Annex 5.1
Methodological Note

ENGLISH May 2023

OVERVIEW

This methodological note provides details on how the information collected through the GPEDC monitoring questionnaire is treated and analysed to generate results for the different components of the framework (see Table 1). It is complementary to the Monitoring Guide, available at this link. The methodological note for the Kampala Principles Assessment (KPA) is presented in a separate document, accessible at this link. This document is organised as follows. Section A briefly recalls the structure of the monitoring framework. Section B describes the primary data source gathered through the questionnaire and the structure of the raw datasets. Section C illustrates the notation and the treatment of missing values in the methodology. Section E describes the methodology.

A. THE MEASUREMENT OF THE GPEDC MONITORING FRAMEWORK

The GPEDC monitoring framework is organised in four dimensions and seventeen components (Table 1). The detailed methodology in Section E follows the sequence of the dimensions and components as presented in Table 1, except for the component "Private sector engagement in development co-operation" for which the methodology is presented in a dedicated KPA methodological note. In this setting, an indicator describes a fundamental characteristic to be reflected in a specific measurement. When methodologically and conceptually feasible, some indicators are combined to provide a summary measurement within a specific component.

TABLE 1 ┃ DIMENSIONS AND COMPONENTS OF THE GPEDC MONITORING FRAMEWORK

Dimension	Component
1. Whole-of-society	1. Engagement and dialogue
	2. Parliamentary oversight
	3. Enabling environment for Civil Society Organisations
	4. Private sector engagement in development co-operation [Kampala Principles Assessment]
2. State and use of country systems	1. Planning
	2. Respect country's policy space – SDG 17.15.1
	3. Public financial management
	4. National budget
	5. Gender budgeting – SDG 5.c.1
	6. Accountability mechanisms
	7. Information management
	8. Procurement
3. Transparency	1. Countries' action
	2. Development partners' action
4. Leaving no-one behind	1. Consultation
	2. Targets and results
	3. Data and statistics

B. PRIMARY DATA: FROM THE MONITORING QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE RAW DATASETS

The measurements of the new monitoring framework are mainly built using primary data collected through the monitoring questionnaire. Evidence available from external sources supplements this primary data in the estimation of some components only (i.e., public financial management, procurement, and transparency).[1]

The questionnaire is organised in four sections, shown in Table 2. Section A and Section B have a unique respondent (partner country and development partners respectively) whereas sections C and D have multiple respondents: partner countries, development partners, and representatives from civil society organisations (CSOs), trade unions (TUs), and larger and smaller private sector enterprises respectively.

The structure of the questionnaire allows for a unique question identification code that summarises both the content and the respondent. For instance, the code **A1_2** refers to question 2 (*Which of the following stakeholders have participated in developing the national development strategy/plan?*) in Section A1 (*National Development Strategies and Results Frameworks*) of the questionnaire, which is reported by the partner country. Similarly, **B1_4** refers to question 4 (*Have any of the following country-level stakeholders been engaged in the preparation of your country strategy or partnership framework?*) of Section B1 (*Development Partners' Country-Level Strategies*) which is answered by each development partner for each partner country.

TABLE 2 | **QUESTIONNAIRE STRUCTURE AND RESPONDENTS**

Questionnaire section	Information related to:	Respondent(s)
A	1. Partner country 2. Development partners	Partner country
B	1. Partner country 2. Development partners 3. Development partners' projects	Development partners
C	1. Partner country	Partner country Development partners Civil society organisations
D[2]	1. Partner country	Partner country Development partners Private sector Trade unions Civil society organisations

The primary data collected through the questionnaire is organised in three datasets:

Dataset 1 Information at the partner country (PC) level. This dataset contains data attributable to a specific partner country, regardless of the questionnaire respondent. Each line in this dataset refers to a given partner country.

Dataset 2 Information at partner country-development partner level (PC-DP). This dataset contains data attributable to a given development partner in a given partner country, regardless of the questionnaire respondent. Each line in this dataset refers to a dual link (one development partner-one partner country).

---

1. The methodology for such measurements is under the custodianship and control of institutions external to the GPEDC. Therefore, GPEDC reporting on such assessments is strictly dependent on their continued availability.

2. Section D of the questionnaire corresponds to the Kampala Principles Assessment (KPA). The methodological note for the KPA is presented in a separate document and can be accessed at this link.

Dataset 3 Information at project level (P). This dataset contains data on individual projects as reported by a given development partner in a given partner country. Each line in this dataset refers to a triple link (one project-one development partner-one partner country or PC-DP-P).

The GPEDC makes available a database with the three datasets, with raw data, outlined above. An additional database, which includes results for the measurements described in this note, is also made available, organised as follows:

1. Partner countries: measurements and aggregates for partner countries.
2. Development partners: measurements and aggregates for development partners.
3. Development partner-partner country: specific information for each development partner in a given partner country.

C. NOTATION AND MISSING VALUES

The measurements within the monitoring framework involve multiple two-way relationships between the data reported by partner countries and development partners (hereafter referred to as PCs and DPs, respectively). The notation reflects this bidirectionality. The notation distinguishes the "*unit of identification*" of information, from the "*unit of analysis*". The unit of identification refers to the data provider, while the unit of analysis refers to how the results are processed and analysed. For instance, when a DP reports data for a PC to produce country-level indicators, the DP is the unit of identification, and the PC is the unit of analysis.[3] Often, the unit of analysis and the unit of information are the same. These distinctions are made explicit.

Subscripts are used to identify the "*unit of analysis*" as follows: "i" refers to any undetermined country, "j" refers to any undetermined development partner, while "k" refers to any undetermined individual project. The combined subscript "ijk" identifies an individual project "k" of a specific DP "j" in a particular PC "i". Any other triplet should be interpreted similarly. The corresponding capital letters refer to the total number of countries "I" or development partners "J" respectively. Superscripts are used to identify the level of information: the superscript $\{PC\}$ or $\{DP\}$ denotes partner countries and development partners respectively. This distinction is made explicit as needed.

The interpretation of each indicator is made within the realm of the corresponding component.[4] Some indicators may also be composed by sub-indicators. Although it is possible that two independent sub-indicators, associated to two different components, receive the same alphanumeric code, their construction and interpretation are made within the context of a particular component as each indicator involves a unique combination of the following elements:

1. The trait of development co-operation being measured[5]
2. The unit of identification of information and the unit of analysis
3. Formulas for all indicators and sub-indicators
4. Interpretation (provided for the main indicators only)
5. Formulas for global aggregation

---

3. These roles revert along the questionnaire. When some PC reports DP information, then the former becomes the unit of identification of information and the latter is therefore the unit of analysis.

4. See Table 4 of the Monitoring Guide for a full description.

5. This is placed within a box to ease visual inspection.

Finally, the construction of indicators accounts for complete-case observations. Despite this, the treatment of missing values (or MV hereafter) in the construction of indicators is taken on a case-by-case basis. In general, if a unit of analysis has missing values for some variables, the corresponding measurement will only consider the observations that do exist (i.e., not necessarily assumed to be zero). This allows for combining the information from a set of variables with incomplete-case observations with a set of variables with complete-case information (this is important for performing a summation or when determining the denominator of a ratio). If all the values of a given unit are missing across variables, the indicator is set to missing for that specific observation. More details are provided on a case-by-case basis below.

D. ADJUSTMENTS FOR COUNTRIES RESPONDING TO THE ADAPTED FRAGILITY FRAMEWORK

The same methodology indicated in this note is also applicable to countries that have chosen the adapted fragility questionnaire. Adjustments to the methodology are made only for two specific cases: Component *Respect country's policy space* and Component *Accountability mechanisms*. They are indicated explicitly in those sections of this methodological note.

In all other cases, the adaptation does not require a change in the methodology but rather provides complementary information for global reporting and/or for country results briefs, as follows:

- Section A1. Responses to questions A1_1.5, 1.5.1 and 1.6 add relevant information on whether national development plans in fragile contexts, and/or risk mitigation strategies are informed by fragility assessments, and whether priorities in the NDP have been identified in co-ordination with humanitarian and peace/security counterparts within the government operating in the country.

- Section A0 and B0. These sections are responded to only by fragile contexts and their DPs. They will provide relevant information respectively on whether PC governments have undertaken inclusive national fragility assessments; and whether DPs have carried out an analysis of risks, needs, vulnerabilities and drivers of fragility in that country.

- Section B1. This section provides relevant information on whether DPs' country strategies contribute to addressing risks, needs, vulnerabilities and drivers of fragility, and include support to strengthen capacity and leadership of national and subnational governments, and whether DPs co-ordinate their contributions/objectives with other development actors operating in the country.

E. **METHODOLOGY**

1. **Dimension 1: Whole-of-society**

1.1 **Engagement and dialogue**

The measurement of this component involves different units of analysis and identification (PC and DP level). For practical reasons, all elements pertaining to PCs are presented together, followed by the element pertaining to DPs.[6]

Measurement at the PC level

> **1.1.1** Countries engage a diversity of stakeholders in the preparation of their national development strategies.

Construction: This indicator employs data reported by the national co-ordinator at country level (i). The unit of analysis are PCs (Dataset 1). A set of dichotomous variables individually receives the value of 1 if a particular stakeholder (g_{is}), in a PC, was involved in the preparation of the national development strategy or plan (hereafter indicated as NDP) as reported in question **A1_2** (*Which of the following stakeholders have participated in developing the national development strategy/plan?*). These variables are 0 otherwise. The degree of stakeholders' engagement (E) is measured by the following proportion:

$$E_i^{PC} = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{s=S_i} g_{is}}{S_i} \quad (1.1.1A)$$

Where S is the maximum number of stakeholders - in this case, six.[7] The resulting value is vetoed with information from question **A1_1** (*Is there a national development strategy or national development plan for the country?*). This expression becomes MV in the absence of a national development plan.

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1] and reflects the extent to which a PC engages a diversity of stakeholders in the preparation of its NDP. A value of 0 indicates no stakeholder involvement and the value of 1 implies a comprehensive involvement of stakeholders. The closer to the maximum value, the more extensive was the inclusion of stakeholders.[8]

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained as follows:

$$E_g^{PC} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{I} (E_i^{PC})}{I}$$

Where (I) is the total number of countries with information.

---

6. While in Table 4 of the Monitoring Guide some elements about PCs and DPs behaviors are presented together, in this methodological note and for this specific component, measurements pertaining to PCs and DPs are separate. This is to ease understanding of how the measurement is built.

7. These stakeholders are: a) Parliament, b) Domestic civil society organizations, c) Trade Unions, d) Domestic philanthropic organisations, e) Domestic private sector, f) Subnational governments. For consistency with past methodology, development partners, while included in the list of stakeholders as contextual information, are not accounted in the scoring. This is because, as foreign development organisations, they cannot be part of the definition of what constitutes a "nationally-owned" development strategy.

8. Missing value shows the absence of the required information to compute this indicator.

1.1.2 Countries include a diversity of stakeholders in dialogues on development priorities and results (based on national development strategies/progress reports).

Construction: This indicator employs data provided by the national co-ordinator at country level (i) (Dataset 1). A set of dichotomous variables individually receives the value of 1 if a particular stakeholder (g_{is}), in a PC, was involved in the dialogue on development priorities and results as reported in question **A1_20.1** (*Indicate the stakeholder group).* These variables are 0 otherwise. The degree of stakeholders' involvement in dialogue (D) is measured by the following proportion:

$$D_i = \frac{\sum_1^{S_i} g_{is}}{S_i} \quad (1.1.2)$$

Where capital S is the maximum number of stakeholders- in this case, six.[9] The resulting value in expression (1.1.2) is vetoed with information from question **A1_20** (*Does the government use the national development strategy/plan [and/or its progress reports] to inform dialogue with stakeholder groups and/or representatives of vulnerable groups of the population on development priorities and results?*).

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1] and reflects the extent to which a PC engages a diversity of stakeholders in dialogues on development priorities and results (based on NDPs/progress reports). A value of 0 indicates no involvement of stakeholder groups in dialogue on development priorities and results. The value of 1 implies the involvement of a diversity of stakeholders in dialogues on development priorities and results.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained as follows:

$$D_g = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=I}(D_i)}{I}$$

Where (I) is the total number of countries.

1.1.3 Countries include a diversity of stakeholders in joint accountability assessments towards targets for development co-operation.

Construction: This indicator employs data provided by the national co-ordinator at country level (i) (Dataset 1). It can be calculated only when a country responds "Yes" to question **A2_9** (*Has the government carried out a mutual assessment of the above-mentioned development co-operation targets, with its development partners, in the past 3 years?*).

The indicator JA_i builds on a set of dichotomous variables, one for each stakeholder group (g_{is}), to describe the extent to which mutual assessments include actors, beyond DPs, as reported in question **A2_14.1** (*Which other actors have been involved in these mutual assessments?*). Each of these variables receive the value of 1 if the actor they refer to is included and 0 otherwise. This indicator is defined by the following proportion:

$$JA_i = \frac{\sum_1^{S_i} g_{is}}{S_i} \quad (1.1.3)$$

Where S, the denominator, is the maximum number (eight in this case) of stakeholders.[10] The resulting value in this expression is vetoed with information from question **A2_14** (*Have other actors been involved in these mutual assessments?*). This indicator is 0 if no other actors, beyond DPs, were involved.

---

9. These stakeholders are: b) Parliament, c) Domestic civil society organisations, d) Trade Unions, e) Domestic philanthropic organisations, f) Domestic private sector, other) Subnational governments. For consistency with past methodology, development partners, while included in the list of stakeholders as contextual information, are not accounted in the scoring. This is because, as foreign development organisations, they cannot be part of the definition of what constitutes "nationally-owned" development strategies.

10. These are: a) CSOs, b) Private sector, c) Trade Unions, d) Private foundations, e) Parliament/legislative body, f) Subnational governments, g) Academia, h) Media/journalist.

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1] and reflects the extent to which a PC engages a diversity of stakeholders in accountability assessments towards targets for development co-operation. A value of 0 indicates that the government did not involve any other actors, beyond DPs, in those assessments. A value of 1 reflects the inclusion of the full diversity of actors in those assessment of country-level targets.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained as follows:

$$JA_g = \sum_{i=1}^{i=I}(w_i * JA_i)$$

Where (I) is the total number of countries, and (w_i) is the weight (equal weights across countries).

A composite measurement for the three elements in ($1.1.1A$), ($1.1.2$) and ($1.1.3$) can be obtained as follows:

$$E_i = \frac{E_i^{PC} + D_i + JA_i}{3} \quad (1.1.C)$$

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1], and describes the extent of engagement and dialogue with a diversity of stakeholder groups in development planning and accountability mechanisms in a given country.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained as follows:

$$E_g = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{I}(E_i)}{I}$$

Where (I) is the total number of countries.

Measurement at the DP level

1.1.4 Development partners engage a diversity of stakeholders in the preparation of their country-level strategies.

Construction: This indicator employs data reported by each DP (j) in each country (i). The information varies both at the level of DPs and at the level of PCs (Dataset 2). A set of dichotomous variables individually receives the value of 1 if a particular stakeholder (g_{is}) was involved in the preparation of the DP's country strategy, in each PC. These variables are 0 otherwise. The dual subscript indicates that information is reported for each DP (unit of identification) in every PC (unit of analysis) in response to question **B1_4** (*Have any of the following country-level stakeholders been engaged in the preparation of your country strategy or partnership framework?*).

The procedure to obtain an indicator at the DP level is performed in two steps. First, the proportion of stakeholders engaged in the preparation of a country strategy for each DP in a PC (E_{ij}^{DP}), a DP-PC link, is obtained as follows:

$$E1_{ij}^{DP} = \frac{\sum_{1}^{S_{ij}} g_{is}}{S_{ij}}$$

Where S_{ij} is the maximum number of stakeholders – in this case, six.[11]

---

11. These stakeholders are: a) Domestic civil society organisations (at least one type of CSO), b) Trade Unions, c) Domestic private sector from the partner country, d) Domestic philanthropic organisations, e) Subnational governments, f) Other providers of development co-operation. Except: g) Other.

The involvement of national government is also defined by a dichotomous variable as reported in question **B1_2** (*Has the national government been involved in the preparation of the strategy or partnership framework?).* This variable receives the value of 1 if the government was consulted or the strategy was signed off by the government (answer options a and b) as follows:

$$E2_{ij}^{DP} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a \text{ or } b \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

These two expressions are combined in the following indicator:

$$E_{ij}^{DP} = \frac{E1_{ij}^{DP} + E2_{ij}^{DP}}{2}$$

This expression yields a value for each DP in a particular PC. The resulting value in this expression is vetoed with information from question **B1_1** (*At this moment, is there a country strategy or a partnership framework that guides your development interventions in the country?*). This indicator is set as MV in the absence of a country strategy or partnership framework.

The second stage produces a group-based indicator at the DP level:

$$E_j^{DP} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=I} E_{ij}^{DP}}{I} \quad (1.1.4B)$$

Where I stands for the total number of countries where a DP has a country strategy. This expression can also be aggregated at the country level:

$$E_i^{DP} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=I} E_{ij}^{DP}}{J_i} \quad (1.1.4A)$$

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1] and reflects the extent to which a DP engages a diversity of stakeholders in the preparation of country-level strategies. A value of 0 indicates that no stakeholder involvement took place, and a value of 1 implies a comprehensive involvement of stakeholders across countries where a DP has a strategy in place. The closer to the maximum value, the more diverse was the engagement of stakeholders across countries where a DP has a strategy in place.[12]

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained as follows:

$$E_g^{DP} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{j=J} (E_j^{DP})}{J}$$

Where (J) is the total number of DPs.

1.2 **Parliamentary oversight**

This measurement involves two indicators concerning regular reporting to parliaments and development co-operation recorded on budget. The unit of analysis (and identification) is PCs (Dataset 1).

1.2.1 Countries regularly provide information on development co-operation to parliaments.

Construction: The sub-indicator (R_i) looks at the information reported by a PC (**i**) to its own parliament as indicated in question **A5_12** (*Do you report development co-operation information to parliament?*) in

---

12. Missing value shows the absence of the required information to compute this indicator.

the form of a dichotomous variable:

$$R_i = \begin{cases} 1 & if \text{ PC reports to parliament} \\ 0 & Otherwise \end{cases}$$

A second sub-indicator, about the frequency (f) of this reporting process, as captured in question **A5_12.1** (*How frequently is development co-operation information reported to parliament?*), supplements this information:

$$F_i = \begin{cases} 1.0 & if \ f = \text{Once (or more than once) a year} \\ 0.6 & if \ f = \text{Once every two years} \\ 0.3 & if \ f = \text{Once every three (or more) years} \end{cases}$$

This sub-indicator F_i is only relevant if the government provided information to parliament. An indicator describes these two characteristics as follows:

$$P_i = \frac{(R_i + F_i)}{2} \quad (1.2.1)$$

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1] and describes the extent to which a PC provides information on development co-operation to parliaments. A value of 0 indicates that the government did not report development co-operation information to parliament. A value between zero and one indicates that the government reported to parliament but information on how frequently this happened is not available (or that they reported a frequency of less than once a year). Finally, a value of 1 indicates that the government reported information to parliament frequently, namely once or more than once a year.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained as follows:

$$P_g = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=I}(P_i)}{I}$$

Where (I) is the total number of countries (equal weights across countries).

1.2.2 Development co-operation is recorded on national budget.

Construction: This indicator builds on the amount of development co-operation funds recorded on national annual budget (b_{ij}) as reported by the national co-ordinator in question **A3_4** (*How much estimated development co-operation funding was recorded in the annual budget of the reporting year of reference?*) and the development co-operation flows scheduled to be disbursed to the public sector by each DP (s_{ij}) as reported by DPs in question **B3_3** (*How much development co-operation flows for the public sector did you schedule for disbursement at country level in the reporting year of reference?*).

The ratio ($r_{ij} = b_{ij}/s_{ij}$) for every DP-PC link describes the share of development co-operation flows scheduled by DPs that are recorded on budget. To bound this indicator between zero and one, a value of 1 is attributed to this indicator when $b_{ij} \geq s_{ij}$. Similarly, the indicator is missing when $s_{ij} = 0$.[13]

Measurement at the PC level

An individual measure for each PC (i) is obtained with complete-case observations as a weighted average:

$$NB_i^{PC} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{j=J_i} r_{ij} * w_{ij}\right) \quad (1.2.2A)$$

---

13. Except when the information for the numerator is available.

Where J_i stands for the total number of DPs in a country i, and w_{ij} is the individual weight as follows: $w_{ij} = s_{ij}/S_i$ and $S_i = \sum_{j=J_i}^{j=J_i} s_{ij}$.

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1] and describes the share of development co-operation flows from DPs that are recorded in the national budget and therefore are subject to parliamentary oversight as part of the budget approval process. A value of 0 indicates that no funding was recorded in the annual budget of the reporting year of reference. A value of 1 indicates an ideal scenario where all the development co-operation flows for the public sector were recorded in a country's annual budget and hence subject to parliamentary oversight.

Aggregation: Other aggregate levels, at the global level (g), can be obtained with a weighted average using expression 1.2.2A and adjusting the upper limit of summation for (j) accordingly.

A composite measurement for the elements 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 can be obtained as follows:

$$PO_i = \frac{P_i + NB_i^{PC}}{2} \; (1.2.C)$$

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1] and describes the extent of parliamentary oversight on development co-operation, based on the information on development co-operation provided to parliaments by governments and the share of development co-operation flows recorded on budget.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained as follows:

$$PO_g = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=I} PO_i}{I}$$

Where (I) is the total number of countries.

1.3 **CSO enabling environment**[14]

1.3.1 CSOs report improvement to their enabling environment due to the government, development partners and their own effectiveness.

Construction: This measurement builds on information provided by the national co-ordinator and two focal points at the country level (i): one for DPs and one for CSOs. The information aims to describe the prevailing situation in a country regarding CSO enabling environment. The unit of analysis is PCs.

This indicator exploits information from 17 questions in section C of the questionnaire. These questions (q) are grouped into four thematic modules (m) with a total (Q) of four questions per module ($Q_m = 4$), except the fourth module which has a total of five questions ($Q_m = 5$), as described in the table below.

Modules (m)	**Content**	**Questions used** (q_m)	**Total questions** (Q_m)
Module 1	Space for CSO dialogue on national development policies	C_1 – C_4	4
Module 2	Accountability and transparency	C_5 – C_8	4

---

14. Up to the 2018 monitoring round, this assessment was referred to as "Indicator 2".

Module 3	Development co-operation with CSOs	C_9 – C_12	4
Module 4	Legal and regulatory framework	C_13 – C_17	5

Each of the three stakeholders provides specific answers (a_q) to questions defined on a four-level scale $a_q = \{a, b, c, d\}$ which is attached to a point (p_q) system. There is a common arrangement across answer options so that the maximum value (p^{max}) for each individual question is 4 (option d) and the minimum is 1 (option a):[15]

$$p_q = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a_q = \text{a} \\ 2 & \text{if } a_q = \text{b} \\ 3 & \text{if } a_q = \text{c} \\ 4 & \text{if } a_q = \text{d} \end{cases}$$

It follows from this expression that the maximum number of points per module is $p_m^{max} = 16$ for the first three modules (and 20 for the last module).[16] An overall indicator is obtained in two steps. First, a score on enabling environment (E_m^s) per module (m) in country *(i)* is obtained for each of the three stakeholders (s): government, civil society, and DPs:

$$E_{mi}^{Gov} = E_{mi}^{CSO} = E_{mi}^{DP} = \frac{\sum_{q=1}^{q=Q_m} p_{qm}}{p_{mi}^{max}}$$

For every module (m), each proportion then reflects the answers of a different stakeholder across these 4 modules (m). Larger values indicate a more enabling environment as reported by these three stakeholders separately. To allow for easier cross-country comparison and to track the performance of countries over time, an overall score reflecting the answers from government, focal points for CSOs and DPs is obtained as follows:

$$EE_i = \frac{E_i^{Gov} + E_i^{CSO} + E_i^{DP}}{3} \quad (1.3.1)$$

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0,1], and reflects the state of civil society enabling environment as perceived by three stakeholders: government, civil society, and DPs. Values closer to 1 indicate a more enabling environment for CSOs.

Country scores translate into four qualitative categories based on the following ranges and are presented for each of the three stakeholders as follows:

Range of scores	CSO enabling environment and development effectiveness
0 to 0.20	Negligible
0.21 to 0.40	Narrow
0.41 to 0.60	Basic
0.61 to 0.80	Moderate
0.81 to 1.00	Extensive

---

15. This ordinal scale [1,4] does not change the earlier ordinal scale [0,3] but facilitates notation.

16. This is: $p_m^{max} = Q_m * p^{max} = 4 * 4 = 16$. In the case of module 4 this is: 5*4=20.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained as follows:

$$EE_g = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=I}(EE_i)}{I}$$

Where (I) is the total number of countries (equal weights across countries).

In addition to the scores above, at global level the improvement to CSO enabling environment, as reported by CSOs, will also be indicated. This is obtained by comparing the two most recent consecutive scores (when available) calculated based on the questions responded to by CSO focal points, as follows:

- Progress in CSO enabling environment due to government behaviour: questions **C_1-C_4** and **C_13-C_17.**
- Progress in CSO enabling environment due to development partners' behaviour: questions **C_9-C_12.**
- Progress in CSO enabling environment due to CSOs' own effectiveness: questions **C_5-C_8.**

2. Dimension 2: State and Use of Country Systems

2.1 Planning[17]

This component involves a series of qualitative attributes (Q) concerning PCs' national development strategies or national development plans. All these measurements employ information at the country level (Dataset 1).[18]

<div style="background-color:orange">

2.1.1 Countries have quality national development strategies and results frameworks.

</div>

Construction: The Global Partnership assesses the quality of development planning across 11 elements of a national development strategy or national development plan (hereafter referred to as NDP). These elements include whether the NDP was developed in an inclusive manner and has a clear results focus, whether progress is regularly and transparently tracked, and whether the NDP is linked to implementation resources. The computations for these 11 elements are described below (Q1 to Q11). An overall score for the indicator is calculated by averaging the scores across these 11 elements.

Element Q1 describes the existence (or absence) of an NDP. A dichotomous sub-indicator receives the value of 1 if there is an NDP as reported in question **A1_1** (*Is there a national development strategy or national development plan for the country?*). This variable is 0 if these conditions are unmet as follows:

$$Q1_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if there is a NDP} \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Element Q2 describes the extent to which a consultation took place with the involvement of the six stakeholders (s) reported in question **A1_2** (*Which of the following stakeholders participated in developing the national development strategy/plan?*).[19]

---

17. Up to the 2018 monitoring round, this assessment was referred to as "Indicator 1b".

18. Together these attributes define former Indicator 1b.

19. These stakeholders are: a) Parliament, b) Domestic civil society organisations (at least one type of CSOs), c) Trade Unions, d) Domestic philanthropic organisations, e) Domestic private sector, f. Subnational governments. For consistency with past methodology, development partners, while included in the list of stakeholders as contextual information, are not accounted in the scoring. This is because, as foreign development organisations, they cannot be part of the definition of what constitutes "nationally-owned" development strategies.

$$Q2_i = \begin{cases} 1.00 & \text{if } \sum s_i = 6 \\ 0.75 & \text{if } \sum s_i \geq 4 \text{ and } \sum s_i \leq 5 \\ 0.50 & \text{if } \sum s_i \geq 2 \text{ and } \sum s_i \leq 3 \\ 0.25 & \text{if } \sum s_i = 1 \text{ } consulted \\ 0 & \text{if } none \text{ } consulted \end{cases}$$

Element Q3 describes the online availability of the NDP in the form of a dichotomous variable with information from question **A1_1.3** (*Is this strategy publicly available online?*) and **A1_1.3.1** (*Please include the link?)* as follows:

$$Q3_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if publicly } available \text{ } and \text{ } a \text{ } link \text{ } is \text{ } provided \\ 0 & Otherwise \end{cases}$$

Element Q4 describes the comprehensiveness of the NDP concerning the inclusion of priorities, targets, and indicators. A dichotomous sub-indicator (p_i) assumes the value of 1 if the NDP defines priorities as reflected in question **A1_3** (*Does the national development strategy/ plan define development priorities?).*

$$p_i = \begin{cases} 1 & if \text{ priorities included in NDP} \\ 0 & Otherwise \end{cases}$$

Similarly, a dichotomous sub-indicator (t_i) receives the value 1 if the NDP defines targets and results (TR hereafter) indicators as recorded in answer option "a" of question **A1_4** (*Does the national development strategy/plan define targets and associated results indicators?*) or if TR are found in sector plans (SP hereafter) as recorded by an affirmative answer in question **A1_4.1** (*If targets and/or results indicators are missing, can these be found in sector strategies/plans instead?*). The information is then introduced in the form of a dichotomous variable (s_i) reflecting this amendment:

$$t_i = \begin{cases} 1 & if \text{ } TR \text{ included in NDP} \\ 0.5 & if \text{ TR included in SP} \\ 0 & Otherwise \end{cases}$$

The sum of these features, $e_i = (p_i + t_i)$, is attached to the following point-based system:

$$Q4_i = \begin{cases} 1.00 & \text{if } e_i = 2 \\ 0.75 & \text{if } e_i = 1.5 \\ 0.50 & \text{if } e_i = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } e_i = 0 \end{cases}$$

---

20. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development stipulates that specific arrangements for follow up and review on the SDG goals and targets should be country-led and voluntary. Therefore, in determining the overall score for this element, the extent of integration does not impact countries' scoring, nor are the specific ways in which such integration may be happening judged. Therefore, this measurement assigns the value of 1 if countries have referred to the 2030 Agenda or the SDGs in their national development strategy/ plan, independently of the approach chosen by the country – or if at least the country has an ongoing plan to do so in the future.

Element Q5 describes whether the NDP contains an explicit reference to the SDGs through a dichotomous variable that receives a value of 1 if a PC refers to the SDGs (at any level) in the NDP as captured in question **A1_11** (*How are the 2030 Agenda and SDGs incorporated or referenced in the development strategy/plan?).*[20] This indicator is 0 otherwise.

$$Q5_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } SDG \text{ reference} \\ 0 & Otherwise \end{cases}$$

Element Q6 reflects the alignment (A) of sector strategies and subnational strategies with the NDP as recorded in questions **A1_10.1** and **A1_10.2** respectively. Sub-indicator $A1_i$ describes the extent to which sector strategies (question **A1_10.1**) align with the NDP. Similarly, sub-indicator $A2_i$ describes the extent to which subnational strategies (question **A1_10.2**) align with the NDP.[21] In both cases the indicator is obtained as follows:

$$A1_i = A2_i = \begin{cases} 1.00 & \text{if } a_q = \text{a} \\ 0.75 & \text{if } a_q = \text{b} \\ 0.50 & \text{if } a_q = \text{c} \\ 0.25 & \text{if } a_q = \text{d} \\ 0.0 & \text{if } a_q = \text{e} \end{cases}$$

The average of these sub-indicators describes the alignment of sector and subnational strategies to the NDP:

$$Q6_i = \frac{A1_i + A2_i}{2}$$

Element Q7 describes three features: the existence, the public availability, and the frequency of NDP progress reports. The sub-indicator (R) is equal to 1 if there is a progress report of the NDP as reported in question **A1_19** (*Is (are) there a progress report(s) of the national development strategy/plan?*). This sub-indicator is 0 otherwise. Similarly, sub-indicator (A) receives a value of 1 to indicate public availability of the report as described in question **A1_19.1.1** (*Is the most recent report publicly available online?*) which is valid only if a link is provided in question **A1_19.1.2**. This variable is 0 otherwise. The frequency (F) is reported in question **A1_19.1** (*How often are they produced?*).[22] The indicator combines this information as follows:

$$Q7_i = \begin{cases} 1.00 & \text{if } R = 1 \text{ and } A = 1 \text{ and } F = \text{a} \\ 0.90 & \text{if } R = 1 \text{ and } A = 0 \text{ and } F = \text{a} \\ 0.70 & \text{if } R = 1 \text{ and } A = 1 \text{ and } F = \text{b} \\ 0.60 & \text{if } R = 1 \text{ and } A = 0 \text{ and } F = \text{b} \\ 0.40 & \text{if } R = 1 \text{ and } A = 1 \text{ and } F = \text{c} \\ 0.30 & \text{if } R = 1 \text{ and } A = 0 \text{ and } F = \text{c} \\ 0.20 & \text{if } R = 1 \text{ and } A = 1 \text{ and } F = \text{d} \\ 0.10 & \text{if } R = 1 \text{ and } A = 0 \text{ and } F = \text{d} \\ 0.00 & \text{if } R = 0 \end{cases}$$

21. The answer options are the following: a) Most strategies must align to the national development strategy/plan, by law and in practice; b) Although there is no law, in practice central authorities (e.g., planning, finance, development ministry) ensure that new sector/subnational strategies align to the national development strategy/plan; c) Although there is no law or central authority enforcing alignment, sector/subnational strategies tend to reflect at least core priorities in the national development strategy/plan; d) Only some sector/subnational strategies are aligned with the national development strategy/plan; e) Sector/subnational strategies are in general not aligned with the national development strategy/plan.

22. The answer options concerning the frequency are: a) every year, or more frequently, b) every 2 years, c) every 3-4 years, and d) every 5 (or more) years.

23. These answer options are: a) A central unit collates all the data from different sources and produces a unified progress report. b) Several ministries (and/or entities) are responsible for collating the data, but a central unit produces a unified progress report. c) Several line ministries (and/or entities) are responsible for collating the data and producing sector or thematic progress report(s), d) Responsibilities for data collection.

Element Q8 describes how the progress reports of the NDP are prepared. A point-based system is defined based on specific answers to (a_q) question **A1_19.2** (*How is progress against the national development strategy/plan reported?*). These answers describe the number of administrative units involved in the preparation of this report, and their responsibility, with four categories.[23] The points attributed to each category reflect different degrees of government engagement in this reporting process as follows:

$$Q8_i = \begin{cases} 1.00 & \text{if } a_q = a \\ 0.50 & \text{if } a_q = b \\ 0.25 & \text{if } a_q = c \\ 0.0 & \text{if } a_q = d \end{cases}$$

Element Q9 describes the governments' reliance on their national statistical systems to report on results indicators contained in the national development strategy/plan. The assessed attributes of the data available in these systems are timeliness, regularity, and accuracy.

First, this measurement builds on attributes defined by three dichotomous sub-elements:

- A sub-element (u_i) assumes a value of 1 if the data used is up-to-date as reported in question **A1_9.1** (*Overall, are the data used to report on these indicators up-to-date?*).
- A sub-element (r_i) assumes a value of 1 if the data is regularly updated (i.e., at determined intervals – weekly, monthly, yearly, etc.) as reported in question **A1_9.2** (*Overall, are the data used to report on these indicators updated regularly?*).
- Finally, the sub-element (a_i) assumes a value of 1 if the data to report on these indicators is accurate as reported in question **A1_9.3** (*Overall, are the data used to report on these indicators accurate?*).

In these three cases, a value of 0 indicates the absence of these attributes. The sum, defined by the composed variable $ura_i = (u_i + r_i + a_i)$, reflects the joint occurrence.[24]

Second, a point-based system is set in place based on the capacity of the statistical system to meet data demands (d_i) as reported in question **A1_9** (…*To what extent does the national statistical system meet the data demands to report on the results indicators contained in the national development strategy/plan?*). Higher (or lower) values reflect different degrees of data availability for: a) most, b) some, or c) very few of the indicators. The interaction of this variable with the previous sub-indicators yields the following:

$$Q9_i = \begin{cases} 1.00 & \text{if } (d_i = most) \text{ and } (ura_i = 3) \\ 0.90 & \text{if } (d_i = most) \text{ and } (ura_i = 2) \\ 0.80 & \text{if } (d_i = most) \text{ and } (ura_i = 1) \\ 0.70 & \text{if } (d_i = most) \text{ and } (ura_i = 0) \\ 0.60 & \text{if } (d_i = some) \text{ and } (ura_i = 3) \\ 0.50 & \text{if } (d_i = some) \text{ and } (ura_i = 2) \\ 0.40 & \text{if } (d_i = some) \text{ and } (ura_i = 1) \\ 0.30 & \text{if } (d_i = some) \text{ and } (ura_i = 0) \\ 0.20 & \text{if } (d_i = few) \text{ and } (ura_i = 3) \\ 0.10 & \text{if } (d_i = few) \text{ and } (ura_i = 2) \\ 0.05 & \text{if } (d_i = few) \text{ and } (ura_i = 1) \\ 0.00 & \text{if } (d_i = few) \text{ and } (ura_i = 0) \end{cases}$$

Element Q10 describes the extent to which governments' NDPs include an indicative budget and inform public expenditure decisions. This indicator is obtained from two dichotomous variables reflecting these

---

24. This indicator now includes more continuous distribution of values (compared to the previous measurement of Indicator 1b that only contained five) given improvements to the questions which allow for the identification of specific attributes. While this measurement captures more nuances in this attribute the new scale of values is consistent with the previous formulation. This sum is missing values (MV) if there is no information available.

traits. First, a sub-indicator (c_i) receives the value of 1 to indicate that the NDP includes costing information as reflected in question **A1_21** (*Does the national development strategy/plan include an indicative budget or costing information?*). Similarly, a sub-indicator (b_i) indicates that the budget included in the NDP informs expenditure decisions as reported in question **A1_22** (*Is that information used to inform the annual budget and the medium-term fiscal or expenditure framework?*). In both cases, a value of 0 is assigned in the case of a negative answer to each individual question.

$$Q10_i = \begin{cases} 1.00 & \text{if } c_i = 1 \text{ and } b_i = 1 \\ 0.50 & \text{if } c_i = 1 \text{ and } b_i = 0 \\ 0.00 & \text{if } c_i = 0 \end{cases}$$

Element Q11 describes the extent to which the NDP informs dialogue with stakeholders on development priorities and results. The indicator builds on a dichotomous variable (d_i) that assigns a value of 1 if the NDP is used to inform dialogue with stakeholders as reported in question **A1_ 20** (*Does the government use the national development strategy/plan to inform dialogue with stakeholder groups and/ or representatives of vulnerable groups of the population on development priorities and results?*). This variable is 0 if this condition is unmet.

The indicator (u_i) builds on four potential uses of the NDP as explicitly defined in question **A1_20.2** (*Please indicate other uses of the national development strategy/plan among the following*):[25]

$$Q11_i = \begin{cases} 1.00 & \text{if } \sum u_i = 4 \text{ and } d_i = 1 \\ 0.75 & \text{if } \sum u_i = 3 \text{ and } d_i = 1 \\ 0.50 & \text{if } \sum u_i = 2 \text{ and } d_i = 1 \\ 0.25 & \text{if } \sum u_i = 1 \text{ and } d_i = 1 \\ 0.00 & \text{if } d_i = 0 \end{cases}$$

An overall score concerning the quality of national development planning is the result of averaging these eleven elements at the country level (i), where the denominator (Q_i) is 11.

$$QS_i = \frac{\sum_{q=1}^{q=Q_i} Q_{qi}}{Q_i} \quad (2.1.1)$$

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0,1], and reflects the quality of planning, based on the eleven specific attributes indicated above. The larger the values, the higher the quality of national planning. A value of 0 describes the absence of an NDP.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained as follows:

$$QS_g = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=I}(QS_i)}{I}$$

Where (I) is the total number of countries (equal weights across countries).

2.2 **Respect country's policy space -SDG 17.15.1[26]**

This component involves three sub-indicators using data from three different levels (PC-DP-Project). It builds on data from dataset 3.

---

25. These potential uses are: a) To agree on priority sectors by stakeholder group. b) To agree on priority results by stakeholder group. c) To identify financing gaps. d) To monitor country progress.

26. Up to the 2018 monitoring round, the elements composing SDG 17.15.1 were referred to as "Indicator 1a.1/1a.2/1a.3".

27. In the context of SDG follow-up and review, the GPEDC provides data on SDG Indicator 17.15.1 only for bilateral development partners. For the monitoring exercise, the methodology for the indicator is extended to multilateral development partners.

> ### 2.2.1 Development partners use country-owned results frameworks and planning tools for developing their country-level interventions: objectives, results indicators, data, and statistics.

Construction: This measurement builds on information from the 6 largest interventions (k) reported by each DP (j)[27] in a particular country (i) (Dataset 3). In this dataset each line describes one project or programme (p_{ijk}) which is characterised by a triple subscript (ijk), as seen in the notation section. Therefore, the unit of identification is DPs, and the unit of analysis is individual projects. This measurement relies on three sub-indicators.

First, a dichotomous variable receives the value of 1 if a project draws its objectives (o_{ijk}) from country-owned results frameworks (CRFs) and planning tools as reported in answers options *a* to *f* to question **B2_6** (*Where are the objective/s of the intervention drawn from?*)[28]. This variable is 0 otherwise. This individual project identification yields a set of dichotomous variables that allows for computing the following proportion:

$$O_{ij} = \frac{\sum_j \sum_k (o_{ijk})}{\sum_j \sum_k (p_{ijk})}$$

> For countries responding to the adapted fragility questionnaire, in addition to the answer options a-f of question **B2_6** (*Where are the objective/s of the intervention drawn from?*), answer options g-j* of the fragility questionnaire are also accounted for to consider project objectives as drawn from CRFs and planning tools.
>
> * These answer options are: g) Resilience strategy/plan with government involvement (e.g. 3RP); h) Fragility assessments, jointly undertaken with the government, i) Humanitarian assessment; j) Other assessment.

Where (O_{ij}) is the share of projects of a particular DP, in a PC, that draws its objectives from CRFs and planning tools. The dual subscript (ij) describes a specific DP-PC link.

Second, another ratio (f_{ijk}) describes the proportion of results indicators, contained in each project, that are drawn from the country results framework (CRF hereafter) as reported in question **B2_10.1** (*Among the indicators included in the results framework of this intervention, how many are drawn from existing government results frameworks, plans and strategies?*). The denominator is the total (t_{ijk}) number of results indicators included in the results framework of the project as reported in **B2_10** (*How many results indicators are included in the results framework or logical framework of this intervention?*) which is directly reported by a DP for every project or intervention. The average ratio of results frameworks, $r_{ijk} = (f_{ijk}/t_{ijk})$, across projects is obtained as follows:

$$R_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{k=K} r_{ijk}}{K}$$

Where capital K is the total number of projects per PC-DP link.

Finally, a third ratio describes the proportion of results indicators monitored using government monitoring or statistical systems. The numerator (s_{ijk}) is the number of results indicators that are reported using sources of information provided by existing government systems as described in question **B2_10.2** (*How many results indicators will be reported using government monitoring or statistical systems?*). The denominator is (t_{ijk}), as defined above. The average ratio of results indicators monitored with government sources, $g_{ijk} = (s_{ijk}/t_{ijk})$, across projects is obtained as follows:

---

28. These answer options are: a) National development strategy/plan; b) Sector plans; c) Ministry plans; d) Subnational government plans; e) Multi-donor trust fund co-led by the government; f) Other government plans.

$$D_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{k=K} g_{ijk}}{K}$$

These three sub-indicators have a dual subscript (***ij***) which means that this indicator can be further expressed at the PC or at the DP level. In other words, the mean of this indicator at either of those levels allows for a more aggregated indicator either at PC (**i**) or DP (**j**) level. A country-based indicator can be obtained by averaging these three sub-indicators at the country level:

$$SDG\ 17.15.1_i = \frac{(\bar{O}_i + \bar{R}_i + \bar{D}_i)}{3} \quad (2.2.1A)$$

Where $\bar{P}_i, \bar{F}_i, \bar{G}_i$ stands for the average of each of these sub-indicators at the country level. Similarly, a DP-based indicator can be obtained using the average of these three sub-indicators at the DP level:

$$SDG\ 17.15.1_j = \frac{(\bar{O}_j + \bar{R}_j + \bar{D}_j)}{3} \quad (2.2.1B)$$

Where $\bar{P}_j, \bar{F}_j, \bar{G}_j$ stands for the average at the DP level.

Interpretation: This measurement, is defined over a range of zero to one [0,1], and describes the extent to which DPs use CRFs and planning tools in the design of their projects/programmes. An ideal value of 1 reflects a situation where all project/programme objectives and results indicators are fully drawn from CRFs and planning tools and where all results indicators are monitored using government data and systems. A value of 0 indicates that none of the objectives, and results indicators are drawn from CRFs and planning tools. Intermediate values describe different degrees of consistency or that only a proportion of DP projects align with the country's CRFs and planning tools.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (*g*), for both PCs and DPs, can be obtained with a simple average (not weighted by the budgets of the interventions) as DPs should use country-owned results frameworks for all interventions independent of the size of the intervention.

2.3 **Public financial management**

This component involves three sub-indicators using both existing data from external available assessments and data reported by each DP at the country level through the questionnaire (Dataset 1). The unit of analysis are PCs and DPs.

2.3.1 Countries have quality public financial management (PFM) systems (PEFA).[29]

This assessment uses the following nine elements from the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment:[30]

---

29. Up to the 2018 monitoring round, this assessment was referred to as "Indicator 9b".

30. The nine selected PEFA elements come from the most recent version of the PEFA methodology, which was upgraded in 2016. All PEFA assessments since 2016 have been undertaken with this methodology. Prior PEFA assessments, before 2016, used an earlier (2011) version of the methodology. Between the 2011 and 2016 versions of the PEFA methodologies, six of the selected dimensions are indirectly comparable and three of the selected dimensions are not comparable. Not comparable dimensions are PI 9.1, PI 24.2, and PI 30.1. In cases where both scores were calculated using the earlier 2011 PEFA methodology, the dimensions covering the same subject areas will be used. In cases where one PEFA assessment was completed using the 2011 methodology and one PEFA assessment was completed using the 2016 methodology, the 2016 PEFA methodology dimensions will be used for the current situation, while the evolution index will be calculated based on the supplementary annex on comparison over time, using the corresponding dimensions of the 2011 PEFA methodology.

Topic	PEFA categories	
Budget	PI 1.1	Aggregate expenditure outturn
	PI 2.1	Expenditure composition outturn by function
	PI 4.1	Budget classification
	PI 9.1	Public access to fiscal information
	PI 18.3	Timing of legislative budget approval
Financial reporting	PI 29.1	Completeness of annual financial reports
Audit	PI 26.1	Coverage of internal audit
	PI 30.1	Audit coverage and standards (external)
Procurement	PI 24.2	Procurement methods

The value of each element for a given country is presented as available in the PEFA database/country report. This measurement attributes a score to each of the above PEFA elements using the two most recent PEFA assessments. A sub-script (t) is used to identify the year of these assessments: $t = 1$ for the most recent year and $t = 0$ for the year of the previous assessment. A score (s_{ic}^t) for each year is assigned to each of the nine PEFA elements (c_i) ranging from A (highest) to D (lowest) as follows:

$$s_{ic}^1 = s_{ic}^0 = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if } c_i^t = A \\ 3.5 & \text{if } c_{it} = B + \\ 3 & \text{if } c_i^t = B \\ 2.5 & \text{if } c_{it} = C + \\ 2 & \text{if } c_i^t = C \\ 1.5 & \text{if } c_{it} = D + \\ 1 & \text{if } c_i^t = D \end{cases} \quad (2.3.1)$$

Interpretation: This measurement, is defined over a range of one to four [1, 4], and describes the quality of the elements of a country PFM system. The larger the values, the higher the quality of the PFM system.

2.3.2 Countries strengthen their PFM systems.

Construction: Building on the previous information (see above), countries are categorised as having made "*significant improvement*", "*improvement*" or "*no improvement*", according to the magnitude, in positions, and the direction (either upward or downward) of the change. The magnitude is defined by the time difference (δ_i) of the score attached to these categories across years: $\delta_i = (s_i^1 - s_i^0)$. A point-based system for each of the nine selected PEFA elements is defined as follows:

$$P_{ic} = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } \delta_{ic} > 0 \text{ or } (c_i^t = A) \\ 0 & \text{if } \delta_{ic} = 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } \delta_{ic} < 0 \end{cases}$$

The sum of these points, expressed as a proportion of the total number of potential points, synthesises these results at the country level:

$$PS_i = \frac{\left(\sum_{c=1}^{C=9} P_{ic}\right)}{9} \quad (2.3.2)$$

Where C is the total number of elements, which is nine, as referred to above.

Interpretation: This indicator is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1], and describes whether a country has experienced an "*Improvement*", "*No change*" or a "*Decline*" in the quality of their PFM systems, based on the two most recent PEFA assessments available for the country. A value of 1 reflects

sustained improvements across the nine elements or a situation where the country had already achieved, and maintained, the highest scores in all nine elements. Intermediate values between 0.5 and 1 describe a situation where the improvements in some elements more than compensate for declines observed in other elements. A value below 0.5 describe a situation where the declines in some elements more than compensate for improvements in other elements.

Countries will be classified according to the following categories:

- Improvement if ($0.50 < P_i < 1.0$).
- No change if ($P_i = 0.50$).
- Decline if ($0.0 \leq P_i < 0.50$).

2.3.3 Development partners use partner country PFM systems when channelling funding to the public sector[31]

Construction: This component employs data reported by each DP at the country level. The unit of identification of information is each individual DP. This information can be analysed at two levels: the unit of analysis can be PCs or DPs (Dataset 2).

This indicator builds on four individual proportions which reflect the use of four elements of a PFM system: budget execution, financial reporting, auditing procedures, and procurement systems. The numerator for each proportion is: the disbursement that used budget execution procedures (E_{ij}), the disbursement that used financial reporting procedures (F_{ij}), the disbursement that used auditing procedures (A_{ij}), and the disbursement that used procurement systems (P_{ij}) as reported in questions: **B3_5** (*…used government budget execution procedures?*), **B3_6** (*…used government financial reporting procedures?*), **B3_7** (*…used government auditing procedures?*), **B3_8** (*…used government procurement systems?*) respectively. The denominator is the total amount of funding disbursed to the public sector (PS_{ij}) reported in question **B3_2** (*How much of this was for the public sector in the reporting year of reference?*):

$$e_{ij} = \frac{E_{ij}}{PS_{ij}}, \quad f_{ij} = \frac{F_{ij}}{PS_{ij}}, \quad a_{ij} = \frac{A_{ij}}{PS_{ij}}, \quad p_{ij} = \frac{P_{ij}}{PS_{ij}}$$

The average of these proportions synthesises all this information to describe the use of a country's PFM systems ($\bar{s}_{ij}$) for every DP (j) in each PC (i): [32]

$$\bar{s}_{ij} = \frac{e_{ij} + f_{ij} + a_{ij} + p_{ij}}{4}$$

The denominator adapts to the total number of elements in the numerator (excludes missing values).

An indicator for every DP can be obtained as follows:

$$s_j = \sum_{i=1}^{i=I_j} w_{ij} * \bar{s}_{ij} \quad (2.3.3A)$$

Where $w_{ij} = PS_{ij}/PS_j$ is the weight. $PS_j = \sum_{i=1}^{i=I_j} PS_{ij}$ is the total amount of funding disbursed to the public sector across countries where every DP operates.

Interpretation: This indicator is defined over a range of zero to one [0,1], and reflects the DP's average use of country PFM systems when channelling their development co-operation funding to the public sector, across four elements (budget execution, financial reporting, auditing procedures, and procurement

---

31. Up to the 2018 monitoring round, this assessment was referred to as "Indicator 9b".

32. The average is obtained with the number of complete-case observations. The proportion is a missing value if the denominator is a missing value. The proportion is zero if the denominator is zero.

systems). A value of 1 indicates that all funds channelled to the public sector use PFM systems. A value of 0 indicates no use of PFM systems; intermediate values describe a partial use of PFM systems.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), for each DP, can be obtained with an average across countries:

$$S_j = \sum_{j}^{J} w_j * s_j$$

Where $w_j = PS_j/PS_g$ is the weight, and $PS_g = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \sum_{i=1}^{i=I} PS_{ij}$.

An indicator for every PC can be obtained as follows:

$$s_i = \sum_{j=1}^{j=J_i} \omega_{ij} * \bar{s}_{ij} \quad (2.3.3B)$$

Where $\omega_j = PS_{ij}/PS_i$, is the weight. $PS_i = \sum_{j=1}^{j=J_i} PS_{ij}$ is the total amount of funding disbursed to the public sector by all DPs operating in a given PC.

Interpretation: This indicator is defined over a range of zero to one [0,1], and reflects the DPs' average use of PFM systems (budget execution, financial reporting, auditing procedures, and procurement systems) in a given PC. A value of 1 indicates that all funds channelled to the public sector use a country's PFM systems. A value of 0 indicates no use of PFM systems; intermediate values describe a partial use of a country's PFM system.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), for each DP, can be obtained with an average across countries:

$$S_i = \sum_{j}^{J} w_i * s_i$$

Where $w_i = PS_i/PS_g$ is the weight, and $PS_g = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \sum_{i=1}^{i=I} PS_{ij}$.

2.4 **National budget**

This component employs two units of identification of information – PC and DP – that are indicated in each indicator and sub-indicator. Similarly, the unit of analysis, either PC or DP (Dataset 2), will be explicit in each case.

<div style="background:#F5A623">2.4.1 Development co-operation is predictable.</div>

2.4.1.1 Annual predictability[33]

Construction: This component employs data reported by each DP at the country level. Therefore, the unit of identification of information is each individual DP. This information can be analysed at two levels: the unit of analysis can be PCs or DPs (Dataset 2). The indicator builds on the ratio (r_{ij}) of actual disbursements to scheduled disbursements [to the public sector in both cases]. The numerator is the disbursements (d_{ij}) reported in question **B3_2** (*How much of this was disbursed to the public sector in the reporting year of reference?*). The denominator is the scheduled (s_{ij}) disbursements reported in

---

33. Up to the 2018 monitoring round, this assessment was referred to as "Indicator 5a". The indicator was split into two sub-indicators which complicated the interpretation of results. The methodology to calculate this indicator has been adjusted to better reflect – now in a single measurement - the heterogeneity of the scheduled-disbursed relationship between DPs and PCs and its impact on planning processes.

34. The proportion is a missing value if the denominator is a missing value. The proportion is zero if the denominator is zero.

35. The parameter lambda is defined over a range of zero to one. Values smaller than one indicate that while over-disbursements negatively impact the government's planning capacity, in practical terms it is less serious than the impact of under-disbursements. To avoid negative values, the indicator will be zero when unexpected over disbursements are 300% larger than scheduled.

question **B3_3** (*How much development co-operation flows for the public sector did you schedule for disbursement at country level in the reporting year of reference?*). Once more, the dual subscript (ij) describes a particular DP-PC link.[34]

The indicator on annual predictability (P_{ij}) reflects that proportion ($r_{ij} = d_{ij}/s_{ij}$) and enables the identification of deviations between actual and scheduled disbursements, either above or below scheduled, and its order of magnitude. To reflect this trait, the methodology employs a tuning parameter (λ) equal to 1/3 to account for the presence of large and unexpected disbursements which also hinder PCs' planning process.[35] The measurement then is as follows:

$$P_{ij} = \begin{cases} r_{ij} & \text{if } d_{ij} \leq s_{ij} \\ (1 + \lambda) - \lambda r_{ij} & \text{if } d_{ij} > s_{ij} \end{cases}$$

This indicator describes the way that both under- and over-disbursements impact the planning capacity of governments as deviations in either direction impact the government's ability to plan.

A weighted mean allows for broader levels of aggregation (this is, at the PC or DP or global levels). The weights are the scheduled disbursements to the public sector (d_{ij}) to reflect the fact that differences in these amounts contribute differently to the final average (in other words, the fact that some observations may contribute more than others to the average).

At the PC level the weighted average for the indicator of annual predictability is:

$$AP_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{j=J}(d_{ij} * P_{ij})}{\sum_{j=1}^{j=J} d_{ij}} \quad (2.4.1.1A)$$

Similarly, the weighted average for the annual predictability indicator at the DP level is:

$$AP_j = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=I}(d_{ij} * P_{ij})}{\sum_{i=1}^{i=I} d_{ij}} \quad (2.4.1.1B)$$

The same procedure applies for any other aggregated measure, at the global level (g).

Interpretation: This indicator is defined over a range of zero to one [0,1] and describes the proportion of funding that DPs disburse to PC governments within the fiscal year during which it was scheduled to be disbursed. A value of 1 indicates that actual disbursements are fully consistent with the scheduled disbursements. Lower values describe deviations (either over- or under- disbursements) between actual and scheduled. Such deviations can impact the government's ability to implement its development efforts as planned as well as DPs' implementation of projects on the ground. The closer to 0, the larger the deviations.

2.4.1.2 Medium-term predictability[36]

Construction: This measurement employs data reported by the PC for each DP. The unit of identification of information and the unit of analysis are PCs and DPs (Dataset 2). The indicator builds on the number of years for which the DP made available forward spending plans over a horizon of three consecutive fiscal years. A dichotomous variable (f_{ij}^{t+1}) becomes 1 if a DP made available information for the first prospective year which is recorded in question **A3_1** (*Fiscal year ending in year t+1?*). Similarly, the variables (f_{ij}^{t+2}) and (f_{ij}^{t+3}) describes information for the second and third years in questions **A3_2** and **A3_3** respectively. The dual subscript (ij) describes a particular DP-PC link.

---

36. Up to the 2018 monitoring round, this assessment was referred to as "Indicator 5b".

Measurement at the PC level

The procedure to obtain an indicator at the PC level is performed in two steps. First, obtain the mean across DPs for every year ($\bar{F}_i^\tau$) for $\tau = \{t + 1, t + 2, t + 3\}$ as follows:

$$\bar{F}_i^\tau = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{j=J_i} f_{ij}^\tau}{J_i}$$

Where J_i is the number of DPs per PC. This yields the share of DPs for which a PC has received forward expenditure plans for a specific year ahead (one, two or three). The second step allows for summary information and consists of taking the average across years for every PC.

$$MP_i^{PC} = \frac{\bar{F}_i^{t+1} + \bar{F}_i^{t+2} + \bar{F}_i^{t+3}}{3} \quad (2.4.1.2A)$$

Interpretation: This indicator is defined over a range of zero to one [0,1] and describes the proportion of DPs for which a PC has received forward spending plans (on average) across three consecutive years. A value of 1 indicates that the country receives forward spending plans, for the three-year period, from all DPs. A value of 0 indicates that a country does not receive forward spending plans from its DPs for any of these three years. The closer to 1, the larger the share of DPs for which a PC has received forward spending plans over a three-year period.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), for every PC, can be obtained with a simple average across countries:

$$MP_g^{PC} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=I} MP_i^{PC}}{I}$$

Where I is the total number of countries.

Measurement at the DP level

With these inputs, the corresponding expressions for the construction of an indicator at the DP level, are the following:

$$\bar{F}_j^\tau = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=I_j} f_{ij}^\tau}{I_j}$$

In this case, I_j is the total number of PCs where a particular DP operates. This gives the share of PCs for which a DP has provided forward spending plans for a specific year ahead (one, two or three). Similarly, the second step is as follows:

$$MP_j^{DP} = \frac{\bar{F}_j^{t+1} + \bar{F}_j^{t+2} + \bar{F}_j^{t+3}}{3} \quad (2.4.1.2B)$$

Interpretation: This indicator is defined over a range of zero to one [0,1] and describes the proportion of PCs for which a DP provides forward spending plans (on average) across three consecutive years. A value of 1 indicates that a DP provides forward spending plans for the three-year period to every country in which it operates. A value of 0 indicates that a DP provides no forward spending plans to any country for any of these three years. The closer to 1, the higher the share of countries to which a DP provides forward spending plans over a three-year period.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), for every DP, can be obtained with a simple average across countries:

---

37. Up to the 2018 monitoring round, this assessment was referred to as "Indicator 6".

$$MP_g^{DP} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{j=J} MP_j^{PC}}{J}$$

Where J is the total number of DPs.

2.4.2 Development co-operation is recorded on the national budget.[37]

Measurement at the DP level

Construction: See section 1.2.2 in component *Parliamentary oversight (Dimension: Whole-of-society)* for the construction of sub-indicators.

Note: The measurement included in component *Parliamentary oversight* is used to indicate the extent to which parliaments have oversight over development co-operation (when this is recorded in national budgets). Under component *National budget*, the same measurement is used to indicate the share of development co-operation that is reflected in the national budget, as the national budget is one of the systems included in the dimension *State and use of country systems*.

As with the approach used in section 1.2.2 for PCs, an individual measure for each DP (j), is obtained with the ratio ($r_{ij} = b_{ij}/s_{ij}$) of complete-case observations as follows:

$$NB_j^{DP} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{i=I} r_{ij} * w_{ij} \right) \quad (1.2.2B)^{[38]}$$

Where I stands for the total number of countries where a DP has scheduled funds for disbursement, and w_{ij} is the individual weight defined as follows: $w_{ij} = s_{ij}/S_j =$ and $S_j = \sum_{i=1}^{i=I} s_{ij}$.[39]

Interpretation: This indicator is defined over a range of zero to one [0,1] and describes the share of development co-operation funds from DPs that are included in the country's national budget. A value of 0 indicates that no funding was recorded in the annual budget of the reporting year of reference. A value of 1 indicates an ideal scenario where all development co-operation flows are recorded in the country's annual budget.[40]

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained with a weighted average using expression 1.2.2B and adjusting the upper limit of summation for (i) accordingly.

2.5 Gender budgeting – SDG 5.c.1[41]

This component employs data reported by national co-ordinators at the PC level. The unit of analysis and the unit of identification of information are PCs (Dataset 1).

2.5.1 Countries have systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment (SDG 5.c.1).

This indicator is the official source of data for SDG Indicator 5.c.1, which measures government efforts to track budget allocations for gender equality throughout the public financial management cycle and to make these allocations publicly available. It links national budgeting systems with implementation of

---

38. This number indicates that the expression in 1.2.2B (for DPs) supplements that in 1.2.2A (for PCs). See section 1.2.2.

39. As indicated in section 2.2, "s_{ij}" are the development co-operation funds scheduled for disbursement to the public sector by each development partner as reported by DPs in question B3_3 and r_j is the share of development co-operation funds from development partners that are recorded on budget, as reported by PCs. To bound this indicator between [0,1], a value of 1 is attributed to this indicator when the amount of funds recorded on national budget (b_j) is equal to or higher than s_{ij}. Similarly, the indicator is missing when $s_{ij} = 0$.

40. MV indicates that no information is available for both the numerator and denominator.

41. Up to the 2018 monitoring round, this assessment was referred to as "Indicator 8".

42. This measurement accounts for complete-case observations only.

legislation and policies for gender equality and women's empowerment (SDG target 5.c).

Construction: The indicator uses thirteen yes/no questions within the three criteria listed in the following table. The indicator first builds on a set of dichotomous variables (a_q) based on 13 individual questions (q). Each of them is equal to 1 for affirmative answers, and 0 otherwise.[42]

Criteria (C)	Content	Questions (q_c)	Number of questions per criterion (Q_c)	Threshold (Z_c)
Criterion 1	Aspects of public expenditure are reflected in programs and their resource allocation	A4_1.1 – A4_1.3	3	2
Criterion 2	Public Financial Management system promotes gender-related, or gender-responsive goals	A4_2.1 – A4_2.7	7	4
Criterion 3	Allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment are made public	A4_3.1 – A4_3.3	3	2

A criterion (c) is considered satisfied if the number of favourable attributes is equal to or larger than a threshold (Z_c) set for each criterion based on a majority rule. This information is the input to produce an indicator (s_i^c) that receives the value of 1 if the criterion is satisfied, and 0 otherwise.

$$s_i^c = \begin{cases} 1 \ \text{if} \ \left(\sum_{q=1}^{q=Q_c} a_q \right) \geq Z_c \\ 0 \ \text{if} \ \left(\sum_{q=1}^{q=Q_c} a_q \right) < Z_c \end{cases}$$

This expression describes three measurements at the country level (this is, one per criterion), which are further synthesised into a single indicator at the country level:

$$S_i = \frac{\sum_{c=1}^{c=3} s_i^c}{3} \quad (2.5.1)$$

Interpretation: This indicator ranges between 0 and 1 and describes the extent to which a country has a system in place to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment. It receives a value of 1 when a country satisfies the three criteria; a value of 0.66 if the country satisfies two criteria; and a value of 0.33 if a country meets only one criterion. This indicator is 0 if no criteria are met.

Country classification: A country will be classified as "fully meets requirements", "approaches requirements", or "does not meet requirements" per the following matrices (eight possible combinations, cases A-H below):

Fully meets requirements

	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3
Case A	x	x	x

Approaches requirements

	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3
Case B	x		
Case C		x	
Case D			x

	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3
Case E	X	X	
Case F	X		X
Case G		X	X

Does not meet requirements

	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3
Case H			

Note: "Checked" boxes represent satisfied criteria; "unchecked" boxes represent unsatisfied criteria.

Because the three criteria are equally important, a country would need to satisfy all three to fully meet the indicator requirements.

Method of computation for global aggregation of the indicator is defined as follows:

$$\textbf{Indicator 5.c.1} = \frac{(\text{Number of countries that } \textbf{fully} \text{ meet requirements}) \times 100}{\text{Total number of countries}}$$

2.6 **Accountability mechanisms**[43]

This component employs five indicators for five individual *elements*. These indicators aim to produce a continuous scale (in a range of 0 and 1) that allows for assessing accountability mechanisms contained in a policy framework. This component uses data reported by national co-ordinators at the PC level. The unit of analysis and the unit of identification of information are PCs (Dataset 1).

> **2.6.1** Countries have inclusive, regular, transparent, result-focused accountability mechanisms captured in a policy framework.

A country is considered to have a mutual accountability mechanism in place when at least four out of five of the following elements are in place:

1. Policy framework for development co-operation
2. Country-level targets for effective development co-operation
3. Assessment of progress towards country-level targets
4. Inclusiveness of assessments of country-level targets
5. Public availability of assessment results

Element 1 **Policy framework**

This element is in place based on characteristics described in three sub-indicators.

Sub-indicator ($I1_i$) builds on a dichotomous variable that describes the existence of a policy framework as reported in question **A2_1** *(Is there a policy framework in place to guide development co-operation and partnerships?)* as follows:

$$I1_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if there is a policy framework} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

---

43. Up to the 2018 monitoring round, this assessment was referred to as "Indicator 7".

44. Where d) Civil society organisations and non-governmental organisations, e) Private sector, f) Private foundations, g) Trade unions.

Sub-indicator ($I2_i$) combines two sets of variables. First, a dichotomous variable identifies the stakeholder groups the policy provides guidance to as reported in question **A2_2** (*For which of the following stakeholder groups does the policy framework provide guidance?)*:

$$i2a_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if bilateral or multilateral partners.} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Second, this information is supplemented with the number (N_i) of other stakeholders to which the policy framework provides guidance, in answer options "d" to "g".[44] A dichotomous variable receives the value of 1 when the policy framework provides guidance to each of these stakeholders (g_{si}) and 0 otherwise. At least one of these other stakeholders is required so that:

$$i2b_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } N_i \geq 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Where $N_i = \sum_{s=d}^{s=g} g_{si}$. The sub-indicator then combines these two variables as follows:

$$I2_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i2a_i = 1 \text{ and } i2b_i = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Sub-indicator ($I3_i$) builds on a set of dichotomous variables that receive the value of 1 if a particular type of development co-operation (t_i) is covered by this policy as reported in question **A2_3** (*Which types of development co-operation does this policy cover?)*. At least two types are required:

$$I3_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } T_i \geq 2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Where T_i is the total number of types covered ($T_i = \sum_{t=a}^{t=d} t_i$), in this case four for answer options "a" to "d".[45] Finally, a dichotomous variable receives the value of 1 if this element is in place according to these three sub-indicators (0 otherwise) as follows:

$$Element \ 1_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } I1_i = 1 \text{ and } I2_i = 1 \text{ and } I3_i = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Element 2 **Country-level targets**

This element is in place based on characteristics described in three sub-indicators.

Sub-indicator ($F1_i$) builds on a dichotomous variable that receives the value of 1 if there are country-level targets as reported in question **A2_6** (*Are there country-level targets for effective development co-operation?)* as follows:

$$F1_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if targets in place} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

A sub-indicator ($F2_i$) builds on a dichotomous variable that receives the value of 1 if there are country-level targets specific to individual actors as reported in question **A2_7** (*Are these country-level targets specific to individual development actors?)* as follows:

$$F2_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if specific targets} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

---

45. These types are: a) International grants, b) International concessional loans, c) International non-concessional flows with development objectives, d) Technical development co-operation.

46. These stakeholders are: c) South-South co-operation partners, d) Civil society organisations, e) Private sector, f) Private foundations.

Sub-indicator ($F3_i$) combines two sets of variables. First, a dichotomous variable identifies two key stakeholders reflected in the country-level targets (answer options a and b) reported in question **A2_8** (*Indicate the stakeholders reflected in specific country-level targets*):

$$f3a_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if bilateral or multilateral partners} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Second, this information is supplemented with the number (N_i) of other stakeholders with country-level targets in answer options "d" to "f".[46] A dichotomous variable for each of these stakeholders (g_{si}) receives the value of 1 when there are country-level targets and 0 otherwise. At least one of these other stakeholders is required so that:

$$f3b_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } N_i \geq 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Where $N_i = \sum_{s=c}^{s=f} g_{si}$. The sub-indicator then combines these two variables as follows:

$$F3_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } f3a_i = 1 \text{ and } f3b_i = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Finally, a dichotomous variable receives the value of 1 if this element is in place according to these three sub-indicators (0 otherwise) as follows:

$$Element\ 2_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } F1_i = 1 \text{ and } F2_i = 1 \text{ and } F3_i = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The resulting value in these two expressions is vetoed with information from question **A2_1** *(Is there a policy framework in place to guide development co-operation and partnerships?)*. The value of this sub-indicator is MV if there is no policy framework.

Element 3 **Assessment of progress**

This element is in place based on characteristics described in two sub-indicators.

Sub-indicator R1 builds on a dichotomous variable that receives the value of 1 if the government carried out a mutual assessment of development co-operation targets as reported in question **A2_9** (*Did the government carry out a mutual assessment of the above-mentioned development co-operation targets, with the government and its development partners, in the past three years?*) as follows:

$$R1_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if government carried out a mutual assessment} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Sub-indicator R2 builds on a dichotomous variable that receives the value of 1 if these assessments are performed on a regular basis (as opposed to being performed on an ad hoc basis) as reported in question **A2_9.3** (*Are these mutual assessments performed on an ad-hoc basis or at regular intervals?*) as follows:

$$R2_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if performed at regular intervals} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Finally, a dichotomous variable receives the value of 1 if this element is in place according to these two indicators (0 otherwise) as follows:

$$Element\ 3_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } R1_i = 1 \text{ and } R2_i = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This is vetoed with information from question **A2_1** *(Is there a policy framework in place to guide development co-operation and partnerships?)* and question **A2_6** (*Are there country-level targets for effective development co-operation?*). The value of this sub-indicator is MV if there is no policy framework or no country-level targets.

> For countries responding to the adapted fragility questionnaire, in case of a negative answer to question **A2_9** (*Did the government carry out a mutual assessment of the above-mentioned development co-operation targets, with the government and its development partners, in the past three years?*), fragile contexts can report on the presence of informal mechanisms in question **A2_9.1.** (*In the absence of a mutual assessment of development co-operation targets, does the government have an informal mechanism for dialogue on development co-operation?*). A positive answer to question **A2_9.1** will serve to assess element 3 on the existence of assessments of progress towards country-level targets for development co-operation as well as for elements 4 and 5.

Element 4 **Inclusiveness of assessment**

This element is in place based on characteristics described in two sub-indicators.

Sub-indicator O1 builds on a dichotomous variable that receives the value of 1 if other actors have been involved in these mutual assessments as reported in question **A2_14** (*Have other actors been involved in these mutual assessments?*) as follows:

$$O1_i = \begin{cases} 1 \ \text{if } Other\ actors\ involved \\ 0 \ \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Sub-indicator O2 supplements this information with the number (N_i) of other actors involved in answer options "a" to "d" as reported in question **A2_14.1** (*Which other actors have been involved in these mutual assessments?*).[47] A dichotomous variable for each of these actors (g_{si}) receives the value of 1 when other actors were involved and 0 otherwise. At least one of these other actors is required so that:

$$O2_i = \begin{cases} 1 \ \text{if } N_i \geq 1 \\ 0 \ \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Where $N_i = \sum_{s=a}^{s=d} g_{si}$. Finally, a dichotomous variable receives the value of 1 if this element is in place according to these two sub-indicators (0 otherwise) as follows:

$$Element\ 4_i = \begin{cases} 1 \ \text{if } O1_i = 1 \text{ and } O2_i = 1 \\ 0 \ \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The resulting value in this expression is MV with a negative answer from questions **A2_1**, **A2_6**, and **A2_9**.

Element 5 **Public availability of assessment results**

This element is in place based on characteristics described in two sub-indicators.

Sub-indicator P1 builds on a dichotomous variable that receives the value of 1 if assessments are made publicly available as reported in question **A2_15** (*Are the results of such assessments made publicly*

---

47. These stakeholders are: a) CSOs (any type), b) Private sector, c) Trade Unions, d) Private foundations. Other options are considered: e) Parliament/legislative body, f) Subnational governments, g) Academia, h) Media/journalists.

available?) as follows:

$$P1_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } publicly\ available\ results \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Sub-indicator P2 builds on a discrete variable with a value defined by the promptness with which the results of mutual assessments are made publicly available as reported in question **A2_15.1** (*When are the results of the mutual assessments made available to the public?*) as follows:

$$P2_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if available within a year} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Finally, a dichotomous variable receives the value of 1 if this element is in place according to these two sub-indicators (0 otherwise) as follows:

$$Element\ 5_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } P1_i = 1 \text{ and } P2_i = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The value of this element is missing value (MV) based on information from question **A2_9** (*Did the government carry out a mutual assessment of the above-mentioned development co-operation targets, with its development partners, in the past three years?*).

Each of these five elements (E) allows for the identification of satisfied elements. The following composite indicator summarises the above elements:

$$A_i = \sum_{e=1}^{e=5} E_{ei} \quad (2.6.1)$$

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero and five [0, 5]. A country is considered to have an accountability mechanism in place when at least four of the five elements are in place (when $A_i \geq 4$).

At the global level, the indicator is calculated as follows $= \frac{NC}{N} * 100$

where NC is the number of countries that meet at least four out of the five elements and N is the total number of countries participating in the respective monitoring round.

2.7 **Information management**

This component uses data reported by PCs and DPs at the country level. In both cases, the unit of identification of information is PCs (Dataset 1 and Dataset 2).

2.7.1 Countries have information management systems for development co-operation.

Construction: This measurement builds on seven sub-indicators.

The first sub-indicator describes the presence of an Aid Information Management System (AIMS) for development co-operation. This indicator is set to 1 if such a system is in place as reported in question **A5_1** (*Does your country have an Aid Information Management System in place?*) or if there is an equivalent system as reported in question **A5_1.1** (*If no, do you have another system in place to collect information from development partners on their development co-operation?*). This sub-indicator is 0 otherwise:

$$S_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{AIMS or other system in place} \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

A second sub-indicator, also in the form of a dichotomous variable, receives the value of 1 if the system collects information on development co-operation as reported in question **A5_1.3** (*Is the system operational and currently used to collect information from development partners on their development co-operation?*):

$$C_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{System operational} \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Four additional sub-indicators, also based on a set of dichotomous variables, supplement this information. Each of these variables describes traits of information management systems: i) the purpose, ii) the types of DPs that are requested to report, iii) the types of flows covered, and iv) the information recorded (for projects/programmes). These traits are reported through four questions (q) where each answer option receives a value of 1 to reflect the presence of that attribute (a) in a particular country, 0 otherwise, as described in the following table.

Sub-indicator	Specific questions (q) attached to each sub-indicator	Answer options (a_q)	Total traits (A_q)
$D1_i$	**A5_2** *If any, for which purposes do you use the information in your system?*	a – d	4
$D2_i$	**A5_3** *Which types of development partners do you request to report to your system?*	a – f	6
$D3_i$	**A5_4** *Which types of development co-operation flows does your system gather information on?*	a – d	4
$D4_i$	**A5_5** *For projects/programmes, which of the following information does your system record?*	a1 – a5 b1 – b3	8

These sub-indicators show the extent to which relevant traits are in place. In each case, larger values describe more comprehensive systems:

$$D1_i = D2_i = D3_i = D4_i = \frac{\sum a_q}{A_q}$$

The capital (A_q) is the total number of traits considered within each question.

The last sub-indicator (F_i) describes the frequency with which DPs are asked to report/update information as reported in question **A5_7** (*How frequently do you request development partners to report/update information to your system?*) as follows:

$$F_i = \begin{cases} 1.0 & \text{Quarterly (or more frequent)} \\ 0.8 & \text{Twice per year} \\ 0.5 & \text{Annually (or less frequent)} \end{cases}$$

This sub-indicator is set to MV if no information is specified ("other").

Finally, when sub-indicator $S_i = 1$ (a system is in place),[48] the comprehensiveness of information management systems is defined by the concurrence of the remaining six sub-indicators:

$$IMS_i = \frac{C_i + D1_i + D2_i + D3_i + D4_i + F_i}{6} \quad \text{(2.7.1)}$$

---

48. The IMS_i indicator is only defined when there is a system in place or when $S_i = 1$. This indicator is 0 otherwise.

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1]. A value of 1 indicates the presence of a comprehensive information management system that frequently collects information on development co-operation, from a diversity of partners, different types of flows, and includes key characteristics of projects/programmes. The closer to 1 the more comprehensive is the information management system, whereas a value of 0 means no such system is in place or that a system does not meet any of the six traits.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained with the average across countries:

$$IMS_g = \sum_i^I \frac{IMS_i}{I}$$

This measurement is also defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1]. In line with the previous interpretation, this value indicates average presence of a comprehensive information management system across countries.

<div style="background:#F5A800;padding:4px">2.7.2 Development partners report to these information management systems.</div>

Measurement at the PC level

Construction: The measurement of this component uses information reported by a PC (i) for each DP (j). The unit of identification of information is an individual PC but the unit of analysis is every DP (Dataset 2). The use of a single superscript "PC" reflects this distinction. A dual subscript will indicate the use of two levels of information.

First, a sub-indicator describes the extent to which every individual DP reports to a country's information management system. A value of 1 is assigned to the dichotomous variable (d_{ij}^{PC}) if a particular DP reports to the country's system as reported in question **A5_8.1** (*Does this development partner report to your system?*). This variable is 0 otherwise. The following indicator, already expressed at the PC level, describes the proportion of DPs reporting, (R_i^{PC}), to a country's system:

$$R_i^{PC} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=D_i}(d_{ij}^{PC})}{D_i}$$

Where the capital D_i is the total number of DPs in a particular country, as reported by the national co-ordinator.

Similarly, a sub-indicator (f_{ij}^{PC}) describes the extent to which every individual DP reports at the requested frequency (conditional on reporting or $d_{ij}^{PC} = 1$). A value of 1 is assigned to the dichotomous variable ($f_{ij}^{PC} \mid d_{ij}^{PC} = 1$) if a DP meets this requirement as reported in question **A5_8.2** (*Does this development partner report at the frequency you request?*), this variable is 0 otherwise:

$$F_i^{PC} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=F_i}(f_{ij}^{PC})}{F_i}$$

Where the capital F_i is the total number of DPs reporting in a particular country.

Finally, a sub-indicator (p_{ij}^{PC}) describes the extent to which every individual DP provides the information requested by every PC (conditional on reporting or $d_{ij}^{PC} = 1$). A value of 1 is assigned to the dichotomous variable ($p_{ij}^{PC} \mid d_{ij}^{PC} = 1$) if a DP meets this requirement as reported in question **A5_8.3** (*Does this development partner provide the information you request?*), this variable is 0 otherwise. The following indicator, expressed at the PC level, describes the proportion of DPs providing the information requested, (P_i^{PC}), to the government's information management system:

$$P_i^{PC} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=P_i}(p_{ij}^{PC})}{P_i}$$

Where the capital P_i is the total number of DPs providing the requested information as reported by the government.

The average of all the sub-indicators synthesises these characteristics:

$$RMS_i^{PC} = \frac{F_i^{PC} + R_i^{PC} + P_i^{PC}}{3} \quad (2.7.2A)$$

Interpretation: This indicator, defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1], describes the extent to which DPs report as requested to a country's system. A value of 1 implies full participation and compliance with the requested information and frequency. A value of 0 indicates that while there may be a system in place, this is not used by the DP in a particular PC or that reporting is not done at the requested frequency.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained with the average across countries:

$$RMS_g^{PC} = \sum_i^I \frac{RMS_i^{PC}}{I}$$

Measurement at the DP level

Note: The information is provided by PCs (by reporting to Section A of the questionnaire) for the DPs in their country. Therefore, the set of DPs referred to in this indicator may differ from the set of DPs that chose to directly report data (by reporting to Section B of the questionnaire) to the monitoring exercise.

Construction: This measurement also employs information provided by a PC (i) for each DP (j). Similarly, the unit of identification of information is an individual PC (the superscript) but the unit of analysis is every DP (Dataset 2). However, the aggregation is performed at the DP level across countries as stated by the subscript.

Once more, a sub-indicator describes the extent to which each individual DP reports to a country's system. A value of 1 is assigned to the dichotomous variable (d_{ij}^{PC}) if a particular DP reports to the country's system as described in question **A5_8.1** (*Does this development partner report to your system?*). This variable is 0 otherwise. The following indicator, now expressed at the DP level, describes the proportion of countries where a DP reports to the corresponding country system (R_j^{PC}):

$$R_j^{PC} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{j=C_j}(d_{ij}^{PC})}{C_j}$$

The capital C_j is the total number of countries where a DP operates, as reported by partner countries.

Once more, a sub-indicator (f_{ij}^{PC}) describes the extent to which each individual DP reports at the requested frequency (conditional on reporting or $d_{ij}^{PC} = 1$). Again, a value of 1 is assigned to the dichotomous variable ($f_{ij}^{PC} \mid d_{ij}^{PC} = 1$) if a DP meets this requirement as reported in question **A5_8.2** (*Does this development partner report at the frequency you request?*); this variable is 0 otherwise. When aggregating at the DP level the indicator becomes:

$$F_j^{PC} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{j=C_j}(f_{ij}^{PC})}{F_j}$$

Where the capital F_j is the total number of countries where a particular DP is reporting as reported by the PC conditional to $d_{ij}^{PC} = 1$.

Finally, a sub-indicator (p_{ij}^{PC}) describes the extent to which each individual DP provided the information requested by each PC (conditional on reporting or $d_{ij}^{PC} = 1$). A value of 1 is assigned to the dichotomous variable ($p_{ij}^{PC} \mid d_{ij}^{PC} = 1$) if a DP meets this requirement as reported in question **A5_8.3** (*Does this development partner provide the information you request?*); this variable is 0 otherwise. The following indicator, expressed at the DP level, describes the proportion of DPs providing the requested information (P_i^{PC}) to government systems:

$$P_j^{PC} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{j=P_j}(p_{ij}^{PC})}{P_j}$$

Where the capital P_j is the total number of DPs providing information as requested by the PC.

The average of all these sub-indicators synthesises these characteristics:

$$RMS_j^{PC} = \frac{F_j^{PC} + R_j^{PC} + P_j^{PC}}{3} \quad (2.7.2B)$$

Interpretation: This indicator, defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1], describes the extent to which DPs report to a country's system and do so at the requested frequency and by providing the requested information. A value of 1 implies full compliance. A value of 0 indicates that while there is a system in place in a particular PC, a DP does not report to it.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained with the average across countries:

$$RMS_g^{PC} = \sum_i^I \frac{RMS_j^{PC}}{J}$$

2.8 **Procurement**

2.8.1 Aid is untied.

This indicator uses the most recent information available in the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS), which is self-reported by the members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and validated by statisticians at the OECD. Results are only available for DAC members.

The indicator is calculated by dividing the amount of untied ODA commitments by the total amount of ODA commitments. In this case, if a unit of analysis has missing values for some variables, the corresponding measurement will only consider available observations to determine the denominator of the ratio.

Figures are disaggregated by PC and by DP and exclude donor administrative costs and in-donor refugee costs. Amounts are provided in current prices. The underlying methodology can be found here.

3. **Dimension 3: Transparency**

3.1 **Countries' action**

This component employs data reported by the national co-ordinator at the PC level. The unit of analysis and the unit of identification of information are PCs (Dataset 1).

<div style="background-color:orange">

3.1.1 Countries make publicly available:
– Information on development co-operation, national development plans and their progress reports;
– Results of joint assessments toward targets for development co-operation.

</div>

Construction: This component employs four sub-indicators to describe the extent to which the following elements of development co-operation are publicly available:

- The national development plan or strategy (NDP)
- Progress reports on the NDP
- Results of joint assessments of development co-operation targets
- Information on development co-operation (IDC)

Sub-indicator ($A1$) describes the online availability of the NDP in the form of a dichotomous variable with information from question **A1_1.3** (*Is this strategy publicly available online?*) and **A1_1.3.1** (*Please include the link.*) as follows:

$$A1_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if NDP } \textit{Available and link available} \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This sub-indicator is vetoed with information on the existence of the NDP as described in question **A1_1** (*Is there a national development strategy or national development plan for the country?*). Hence, the indicator is 0 if there is no NDP.

Sub-indicator ($A2$) receives the value of 1 to describe the public availability of progress reports (PR) concerning the national development strategy reported in question **A1_19.1.1** (*Is the most recent report publicly available online?*) and **A1_19.1.2** (*Please include available links to relevant platforms or most recent documents.*). This indicator is 0 otherwise.

$$A2_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if PR } \textit{Available and link available} \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Similarly, this sub-indicator is vetoed with information on the existence of these reports as described in question **A1_19** (*Is (Are) there a progress report(s) of the national development strategy/plan?*). Hence, the indicator is 0 if there are no progress reports.

Sub-indicator ($A3$) attributes the value of 1 if results of mutual assessments towards targets for development co-operation are available as reported in question **A2_15** (*Are the results of such assessments made publicly available?*) and **A2_15.2** (*Please include available links to relevant platforms or most recent documents.*). This indicator is 0 otherwise:

$$A3_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if Assessments } \textit{available and link available} \\ 0 & \text{if } \textit{Not available} \end{cases}$$

Similarly, this sub-indicator is vetoed with information from question **A2_9** (*Did the government carry out a mutual assessment of the above-mentioned development co-operation targets, with its development partners, in the past three years?*). The value of this indicator is set to MV if the government did not carry

out such mutual assessments.

Finally, sub-indicator ($A4$) receives the value of 1 to describe the fact that information on development co-operation (IDC) is publicly available as described in question **A5_11** (*Do you make information on development co-operation publicly available?*). This indicator is 0 otherwise.

$$A4_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if IDC } Available \\ 0 & \text{if } Not \; available \end{cases}$$

The average of all these four indicators synthesises this information:

$$CA_i = \frac{\sum_{a=1}^{a=4} A_{ai}}{4} \quad (3.1.1)$$

Interpretation: This indicator, defined in a range of [0,1], describes the extent to which the NDP, its progress reports, mutual assessments of development co-operation targets, or other information on development co-operation are publicly available. A value of 1 indicates full transparency in the sense that that all these elements are publicly available. A value of 0 indicates that these elements are absent in a country or that while existing these are not publicly available. Intermediate values reflect nuances on the existence and availability of these elements.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained with the average across countries:

$$CA_g = \sum_i^I \frac{CA_i}{I}$$

3.2 **Development partners' action**

3.2.1 Development partners report to global systems and standards[49]

This measurement relies on assessments produced by the secretariats of two information systems and are provided expressly to the GPEDC: the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS) and the International Aid Transparency Initiative standard (IATI). Each of these assessments has its own distinct methodology, therefore results are not directly comparable and are presented separately. To facilitate interpretation of the overall scores between the three assessments, DPs are categorised on a four-tiered scale: "excellent", "good", "fair" and "needs improvement".

The two assessments place varying weight on specific dimensions such as *timeliness, comprehensiveness, provision of forward-looking data, and data accuracy*. The CRS uses the following weights: timeliness (5/20); completeness (3/20) and accuracy (12/20). IATI uses equal weights for its dimensions. Within the comprehensiveness dimension, three sub-components are weighted: core (50%), financial (25%) and forward-looking (25%). The IATI reporting scores are adjusted for the coverage of the financial flows reported using the following scale of coverage: Excellent: 80% or over (adjustment factor 1); Good: greater than or equal to 60% and less than 80% (adjustment factor 0.8); Fair: greater than or equal to 40% and less than 60% (adjustment factor 0.6); and Poor: less than 40% (adjustment factor 0.4).

For the GPEDC reporting, the adjusted IATI scores are converted to a descriptive scale as follows: "Excellent" (80% or over); "Good" (60 – 80%); "Fair" (40 – 60%); and "Needs improvement" (0 – 40%).

Disclaimer: As the methodology for these measurements is under the custodianship and control of institutions external to

---

49. Up to the 2018 monitoring round, this assessment was referred to as "Indicator 4".

the GPEDC, reporting on such assessments is strictly dependent on their continued availability.

3.2.2 Development partners make publicly available their country-level strategies.

The measurement of this component resorts to information provided by each DP (unit of identification) for each PC (Dataset 2).

Construction: A dichotomous variable receives the value of 1 if a DP makes publicly available their country-level strategy as reported in question **B1_1.2** (*Is this country strategy or partnership framework publicly available online?*) and **B1_1.3** *(Please provide a link).* This indicator is 0 otherwise.

$$A_j = \begin{cases} 1.0 & \text{if } Available \ and \ link \ provided \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3.2.2)$$

An indicator at the PC level can be obtained as follows:

$$A_i = \sum (A_{ij})/J_i$$

Where J is the number of DPs in a country *(i)*.

Interpretation: This is a dichotomous indicator, with a value of 1 if a DP makes publicly available their country-level strategy and 0 otherwise.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (*g*), can be obtained with the average of all DPs.

$$A_g = \sum_i^J \frac{A_j}{J}$$

4. Dimension 4: Leaving No One Behind

4.1 Consultation

The measurement of this component involves different units of analysis and identification (PC and DP level). For practical reasons, all elements pertaining to PCs are presented together, followed by the elements pertaining to DPs.[50]

4.1.1 Countries engage representatives of women and girls, youth and children, and vulnerable and marginalised groups in the preparation of their national development strategies.

Measurement at the PC level

Construction: This measurement uses data provided by the national co-ordinator at country level (Dataset 1). A set of variables (g_{is}) individually receives the value of 1 if a population group (represented by CSOs) (g_{is}) was involved in the preparation of the NDP, as reported in question **A1_2** (*Which of the following stakeholders have participated in developing the national development strategy/plan?*).

---

50. While in the 2023-2026 Monitoring Guide some elements of PC and DP behavior are presented together, in this methodological note and for this specific component, measurements pertaining to PCs and DPs are separate. This is to ease understanding of how the measurement is built.

51. The questionnaire allows for up to three vulnerable and marginalised groups represented by CSOs (answer options b3-b5), as openly reported by the national co-ordinator.

52. The denominator is three to allow for the inclusion of CSOs representing vulnerable and marginalized (this is, besides the inclusion of CSOs representing women and girls and CSOs representing youth and children). This adds flexibility to this measurement given that the number of vulnerable groups varies by country, as declared by the respective national co-ordinator. The proportion then allows for a common construction and interpretation across countries.

These variables are 0 otherwise:

$$g_{i,s} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \text{CSO representing } group \ \{s\} \ involved \ in \ NDP \\ 0 & \text{if } \text{CSO representing } group \ \{s\} \ not \ involved \end{cases}$$

This applies for population groups {s} indicated in answer options b1 and b2 for women and girls {s = W}, and youth and children {s = Y} respectively. The same would apply for answer options b3 through b5 (as openly reported by the national co-ordinator).[51] These variables are MV in the absence of an NDP as reported in question **A1_1** (*Is there a national development strategy or national development plan for the country?*).

This measurement is obtained in two steps. First, a sub-indicator for vulnerable groups (in answer options b3-b5) is obtained as follows:

$$g_{i,V} = \frac{\sum_{g=1}^{g=G_i} g_{i,s}}{G_i}$$

Where G_i is the maximum number of vulnerable groups (represented by CSOs) reported by every PC. The second step provides the degree of overall participation as follows:

$$E_i = \frac{g_{i,W} + g_{i,Y} + g_{i,V}}{3} \quad (4.1.1A)$$

Where $g_{i,w}$ and $g_{i,Y}$ is the dichotomous variable for women and girls and for youth and children respectively.[52]

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1] and describes the extent to which a PC engages a diversity of population groups (represented by CSOs) in dialogues on development priorities and results (based on NDPs/progress reports). A value of 0 indicates no population groups (represented by CSOs) were involved in the preparation of the NDP. A value of 1 implies a comprehensive involvement of representatives of different population groups.[53] The closer to the maximum value, the more extensive was the inclusion of population groups in the preparation of the NDP.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained as follows:

$$E_g = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{I}(E_i)}{I}$$

Where (I) is the total number of countries.

4.1.2 Countries include representatives of women and girls, youth and children, and vulnerable and marginalised groups in: dialogue on development priorities and results (based on national development strategies/progress reports).

Construction: This measurement uses data provided by the national co-ordinator at PC level (Dataset 1).

---

53. Missing value shows the absence of the required information to compute this indicator.

54. The questionnaire allows for up to three vulnerable and marginalised groups represented by CSOs (answer options c3-c5), as openly reported by the national co-ordinator.

55. The denominator is three to allow for the inclusion of CSOs representing vulnerable and marginalized (this is, besides the inclusion of CSOs representing women and girls and CSOs representing youth and children). This adds flexibility to this measurement given that the number of vulnerable groups varies by country, as declared by the respective national co-ordinator. The proportion then allows for a common construction and interpretation across countries.

This indicator builds on a proportion obtained through a set of dichotomous variables that individually receives the value of 1 if a population group (g_{is}), represented by CSOs, was included in dialogue on development priorities as reported in question **A1_20.1** (*Please indicate the stakeholder group*). These variables are 0 otherwise.

$$g_{i,s} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if CSO representing } group\ \{s\}\ included\ in\ dialogue \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This applies for population groups {*s*} indicated in answer options c1 and c2 for women and girls {*s = W*}, and youth and children {*s = Y*} respectively. The same would apply for answer options c3 through c5 (as openly reported by the national co-ordinator).[54] This measurement is obtained in two steps. First, a sub-indicator for vulnerable groups (in answer options c3-c5) is obtained as follows:

$$g_{i,V} = \frac{\sum_{g=1}^{g=G_i} g_{i,s}}{G_i}$$

Where G_i is the maximum number of vulnerable groups (represented by CSOs) reported by every PC. The second step provides the extent of inclusion in dialogue as follows:

$$D_i = \frac{g_{i,W} + g_{i,Y} + g_{i,V}}{3} \quad (4.1.2)$$

Where $g_{i,w}$ and $g_{i,Y}$ is the dichotomous variable for women and girls and for youth and children respectively.[55]

This indicator receives the value of 0 if the NDP was not used to inform dialogue with any group as reported in question **A1_20** (*Does the government use the national development strategy/plan [and/or its progress reports] to inform dialogue with stakeholder groups and/or representatives of vulnerable groups of the population on development priorities and results?*). The resulting value is vetoed with information from question **A1_1** (*Is there a national development strategy or national development plan for the country?*). This expression becomes MV in the absence of a national development plan.

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1] and describes the extent to which a diversity of population groups (represented by CSOs) was consulted in the preparation of the NDP. A value of 0 indicates that there was no involvement of representatives of different stakeholder/vulnerable groups in dialogue on development priorities and results; the value of 1 implies a comprehensive involvement of these groups in such dialogue.[56]

4.1.3 Countries include representatives of women and girls, youth and children, and vulnerable and marginalised groups in joint assessments towards targets for development co-operation.

Construction: This measurement uses data provided by the national co-ordinator at PC level (Dataset 1). This indicator builds on a proportion obtained through a set of dichotomous variables that individually receives the value of 1 if a population group (g_{is}), represented by CSOs, was involved in mutual assessments as reported in question **A2_14.1** (*Which other actors have been involved in these mutual assessments?*). These variables are 0 otherwise.

---

56. Missing value refers to the absence of the required information to compute this indicator.

57. The questionnaire allows for up to three vulnerable and marginalised groups represented by CSOs (answer options c3-c5), as openly reported by the national co-ordinator.

58. The denominator is three to allow for the inclusion of CSOs representing vulnerable and marginalized (this is, besides the inclusion of CSOs representing women and girls and CSOs representing youth and children). This adds flexibility to this measurement given that the number of vulnerable groups varies by country, as declared by the respective national co-ordinator. The proportion then allows for a common construction and interpretation across countries.

$$g_{i,s} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if CSO representing } group \: \{s\} \: involved \: in \: mutual \: assessments \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This applies for population groups $\{s\}$ indicated in answer options a1 and a2 for women and girls $\{s = W\}$, and youth and children $\{s = Y\}$ respectively. The same would apply for answer options a3 through a5 (as openly reported by the national co-ordinator). [57] This measurement is obtained in two steps. First, a sub-indicator for vulnerable groups (in answer options a3-a5) is obtained as follows:

$$g_{i,V} = \frac{\sum_{g=1}^{g=G_i} g_{i,s}}{G_i}$$

Where G_i is the maximum number of vulnerable groups (represented by CSOs) reported by every PC. The second step provides a degree of overall involvement in these mutual assessments as follows:

$$A_i = \frac{g_{i,W} + g_{i,Y} + g_{i,V}}{3} \quad (4.1.3)$$

Where $g_{i,w}$ and $g_{i,Y}$ is the dichotomous variable for women and girls and for youth and children respectively.[58]

This indicator receives the value of 0 if no population groups have been involved in mutual assessments of development co-operation targets as reported in question **A2_14** (*Have other actors been involved in these mutual assessments?*). The resulting value is vetoed with information from question **A2_9** (*Has the government carried out a mutual assessment of the above-mentioned development co-operation targets, with its development partners, in the past three years?*). This expression becomes MV in the absence of a mutual assessment.

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1] and describes the extent to which a PC engages a diversity of population groups (represented by CSOs) in mutual assessments towards targets for development co-operation. A value of 0 indicates that there was no involvement of representatives of different population groups in mutual assessments. The value of 1 implies a comprehensive involvement of these groups in these assessments.[59]

•..

A composite measurement for the elements 4.1.1, 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 can be obtained as follows:

$$C_i = \frac{E_i + D_i + A_i}{3} \quad (4.1.C)$$

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1], and describes the extent of consultation, engagement and dialogue with a diversity of population groups, including vulnerable and marginalised groups, in development planning and accountability mechanisms, in a given country.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained as follows:

$$C_g = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{I}(C_i)}{I}$$

Where (I) is the total number of countries.

....•

---

59. Missing value refers to the absence of the required information to compute this indicator.

Measurement at the DP level

> **4.1.4** Development partners engage representatives of women and girls, youth and children, and vulnerable and marginalised groups in the preparation of their country-level strategies.

Construction: This measurement uses data reported by each DP (j) in every PC (i) (Dataset 2). A set of variables (g_{ij}) receives a value of 1 if a population group (represented by CSOs) was involved in the preparation of the country strategy for a given DP. These variables are 0 otherwise. The subscript (ij) indicates that information is reported for each DP in every PC as reported in question **B1_4** (*Which of the following country-level stakeholders been engaged in the preparation of your country strategy or partnership framework?*). The third subscript indicates the involved group for each DP-PC link:

$$g_{ijs}^{DP} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if CSO } group\ \{s\}\ engaged\ in\ country\ strategy \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Once a dichotomous indicator is obtained for each population group, the procedure to obtain an indicator at the DP level is performed in three steps. First, obtain the proportion of vulnerable groups (represented by CSOs as in answer options c3-c5 when available) that was engaged in the preparation of a country strategy for each DP in a PC (E_i^{PC}):

$$g_{ij,V}^{DP} = \frac{\sum_{g_{ij}=1}^{g_{ij}=G_{ij}} g_{ijs}^{DP}}{G_{ij}}$$

Where G_{ij} is the maximum number of population groups (represented by CSOs) reported by every DP for each PC. Then, obtain the degree of overall participation for every DP-PC link as follows:

$$E_{ij}^{DP} = \frac{g_{ij,W}^{DP} + g_{ij,Y}^{DP} + g_{ij,V}^{DP}}{3}$$

Where $g_{ij,W}^{PC}$ and $g_{ij,Y}^{PC}$ is the dichotomous variable for women and girls and for youth and children respectively (dichotomous variables from answer options c1-c2 obtained from the first expression where the subscript $s = \{W, Y\}$).[60] Finally, the proportion of population groups (represented by CSOs) engaged in the preparation of a country strategy for each DP across each PC (E_i^{DP}), a DP-PC link, is calculated as follows:

$$E_j^{DP} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=I_j} E_{ij}^{DP}}{I_j} \quad (4.1.4)$$

Where I_i stands for the total number of countries where a DP has a country strategy. This expression yields a value for each DP. The resulting value in this expression is vetoed with information from question **B1_1** (*Currently, is there a country strategy or a partnership framework that guides your development interventions in the country?*). This indicator is MV in the absence of a country strategy. The construction and interpretation of this indicator is similar to that in expression (**4.1.1A**) except that this applies for every DP (instead of a single value for a particular PC).

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1]. A value of 0 indicates that there was no engagement of representatives of different population groups in the preparation of a DP's country strategies. A value of 1 implies a comprehensive involvement of representatives of population

---

60. The denominator is three to allow for the inclusion of CSOs representing vulnerable and marginalised (this is, besides the inclusion of CSOs representing women and girls and CSOs representing youth and children). This adds flexibility to this measurement given that the number of vulnerable groups varies by country, as declared by the respective national co-ordinator. The proportion then allows for a common construction and interpretation across countries.

61. Missing value refers to the absence of the required information to compute this indicator.

62. These are: a) The poorest, b) Women and girls, c) Youth and children, d) Elderly, e) People with disability, f) People in disadvantaged geographical areas, g) Indigenous people, h) Ethnic minorities, i) Internally displaced people, j) Stateless people, asylum-seekers and refugees, k) Sexual and gender identity (LGBTIQ+) l) Population vulnerable to climate change, m) Other (to be added by the country as relevant).

groups across the PCs where a DP has a country strategy. Overall, the closer to the maximum value, the more extensive was the engagement of these groups in the preparation of a DP's strategies.[61]

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained as follows:

$$E_g^{DP} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{j=J}(E_j^{DP})}{J}$$

Where (J) is the total number of DPs.

4.2 **Targets and results**

The measurement of this component uses data provided by PCs and DPs. While the unit of identification of information varies across these sub-indicators, the unit of analysis is PCs.

<div style="background-color:orange">

4.2.1 National development strategies include development priorities for women and girls, youth and children, and vulnerable and marginalised groups.

</div>

Priorities (P) for population groups at the PC level

Construction: The measurement of this component uses data provided by the national co-ordinator at country (i) level. The unit of analysis is PCs (Dataset 1). A variable (g_i) receives the value of 1 if NDPs include development priorities for different population groups as reported in question **A1_3.1** (*Does this strategy define specific development priorities for…?*). These variables are 0 otherwise.

$$g_{i,s} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the NDP includes development priorities for population group } \{s\} \\ 0 & \text{if the NDP does not include priorities for that population group} \end{cases}$$

This applies to population groups $\{s\}$ in answer options a- l (and eventually m if reported by the national co-ordinator).[62]

In the case of population groups indicated in answer options $s = \{a, d, …, l\}$ this set of variables allows for computing the following proportion:

$$g_{i,V} = \frac{\sum_{g=1}^{g=G_i} g_{i,s}}{G_i}$$

Where G_i is the maximum number of population groups recorded as reported by the PC. The degree of overall inclusion of development priorities for all population groups is obtained as follows:

$$P_i^{PC} = \frac{g_{i,w} + g_{i,Y} + g_{i,V}}{3} \quad (4.2.1A)$$

Where $g_{i,w}$ and $g_{i,Y}$ is the dichotomous variable for women and girls and for youth and children respectively obtained from the first expression where the subscript $s = \{W, Y\}$.[63] This ratio is set to MV if there is no NDP as reported in question **A1_1** (*Is there a national development strategy or national development plan for the country?*).

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1]. A value of 0 indicates

---

63. The denominator is two when there is no information reported by the national co-ordinator on CSOs for vulnerable groups. While the number of groups varies by country, as declared by the corresponding national co-ordinator, the proportion allows for a common construction and interpretation.

64. Since not all the countries have to follow the same approach, the denominator includes all relevant criteria as declared by the national co-ordinator. This allows for full flexibility as it is country specific. These criteria are: a) Income groups (e.g. quintile, decile), b) Sex, c) Age (younger/older population), d) Health status (i.e. people with disabilities), e) Geographic area (urban/rural), f) Territorial units (e.g. state/province or district/municipalities), g) Ethnicity and indigenous status, h) Migration status [e.g. refugees, stateless, Internally Displaced People]. Except "others" which is country specific.

that there are no development priorities included for women and girls, youth and children and vulnerable groups; the value of 1 implies a comprehensive inclusion of priorities for women and girls, for youth and children and for vulnerable groups in the country strategy.

4.2.2 National development strategies include disaggregated targets and results indicators.

Construction: The unit of identification of information and the unit of analysis for this measurement are PCs (Dataset 1). This indicator builds on a proportion obtained through a set of dichotomous variables that individually receives the value of 1 if the NDP defines target indicators (T_i) at disaggregated levels as reported in the following questions (q): **A1_5** (*Are targets disaggregated by…?*). The same principle applies for results indicators (R_i) as described in question **A1_6** (*Are results indicators disaggregated by…?*). The variables contained in these two sets of variables are 0 if there is no disaggregation at a particular level and MV if not applicable.

This indicator builds on the proportion of groups/criteria used to define targets and results indicators, respectively, in the NDP as follows:

$$T_i = R_i = \frac{\sum_1^{Z_i}(g_{i,s})}{Z_i}$$

Where Z_i is the total number of groups/criteria declared as applicable by each national co-ordinator (specific to their country).[64] The value of this indicator is set to MV if there is no NDP as reported in question **A1_1** (*Is there a national development strategy or national development plan for the country?*).

The average of these two indicators synthesises these characteristics for each PC (i):

$$DI_i = \frac{T_i + R_i}{2} \quad (4.2.2)$$

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1]. A value of 0 indicates that the NDP does not define targets and results indicators at any disaggregated level and the value of 1 implies a disaggregated definition of targets and results indicators. The closer to the maximum value, the more disaggregated are targets and results indicators contained in the NDP.[65]

● ....

A composite measurement for the elements 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 can be obtained as follows:

$$TRI_i = \frac{P_i^{PC} + D_i}{2} \quad (4.2.C)$$

Interpretation: Tis measurement is defined over a range of zero and one [0, 1] and describes the extent to which the NDP includes development priorities, targets, and results indicators for a diversity of population groups.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (g), can be obtained as follows:

$$TRI_g = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{I}(TRI_i)}{I}$$

Where (I) is the total number of countries.

---

65. Missing value refers to the absence of the required information to compute this indicator.

66. These groups are a) The poorest, d) Elderly, e) People with disabilities, f) People in disadvantaged geographical areas, g) Indigenous people, h) Ethnic minorities, i) Internally displaced people, j) Stateless people, asylum-seekers and refugees, k) Sexual and gender identity (LGBTIQ+), and l) Population vulnerable to climate change. Except "others" which is country specific. This decision avoids penalising DPs for not having this precise group composition – which is country specific.

4.2.3 Development partners' country-level strategies include development priorities for women and girls, youth and children, and vulnerable and marginalised groups.

Priorities (P) for population groups at the DP level

Construction: This indicator uses information provided by each DP (j) for every PC (i) (Dataset 2). A set of variables (g_{ij}) receive a value of 1 if a DP's country strategy includes development priorities for different population groups. These variables are 0 otherwise. The dual subscript (ij) indicates that information is reported for each DP in every PC as reported in question **B1_6** (*Does your country strategy or partnership framework include development priorities for …?*). A third subscript indicates the included group for each DP-PC link:

$$g_{ijs}^{DP} = \begin{cases} 1.0 & \text{if the } DP's \ (j) \text{ country strategy includes priorities for } group \ \{s\} \ in \ a \ PC \ (i) \\ 0 & \text{if the country strategy does not include priorities for that group} \end{cases}$$

Once a dichotomous indicator for each population group is obtained, the procedure to obtain a measurement at the PC level is performed in three steps. First, obtain the proportion of population groups in answer options $s = \{a, d, …, l\}$ having explicitly a priority in a country strategy ($g_{i,V}^{PC}$):

$$g_{ij,V}^{DP} = \frac{\sum_{g_{ij}=1}^{g_{ij}=G_{ij}} g_{ijs}^{DP}}{G_{ij}}$$

Where G_{ij} is the maximum number of population groups reported by every DP for each PC.[66] Then, the degree of overall inclusion of every country strategy, or for every DP-PC link, is obtained as follows:

$$E_{ij}^{DP} = \frac{g_{ij,W}^{DP} + g_{ij,Y}^{DP} + g_{ij,V}^{DP}}{3}$$

Where $g_{ij,W}^{PC}$ and $g_{ij,Y}^{PC}$ is the dichotomous variable for women and girls and for youth and children respectively (dichotomous variables from answer options b and c obtained from the first expression where the subscript $s = \{W, Y\}$).[67] Finally, the proportion of groups explicitly included in the priorities of a country strategy for each DP (E_i^{DP}) across countries, is obtained as follows:

$$E_j^{DP} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=I_j} E_{ij}^{DP}}{I_j} \quad (4.2.1B)$$

Where I_j stands for the total number of countries where a DP has a country strategy. This expression yields a value for each DP. The resulting value in this expression is vetoed, is set to MV, if there is no country strategy as reported in question **B1_1** (*At this moment, is there a country strategy or a partnership framework that guides your development interventions in the country?*).

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1]. A value of 0 indicates that the country strategy does not include development priorities for women and girls, youth and children and other groups (i.e., vulnerable groups); a value of 1 describes a situation where the country strategy comprehensively includes development priorities for a diversity of population groups. The closer to the maximum value, the more comprehensive the definition of development priorities is for different population groups.[68]

4.2.4 Development partners use distributional analysis to define targets and results indicators for the beneficiaries of their interventions.

---

67. While the number of groups varies by country, as declared by the responding DP, the proportion allows for a common construction and interpretation.

68. Missing value refers to the absence of the required information to compute this indicator.

Construction: This indicator uses information provided for each of the six interventions (k) reported by DPs (j) in every PC (i). The unit of analysis are projects (P), and the unit of identification are DPs (Dataset 3). This indicator builds on two dichotomous variables using two questions (q) from the questionnaire. The variable (t_{ijk}) receives the value of 1 if a DP uses any form of distributional analysis (A_q), or any other data-driven analysis, to define targets for the (up to six) interventions reported in question **B2.11a** (*Targets for the beneficiaries?*). Similarly, the variable (r_{ijk}) receives the value of 1 if a DP uses distributional analysis to define results indicators for each intervention (up to six) reported in question **B2.11b** (*Results indicators?*) respectively. These variables are 0 for a negative answer and MV if Not Applicable (NA). The triple subscript indicates that information is reported for individual projects by every DP (unit of identification) in every PC (unit of analysis).

$$t_{ijk} = r_{ijk} = \begin{cases} 1.0 & \text{if } A_{qijk} = Yes \\ 0 & \text{if } A_{qijk} = No \end{cases}$$

The average of these two indicators synthesises the variation from these three units, or for a specific ($PC - DP - P$) link, as follows:

$$\overline{DA}_{ijk} = \frac{t_{ijk} + r_{ijk}}{2}$$

The indicator at the DP level is performed in two additional steps. First, the average for every ($PC - DP$) link is calculated exploiting the variation at the project level as follows:

$$\overline{\overline{DA}}_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{k=K} \overline{DA}_{ijk}}{K}$$

Where (K) is the total number of projects each DP has in a particular country. The maximum value is $K = 6$ which is observed when these analyses are applicable to the full set of six projects reported in the questionnaire. This indicator then only accounts for interventions where such analysis is applicable (otherwise these interventions receive MV). The average for a particular DP across countries is obtained as follows:

$$DA_j = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=I_j} \overline{\overline{DA}}_{ij}}{I_j} \quad (4.2.4)$$

Where (I_j) is the total number of countries where each DP operates, which is not homogeneous.

Interpretation: This indicator, defined in a range of [0,1], describes the extent to which a DP conducts distributional analyses, or any other data-driven analysis, to target the beneficiaries of its interventions across countries. A value of 1 describes a situation where a particular DP performs any of these analyses in all projects across countries (whenever is relevant for the type of reported projects). A value of 0 describes a situation where no analysis is performed.

4.3 **Data and Statistics**

This component is based on information provided by PCs and DPs. While the unit of identification of information varies across, and within, the following sub-indicators, the units of analysis are PCs.

4.3.1 Data-based assessments inform national development plans.

Construction: The unit of identification of information and the unit of analysis for this measurement are PCs (Dataset 1). The sub-indicator (A) describes the public availability of a data-based assessment (to identify the most vulnerable and marginalised) according to question **A1_14.1** (*Is this assessment*

publicly available online?) as follows:

$$A_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if publicly available} \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The following sub-indicator describes the extent to which this information is recent (R) according to question **A1_15** (*When did this assessment last take place?*). Less recent assessments receive less points according to the simple difference between the year of the last assessmentand (y_i) the year in which a country participates to the GPEDC monitoring exercise (y_r), $\delta = (y_r - y_i)$, as follows:

$$R_i = \begin{cases} 1.0 & \text{if } \delta < 5 \\ 0.6 & \text{if } 5 \leq \delta \leq 10 \\ 0.3 & \text{if } \delta > 10 \end{cases}$$

Finally, a sub-indicator describes the extent to which this information is available at different subnational levels. The extent of subnational disaggregation is attached to a point system according to question **A1_ 16.1** (*Please specify*) as follows:

$$s_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if Blocks or group of blocks} \\ 1 & \text{if District or municipality} \\ 1 & \text{if Department or state or province} \\ 0 & \text{if No subnational disaggregation} \end{cases}$$

The degree of subnational disaggregation is reported in question **A1_16** (*Was this assessment informed by data disaggregated at subnational level [i.e., States/Provinces or more disaggregated levels District/ Municipality]?*). This point-based system allows for the joint presence of favourable attributes. The greater the extent of subnational disaggregation, the more points a country receives:

$$S_i = \frac{\sum s_i}{3}$$

For instance, if a country has disaggregated data for all three levels (e.g., *state*, *municipality*, and *blocks*), it will receive the maximum score of three. The average of these elements synthesises the availability (DD_i) of data-driven assessments at the country level:

$$DD_i = \frac{(A_i + R_i + S_i)}{3} \quad (4.3.1)$$

The resulting value is vetoed with information from question **A1_13** (*does the country have such an official data-driven assessment to identify the population that is being left behind?*) that describes the extent to which a national government uses a data-driven assessment to identify the most vulnerable and marginalised population groups. This indicator is 0 if there is no official data-driven assessment to identify the population(s) at risk of being left behind.

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1]. A value of 0 indicates there is no official data-driven assessment to identify the population(s) [at risk of being] left behind. The value of

---

69. Missing value refers to the absence of the required information to compute this indicator.

70. These criteria are: a) Income groups (e.g. quintile, decile), b) Sex, c) Age (younger/older population), d) Health status (i.e. people with disabilities), e) Geographic area (urban/rural), f) Territorial units (e.g. state/province or district/municipalities), g) Ethnicity and indigenous status, h) Migration status [e.g. refugees, stateless, Internally Displaced People]. Except "others" which is country specific. This decision avoids penalising countries for not using these criteria.

71. When a particular group is not relevant for a particular country, as reported by the national co-ordinator in answer option "Not applicable", the sub-indicator is coded as MV.

1 implies a comprehensive use of data to identify the(se) population(s) in terms of: the public availability of data-driven assessments; how recent the assessment is; and the extent to which it uses data disaggregated at various subnational levels. The closer to the maximum value, the more comprehensive, recent, and publicly available is the official data-driven assessment.[69]

4.3.2 Disaggregated data and statistics are available to monitor progress on targets and results indicators.

Construction: The unit of identification of information and the unit of analysis for this measurement are PCs (Dataset 1). This indicator builds on a qualitative variable describing the extent to which disaggregated data is available to monitor the progress of results indicators in the NDP as reported in question **A1_7** (*Are disaggregated data available to monitor progress on results indicators?*).[70] This sub-indicator builds on an array of disaggregation relevant (r_{ik}) to a country as reported by the national co-ordinator.[71] A dual subscript (ik) indicates a specific disaggregation (k) for a particular country (i).

A dichotomous variable receives the value of 1 if the disaggregation is relevant (or used) in a particular setting according to question (q_{ik}) **A1_6** (*Are results indicators disaggregated by…?*):

$$r_{ik} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } q_{ik} \neq NA \\ 0 & \text{if } q_{ik} = NA \end{cases}$$

The availability (a_{ik}) of disaggregated data, conditional on relevance, is defined as follows:

$$A_{ik} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a_{ik} = Yes, all \quad and \quad r_{ik} = 1 \\ 0.5 & \text{if } a_{ik} = Yes, some \quad and \quad r_{ik} = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } a_{ik} = No, any \quad and \quad r_{ik} = 1 \\ mv & \text{if } r_{ik} = 0 \end{cases}$$

The average availability of information, using all relevant disaggregations set in place in every country, synthesises this information further:

$$AI_i = \frac{\sum_1^{D_i}(A_{ik})}{D_i} \quad (4.3.2)$$

Where $D_i = \sum r_{ik}$ is the total number of relevant disaggregations per country.

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1]. A value of 0 indicates the absence of disaggregated information to monitor progress on results indicators. The value of 1 describes the availability of a wide array of disaggregated data (among multiple demographic and economic criteria) to monitor progress on results indicators. Intermediate values describe partial availability of disaggregated data to monitor progress on results indicators.

●⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯

A composite measurement for the elements 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 can be obtained as follows:

$$DS_i = \frac{AI_i + DD_i}{2} \quad (4.3.C)$$

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1], and describes the extent of availability and use of data and statistics in support of the identification of the most vulnerable and marginalised group of the population as well as to monitor progress on results indicators for a variety

of population groups.

Aggregation: An aggregated measure, at the global level (*g*), can be obtained as follows:

$$DS_g = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{I}(DS_i)}{I}$$

Where (*I*) is the total number of countries.

<div style="background-color:orange">4.3.3 Data-based assessments inform development partners' country-level strategies.</div>

Measurement at the DP level

Construction: The unit of identification of information and the unit of analysis for this measurement are DPs (Dataset 2). A dichotomous indicator (d_{ij}) describes the extent to which a country strategy builds on a data-driven assessment to identify the vulnerable population groups as reported in question **B1_7**

(*Have these groups been identified based on a data-driven assessment?*) as follows:

$$d_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if assessment based on data} \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Where a data-driven assessment is characterised by any of the following answer options {a, b, c}.[72] The indicator at the DP level is then obtained as follows:

$$D_j = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{i=I_j} d_{ij}}{I_j} \qquad (4.3.3)$$

Where I_j is the total number of countries where a DP has a country strategy. A similar approach can be used to get an indicator at the DP level where the denominator is the number of DPs per country *(i).*

Interpretation: This measurement is defined over a range of zero to one [0, 1]. A value of 0 indicates that no country strategy of a particular DP is based on a data-driven assessment to identify the population(s) [at risk of being] left behind. The value of 1 implies the use of statistical information in the identification of these populations in all countries where a DP has a country strategy. The closer to the maximum value, the greater the extent to which the DP uses data-driven assessments to identify populations [at risk of being] left behind.[73]

---

72. These answers are: a) Yes, identification based on existing data from the national statistical system of the partner country, b) Yes, identification based on data from international surveys, c) Yes, identification based on data collected by your organization, d) No, identification not based on data-driven assessment.

73. Missing value refers to the absence of the required information to compute this indicator.