PPD Codebook

Updated July 5, 2018

# Introduction

The Project Performance Database (PPD) is a database of project evaluations from eight International Development Organizations (IDOs) between 1973 and 2013. The PPD contains data on over 14,000 unique projects which took place in 178 recipient environments. The PPD is unique amongst large foreign aid datasets in including a measure of overall project success.

Please cite these data using the book for which they were created: Honig, Dan. 2018. Navigation by Judgment: Why and When Top Down Management of Foreign Aid Won’t Work. New York: Oxford University Press.

While for seven of the IDOs in the sample these data are either not public or not available publicly in an accessible format, the World Bank’s data is publicly available and easily accessible. The PPD reflects World Bank data from approximately mid-2013; fuller World Bank data can be found on the World Bank’s website at <http://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/data>. I thank AsDB, GFATM, JICA, and KfW for their release of information in response to requests. GiZ, IFAD, and JICA information was coded from publicly available project-level reports. Appendix I of Honig 2018 provides fuller information on the data collection process.

These data can appropriately be seen as a convenience sample; that is, this represents the universe of available projects for which I was able to identify a holistic measure of success (an overall likert-type rating of project performance). Projects are unique; that is, to my knowledge there are no projects in the dataset that are evaluated by multiple donors.

This Codebook provides a detailed description of every variable in the PPD, categorized into Combined Variables (those that are merged/appended across donors), Aid Data Variables, IDO-Specific Variables (further categorized by each of the eight IDOs), and Suggested Variables. If I can provide any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at [dhonig@jhu.edu](mailto:dhonig@jhu.edu).

The preparation of this codebook and cleaning of these data for public use was supported by Rachit Khaitan, to whom I am very grateful for his excellent work, and to Ryan Briggs, Matthew Geddes, and Erica Gould for their efforts and suggestions regarding how to improve the PPD.

# Version Notes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Previous version updated on** | **Modifications in this version** |
| Jan 28, 2018 | NA (base PPD dataset compiled from Raw PPD). |
| Feb 14, 2018 | project\_id variable renamed to ppd\_project\_id and relabeled accordingly. |
| March 23, 2018 | KfW sustainability scores inflated from original 4-point scale to 6-point scale and inversed. |
| May 15, 2018 | WB projects with negative duration data changed to missing values. Acknowledgement to Ryan Briggs added. |
| July 3, 2018 | From this version onward, the do file has been modified to use the Feb 14 (2-14) version of the PPD dataset as the base PPD dataset to maintain the order of projects and ppd\_project\_id assignment (the March and May version of the data used *different* ppd\_project\_id assignment than did the original PPD). In other words, from this version onward, the base PPD dataset is not recompiled from the Raw PPD. Changes from March 23 and May 15 versions were incorporated to this base dataset. The earlier version of the March 23 (3-23) dataset posted online had a different order of projects. In addition, the MMG variables were added, filling out CRS sector codes (see MMG Variables section in the codebook).; acknowledgment to Matthew Geddes, who added these codes. |

# Combined Variables

The following table describes the calculation methodology of each of variables that are combined across all or some donors.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable Name | Label | Description | Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology |
| ppd\_project\_id | PPD Project ID | Unique identification number for each project | A unique project ID useful only in this dataset; generated by Honig after creating the dataset, cannot be used to retroactively merge donor data |
| donor | Donor name | Name of the donor | |  |  | | --- | --- | | AsianDB | Asian Development Bank | | DFID | UK’s Department for International Development | | GFATM | Global Fund for AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria | | GiZ | German Society for International Cooperation | | IFAD | International Fund for Agricultural Development | | JICA | Japanese International Cooperation Agency | | KfW | German Development Bank | | WB | World Bank | |
| six\_overall\_rating | 6-point outcome | A project’s overall success rating on a 6-point scale  The individual ratings are as follows:  6: highly unsatisfactory  5:  4:  3:  2:  1: highly satisfactory | Original donor ratings were rescaled to standardized 6-point scale in different ways, depending on the donor data. Organizational fixed effects are almost always appropriate when using these data (as the meaning of a “4” for one donor may be different than another); when using fixed effects there is no econometric concern brought about from ‘inflating’ some donors’ scales. See Honig *Navigation by Judgment*, Chapter 4, for a fuller discussion of these issues.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | AsianDB | original (1-4) rating multiplied by 1.5 | | DFID | original (1-5) rating multiplied by 1.2 | | GFATM | original (1-4) rating multiplied by 1.5 | | GiZ | original rating has natural scale of 6 | | IFAD | original rating has natural scale of 6 | | JICA | original (1-4) rating multiplied by 1.5 | | KfW | original rating has natural scale of 6 | | WB | original rating has natural scale of 6 | |
| country\_code\_COW | Country code | Country code according to the Correlates of War database | The following new COW codes have been added to the original list:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | COW code | Country | | SSD | South Sudan | | SRB | Serbia | | MNS | Montserrat | | PIT | Pitcairn Islands | | WBG | West Bank and Gaza | | TRS | Tristan da Cunha | | TUC | Turks and Caicos Islands | | WIN | Windward Islands | | STH | St Helena |   The following country codes (used by various donors, or other data providers – e.g. the state fragility index - internally) were converted to the following COW codes:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | COW code | Non-standard (non-ISO, non-COW) Country Code | | BNG | BAN | | CHN | PRC | | GRG | GEO | | INS | INO | | KYR | KGZ, Kyrgyzstan | | MSI | RMI | | PAK | Pakistan | | [dropped] | REG | | DRV | VIE | | WSM | SAM | | THI | THA | | ETM | TIM | | KZK | KAZ | | ROK | KOR | | DRC | ZAI | | CDI | IVO | | ETH | ETI | | FIJ | FJI | | ROM | RUM | | DRV | VIE | | SRB | SER | | MNG | MNT | |
| evaluation\_date | Evaluation date | Date project evaluation took place  Example of format: “01jan2012” | Combined across all 8 donors  Month data was converted to the date of the first day of that month  Year data was converted to the date of the first day of January of that year |
| project\_duration | Project duration | Difference between date of project completion and date of project start | Calculated in different ways depending on the underlying donor data:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | AsianDB | completion\_date-asdb\_approvaldate | | DFID | NA | | GFATM | completion\_date-start\_date | | GiZ | completion\_date-start\_date | | IFAD | completion\_date-ifad\_effectivedate | | JICA | completion\_date-start\_date | | KfW | completion\_date-start\_date | | WB | completion\_date-wb\_approvaldate |   Any project with a completion date earlier than a start date is given a direction of 0. Updated in July 2018 version of data per Ryan Briggs’ excellent suggestion. |
| eval\_lag | Lag to project evaluation | Difference between date of project evaluation and date of project completion | Calculated as the difference between *evaluation\_date* and *completion\_date* for all 8 donors |
| start\_date | Project start date | Date project started  Example of format: “01jan2012” | Combined across 7 donors  Data is not available for DFID  Month data was converted to the date of the first day of that month  Year data was converted to the date of the first day of January of that year  For AsianDB, IFAD, and WB, the respective project approval dates were used as “start dates” |
| completion\_date | Project completion date | Date of project completion  Example of format: “01jan2012” | Combined across all 8 donors  Month data was converted to the date of the first day of that month  Year data was converted to the date of the first day of January of that year |
| aid\_type | Type of aid | 3 categories as follows:  L: Loan  G: Grant  T: TA | Combined across 6 donors  Data is not available for donors GiZ, KfW |
| project\_name | Project name | Name of project as provided by the respective donors | Combined across all 8 donors |
| crs\_purpose\_code | CRS purpose code | 3-digit purpose classification code according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC | Combined across all 8 donors. Note that MMG\_purpose\_code (also in this codebook) is more complete. |
| crs\_purpose\_sector | CRS purpose sector | 5-digit purpose classification code according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC | Combined across all 8 donors. Note that MMG\_purpose\_sector (also in this codebook) is more complete. |
| crs\_id | CRS ID | Index according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC | Combined across all donors where project CRS ID available |
| original\_overall\_rating | Original overall rating | A project’s overall success rating on the original scale provided by the respective donors | Provided in different ways depending on the respective donor’s original scale:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | AsianDB | 1: “Unsuccessful”  2: “Less than successful”  3: “Successful/Generally Successful”  4: “Highly Successful” | | DFID | 1: “Unlikely to be achieved”  2: “Likely to be achieved to a limited extent”  3: “Likely to be partially achieved”  4: “Likely to be largely achieved”  5: “Likely to be achieved completely” | | GFATM | 1: “C”  2: “B2”  3: “B1”  4: “A/A1/A2” | | GiZ | 6:best, 1:worst. This scale is inverted from GiZ’s internal measure, in which 1 is the best and 6 is worst. The original (pre-inversion) description of the success ratings is:  “A development measure rated 1 to 3 is classed as  ‘unsuccessful’. The scale is as follows:  1: “the project/programme is useless, or the  situation has deteriorated on balance”  2: “clearly inadequate rating: despite several  positive partial results, the negative results  clearly dominate”  3: “unsatisfactory rating, significantly below  expectations, and negative results dominate  despite identifiable positive results”  A development measure rated 4 to 6 is classed  as ‘successful’. The individual ratings are:  4: “satisfactory rating, falling short of expectations,  but with positive results dominant”  5: “good rating, fully in line with expectations,  no significant defects”  6: “very good rating, significantly better than expected”” | | IFAD | 1: “Highly unsatisfactory”  2: “Unsatisfactory”  3: “Moderately unsatisfactory”  4: “Moderately satisfactory”  5: “Satisfactory”  6: “Highly satisfactory” | | JICA | 1: “Unsatisfactory”  2: “Partially/Fairly Satisfactory”  3: “Satisfactory”  4: “Highly Satisfactory” | | KfW | 1: worst  6: best  This scale is inverted from KfW’s internal measure, in which 6 is worst and 1 is best | | WB | 1: “highly unsatisfactory”  2: “unsatisfactory”  3: “marginally/moderately unsatisfactory”  4: “marginally/moderately satisfactory”  5: “satisfactory”  6: “highly satisfactory” | |
| external\_evaluator | External evaluator | Whether the project evaluation was carried out by an external party  3 categories as follows:  internal  external  independent eval office | Evaluation type was assigned by research team based on type of evaluation document (e.g. WB PPAR vs. PCR, AsDB PPER vs. PCR), review of actual evaluation documents, and communications with various donors. Further coding information available on request. |
| office\_presence | Office presence | Whether an IDO office was present during the project  2 categories as follows:  1: Office present  0: Office not present | These codes were assigned based on office opening data provided by donors or publicly available. As noted in Honig *Navigation by Judgment* Appendix II page 205, these data include some somewhat heroic assumptions – e.g. that offices, once opened, never closed. Use with caution, and verification/improvement may be warranted before placing substantial analytic weight on these data. |

# MMG Variables

The following variables are revised purpose sectors and codes and corresponding names according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC. These are “MMG” variables as they were generated by ODI’s Matthew M. Geddes. These variables have fewer missing values than their non-MMG equivalents (crs\_purpose\_code and crs\_purpose\_sector).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable Name | Label | Description | Source |
| mmg\_purpose\_sector | MMG 5-digit purpose sector | 5-digit purpose classification code according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC | Generated by Matthew Geddes, ODI |
| mmg\_purpose\_sectorname | MMG 5-digit purpose sector name | 5-digit purpose classification name according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC | Generated by Matthew Geddes, ODI |
| mmg\_purpose\_code | MMG 3-digit purpose code | 3-digit purpose classification code according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC | Generated by Matthew Geddes, ODI |
| mmg\_purpose\_codename | MMG 3-digit purpose code name | 3-digit purpose classification name according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC | Generated by Matthew Geddes, ODI |

# AidData Variables

The following variables are from the AidData’s core research release (http://aiddata.org/datasets), in those cases where it was possible to merge projects with AidData’s records. It is very possible that with additional work more projects could be merged with AidData’s records.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable Name | Label | Description | Calculation Methodology |
| aiddata\_id | AidData ID | ID Number in AidData's project database | Provided |
| aiddata\_shortdescription | AidData short description | A short description of the project | Provided |
| aiddata\_longdescription | AidData long description | A longer description of the project | Provided |
| aiddata\_sectorname | AidData sector name | Project sector name with 44 categories | Provided |
| aiddata\_sectorcode | AidData sector code | Project sector code with 43 categories | Provided |
| aiddata\_purposename | AidData purpose name | Project purpose name with 152 categories | Provided |
| aiddata\_purposecode | AidData purpose code | Project purpose code with 152 categories | Provided |
| aiddata\_title | AidData title | Project title with 291 unique titles | Provided |
| aiddata\_disbursement\_amount | AidData disbursement amount | Project disbursement amount | Provided |

# Donor-Specific Variables

Variables that pertain to specific donors. Variables pertaining to more than one donor are included in each of the donors’ tables and indicated as such.

## Asian Development Bank (AsianDB)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable Name | Label | Description | Source |
| asdb\_loannumber | AsianDB loan number | Donor generated index number for each loan | Provided; slightly modified to remove blank spaces before some entries |
| asdb\_departmentname | AsianDB department | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| approvaldate | AsianDB approval date | Date of project approval  Example of format: “01jan2012” | Combined original variables *approvaldate* and *approvalyear* |
| asdb\_countryclassification | AsianDB country classification | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| asdb\_projecttype | AsianDB project type | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| asdb\_funds\_source\_name | AsianDB source of funds | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| asdb\_pcrrating | AsianDB PCR rating | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| asdb\_pvryear | AsianDB PVR rating year | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| asdb\_pvrrating | AsianDB PVR rating | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| asdb\_pperyear | AsianDB PPER rating year | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| asdb\_pperrating | AsianDB PPER rating | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| asdb\_approvalyear | AsianDB approval year | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| asdb\_project\_id | Asian DB donor project ID | Index number for each project | Generated based on provided variable |
| asdb\_approvedamount | AsianDB approved amount | In USD  Scaled by 1 million | Provided |

## Department for International Development (DFID)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable Name | Label | Description | Source |
| dfid\_project\_id | DFID donor project ID | Index number for each project | Generated based on provided variable |
| dfid\_divisionname | DFID division name | 14 regional and functional divisions within which project is housed | Provided |
| dfid\_deptofficename | DFID department office name | 68 department offices within project is housed | Provided |
| dfid\_principalsector | DFID principal sector | 95 principal sector categories | Provided |
| dfid\_sectorgroup | DFID sector group | 32 sector group categories | Provided |
| dfid\_reviewstyle | DFID review style | 2 categories as follows:  Legacy format  Pre-2012 format | Provided |
| dfid\_reviewtype | DFID review type | 1 category as follows:  PCR | Provided |
| dfid\_overallriskscore | DFID overall risk score | 4 categories as follows:  [blank]  0  High  Low  Medium | Provided |
| dfid\_totalimpactscore | DFID total impact score | Score between and including 0 and 400 | Provided |
| dfid\_projectpurposescore | DFID project purpose score | Score between and including 1 and 5 | Provided |
| dfid\_projectpurpose | DFID project purpose | 4 categories as follows:  Likely to be achieved to a limited extent  Likely to be completely achieved  Likely to be largely achieved  Likely to be partially achieved  Unlikely to be achieved | Provided |
| dfid\_outputriskscore | DFID output risk score | 3 categories as follows:  High  Low  Medium | Provided |
| dfid\_projectbudgetcurrent | DFID project budget current | In local currency (GBP) | Provided |

## The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria (GFATM)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable Name | | Label | Description | Source |
| gfatm\_project\_component | GFATM project component | | 4 categories as follows:  HIV/AIDS  Malaria  Other  Tuberculosis | Provided |
| gfatm\_grantcurrentstatus | GFATM grant current status | | 2 categories as follows:  Closed  In Closure | Provided |
| gfatm\_grantcurrentsubstatus | GFATM grant current sub status | | 5 categories as follows:  Consolidated  End date  No Go  PR Change  Terminated | Provided |
| gfatm\_programstartdate | GFATM program start date | | In dd-mm-yyyy format | Provided |
| gfatm\_programenddate | GFATM program end date | | In dd-mm-yyyy format | Provided |
| gfatm\_grantsigned\_amount | GFATM grant signed amount (USD equivalent) | |  | Provided |
| gfatm\_grant\_title | GFATM grant title | | 521 grant titles | Provided |
| gfatm\_principalrecipient\_name | GFATM principal recipient | | 234 principal recipients | Provided |
| gfatm\_project\_subtype | GFATM project subtype | | 10 categories as follows:  CS/PS: FBO  CS/PS: NGO  CS/PS: Oth  CS/PS: PS  Gov: MOF  Gov: MOH  Gov: Oth  MO: Oth  MO: UNDP  Third Party | Provided |
| gfatm\_progressupdatenumber | GFATM progress update number | | Update numbers between and including 1 and 27 | Provided |
| gfatm\_progressupdate\_startdate | GFATM progress update start date | | In dd-mm-yyyy format | Provided |
| gfatm\_progressupdate\_enddate | GFATM progress update end date | | In dd-mm-yyyy format | Provided |
| gfatm\_projectdisbconst\_amount | GFATM project disbursement amount constant (USD 2011) | |  | Provided |
| gfatm\_grantdisbursedamount | GFATM grant disbursed amount | | In USD | Provided |

## German Society for International Cooperation (GiZ)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable Name | Label | Description | Source |
| giz\_relevance\_rating | GiZ relevance rating | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| giz\_effectiveness\_rating | GiZ effectiveness rating | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| giz\_efficiency\_rating | GiZ efficiency rating | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| giz\_impact\_rating | GiZ impact rating | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| giz\_sustainability\_rating | GiZ sustainability rating | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| giz\_leadexecagency\_name | GiZ lead executing agency name | 127 lead executing agency names | Provided |
| giz\_leadexecagency\_type | GiZ lead executing agency type | 1 category as follows:  public | Provided |
| giz\_leadexecagency\_country | GiZ lead executing agency country | 3 categories as follows:  Not from Donor’s Nation  From Donor’s Nation  Mixed | Provided |
| giz\_leadimplementingorg\_name | GiZ lead implementing organization name | 130 lead implementing organization names | Provided |
| giz\_leadimplementingorg\_type | GiZ lead implementing organization type | 1 category as follows:  public | Provided |
| giz\_leadimplementingorg\_country | GiZ lead implementing organization country | 3 categories as follows:  Not from Donor’s Nation  From Donor’s Nation  Mixed | Provided |
| giz\_projectsize | GiZ project size | In local currency (EUR)  Scaled by 1 thousand | Provided |

## International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable Name | | | Label | | Description | | Source |
| ifad\_relevance\_rating | | IFAD relevance rating | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_effectiveness\_rating | IFAD effectiveness rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_efficiency\_rating | IFAD efficiency rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_sustainability\_rating | IFAD sustainability rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_evaluationtype | IFAD evaluation type | | | 4 categories as follows:  Completion Evaluation  Completion evaluation  Interim Evaluation  PPA | | Provided | |
| ifad\_approvaldate | IFAD approval date | | | In Short Month-YY format | | Provided | |
| ifad\_effectivedate | IFAD effective date | | | In Short Month-YY format | | Provided | |
| ifad\_operationaldate | IFAD operational date | | | In Short Month-YY format | | Provided | |
| ifad\_closingdate | IFAD closing date | | | In Short Month-YY format | | Provided | |
| ifad\_reviseddate | IFAD project revision date | | | In Short Month-YY format | | Provided with modification to add “Feb-06" for *project\_title* values "Area-Based Agricultural Modernization Programme" | |
| ifad\_ruralpovimpact\_rating | IFAD rural poverty impact rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_innovation\_rating | IFAD innovation rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_overallachievement\_rating | IFAD overall achievement rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_hhincomeasset\_rating | IFAD household income and asset rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_humansocialcapital\_rating | IFAD human and social capital rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_foodsecagriproduce\_rating | IFAD food security and agricultural production rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_natresourcesenvir\_rating | IFAD natural resources and environment rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_institutionspolicies\_rating | IFAD institutions and policies rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_genderemp\_rating | IFAD gender equality and women's empowerment rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_humanassets\_rating | IFAD human assets (principally improvement in access to potable water and training) rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_phyfinasset\_rating | IFAD physical and financial assets rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_areaofhealth\_rating | IFAD area of health rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_areaofeducation\_rating | IFAD area of education rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_replication\_rating | IFAD replication rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_replication\_rating | IFAD markets rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_markets\_rating | IFAD IFAD partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_ifadpartner\_rating | IFAD UNOPS partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_unopspartner\_rating | IFAD replication rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_cafpartner\_rating | IFAD CAF partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_cipartner\_rating | IFAD CI partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_boadpartner\_rating | IFAD BOAD partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_ngospartner\_rating | IFAD NGOS partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_wfppartner\_rating | IFAD WFP partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_ndaspartner\_rating | IFAD NDAS partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_rccspartner\_rating | IFAD RCCS partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_wfpartner\_rating | IFAD WF partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_finagropartner\_rating | IFAD FINAGRO partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_iicapartner\_rating | IFAD IICA partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_coexpartner\_rating | IFAD COEXECUTINGAGENCI partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_afdbpartner\_rating | IFAD AFDB partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_idaworldbankpartner\_rating | IFAD IDA World Bank partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_rpartnerspartner\_rating | IFAD research partners partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_contractorspartner\_rating | IFAD contractors partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_bankspartner\_rating | IFAD banks partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_cbospartner\_rating | IFAD CBOS partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_beneficiariespartner\_rating | IFAD beneficiaries partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_serviceproviders\_rating | IFAD service providers partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_OPECcofin\_rating | IFAD OPEC cofinanciers rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_irishaidcofin\_rating | IFAD Irish Aid cofinanciers rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_asdb\_rating | IFAD ASDB rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_creditinstBCR\_rating | IFAD credit institutions BCR rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_creditinstBCC\_rating | IFAD credit institutions BCC rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_projectmanagement\_rating | IFAD project management rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_privsectorpartners\_rating | IFAD private sector partners rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_sida\_rating | IFAD SIDA rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_undp\_rating | IFAD UNDP rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_government\_partner\_rating | IFAD government partner rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_sixoverall\_rating | IFAD six-point overall rating | | | Rating scale:  6 = Highly satisfactory  5 = Satisfactory  4 = Moderately satisfactory  3 = Moderately unsatisfactory  2 = Unsatisfactory  1 = Highly unsatisfactory | | Provided | |
| ifad\_projectsize | IFAD project size | | | In USD  Scaled by 1 million | | Provided | |

## Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable Name | | Label | Description | Source |
| jica\_borrowerimplementername | | JICA borrower implementer name | 554 borrower implementer names | Provided |
| jica\_borrowerimplementertype | JICA borrower implementer type | | 2 categories as follows:  private  public | Provided |
| jica\_primarycontractortype | JICA primary contractor type | | 1 category as follows:  private | Provided |
| jica\_primarycontractorcountry | JICA primary contractor country | | 3 categories as follows:  0  1  2 | Provided |
| jica\_relevance\_rating | JICA relevance rating | | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| jica\_effectiveness\_rating | JICA effectiveness rating | | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| jica\_efficiency\_rating | JICA efficiency rating | | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| jica\_impact\_rating | JICA impact rating | | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| jica\_sustainability\_rating | JICA sustainability rating | | [Refer to donor-specific documentation] | Provided |
| jica\_ratingunknownreason | JICA reason for unknown ratings | | Reasons for unknown ratings (for 12 projects, all JICA) such as Counterparts no response to questionnaire, No data in project database, No response from executing agencies, etc. | Provided |
| jica\_ratingsimputed | JICA ratings imputed | | Whether ratings were imputed  2 categories as follows:  0: Ratings not imputed  1: Ratings imputed | JICA documents were, as noted above, extracted from individual JICA project evaluations. All but three of these projects listed an overall project success rating; these ratings were a simple average of rated subcomponents (e.g. impact, relevance). In the case of three projects there were subcomponent but no overall rating; in these three cases we averaged the subcomponents ourselves. However, as these ratings are calculated by us (using what we induce to be JICA's methodology) rather than assigned by JICA, these three projects are flagged as having imputed ratings. |
| jica\_projectsize | JICA project size | | In local currency (JPY)  Scaled to 1 million |  |

## German Development Bank (KfW)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable Name | | Label | Description | Source |
| kfw\_effectiveness\_rating | | KfW effectiveness rating | Ratings as follows:  6  5  4  3  2  1 | Scale inversed from the original scale in which lower numbers meant less success |
| kfw\_efficiency\_rating | KfW efficiency rating | | Ratings as follows:  6  5  4  3  2  1 | Scale inversed from the original scale in which lower numbers meant less success |
| kfw\_impact\_rating | KfW impact rating | | Ratings as follows:  6  5  4  3  2  1 | Scale inversed from the original scale in which lower numbers meant less success |
| kfw\_sustainability\_rating | KfW sustainability rating | | Ratings as follows:  6  4.5  3  1.5 | Scale inflated from original 4-point scale  Scale inversed from the original scale in which lower numbers meant less success |
| kfw\_appraisal\_date | KfW appraisal date | | In dd-mm-yyyy format | Provided |
| kfw\_reportcompletion\_date | KfW report completion date | | In dd-mm-yyyy format | Provided |
| kfw\_evaluation\_date | KfW evaluation date | | In dd-mm-yyyy format | Provided |
| kfw\_officeopening\_date | KfW office opening date | | In dd-mm-yyyy format | Provided |
| kfw\_significance\_rating | KfW rating significance | | Ratings as follows:  6  5  4  3  2  1 | Scale inversed from the original scale in which lower numbers meant less success |
| kfw\_projectsize | KfW project size | | In local currency (EUR) | Calculated by combining original variables *totaldisbursement* and *totalcost*, keeping the value of variable where data exists and higher values if data for both variables exist |

## World Bank

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable Name | | Label | Description | Source |
| wb\_projecttype | | WB project type | 4 categories as follows:  Dev Pol Lend  Investment  Not assigned  UNKNOWN | Provided |
| wb\_approvaldate | WB approval date | | Date of project approval  Example of format: “01jan2012” | Combined original variables *approvaldate* and *approvalyear* |
| wb\_government\_partner\_rating | WB government partner rating | | Ratings as follows:  6  5  4  3  2  1 | Provided |
| wb\_lendingproject\_cost | WB lending project cost | | In USD | Provided |
| wb\_lendinginstrumenttype | WB lending instrument | | 17 categories as follows:  [Blank]  APL  DPL  DRL  ERL  FIL  LIL  NA  PRC  PSL  RIL  SAD  SAL  SIL  SIM  SSL  TAL | Provided |
| wb\_productline\_code | WB project line code | | 8 categories as follows:  EP  GE  GU  MT  PE  RE  RN  SF | Provided |
| wb\_projectline\_name | WB project line | | 8 categories as follows:  Global Environment Project  Guarantees  IBRD/IDA  Montreal Protocol  Project Evaluations  Rainforest  Recipient Executed Activities  Special Financing | Provided |
| wb\_ieg\_evaluationdate | WB IEG evaluation date | | In mm/dd/yyyy format | Provided |
| wb\_ieg\_evaluationtype | WB IEG evaluation type | | 7 categories as follows:  CSSR  ES  EVM  PAR  PCM  PCN  PCR | Provided |
| wb\_ieg\_rdoclassification | WB IEG RDO classification | | Risk to Development Outcome classification  6 categories as follows:  #  HIGH  MODERATE  NEGLIGIBLE TO LOW  NON-EVALUABLE  SIGNIFICANT | Provided |
| wb\_ieg\_idimpactclassification | WB IEG ID impact (disc) classification | | 6 categories as follows:  HIGH  MODEST  NEGLIGIBLE  NOT APPLICABLE  NOT AVAILABLE  NOT RATED  SUBSTANTIAL | Provided |
| wb\_qualityatentry\_rating | WB rating quality at entry | | Ratings as follows:  6  5  4  3  2  1 | Provided |
| wb\_supervisionquality\_rating | WB rating supervision quality | | Ratings as follows:  6  5  4  3  2  1 | Provided |
| wb\_owninstperformance\_rating | WB rating own institutitution's performance | | Ratings as follows:  6  5  4  3  2  1 | Provided |
| wb\_borrowerpreparation\_rating | WB IEG borrower preparation (disc) classification | | 7 categories as follows:  HIGHLY SATISFACTORY  HIGHLY UNSATISFACTORY  NOT APPLICABLE  NOT AVAILABLE  NOT RATED  SATISFACTORY  UNSATISFACTORY | Provided |
| wb\_borrowerimplementation\_rating | | WB rating borrower implementation | Ratings as follows:  6  5  4  3  2  1 | Provided |
| wb\_borrowercompliance\_rating | | WB rating borrower compliance | Ratings as follows:  6  5  4  3  2  1 | Provided |
| wb\_ieg\_icrqualityclassification | | WB IEG ICR quality classification | 7 categories as follows:  #  EXEMPLARY  NOT APPLICABLE  NOT AVAILABLE  NOT RATED  SATISFACTORY  UNSATISFACTORY | Provided |
| wb\_sustainability\_classification | | WB IEG sustainability classification | 9 categories as follows:  HIGHLY LIKELY  HIGHLY UNLIKELY  HIGLY UNLIKELY  LIKELY  NON-EVALUABLE  NOT APPLICABLE  NOT RATED  UNCERTAIN  UNLIKELY | Provided |
| wb\_ieg\_mequalityclassification | | WB IEG ME quality classification | 5 categories as follows:  HIGH  MODEST  NEGLIGIBLE  NON-EVALUABLE  SUBSTANTIAL | Provided |

# Suggested Variables

The following variables are possible to generate through an additional calculation or combination. These variables may be useful for additional analysis.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable Name | Label | Description | Calculation Methodology |
| bi\_overall\_rating | Binary overall rating | 2 categories are follows:  1: Satisfactory  0: Unsatisfactory | Can be generated based on the 6-point outcome, assigning the following specifications:  1: for outcomes 4,5,6  0: for outcomes 1,2,3 |
| relevance\_rating | Relevance rating | The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.  In evaluating the relevance of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:   * To what extent are the objectives of the programme still valid? * Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives? * Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?   Source:  OECD DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm | Can be combined across the following 3 donors:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Donor** | **Donor-Specific Variable** | | GiZ | giz\_relevance\_rating | | IFAD | ifad\_relevance\_rating | | JICA | jica\_relevance\_rating | |
| effectiveness\_rating | Effectiveness rating | A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.  In evaluating the effectiveness of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:   * To what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved? * What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?   Source:  OECD DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm | Can be combined across the following 4 donors:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Donor** | **Donor-Specific Variable** | | GiZ | giz\_effectiveness\_rating | | IFAD | ifad\_effectiveness\_rating | | JICA | jica\_effectiveness\_rating | | KfW | kfw\_effectiveness\_rating | |
| efficiency\_rating | Efficiency rating | Efficiency measures the outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.  When evaluating the efficiency of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:   * Were activities cost-efficient? * Were objectives achieved on time? * Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?   Source:  OECD DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm> | Can be combined across the following 4 donors:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Donor** | **Donor-Specific Variable** | | GiZ | giz\_efficiency\_rating | | IFAD | ifad\_efficiency\_rating | | JICA | jica\_efficiency\_rating | | KfW | kfw\_efficiency\_rating | |
| impact\_rating | Impact rating | The positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators. The examination should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of trade and financial conditions.  When evaluating the impact of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:   * What has happened as a result of the programme or project? * What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries? * How many people have been affected?   Source:  OECD DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm> | Can be combined across the following 3 donors:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Donor** | **Donor-Specific Variable** | | GiZ | giz\_impact\_rating | | JICA | jica\_impact\_rating | | KfW | kfw\_impact\_rating | |
| sustainability\_rating | Sustainability rating | Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.  When evaluating the sustainability of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:   * To what extent did the benefits of a programme or project continue after donor funding ceased? * What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?   Source:  OECD DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm> | Can be combined across the following 4 donors:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Donor** | **Donor-Specific Variable** | | GiZ | giz\_sustainability\_rating | | IFAD | ifad\_sustainability\_rating | | JICA | jica\_sustainability\_rating | | KfW | kfw\_sustainability\_rating (inflated from original 4-point rating to 6-point rating) | |
| expost\_evaluation | Ex-post evaluation | Whether the evaluation was carried out ex-post (i.e. after the project is closed)  2 categories as follows:  1: Evaluation was carried out ex-post  0: Evaluation was not carried out ex-post | Can be generated by checking if the Lag to evaluation (eval\_lag) variable is greater than some time period (suggested: 100 days) |
| project\_size\_USD\_calculated | Project size in USD | The size of the project descaled and converted to USD | Can be generated by multiplying the appropriate exchange rate and/or scale factor with each of the respective donor’s provided values. The exchange rates used in initial conversions are included in code below (based on current exchange rates at time of first conversion) but can be updated; indeed, a more thorough conversion would use historic exchange rates at time of project approval, or completion.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | AsianDB | Multiply by 1 million to de-scale | | DFID | Multiply by 1.51 (GBP-USD exchange rate on April 3, 2013) | | GFATM | No modification necessary | | GiZ | Multiply by 1 thousand to de-scale  multiply by 1.3065 (EUR-USD exchange rate on July 13, 2013) | | IFAD | Multiply by 1 million to de-scale | | JICA | Multiply by 10687 | | KfW | Multiply by 1.28 (EUR-USD exchange rate on April 4, 2013) | | WB | No modification necessary | |
| multi\_donor | Multilateral donor | Whether the project’s donor is a multilateral entity  2 categories as follows:  1: The project’s donor is a multilateral entity  0: The project’s donor is not a multilateral entity | Can be generated if the donor is World Bank, GFATM, AsianDB, or IFAD |