – how detailed?  3) how will we geocode if, for example, there are 35 schools being paid for by one project?  4) How to link to domestic spend?
General / Detailed Sector	Sector classifications  must be aligned with partner country budgets,  other requirements include more detailed, and allow multiple codes.	Y	ALL		Planning and coordination finding info, comparable stats  Alignment with budget & MTEF	Government budget & aid mgt,  CSO, academics  & DAC	L-H (depends on definitions)	1) Meeting the needs of 100+ donors, 100+ countries, 100+ stakeholders  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?  3) Tension of detail vs. practicality vs. double-counting

Information	Description (what does this mean?) Inc. examples	Donor Systems	Online Database	Available elsewhere	Drivers for Publication	Who wants it?	Cost/Benefit (Est. Low/Med/High cost)	Issues and questions
Funding Type / Type of aid flow	<p>What type of aid is being delivered</p> <p>e.g. to cover</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-transfer ODA (e.g. debt relief, imputed student cost, etc.)</li> <li>Non-financial transfer: Transfer of consumables (e.g. food aid), physical capital, Technical Cooperation</li> <li>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</li> </ul>	Y	DAC / AIMS	Project docs	Essential for meaningful analysis	Government budget & aid mgt,  CSO, academics  & DAC	L	<p>1) Are the existing methods of classifying types of aid flows adequate?</p> <p>2) Take account of DAC work (nearing completion) to update aid typology.</p>
Tied Aid Status		Y	DAC			DAC/Paris Declaration monitoring	?	<p>Is the DAC definition adequate?</p> <p>What of procurement source?</p>
Other Policy Markers	<b>To be defined.</b> e.g. CRS has Gender/ Environment and Rio markers: Biodiversity/ climate change / desertification	Some	DAC			DAC UN Conventions	M	Do we need other policy markers?
<b>Financial</b>								
Funding Country/Agency / Organisation & Type	Who funds the project?	Y	DAC / AIMS			Government Multilateral organisations	L	Possible link to traceability
Total project cost	The total cost of the project, including commitments from all donors	?	AIMS	Project docs		Donor coordination Government	M	

Information	Description (what does this mean?) Inc. examples	Donor Systems	Online Database	Available elsewhere	Drivers for Publication	Who wants it?	Cost/Benefit (Est. Low/Med/High cost)	Issues and questions
Total amount committed	The total amount committed by donor to the project over the period of the project	Y	?			Governments	L	Related to project ID
Annual project budgets	Amount planned to spend during each year of the project. Including planned disbursement dates	Y	?			Min of Finance	L	See predictability below
Commitments	Individual Commitment dates & value. & planned disbursement dates	Y	Y		Traceability	Partner country Finance ministries & budget depts  CSO	L-M	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, as 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
Disbursement	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	Y	Y		More effective planning & accounting processes  BoP analysis  Dates enable mapping to partner country cycles		L-H (depends on traceability requirements)	
Implementing Agency / channel of delivery	Name of organization(s) that are delivering the project	Y	Y		Traceability  Mutual accountability	Partner countries  CSO  CBO	L	4) We need to link disbursements to commitments (which commitment is each disbursement against?)  5) Clarify any differences between implementing agency & channel of delivery

Information	Description (what does this mean?) Inc. examples	Donor Systems	Online Database	Available elsewhere	Drivers for Publication	Who wants it?	Cost/Benefit (Est. Low/Med/High cost)	Issues and questions
Import Content	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?	?				??	?	Misnomer? Is Import content impossible to measure in globalised world? Link to tying and procurement
Annual forward planning budgets	How much are donors expecting to spend during the next year (preferably multiyear): By country; sector; partner country budget code	Y	N	<a href="#">Annual DAC aid allocation Survey</a>	Predictability Planning for complementary programmes	Partner governments CSOs	L	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?)
<b>Alignment Indicators</b>								
Paris Declaration Targets	Not captured within most donor systems	?	In some AIMS	<a href="#">Annual PD Survey</a>			M	1) Which indicators can be collected on a project-by-project basis? 2) Role of targets beyond 2010
<b>Aid agreements &amp; Conditions</b>								
Aid Agreements	e.g. MOUs with partner countries, suspension criteria	Available but not	N	Government MoF	Accountability	CSOs	L	



Information	Description (what does this mean?) Inc. examples	Donor Systems	Online Database	Available elsewhere	Drivers for Publication	Who wants it?	Cost/Benefit (Est. Low/Med/High cost)	Issues and questions
Conditions	The <i>terms of aid</i> : includes <i>synonymous</i> terms such as benchmarks, priors  - Are conditions are attached, - What they are, and - Has funding has 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	
<b>Documentation</b>								
Concept notes	Project documentation and more detailed unstructured information linked to specific projects	Available but not linked to project/finance systems.  On some donor websites	Available in some AIMS				M	Need to standardize classifications  Language  Partial confidentiality of documents  Documents must be searchable
Project design docs / logframes								
Pre-project impact appraisals (e.g. environment, gender)								
Project evaluations								
Websites & other relevant resources								
<b>Results</b>								

Information	Description (what does this mean?) Inc. examples	Donor Systems	Online Databases	Available elsewhere	Drivers for Publication	Who wants it?	Cost/Benefit (Est. Low/Med/High cost)	Issues and questions
Outputs and outcomes indicators	Indicators for expected project outputs and outcomes  1) Availability of indicators with links to budgets 2) Standardisation of indicators	Known info, but not in systems	Some AIMS	Project docs – logframe  MTEF	More efficient output monitoring  Benchmarking  Info to make the case for aid	NGOs  Taxpayers  Donors  Parliamentarians	M-H	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)
Contract / procurement information								
Contracts awarded for project	Details of contracts awarded. Name of organization, value, dates, terms	Available but not linked to project/finance systems.  On some donor websites	N	Websites	Accountability	CSOs  Parliamentarians	M	Needs to be mapped to the flow  Needs common sector coding
Future funding opportunities				tenders	Open, transparent competition for contracts  Coordination  Integrity	NGOs  Parliamentarians  Donors	M	Needs to be mapped to the flow  Needs common sector coding  Standardised
Other information not related to specific aid flows								
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)	?	N	DAC peer review		Integrity lobby	M	Consider how we can standardize access to this information

Information	Description (what does this mean?) Inc. examples	Donor Systems	Online Databases	Available elsewhere	Drivers for Publication	Who wants it?	Cost/Benefit (Est. Low/Med/High cost)	Issues and questions
Procurement procedures	criteria, tenders and decisions, contracts, and reporting on contracts, including information about and from contractors and sub-contracting agents						L	See above under import content and tying
Assessments of aid and aid effectiveness	Including monitoring, evaluation and audit reports			Paris declaration World Bank projects database IEG Internal evaluation depts	Evaluations Info to make the case for aid		L	How can we link audits and evaluations to the aid flows (e.g. linking to country evaluation from a project)  This should include all Paris Indicators
Regional, country, sectoral strategies					CSOs		L	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
Information on opportunities for public participation in decision making and evaluation	Consultative documentation etc.				more meaningful public participation and engagement in donor and recipient countries	Citizens Parliamentarians  CSOs Taxpayers	M	