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# Introduction

The Project Performance Database (PPD), Version 2 is a database of project evaluations from 12 bilateral and multilateral aid agencies between 1956 and 2016. The PPD 2.0 contains data on more than 20,000 unique foreign aid projects (21,198 projects) taking place in 183 recipient countries around the world. The PPD 2 is unique amongst large foreign aid datasets in including a measure of overall project success (20,686 projects in the database contain project ratings). If you use the data, please cite the following article:

Honig, Dan, Ranjit Lall, and Bradley Parks. 2022. “When Does Transparency Improve Institutional Performance? Evidence from 20,000 Projects in 183 Countries.” *American Journal of Political Science*.

This Codebook provides a detailed description of every variable in the PPD 2. The Codebook first contains a brief description of sources for new data first included in v 2.0 (Data Sources), then describes the construction and details of variables that draw from multiple donors in the dataset (Combined Variables). It then describes variables drawn from AidData’s dataset (AidData Variables) and variables that are donor-specific (Donor-Specific Variables), listing each donor in alphabetical order. The Codebook closes by describing a number of variables that could be constructed from the donor-specific variables, were it of interest to users (Suggested Variables). Note that some of the suggested variables are things that would likely be prudent to do for many users making use of multiple donors’ data – e.g. converting project size from the original transmitted value to comparable USD equivalents.

The PPD 2 builds on the (originally 2018, updated 2019) PPD Version 1, which includes project evaluations from eight International Development Organizations (IDOs) between 1973 and 2013. Data is provided in both .dta and .csv formats; please note that the .csv is an export of the .dta, so where the CSV has limitations (e.g. recognition/processing of non-English characters in project names) it may be useful to refer back to the .csv file. The PPD 1, prepared by Dan Honig in relation to his 2018 book *Navigation by Judgment*, can still be found on the Harvard Dataverse at <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/444GNW>. However, all data in the PPD 1 are included in – and expanded upon – in this PPD 2.

This Codebook and the PPD 2.0 owes a debt of gratitude to Saad Imtiaz, without whose exceptional labors it would not have come together. We’d also like to thank all those who took the time to reach out with queries that helped us improve the PPD from version 2.0 onwards, including Lisa Mandle (Natural Capital Project, Stanford University) and Ruth Carlitz. In drawing on PPD 1, this release builds on the work of Rachit Khaitan and the efforts and suggestions of Ryan Briggs, Matthew Geddes, Erica Gould, Alena Stern, and Thomas Wencker. For version notes/changes as the PPD 1 evolved, please see the final PPD 1 Codebook at the Harvard Dataverse link above. For any questions about this data, or if you notice any errors that should be corrected, contact Dan Honig at [dan.honig@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:dan.honig@ucl.ac.uk).

# Data Sources

Project data from the following donor have been added / updated to v1.0 of the PPD

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Donor | Source |
| African Development Bank | Extracted with Data from Internal Project Databases, Communicated via Email (no limitations on onward public disclosure) Feb 27, 2018. |
| Caribbean Development Bank | Extracted with Data from Internal Project Databases, Communicated via Email (no limitations on onward public disclosure) Feb 14, 2018. |
| Australia’s Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade | Wood, Terence (2020): Data on Australian aid appraisals. figshare. Dataset. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.11678118.v1 |
| Global Environment Fund | Extracted with Data from Internal Project Databases, Communicated via Email (no limitations on onward public disclosure) Jan 11, 2018. |
| Global Fund for AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria | Extracted with Data from Internal Project Databases, Communicated via Email (no limitations on onward public disclosure) March 3, 2018. |
| International Fund for Agricultural Development | Extracted with Data from Internal Project Databases, Communicated via Email (no limitations on onward public disclosure) Jan 11, 2018. |
| World Bank | World Bank project performance data from IEG, World Bank Group, 2019 |

# Combined Variables

The following table describes the calculation methodology for each variable that is combined across donors.

| Variable Name | Label | Description | Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| project\_id | Project ID | Unique identification number for each project | Generated after creating the dataset, cannot be used to retroactively merge donor data |
| donor | Donor name | Name of the donor | |  |  | | --- | --- | | AfricanDB | African Development Bank | | AsianDB | Asian Development Bank | | CDB | Caribbean Development Bank | | DFAT | Australia’s Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade | | DFID | UK’s Department for International Development | | GEF | Global Environment Fund | | 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 satisfactory  5:  4:  3:  2:  1: highly unsatisfactory | Original donor ratings were rescaled to standardized 6-point scale in different ways, depending on the donor data. Donor 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’s *Navigation by Judgment*, Chapter 4, for a fuller discussion of these issues.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | AfricanDB | original (1-4) rating multiplied by 1.5 | | AsianDB | original (1-4) rating multiplied by 1.5 | | CDB | original (1-5) rating multiplied by 1.2 | | DFAT | original rating has natural scale of 6 | | DFID | original (1-5) rating multiplied by 1.2 | | GEF | original rating has natural scale of 6 | | 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 | |
| country\_code\_WB | Country Code | Country code as per World Bank |  |
| evaluation\_date | Evaluation date | Date project evaluation took place  Example of format: “01jan2012” | Combined across all 8 donors  Data are not available for DFAT, IFAD, GEF  Where dates were unavailable but the year was available, we substitute in the year with a default date of 1st January. |
| 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 | | AfricanDB | completion\_date-start\_date | | CDB | N/A | | DFAT | completion\_date-start\_date | | DFID | completion\_date-start\_date | | GEF | completion\_date-start\_date | | 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 | |
| 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 9 donors  For IFAD, DFAT, GEF, the evaluation date is not available and the indicator is calculated as the difference between *evaluation\_year* and *completion\_year*  Data is not available for CDB |
| start\_date | Project start date | Date project started  Example of format: “01jan2012” | Combined across all 12 donors  Where dates were unavailable but the year was available, we substitute in the year with a default date of 1st January. |
| completion\_date | Project completion date | Date of project completion  Example of format: “01jan2012” | Combined across 11 donors  Data is not available for CDB  Where dates were unavailable but the year was available, we substitute in the year with a default date of 1st January. |
| aid\_type | Type of aid | 3 categories as follows:  L: Loan  G: Grant  T: TA | Combined across 4 donors  Data are not available for donors AfricanDB, CDB, DFAT, IFAD, GiZ, GEF, KfW, WB |
| projectname | Project name | Name of project as provided by the respective donors | Combined across 11 donors  Data are not available for GFATM |
| 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:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | AfricanDB | The African Development Bank project data did not include overall ratings. The overall rating is the mean rating of all project subcomponents. | | AsianDB | 1: “Unsuccessful”  2: “Less than successful”  3: “Successful/Generally Successful”  4: “Highly Successful” | | CDB | 1: "Unsatisfactory"  2: “Marginally Unsatisfactory"  3: “Satisfactory"  4: “Highly Satisfactory"  5: “Excellent" | | DFAT | 1: “Very poor; does not satisfy criteria in any major area”  2 “Poor; does not satisfy criteria in several major areas”  3: “Less than adequate; on balance does not satisfy criteria and/or fails in at least one major area”  4: “Adequate; on balance satisfies criteria; does not fail in any major area”  5: “Good; satisfies criteria in almost all areas”  6: “Very good; satisfies criteria in all areas” | | 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” | | GEF | 1: “highly unsatisfactory”  2: “unsatisfactory”  3: “moderately unsatisfactory”  4: “moderately satisfactory”  5: “satisfactory”  6: “highly satisfactory” | | 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  ‘successful’. 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 ‘unsuccessful’. 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.  Data are not available for CDB, GFATM, KfW |
| office\_presence | Office presence | Whether a donor office was present during the project  2 categories as follows:  1: Office present  0: Office not present | These codes were assigned based on office data provided by donors or publicly available. As noted in Honig’s *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. |
| sector\_codes | 3 digit sector code | 3-digit sector classification code according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC | Revised sectors codes according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC. These build on the original sector codes of the PPD 1.0, and defers to those hand-coded and checked by ODI’s Matthew M. Geddes (“MMG codes”) in the PPD 1.0. Where a CRS code was absent, Saad Imtiaz assigned the closest CRS 3 digit broad category equivalent. These variables have fewer missing values than the more detailed 5-digit codes (crs\_purpose\_sector). |
| sector\_description | 3 digit sector description | 3-digit purpose classification name according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC | Corresponding sector names according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC |
| purpose\_codes | 5 digit sector code | 5-digit purpose classification code according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC | These are purpose codes according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC. If codes are not present in the agencies’ source data or the PPD 1.0, we do not create new codes in the PPD 2.0, but rather leave these fields missing; in drawing from the PPD 1.0 we defer to Matthew Geddes’ hand-checked “MMG codes” in cases of conflict regarding the appropriate CRS code. Note that users wishing to remove sector codes generated by the PPD 2.0’s creators can thus do so by removing any sector code present where a purpose code is absent. |
| purpose\_description | 5 digit sector description | 5-digit purpose classification name according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC | Corresponding purpose names according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC |

# AidData Variables

The following variables are from AidData’s core research release (<http://aiddata.org/datasets>) and cover projects included in AidData’s records. It is very possible that with additional work more projects could be merged.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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.

**African Development Bank (AfDB)**

| **Variable Name** | **Label** | **Source** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **afdb\_score\_C1** | AfDB Implementation Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C101** | AfDB Adherence to implementation schedule Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C102** | AfDB Time Variation Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C103** | AfDB Adherence to cost schedule Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C104** | AfDB Cost Variation Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C105** | AfDB Compliance with covenants and conditions Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C106** | AfDB Adequacy of monitoring evaluation and reporting Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C107** | AfDB Satisfactory operations Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C2** | AfDB Bank Performance Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C201** | AfDB Identification Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C202** | AfDB Preparation Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C203** | AfDB Appraisal Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C204** | AfDB Supervision Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C3** | AfDB Relevance and achievement of objectives Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C301** | AfDB Macro Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C302** | AfDB Sector policy Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C303** | AfDB Relevance Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C304** | AfDB Physical (including production) Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C305** | AfDB Financial aspect Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C306** | AfDB Efficacy Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C307** | AfDB Poverty reduction, social impact and gender Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C308** | AfDB Environment Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C309** | AfDB Private sector development Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C310** | AfDB Other (Specify) Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C4** | AfDB Institutional Development (ID) Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C401** | AfDB Institutional framework including restructuring Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C402** | AfDB Financial and integrated systems of management including audit systems Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C403** | AfDB Transfer of Technology Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C404** | AfDB Staffing by qualified/skilled personnel (including turnover), training | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C5** | AfDB Sustainability Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C501** | AfDB Continued commitment of borrower Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C502** | AfDB Environmental policy Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C503** | AfDB Institutional framework Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C504** | AfDB Technical viability and staffing Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C505** | AfDB Financial viability ( including cost Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C506** | AfDB Economic viability Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C507** | AfDB Environmental viability Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C508** | AfDB O & M facilitation (foreign exchange and recurrent cost financing available) | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C6** | AfDB Economic Internal rate of return Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C601** | AfDB Efficiency Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C602** | AfDB Outcome Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_C7** | AfDB Project Outcome Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D1** | AfDB relevance of project objectives & design Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D101** | AfDB Relevance of project Objectives Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D102** | AfDB Relevance of project Design Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D2** | AfDB achievement of project outputs Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D201** | AfDB Output 1 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D202** | AfDB Output 2 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D203** | AfDB Output 3 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D204** | AfDB Output 4 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D205** | AfDB Output 5 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D206** | AfDB Output 6 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D207** | AfDB Output 7 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D208** | AfDB Output 8 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D209** | AfDB Output 9 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D210** | AfDB Output 10 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D211** | AfDB Output 11 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D212** | AfDB Output 12 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D213** | AfDB Output 13 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D214** | AfDB Output 14 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D215** | AfDB Output 15 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D216** | AfDB Output 16 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D217** | AfDB Output 17 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D218** | AfDB Output 18 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D219** | AfDB Output 19 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D220** | AfDB Output 20 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D221** | AfDB Output 21 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D222** | AfDB Output 22 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D223** | AfDB Output 23 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D224** | AfDB Output 24 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D225** | AfDB Output 25 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D3** | AfDB achievement of project outcomes Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D301** | AfDB Outcome 1 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D302** | AfDB Outcome 2 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D303** | AfDB Outcome 3 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D304** | AfDB Outcome 4 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D305** | AfDB Outcome 5 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D306** | AfDB Outcome 6 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D307** | AfDB Outcome 7 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D308** | AfDB Outcome 8 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D309** | AfDB Outcome 9 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D310** | AfDB Outcome 10 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D311** | AfDB Outcome 11 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D312** | AfDB Outcome 12 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D313** | AfDB Outcome 13 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D314** | AfDB Outcome 14 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D315** | AfDB Outcome 15 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D316** | AfDB Outcome 16 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D317** | AfDB Outcome 17 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D318** | AfDB Outcome 18 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D319** | AfDB Outcome 19 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D320** | AfDB Outcome 20 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D321** | AfDB Outcome 21 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D322** | AfDB Outcome 22 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D323** | AfDB Outcome 23 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D324** | AfDB Outcome 24 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D325** | AfDB Outcome 25 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D4** | AfDB additional outcomes (not captured in the logframe) Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D401** | AfDB Institutional Development Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D402** | AfDB Gender Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D403** | AfDB Environment & Climate Change Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D404** | AfDB Poverty Reduction Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D405** | AfDB Private Sector Development Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D406** | AfDB Regional Integration Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D407** | AfDB Other (Specify) Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D5** | AfDB efficiency in achieving outputs & outcomes Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D501** | AfDB Timeliness (in adhering to the original closing date) Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D502** | AfDB Rates of returns (Specify if applicable) Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D503** | AfDB Other Criteria (Specify) Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D6** | AfDB risk to sustained achievement of project outcome Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D7** | AfDB bank performance Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D701** | AfDB Design and Readiness Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D702** | AfDB Supervision Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D8** | AfDB borrower performance Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D801** | AfDB Design and Readiness Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D802** | AfDB Implementation Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D9** | AfDB M & E design, implementation & utilization Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D901** | AfDB M & E Design Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D902** | AfDB M & E Implementation Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_D903** | AfDB M & E Use Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_E1** | AfDB Quality Of PCR Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_E101** | AfDB Adequacy of analysis of Project goals, objective and Formulation | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_E102** | AfDB Adequacy of analysis of Project execution | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_E103** | AfDB Soundness of judgments on Project Performance and Results | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_E104** | AfDB Adequacy of analysis of social and environmental impacts Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_E105** | AfDB Soundness of judgments on project sustainability, plan for future project | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_E106** | AfDB Soundness of judgments on Performance of the Bank, Borrower and Co Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_E107** | AfDB Consistency of Overall rating with individual rating components Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_E108** | AfDB Adequacy of analysis and clarity of conclusions, lessons learned | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_E109** | AfDB Other (Specify) Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_F1** | AfDB Quality Of PCR Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_F101** | AfDB Extent of quality and completeness of the PCR evidence and analysis | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_F102** | AfDB Extent of objectivity PCR assessment scores Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_F103** | AfDB Extent of internal consistency of PCR assessment ratings; inaccuracies | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_F104** | AfDB Extent of identification and assessment of key factors | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_F105** | AfDB Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_F106** | AfDB Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis processes | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_F107** | AfDB Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_F108** | AfDB Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_F109** | AfDB Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_F110** | AfDB Other (to be specified) Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_F2** | AfDB PCR Compliance with Guidelines (PCR/OM; OPEV) Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_F201** | AfDB PCR Timeliness Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_F202** | AfDB Extent of participation of Borrower, Co Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_F203** | AfDB Other aspect (Specify) Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O1** | AfDB Relevance Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O101** | AfDB Relevance of project development objective Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O102** | AfDB Relevance of project design Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O2** | AfDB Effectiveness Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O201** | AfDB Outcome reporting Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O202** | AfDB Output reporting Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O203** | AfDB Development Objective (DO) rating Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O3** | AfDB Efficiency Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O301** | AfDB Timeliness Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O302** | AfDB Resource use efficiency Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O303** | AfDB Cost benefit analysis Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O304** | AfDB Implementation Progress (IP) Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O4** | AfDB Sustainability Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O401** | AfDB Financial sustainability Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O402** | AfDB Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O403** | AfDB Ownership and sustainability of partnerships Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O404** | AfDB Environmental and social sustainability Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O405** | AfDB Bank performance Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O406** | AfDB Borrower performance Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O407** | AfDB Performance of other stakeholders Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_O5** | AfDB Overall Project Rating Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_P1** | AfDB Quality Of PCR Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_P101** | AfDB Extent of quality and completeness of the PCR evidence and analysis to sub | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_P102** | AfDB Extent of objectivity PCR assessment scores Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_P103** | AfDB Extent of internal consistency of PCR assessment ratings; inaccuracies | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_P104** | AfDB Extent of identification and assessment of key factors (internal and exogenous) | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_P105** | AfDB Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_P106** | AfDB Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis processes | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_P107** | AfDB Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_P108** | AfDB Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_P109** | AfDB Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_P110** | AfDB Other (to be specified) Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_P2** | P2 Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_P201** | AfDB PCR Timeliness Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_P202** | AfDB Extent of participation of Borrower, Co Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_score\_P203** | AfDB Other aspect (Specify) Score | Provided |
| **afdb\_ProjectSapCode** | ProjectSapCode | Provided |
| **afdb\_DocNo** | DocNo | Provided |
| **afdb\_FormatType** | FormatType | Provided |
| **afdb\_ProjectSapCodes** | ProjectSapCodes | Provided |
| **afdb\_SectorNames** | SectorNames | Provided |
| **afdb\_SubSectorNames** | SubSectorNames | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_evalyear** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Year of Review | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_CountryNames** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Recipient Country Name | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_sector** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Sector | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_projectname** | Project Name | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_department** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Department | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_relevance** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Part A: Relevance | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_a1** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Relevance of the project's development objective | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_a2** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Relevance of the project design (II.A.2) | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_effectiveness** | AfDB Implementing Staff - COMPONENT B: EFFECTIVENESS | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_b4** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Development Objective (DO) (II.B.4) | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_efficiency** | AfDB Implementing Staff - COMPONENT C: EFFICIENCY | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_c1** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Respect of the calendar (II.C.1) | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_c2** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Efficiency of resource use (II.C.2) | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_c3** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Cost Benefit Analysis (II.C.3) | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_c4** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Status of Implementation (PI) (II.C.4) | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_durability** | AfDB Implementing Staff - SECTION D: SUSTAINABILITY | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_d1** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Financial viability (II.D.1) | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_d2** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Institutional sustainability and capacity building | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_d3** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Ownership and sustainability of partnerships (II.D.3) | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_d4** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Environmental and social sustainability (II.D.4) | Provided |
| **afdb\_impl\_staff\_overall\_rating** | AfDB Implementing Staff - Overall Rating | Provided |
| **afdb\_evaluator** | afdb\_evaluator\_label | Provided |
| **afdb\_projectamount\_usd** | Commitment signed in UA | Provided |
| **afdb\_relevance** | AfDB Relevance score (combined) | Provided |
| **afdb\_efficiency** | AfDB Efficiency score (combined) | Provided |
| **afdb\_sustainability** | AfDB Sustainability score (combined) | Provided |

## **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 |

## **Caribbean Development Bank (CDB)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable Name** | **Label** | **Source** |
| **cdb\_StrategicRelevance** | CDB - OIE StrategicRelevance | Provided |
| **cdb\_PovertyRelevance** | CDB - OIE PovertyRelevance | Provided |
| **cdb\_Effectiveness** | CDB - OIE Effectiveness | Provided |
| **cdb\_Efficiency** | CDB - OIE Efficiency | Provided |
| **cdb\_ThematicAreas** | CDB - OIE ThematicAreas | Provided |
| **cdb\_Sustainability** | CDB - OIE Sustainability | Provided |
| **cdb\_AggregateScore** | CDB - OIE AggregateScore | Provided |
| **cdb\_BorrowerPerformance** | CDB - OIE BorrowerPerformance | Provided |
| **cdb\_CDBPerformance** | CDB - OIE CDBPerformance | Provided |
| **cdb\_QualityofPCR** | CDB - OIE QualityofPCR | Provided |
| **cdb\_terminal\_disb\_date** | CDB - Terminal disbursment Date | Provided |
| **cdb\_amount\_usdm** | CDB - Project Value in Million USD | Provided |
| **cdb\_approval\_date** | CDB - approval date | Provided |
| **cdb\_StrategicRelevance\_rating** | CDB - OIE StrategicRelevance Score | Provided |
| **cdb\_PovertyRelevance\_rating** | CDB - OIE PovertyRelevance Score | Provided |
| **cdb\_Effectiveness\_rating** | CDB - OIE Effectiveness Score | Provided |
| **cdb\_Efficiency\_rating** | CDB - OIE Efficiency Score | Provided |
| **cdb\_ThematicAreas\_rating** | CDB - OIE ThematicAreas Score | Provided |
| **cdb\_Sustainability\_rating** | CDB - OIE Sustainability Score | Provided |
| **cdb\_AggregateScore\_rating** | CDB - OIE AggregateScore Score | Provided |
| **cdb\_BorrowerPerformance\_rating** | CDB - OIE BorrowerPerformance Score | Provided |
| **cdb\_CDBPerformance\_rating** | CDB - OIE CDBPerformance Score | Provided |
| **cdb\_QualityofPCR\_rating** | CDB - OIE QualityofPCR Score | Provided |

## **Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable Name** | **Label** | **Source** |
| **dfat\_QualityReportType** | DFAT - Quality Report Type | Provided |
| **dfat\_InvestmentNumber** | DFAT - Investment Number | Provided |
| **dfat\_ApprovalTotalAUD** | DFAT - Approval Total | Provided |
| **dfat\_EfficiencyRating** | DFAT - Efficiency Rating | Provided |
| **dfat\_RelevanceRating** | DFAT - Relevance Rating | Provided |
| **dfat\_GenderEqualityRating** | DFAT - Gender Equality Rating | Provided |
| **dfat\_MERating** | DFAT - M & E Rating | Provided |
| **dfat\_SustainabilityRating** | DFAT - Sustainability Rating | Provided |
| **dfat\_ConnectednessRating** | DFAT - Connectedness Rating | Provided |
| **dfat\_ProtectionRating** | DFAT - Protection Rating | Provided |
| **dfat\_Ratedeffectiveness** | DFAT - Effectiveness Rating | Provided |
| **dfat\_Ratedefficiency** | DFAT - Efficiency Rating | Provided |
| **dfat\_Ratedrelevance** | DFAT - Relevance Rating | Provided |
| **dfat\_Ratedgender** | DFAT - Gender Rating | Provided |
| **dfat\_RatedME** | DFAT - M&E Rating | Provided |
| **dfat\_Ratedsustainability** | DFAT - Sustainability Rating | Provided |
| **dfat\_InvestmentPriorityArea** | DFAT - Investment Priority Area Rating | 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 |

**Global Environment Fund (GEF)**

| **Variable Name** | **Label** | **Source** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| gef\_id | GEF ID | Provided |
| gef\_ImplementingAgency | Implementing Agency | Provided |
| gef\_LeadImplementingAgency | Lead Implementing Agency | Provided |
| gef\_Listofparticipatingcountries | List of participating countries | Provided |
| gef\_Region | Region | Provided |
| gef\_ProjectSize | Project Size | Provided |
| gef\_TrustFund | Trust Fund | Provided |
| gef\_FocalArea | Focal Area | Provided |
| gef\_phase | GEF Phase | Provided |
| gef\_ProjectStart | Project Start | Provided |
| gef\_grant\_mil\_usd | GEF Project Grant (million USD) | Provided |
| gef\_prep\_grant\_mil\_usd | GEF Project Preparation Grant (million USD) | Provided |
| gef\_cofin\_mil\_usd\_promised | Cofinancing Promised (million USD) | Provided |
| gef\_cofin\_mil\_usd\_actual | Cofinancing Actual (million USD) | Provided |
| gef\_SourceofRating | Source of Rating | Provided |
| gef\_OutcomesBinary | GEF Outcomes [Binary] Score | Provided |
| gef\_Outcomes6point | GEF Outcomes [6 point] Score | Provided |
| gef\_SustainabilityBinary | GEF Sustainability [Binary] Score | Provided |
| gef\_Sustainability4point | GEF Sustainability [4 point] Score | Provided |
| gef\_MEDesignBinary | GEF M&E Design [Binary] Score | Provided |
| gef\_MEDesign6point | GEF M&E Design [6 point] Score | Provided |
| gef\_MEImplementationBinary | GEF M&E Implementation [Binary] Score | Provided |
| gef\_MEImplementation6point | GEF M&E Implementation [6 point] Score | Provided |
| gef\_ImplementationQualityBinary | GEF Implementation Quality [Binary] Score | Provided |
| gef\_ImplementationQuality6point | GEF Implementation Quality [6 point] Score | Provided |
| gef\_ExecutionQualityBinary | GEF Execution Quality [Binary] Score | Provided |
| gef\_ExecutionQuality6point | GEF Execution Quality [6 point] Score | Provided |
| gef\_terminal\_eval\_overall | GEF Terminal Evaluation overall Quality [Binary] Score | 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:  1  2  3  4  5  6 | Scale inversed from the original scale in which lower numbers meant less success |
| kfw\_efficiency\_rating | KfW efficiency rating | | Ratings as follows:  1  2  3  4  5  6 | Scale inversed from the original scale in which lower numbers meant less success |
| kfw\_impact\_rating | KfW impact rating | | Ratings as follows:  1  2  3  4  5  6 | Scale inversed from the original scale in which lower numbers meant less success |
| kfw\_sustainability\_rating | KfW sustainability rating | | Ratings as follows:  1  2  3  4  5  6 | 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:  1  2  3  4  5  6 | 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:  1  2  3  4  5  6 | 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:  1  2  3  4  5  6 | Provided |
| wb\_supervisionquality\_rating | WB rating supervision quality | | Ratings as follows:  1  2  3  4  5  6 | Provided |
| wb\_owninstperformance\_rating | WB rating own institutitution's performance | | Ratings as follows:  1  2  3  4  5  6 | 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:  1  2  3  4  5  6 | Provided |
| wb\_borrowercompliance\_rating | | WB rating borrower compliance | Ratings as follows:  1  2  3  4  5  6 | 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** | | AfricanDB | afdb\_relevance | | CDB | cdb\_StrategicRelevance\_rating | | DFAT | dfat\_RelevanceRating | | GiZ | giz\_relevance\_rating | | IFAD | ifad\_rating\_relevance | | 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** | | AfricanDB | afdb\_score\_O2 | | CDB | cdb\_Effectiveness\_rating | | GiZ | giz\_effectiveness\_rating | | IFAD | ifad\_rating\_effectiveness | | 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** | | AfricanDB | afdb\_efficiency | | CDB | cdb\_Efficiency\_rating | | DFAT | dfat\_EfficiencyRating | | GiZ | giz\_efficiency\_rating | | IFAD | ifad\_rating\_efficiency | | 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** | | AfricanDB | afdb\_sustainability | | CDB | cdb\_Sustainability\_rating | | DFAT | dfat\_SustainabilityRating | | GEF | gef\_Sustainability4point | | GiZ | giz\_sustainability\_rating | | IFAD | ifad\_rating\_sustainability | | JICA | jica\_sustainability\_rating | | KfW | kfw\_sustainability\_rating | | WB | wb\_sustainability\_classification (qualititative) | |
| 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 (projectsize\_original) descaled and converted; e.g. to USD dollars (as opposed to Euros or GB Pounds, or millions of dollars). | 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 better approach if using this variable as an important predictor would use historic exchange rates at time of project approval, or completion.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | AfricanDB | No modification necessary | | AsianDB | Multiply by 1 million to de-scale | | DFID | Multiply by 1.35 (GBP-USD exchange rate on 12/31/2017) | | GEF | Multiply by 1 million to de-scale | | GFATM | No modification necessary | | GiZ | Multiply by 1 thousand to de-scale  multiply by 1.20 (EUR-USD exchange rate on 12/31/2017) | | IFAD | Multiply by 1 million to de-scale | | JICA | Multiply by 10687 | | KfW | Multiply by 1.20 (EUR-USD exchange rate on 12/31/2017) | | 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, GEF, AsianDB, AfricanDB, CDB or IFAD |