

PPD Codebook, Version 2.0

Updated January 21, 2022

Introduction

The Project Performance Database (PPD), Version 2.0 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 2.0 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 PPDv2.0. The Codebook first contains a brief description of sources for new data 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 2.0 builds on the (originally 2018, updated 2019) PPD Version 1.0, 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 .dta file. The PPD 1.0, 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 1.0 are included in – and expanded upon – in this PPD 2.0.

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. In drawing on PPD 1.0, it 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 1.0 evolved, please see the final PPD 1.0 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.

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	<p>A project's overall success rating on a 6-point scale</p> <p>The individual ratings are as follows: 6: highly unsatisfactory 5: 4: 3: 2: 1: highly satisfactory</p>	<p>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 <i>Navigation by Judgment</i>, Chapter 4, for a fuller discussion of these issues.</p>	
			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

Variable Name	Label	Description	Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology	
			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	
			SSD	
			SRB	
			MNS	
			PIT	
			WBG	
			TRS	
			TUC	
			WIN	
			STH	
			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	
			BNG	
			CHN	
			GRG	

Variable Name	Label	Description	Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology	
			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	Combined across all 8 donors Data are not available for DFAT, IFAD, GEF	
		Example of format: “01jan2012”		
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

Variable Name	Label	Description	Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology	
			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 <i>evaluation_date</i> and <i>completion_date</i> for 9 donors For IFAD, DFAT, GEF, the evaluation date is not available and the indicator is calculated as the difference between <i>evaluation_year</i> and <i>completion_year</i> Data are not available donor CDB	
start_date	Project start date	Date project started Example of format: “01jan2012”	Combined across all 12 donors	
completion_date	Project completion date	Date of project completion Example of format: “01jan2012”	Combined across 11 donors Data is not available for CDB	
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	

Variable Name	Label	Description	Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology	
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"

Variable Name	Label	Description	Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology	
				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”

Variable Name	Label	Description	Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology	
				<p>A development measure rated 4 to 6 is classed as ‘unsuccessful’. The individual ratings are:</p> <p>4: “satisfactory rating, falling short of expectations, but with positive results dominant”</p> <p>5: “good rating, fully in line with expectations, no significant defects”</p> <p>6: “very good rating, significantly better than expected””</p>
			IFAD	<p>1: “Highly unsatisfactory”</p> <p>2: “Unsatisfactory”</p> <p>3: “Moderately unsatisfactory”</p> <p>4: “Moderately satisfactory”</p> <p>5: “Satisfactory”</p> <p>6: “Highly satisfactory”</p>
			JICA	<p>1: “Unsatisfactory”</p> <p>2: “Partially/Fairly Satisfactory”</p> <p>3: “Satisfactory”</p> <p>4: “Highly Satisfactory”</p>
			KfW	<p>1: worst</p> <p>6: best</p> <p>This scale is inverted from KfW’s internal measure, in which 6 is worst and 1 is best</p>
			WB	<p>1: “highly unsatisfactory”</p> <p>2: “unsatisfactory”</p> <p>3: “marginally/moderately unsatisfactory”</p>

Variable Name	Label	Description	Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology	
				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 <i>Navigation by Judgment</i> 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	Corresponding sector names according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC	

Variable Name	Label	Description	Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology
		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

Variable Name	Label	Source
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

Variable Name	Label	Source
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

Variable Name	Label	Source
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

Variable Name	Label	Source
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

Variable Name	Label	Source
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

Variable Name	Label	Source
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

Variable Name	Label	Source
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 <i>approvaldate</i> and <i>approvalyear</i>
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_pcerrating	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 disbursement 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

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
dfid_deptoofficename	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

Variable Name	Label	Source
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	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		CS/PS: Oth CS/PS: PS Gov: MOF Gov: MOH Gov: Oth MO: Oth MO: UNDP Third Party	
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

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
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

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
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

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
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 <i>project_title</i> 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	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
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	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
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	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
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	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
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	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
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	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
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	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
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	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
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	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
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	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
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	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
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	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
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

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
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 <i>totaldisbursement</i> and <i>totalcost</i> , 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 <i>approvaldate</i> and <i>approvalyear</i>
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	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		SIL SIM SSL TAL	
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

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
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

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
wb_owninstperformance_rating	WB rating own instititution'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: #	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		EXEMPLARY NOT APPLICABLE NOT AVAILABLE NOT RATED SATISFACTORY UNSATISFACTORY	
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	<p>The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.</p> <p>In evaluating the relevance of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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? <p>Source: OECD DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriafovaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm</p>	<p>Can be combined across the following 3 donors:</p> <table><tr><th>Donor</th><th>Donor-Specific Variable</th></tr><tr><td>African DB</td><td>afdb_relevance</td></tr><tr><td>CDB</td><td>cdb_StrategicRelevance_rating</td></tr><tr><td>DFAT</td><td>dfat_RelevanceRating</td></tr><tr><td>GiZ</td><td>giz_relevance_rating</td></tr><tr><td>IFAD</td><td>ifad_rating_relevance</td></tr><tr><td>JICA</td><td>jica_relevance_rating</td></tr></table>	Donor	Donor-Specific Variable	African DB	afdb_relevance	CDB	cdb_StrategicRelevance_rating	DFAT	dfat_RelevanceRating	GiZ	giz_relevance_rating	IFAD	ifad_rating_relevance	JICA	jica_relevance_rating
Donor	Donor-Specific Variable																
African DB	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	<p>A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.</p> <p>In evaluating the effectiveness of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:</p>	<p>Can be combined across the following 4 donors:</p> <table><tr><th>Donor</th><th>Donor-Specific Variable</th></tr></table>	Donor	Donor-Specific Variable												
Donor	Donor-Specific Variable																

Variable Name	Label	Description	Calculation Methodology																	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">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? <p>Source: OECD DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforrevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm</p>	<table><tr><td>AfricanDB</td><td>afdb_score_O2</td></tr><tr><td>CDB</td><td>cdb_Effectiveness_rating</td></tr><tr><td>GiZ</td><td>giz_effectiveness_rating</td></tr><tr><td>IFAD</td><td>ifad_rating_effectiveness</td></tr><tr><td>JICA</td><td>jica_effectiveness_rating</td></tr><tr><td>KfW</td><td>kfw_effectiveness_rating</td></tr></table>	AfricanDB	afdb_score_O2	CDB	cdb_Effectiveness_rating	GiZ	giz_effectiveness_rating	IFAD	ifad_rating_effectiveness	JICA	jica_effectiveness_rating	KfW	kfw_effectiveness_rating					
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	<p>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.</p> <p>When evaluating the efficiency of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Were activities cost-efficient?Were objectives achieved on time?Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives? <p>Source:</p>	<p>Can be combined across the following 4 donors:</p> <table><tr><th>Donor</th><th>Donor-Specific Variable</th></tr><tr><td>AfricanDB</td><td>afdb_efficiency</td></tr><tr><td>CDB</td><td>cdb_Efficiency_rating</td></tr><tr><td>DFAT</td><td>dfat_Efficiency Rating</td></tr><tr><td>GiZ</td><td>giz_efficiency_rating</td></tr><tr><td>IFAD</td><td>ifad_rating_efficiency</td></tr><tr><td>JICA</td><td>jica_efficiency_rating</td></tr><tr><td>KfW</td><td>kfw_efficiency_rating</td></tr></table>	Donor	Donor-Specific Variable	AfricanDB	afdb_efficiency	CDB	cdb_Efficiency_rating	DFAT	dfat_Efficiency Rating	GiZ	giz_efficiency_rating	IFAD	ifad_rating_efficiency	JICA	jica_efficiency_rating	KfW	kfw_efficiency_rating	
Donor	Donor-Specific Variable																			
AfricanDB	afdb_efficiency																			
CDB	cdb_Efficiency_rating																			
DFAT	dfat_Efficiency Rating																			
GiZ	giz_efficiency_rating																			
IFAD	ifad_rating_efficiency																			
JICA	jica_efficiency_rating																			
KfW	kfw_efficiency_rating																			

Variable Name	Label	Description	Calculation Methodology								
impact_rating	Impact rating	OECD DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriafovaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm									
		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.	Can be combined across the following 3 donors: <table><tr><th>Donor</th><th>Donor-Specific Variable</th></tr><tr><td>GiZ</td><td>giz_impact_rating</td></tr><tr><td>JICA</td><td>jica_impact_rating</td></tr><tr><td>KfW</td><td>kfw_impact_rating</td></tr></table>	Donor	Donor-Specific Variable	GiZ	giz_impact_rating	JICA	jica_impact_rating	KfW	kfw_impact_rating
		Donor	Donor-Specific Variable								
GiZ	giz_impact_rating										
JICA	jica_impact_rating										
KfW	kfw_impact_rating										
When evaluating the impact of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">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/daccriteriafovaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm											

Variable Name sustainability_rating	Label Sustainability rating	Description 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">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/daccriteriaofreevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm	Calculation Methodology Can be combined across the following 4 donors: <table><tr><th>Donor</th><th>Donor-Specific Variable</th></tr><tr><td>AfricanDB</td><td>afdb_sustainability</td></tr><tr><td>CDB</td><td>cdb_Sustainability_rating</td></tr><tr><td>DFAT</td><td>dfat_SustainabilityRating</td></tr><tr><td>GEF</td><td>gef_Sustainability4point</td></tr><tr><td>GiZ</td><td>giz_sustainability_rating</td></tr><tr><td>IFAD</td><td>ifad_rating_sustainability</td></tr><tr><td>JICA</td><td>jica_sustainability_rating</td></tr><tr><td>KfW</td><td>kfw_sustainability_rating</td></tr><tr><td>WB</td><td>wb_sustainability_classification (qualitative)</td></tr></table>	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 (qualitative)
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 (qualitative)																						
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)																				

Variable Name project_size_USD_calculated	Label Project size in USD	Description 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).	Calculation Methodology 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.	
			Africa nDB	No modification necessary
			Asian DB	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
			GFAT M	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	Can be generated if the donor is World Bank, GFATM, GEF, AsianDB, AfricanDB, CDB or IFAD

Variable Name	Label	Description	Calculation Methodology
		2 categories as follows: 1: The project's donor is a multilateral entity 0: The project's donor is not a multilateral entity	