

# PPD Codebook, Version 2.0

Updated January 21, 2022

## Introduction

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

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

This Codebook provides a detailed description of every variable in the PPDv2.0. The Codebook first contains a brief description of sources for new data included in v 2.0 (Data Sources), then describes the construction and details of variables that draw from multiple donors in the dataset (Combined Variables). It then describes variables drawn from AidData’s dataset (AidData Variables) and variables that are donor-specific (Donor-Specific Variables), listing each donor in alphabetical order. The Codebook closes by describing a number of variables that could be constructed from the donor-specific variables, were it of interest to users (Suggested Variables). Note that some of the suggested variables are things that would likely be prudent to do for many users making use of multiple donors’ data – e.g. converting project size from the original transmitted value to comparable USD equivalents.

The PPD 2.0 builds on the (originally 2018, updated 2019) PPD Version 1.0, which includes project evaluations from eight International Development Organizations (IDOs) between 1973 and 2013. Data is provided in both .dta and .csv formats; please note that the .csv is an export of the .dta, so where the CSV has limitations (e.g. recognition/processing of non-English characters in project names) it may be useful to refer back to the .dta file. The PPD 1.0, prepared by Dan Honig in relation to his 2018 book *Navigation by*

*Judgment*, can still be found on the Harvard Dataverse at <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/444GNW>. However, all data in the PPD 1.0 are included in – and expanded upon – in this PPD 2.0.

This Codebook and the PPD 2.0 owes a debt of gratitude to Saad Imtiaz, without whose exceptional labors it would not have come together. In drawing on PPD 1.0, it builds on the work of Rachit Khaitan and the efforts and suggestions of Ryan Briggs, Matthew Geddes, Erica Gould, Alena Stern, and Thomas Wencker. For version notes/changes as the PPD 1.0 evolved, please see the final PPD 1.0 Codebook at the Harvard Dataverse link above. For any questions about this data, or if you notice any errors that should be corrected, contact Dan Honig at [dan.honig@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:dan.honig@ucl.ac.uk).

## Data Sources

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

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

## Combined Variables

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

Variable Name	Label	Description	Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology	
<b>project_id</b>	Project ID	Unique identification number for each project	Generated after creating the dataset, cannot be used to retroactively merge donor data	
<b>donor</b>	Donor name	Name of the donor	AfricanDB	African Development Bank
			AsianDB	Asian Development Bank
			CDB	Caribbean Development Bank
			DFAT	Australia’s Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
			DFID	UK’s Department for International Development
			GEF	Global Environment Fund
			GFATM	Global Fund for AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria
			GiZ	German Society for International Cooperation
			IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
			JICA	Japanese International Cooperation Agency
			KfW	German Development Bank
			WB	World Bank
<b>six_overall_rating</b>	6-point outcome	<p>A project’s overall success rating on a 6-point scale</p> <p>The individual ratings are as follows:          6: highly unsatisfactory          5:          4:          3:          2:          1: highly satisfactory</p>	<p>Original donor ratings were rescaled to standardized 6-point scale in different ways, depending on the donor data. Donor fixed effects are almost always appropriate when using these data (as the meaning of a “4” for one donor may be different than another); when using fixed effects there is no econometric concern brought about from ‘inflating’ some donors’ scales. See Honig’s <i>Navigation by Judgment</i>, Chapter 4, for a fuller discussion of these issues.</p>	
			AfricanDB	original (1-4) rating multiplied by 1.5
			AsianDB	original (1-4) rating multiplied by 1.5
			CDB	original (1-5) rating multiplied by 1.2
			DFAT	original rating has natural scale of 6

Variable Name	Label	Description	Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology																												
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>DFID</td> <td>original (1-5) rating multiplied by 1.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GEF</td> <td>original rating has natural scale of 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GFATM</td> <td>original (1-4) rating multiplied by 1.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GiZ</td> <td>original rating has natural scale of 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IFAD</td> <td>original rating has natural scale of 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>JICA</td> <td>original (1-4) rating multiplied by 1.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KfW</td> <td>original rating has natural scale of 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WB</td> <td>original rating has natural scale of 6</td> </tr> </table>	DFID	original (1-5) rating multiplied by 1.2	GEF	original rating has natural scale of 6	GFATM	original (1-4) rating multiplied by 1.5	GiZ	original rating has natural scale of 6	IFAD	original rating has natural scale of 6	JICA	original (1-4) rating multiplied by 1.5	KfW	original rating has natural scale of 6	WB	original rating has natural scale of 6												
DFID	original (1-5) rating multiplied by 1.2																														
GEF	original rating has natural scale of 6																														
GFATM	original (1-4) rating multiplied by 1.5																														
GiZ	original rating has natural scale of 6																														
IFAD	original rating has natural scale of 6																														
JICA	original (1-4) rating multiplied by 1.5																														
KfW	original rating has natural scale of 6																														
WB	original rating has natural scale of 6																														
<b>country_code_COW</b>	Country code	Country code according to the Correlates of War database	<p>The following new COW codes have been added to the original list:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <th>COW code</th> <th>Country</th> </tr> <tr> <td>SSD</td> <td>South Sudan</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SRB</td> <td>Serbia</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MNS</td> <td>Montserrat</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PIT</td> <td>Pitcairn Islands</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WBG</td> <td>West Bank and Gaza</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TRS</td> <td>Tristan da Cunha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TUC</td> <td>Turks and Caicos Islands</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WIN</td> <td>Windward Islands</td> </tr> <tr> <td>STH</td> <td>St Helena</td> </tr> </table> <p>The following country codes (used by various donors, or other data providers – e.g. the state fragility index - internally) were converted to the following COW codes:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <th>COW code</th> <th>Non-standard (non-ISO, non-COW) Country Code</th> </tr> <tr> <td>BNG</td> <td>BAN</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CHN</td> <td>PRC</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GRG</td> <td>GEO</td> </tr> </table>	COW code	Country	SSD	South Sudan	SRB	Serbia	MNS	Montserrat	PIT	Pitcairn Islands	WBG	West Bank and Gaza	TRS	Tristan da Cunha	TUC	Turks and Caicos Islands	WIN	Windward Islands	STH	St Helena	COW code	Non-standard (non-ISO, non-COW) Country Code	BNG	BAN	CHN	PRC	GRG	GEO
COW code	Country																														
SSD	South Sudan																														
SRB	Serbia																														
MNS	Montserrat																														
PIT	Pitcairn Islands																														
WBG	West Bank and Gaza																														
TRS	Tristan da Cunha																														
TUC	Turks and Caicos Islands																														
WIN	Windward Islands																														
STH	St Helena																														
COW code	Non-standard (non-ISO, non-COW) Country Code																														
BNG	BAN																														
CHN	PRC																														
GRG	GEO																														

Variable Name	Label	Description	Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology	
			INS	INO
			KYR	KGZ, Kyrgyzstan
			MSI	RMI
			PAK	Pakistan
			[dropped]	REG
			DRV	VIE
			WSM	SAM
			THI	THA
			ETM	TIM
			KZK	KAZ
			ROK	KOR
			DRC	ZAI
			CDI	IVO
			ETH	ETI
			FIJ	FJI
			ROM	RUM
			DRV	VIE
			SRB	SER
			MNG	MNT
<b>country_code_WB</b>	Country Code	Country code as per World Bank		
<b>evaluation_date</b>	Evaluation date	Date project evaluation took place	Combined across all 8 donors Data are not available for DFAT, IFAD, GEF	
		Example of format: "01jan2012"		
<b>project_duration</b>	Project duration	Difference between date of project completion and date of project start	Calculated in different ways depending on the underlying donor data:	
			AsianDB	completion_date-asdb_approvaldate
			AfricanDB	completion_date-start_date

Variable Name	Label	Description	Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology	
			CDB	N/A
			DFAT	completion_date-start_date
			DFID	completion_date-start_date
			GEF	completion_date-start_date
			GFATM	completion_date-start_date
			GiZ	completion_date-start_date
			IFAD	completion_date-ifad_effectivedate
			JICA	completion_date-start_date
			KfW	completion_date-start_date
			WB	completion_date-wb_approvaldate
<b>eval_lag</b>	Lag to project evaluation	Difference between date of project evaluation and date of project completion	Calculated as the difference between <i>evaluation_date</i> and <i>completion_date</i> for 9 donors For IFAD, DFAT, GEF, the evaluation date is not available and the indicator is calculated as the difference between <i>evaluation_year</i> and <i>completion_year</i> Data are not available donor CDB	
<b>start_date</b>	Project start date	Date project started  Example of format: "01jan2012"	Combined across all 12 donors	
<b>completion_date</b>	Project completion date	Date of project completion  Example of format: "01jan2012"	Combined across 11 donors Data is not available for CDB	
<b>aid_type</b>	Type of aid	3 categories as follows: L: Loan G: Grant T: TA	Combined across 4 donors Data are not available for donors AfricanDB, CDB, DFAT, IFAD, GiZ, GEF, KfW, WB	
<b>projectname</b>	Project name	Name of project as provided by the respective donors	Combined across 11 donors Data are not available for GFATM	

Variable Name	Label	Description	Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology	
<b>original_overall_rating</b>	Original overall rating	A project’s overall success rating on the original scale provided by the respective donors	Provided in different ways depending on the respective donor’s original scale:	
			AfricanDB	The African Development Bank project data did not include overall ratings. The overall rating is the mean rating of all project subcomponents.
			AsianDB	1: “Unsuccessful” 2: “Less than successful” 3: “Successful/Generally Successful” 4: “Highly Successful”
			CDB	1: "Unsatisfactory" 2: “Marginally Unsatisfactory” 3: “Satisfactory” 4: “Highly Satisfactory” 5: “Excellent”
			DFAT	1: “Very poor; does not satisfy criteria in any major area” 2 “Poor; does not satisfy criteria in several major areas” 3: “Less than adequate; on balance does not satisfy criteria and/or fails in at least one major area” 4: “Adequate; on balance satisfies criteria; does not fail in any major area” 5: “Good; satisfies criteria in almost all areas” 6: “Very good; satisfies criteria in all areas”
			DFID	1: “Unlikely to be achieved” 2: “Likely to be achieved to a limited extent”

Variable Name	Label	Description	Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology
			<p>3: “Likely to be partially achieved”                      4: “Likely to be largely achieved”                      5: “Likely to be achieved completely”</p>
			<p>GEF</p> <p>1: “highly unsatisfactory”                      2: “unsatisfactory”                      3: “moderately unsatisfactory”                      4: “moderately satisfactory”                      5: “satisfactory”                      6: “highly satisfactory”</p>
			<p>GFATM</p> <p>1: “C”                      2: “B2”                      3: “B1”                      4: “A/A1/A2”</p>
			<p>GiZ</p> <p>6:best, 1:worst. This scale is inverted from GiZ’s internal measure, in which 1 is the best and 6 is worst. The original (pre-inversion) description of the success ratings is:</p> <p>“A development measure rated 1 to 3 is classed as ‘successful’. The scale is as follows:</p> <p>1: “the project/programme is useless, or the situation has deteriorated on balance”                      2: “clearly inadequate rating: despite several positive partial results, the negative results clearly dominate”                      3: “unsatisfactory rating, significantly below expectations, and negative results dominate despite identifiable positive results”</p>

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

Variable Name	Label	Description	Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology
			4: “marginally/moderately satisfactory” 5: “satisfactory” 6: “highly satisfactory”
<b>external_evaluator</b>	External evaluator	Whether the project evaluation was carried out by an external party  3 categories as follows: internal external independent eval office	Evaluation type was assigned by research team based on type of evaluation document (e.g. WB PPAR vs. PCR, AsDB PPER vs. PCR), review of actual evaluation documents, and communications with various donors. Further coding information available on request.  Data are not available for CDB, GFATM, KfW
<b>office_presence</b>	Office presence	Whether a donor office was present during the project  2 categories as follows: 1: Office present 0: Office not present	These codes were assigned based on office data provided by donors or publicly available. As noted in Honig’s <i>Navigation by Judgment</i> Appendix II page 205, these data include some somewhat heroic assumptions – e.g. that offices, once opened, never closed. Use with caution.
<b>sector_codes</b>	3 digit sector code	3-digit sector classification code according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC	Revised sectors codes according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC. These build on the original sector codes of the PPD 1.0, and defers to those hand-coded and checked by ODI’s Matthew M. Geddes (“MMG codes”) in the PPD 1.0. Where a CRS code was absent, Saad Imtiaz assigned the closest CRS 3 digit broad category equivalent. These variables have fewer missing values than the more detailed 5-digit codes (crs_purpose_sector).
<b>sector_description</b>	3 digit sector description	3-digit purpose classification name according to the Creditor	Corresponding sector names according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Donor-by-Donor Details/Calculation Methodology</b>
		Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC	
<b>purpose_codes</b>	5 digit sector code	5-digit purpose classification code according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC	These are purpose codes according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC. If codes are not present in the agencies' source data or the PPD 1.0, we do not create new codes in the PPD 2.0, but rather leave these fields missing; in drawing from the PPD 1.0 we defer to Matthew Geddes' hand-checked "MMG codes" in cases of conflict regarding the appropriate CRS code. Note that users wishing to remove sector codes generated by the PPD 2.0's creators can thus do so by removing any sector code present where a purpose code is absent.
<b>purpose_description</b>	5 digit sector description	5-digit purpose classification name according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC	Corresponding purpose names according to the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD-DAC

### AidData Variables

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

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Calculation Methodology</b>
<b>aiddata_id</b>	AidData ID	ID Number in AidData's project database	Provided
<b>aiddata_shortdescription</b>	AidData short description	A short description of the project	Provided
<b>aiddata_longdescription</b>	AidData long description	A longer description of the project	Provided
<b>aiddata_sectorname</b>	AidData sector name	Project sector name with 44 categories	Provided
<b>aiddata_sectorcode</b>	AidData sector code	Project sector code with 43 categories	Provided
<b>aiddata_purposename</b>	AidData purpose name	Project purpose name with 152 categories	Provided
<b>aiddata_purposecode</b>	AidData purpose code	Project purpose code with 152 categories	Provided
<b>aiddata_title</b>	AidData title	Project title with 291 unique titles	Provided
<b>aiddata_disbursement_amount</b>	AidData disbursement amount	Project disbursement amount	Provided

## Donor-Specific Variables

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

### African Development Bank (AfDB)

Variable Name	Label	Source
<b>afdb_score_C1</b>	AfDB Implementation Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C101</b>	AfDB Adherence to implementation schedule Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C102</b>	AfDB Time Variation Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C103</b>	AfDB Adherence to cost schedule Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C104</b>	AfDB Cost Variation Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C105</b>	AfDB Compliance with covenants and conditions Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C106</b>	AfDB Adequacy of monitoring evaluation and reporting Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C107</b>	AfDB Satisfactory operations Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C2</b>	AfDB Bank Performance Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C201</b>	AfDB Identification Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C202</b>	AfDB Preparation Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C203</b>	AfDB Appraisal Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C204</b>	AfDB Supervision Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C3</b>	AfDB Relevance and achievement of objectives Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C301</b>	AfDB Macro Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C302</b>	AfDB Sector policy Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C303</b>	AfDB Relevance Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C304</b>	AfDB Physical (including production) Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C305</b>	AfDB Financial aspect Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C306</b>	AfDB Efficacy Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C307</b>	AfDB Poverty reduction, social impact and gender Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C308</b>	AfDB Environment Score	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>afdb_score_C309</b>	AfDB Private sector development Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C310</b>	AfDB Other (Specify) Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C4</b>	AfDB Institutional Development (ID) Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C401</b>	AfDB Institutional framework including restructuring Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C402</b>	AfDB Financial and integrated systems of management including audit systems Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C403</b>	AfDB Transfer of Technology Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C404</b>	AfDB Staffing by qualified/skilled personnel (including turnover), training	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C5</b>	AfDB Sustainability Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C501</b>	AfDB Continued commitment of borrower Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C502</b>	AfDB Environmental policy Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C503</b>	AfDB Institutional framework Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C504</b>	AfDB Technical viability and staffing Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C505</b>	AfDB Financial viability ( including cost Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C506</b>	AfDB Economic viability Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C507</b>	AfDB Environmental viability Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C508</b>	AfDB O & M facilitation (foreign exchange and recurrent cost financing available)	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C6</b>	AfDB Economic Internal rate of return Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C601</b>	AfDB Efficiency Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C602</b>	AfDB Outcome Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_C7</b>	AfDB Project Outcome Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D1</b>	AfDB relevance of project objectives & design Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D101</b>	AfDB Relevance of project Objectives Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D102</b>	AfDB Relevance of project Design Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D2</b>	AfDB achievement of project outputs Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D201</b>	AfDB Output 1 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D202</b>	AfDB Output 2 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D203</b>	AfDB Output 3 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D204</b>	AfDB Output 4 Score	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>afdb_score_D205</b>	AfDB Output 5 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D206</b>	AfDB Output 6 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D207</b>	AfDB Output 7 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D208</b>	AfDB Output 8 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D209</b>	AfDB Output 9 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D210</b>	AfDB Output 10 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D211</b>	AfDB Output 11 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D212</b>	AfDB Output 12 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D213</b>	AfDB Output 13 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D214</b>	AfDB Output 14 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D215</b>	AfDB Output 15 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D216</b>	AfDB Output 16 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D217</b>	AfDB Output 17 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D218</b>	AfDB Output 18 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D219</b>	AfDB Output 19 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D220</b>	AfDB Output 20 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D221</b>	AfDB Output 21 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D222</b>	AfDB Output 22 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D223</b>	AfDB Output 23 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D224</b>	AfDB Output 24 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D225</b>	AfDB Output 25 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D3</b>	AfDB achievement of project outcomes Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D301</b>	AfDB Outcome 1 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D302</b>	AfDB Outcome 2 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D303</b>	AfDB Outcome 3 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D304</b>	AfDB Outcome 4 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D305</b>	AfDB Outcome 5 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D306</b>	AfDB Outcome 6 Score	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>afdb_score_D307</b>	AfDB Outcome 7 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D308</b>	AfDB Outcome 8 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D309</b>	AfDB Outcome 9 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D310</b>	AfDB Outcome 10 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D311</b>	AfDB Outcome 11 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D312</b>	AfDB Outcome 12 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D313</b>	AfDB Outcome 13 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D314</b>	AfDB Outcome 14 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D315</b>	AfDB Outcome 15 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D316</b>	AfDB Outcome 16 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D317</b>	AfDB Outcome 17 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D318</b>	AfDB Outcome 18 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D319</b>	AfDB Outcome 19 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D320</b>	AfDB Outcome 20 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D321</b>	AfDB Outcome 21 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D322</b>	AfDB Outcome 22 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D323</b>	AfDB Outcome 23 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D324</b>	AfDB Outcome 24 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D325</b>	AfDB Outcome 25 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D4</b>	AfDB additional outcomes (not captured in the logframe) Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D401</b>	AfDB Institutional Development Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D402</b>	AfDB Gender Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D403</b>	AfDB Environment & Climate Change Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D404</b>	AfDB Poverty Reduction Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D405</b>	AfDB Private Sector Development Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D406</b>	AfDB Regional Integration Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D407</b>	AfDB Other (Specify) Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D5</b>	AfDB efficiency in achieving outputs & outcomes Score	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>afdb_score_D501</b>	AfDB Timeliness (in adhering to the original closing date) Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D502</b>	AfDB Rates of returns (Specify if applicable) Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D503</b>	AfDB Other Criteria (Specify) Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D6</b>	AfDB risk to sustained achievement of project outcome Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D7</b>	AfDB bank performance Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D701</b>	AfDB Design and Readiness Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D702</b>	AfDB Supervision Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D8</b>	AfDB borrower performance Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D801</b>	AfDB Design and Readiness Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D802</b>	AfDB Implementation Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D9</b>	AfDB M & E design, implementation & utilization Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D901</b>	AfDB M & E Design Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D902</b>	AfDB M & E Implementation Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_D903</b>	AfDB M & E Use Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_E1</b>	AfDB Quality Of PCR Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_E101</b>	AfDB Adequacy of analysis of Project goals, objective and Formulation	Provided
<b>afdb_score_E102</b>	AfDB Adequacy of analysis of Project execution	Provided
<b>afdb_score_E103</b>	AfDB Soundness of judgments on Project Performance and Results	Provided
<b>afdb_score_E104</b>	AfDB Adequacy of analysis of social and environmental impacts Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_E105</b>	AfDB Soundness of judgments on project sustainability, plan for future project	Provided
<b>afdb_score_E106</b>	AfDB Soundness of judgments on Performance of the Bank, Borrower and Co Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_E107</b>	AfDB Consistency of Overall rating with individual rating components Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_E108</b>	AfDB Adequacy of analysis and clarity of conclusions, lessons learned	Provided
<b>afdb_score_E109</b>	AfDB Other (Specify) Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_F1</b>	AfDB Quality Of PCR Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_F101</b>	AfDB Extent of quality and completeness of the PCR evidence and analysis	Provided
<b>afdb_score_F102</b>	AfDB Extent of objectivity PCR assessment scores Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_F103</b>	AfDB Extent of internal consistency of PCR assessment ratings; inaccuracies	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>afdb_score_F104</b>	AfDB Extent of identification and assessment of key factors	Provided
<b>afdb_score_F105</b>	AfDB Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment	Provided
<b>afdb_score_F106</b>	AfDB Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis processes	Provided
<b>afdb_score_F107</b>	AfDB Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence	Provided
<b>afdb_score_F108</b>	AfDB Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear	Provided
<b>afdb_score_F109</b>	AfDB Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_F110</b>	AfDB Other (to be specified) Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_F2</b>	AfDB PCR Compliance with Guidelines (PCR/OM; OPEV) Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_F201</b>	AfDB PCR Timeliness Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_F202</b>	AfDB Extent of participation of Borrower, Co Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_F203</b>	AfDB Other aspect (Specify) Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O1</b>	AfDB Relevance Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O101</b>	AfDB Relevance of project development objective Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O102</b>	AfDB Relevance of project design Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O2</b>	AfDB Effectiveness Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O201</b>	AfDB Outcome reporting Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O202</b>	AfDB Output reporting Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O203</b>	AfDB Development Objective (DO) rating Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O3</b>	AfDB Efficiency Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O301</b>	AfDB Timeliness Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O302</b>	AfDB Resource use efficiency Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O303</b>	AfDB Cost benefit analysis Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O304</b>	AfDB Implementation Progress (IP) Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O4</b>	AfDB Sustainability Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O401</b>	AfDB Financial sustainability Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O402</b>	AfDB Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O403</b>	AfDB Ownership and sustainability of partnerships Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O404</b>	AfDB Environmental and social sustainability Score	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>afdb_score_O405</b>	AfDB Bank performance Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O406</b>	AfDB Borrower performance Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O407</b>	AfDB Performance of other stakeholders Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_O5</b>	AfDB Overall Project Rating Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_P1</b>	AfDB Quality Of PCR Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_P101</b>	AfDB Extent of quality and completeness of the PCR evidence and analysis to sub	Provided
<b>afdb_score_P102</b>	AfDB Extent of objectivity PCR assessment scores Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_P103</b>	AfDB Extent of internal consistency of PCR assessment ratings; inaccuracies	Provided
<b>afdb_score_P104</b>	AfDB Extent of identification and assessment of key factors (internal and exogenous)	Provided
<b>afdb_score_P105</b>	AfDB Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment	Provided
<b>afdb_score_P106</b>	AfDB Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis processes	Provided
<b>afdb_score_P107</b>	AfDB Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure	Provided
<b>afdb_score_P108</b>	AfDB Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear	Provided
<b>afdb_score_P109</b>	AfDB Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_P110</b>	AfDB Other (to be specified) Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_P2</b>	P2 Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_P201</b>	AfDB PCR Timeliness Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_P202</b>	AfDB Extent of participation of Borrower, Co Score	Provided
<b>afdb_score_P203</b>	AfDB Other aspect (Specify) Score	Provided
<b>afdb_ProjectSapCode</b>	ProjectSapCode	Provided
<b>afdb_DocNo</b>	DocNo	Provided
<b>afdb_FormatType</b>	FormatType	Provided
<b>afdb_ProjectSapCodes</b>	ProjectSapCodes	Provided
<b>afdb_SectorNames</b>	SectorNames	Provided
<b>afdb_SubSectorNames</b>	SubSectorNames	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_evalyear</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Year of Review	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_CountryNames</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Recipient Country Name	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_sector</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Sector	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>afdb_impl_staff_projectname</b>	Project Name	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_department</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Department	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_relevance</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Part A: Relevance	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_a1</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Relevance of the project's development objective	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_a2</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Relevance of the project design (II.A.2)	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_effectiveness</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - COMPONENT B: EFFECTIVENESS	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_b4</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Development Objective (DO) (II.B.4)	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_efficiency</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - COMPONENT C: EFFICIENCY	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_c1</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Respect of the calendar (II.C.1)	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_c2</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Efficiency of resource use (II.C.2)	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_c3</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Cost Benefit Analysis (II.C.3)	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_c4</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Status of Implementation (PI) (II.C.4)	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_durability</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - SECTION D: SUSTAINABILITY	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_d1</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Financial viability (II.D.1)	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_d2</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Institutional sustainability and capacity building	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_d3</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Ownership and sustainability of partnerships (II.D.3)	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_d4</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Environmental and social sustainability (II.D.4)	Provided
<b>afdb_impl_staff_overall_rating</b>	AfDB Implementing Staff - Overall Rating	Provided
<b>afdb_evaluator</b>	afdb_evaluator_label	Provided
<b>afdb_projectamount_usd</b>	Commitment signed in UA	Provided
<b>afdb_relevance</b>	AfDB Relevance score (combined)	Provided
<b>afdb_efficiency</b>	AfDB Efficiency score (combined)	Provided
<b>afdb_sustainability</b>	AfDB Sustainability score (combined)	Provided

**Asian Development Bank (AsianDB)**

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>asdb_loannumber</b>	AsianDB loan number	Donor generated index number for each loan	Provided; slightly modified to remove blank spaces before some entries
<b>asdb_departmentname</b>	AsianDB department	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>approvaldate</b>	AsianDB approval date	Date of project approval Example of format: "01jan2012"	Combined original variables <i>approvaldate</i> and <i>approvalyear</i>
<b>asdb_countryclassification</b>	AsianDB country classification	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>asdb_projecttype</b>	AsianDB project type	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>asdb_funds_source_name</b>	AsianDB source of funds	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>asdb_pcerrating</b>	AsianDB PCR rating	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>asdb_pvryear</b>	AsianDB PVR rating year	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>asdb_pvrrating</b>	AsianDB PVR rating	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>asdb_pperyear</b>	AsianDB PPER rating year	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>asdb_pperrating</b>	AsianDB PPER rating	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>asdb_approvalyear</b>	AsianDB approval year	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>asdb_project_id</b>	Asian DB donor project ID	Index number for each project	Generated based on provided variable
<b>asdb_approvedamount</b>	AsianDB approved amount	In USD; Scaled by 1 million	Provided

**Caribbean Development Bank (CDB)**

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>cdb_StrategicRelevance</b>	CDB - OIE StrategicRelevance	Provided
<b>cdb_PovertyRelevance</b>	CDB - OIE PovertyRelevance	Provided
<b>cdb_Effectiveness</b>	CDB - OIE Effectiveness	Provided
<b>cdb_Efficiency</b>	CDB - OIE Efficiency	Provided
<b>cdb_ThematicAreas</b>	CDB - OIE ThematicAreas	Provided
<b>cdb_Sustainability</b>	CDB - OIE Sustainability	Provided
<b>cdb_AggregateScore</b>	CDB - OIE AggregateScore	Provided
<b>cdb_BorrowerPerformance</b>	CDB - OIE BorrowerPerformance	Provided
<b>cdb_CDBPerformance</b>	CDB - OIE CDBPerformance	Provided
<b>cdb_QualityofPCR</b>	CDB - OIE QualityofPCR	Provided
<b>cdb_terminal_disb_date</b>	CDB - Terminal disbursement Date	Provided
<b>cdb_amount_usdm</b>	CDB - Project Value in Million USD	Provided
<b>cdb_approval_date</b>	CDB - approval date	Provided
<b>cdb_StrategicRelevance_rating</b>	CDB - OIE StrategicRelevance Score	Provided
<b>cdb_PovertyRelevance_rating</b>	CDB - OIE PovertyRelevance Score	Provided
<b>cdb_Effectiveness_rating</b>	CDB - OIE Effectiveness Score	Provided
<b>cdb_Efficiency_rating</b>	CDB - OIE Efficiency Score	Provided
<b>cdb_ThematicAreas_rating</b>	CDB - OIE ThematicAreas Score	Provided
<b>cdb_Sustainability_rating</b>	CDB - OIE Sustainability Score	Provided
<b>cdb_AggregateScore_rating</b>	CDB - OIE AggregateScore Score	Provided
<b>cdb_BorrowerPerformance_rating</b>	CDB - OIE BorrowerPerformance Score	Provided
<b>cdb_CDBPerformance_rating</b>	CDB - OIE CDBPerformance Score	Provided
<b>cdb_QualityofPCR_rating</b>	CDB - OIE QualityofPCR Score	Provided

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

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>dfat_QualityReportType</b>	DFAT - Quality Report Type	Provided
<b>dfat_InvestmentNumber</b>	DFAT - Investment Number	Provided
<b>dfat_ApprovalTotalAUD</b>	DFAT - Approval Total	Provided
<b>dfat_EfficiencyRating</b>	DFAT - Efficiency Rating	Provided
<b>dfat_RelevanceRating</b>	DFAT - Relevance Rating	Provided
<b>dfat_GenderEqualityRating</b>	DFAT - Gender Equality Rating	Provided
<b>dfat_MERating</b>	DFAT - M & E Rating	Provided
<b>dfat_SustainabilityRating</b>	DFAT - Sustainability Rating	Provided
<b>dfat_ConnectednessRating</b>	DFAT - Connectedness Rating	Provided
<b>dfat_ProtectionRating</b>	DFAT - Protection Rating	Provided
<b>dfat_Ratedeffectiveness</b>	DFAT - Effectiveness Rating	Provided
<b>dfat_Ratedefficiency</b>	DFAT - Efficiency Rating	Provided
<b>dfat_Ratedrelevance</b>	DFAT - Relevance Rating	Provided
<b>dfat_Ratedgender</b>	DFAT - Gender Rating	Provided
<b>dfat_RatedME</b>	DFAT - M&E Rating	Provided
<b>dfat_Ratedsustainability</b>	DFAT - Sustainability Rating	Provided
<b>dfat_InvestmentPriorityArea</b>	DFAT - Investment Priority Area Rating	Provided

**Department for International Development (DFID)**

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>dfid_project_id</b>	DFID donor project ID	Index number for each project	Generated based on provided variable
<b>dfid_divisionname</b>	DFID division name	14 regional and functional divisions within which project is housed	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>dfid_deptofficename</b>	DFID department office name	68 department offices within project is housed	Provided
<b>dfid_principalsector</b>	DFID principal sector	95 principal sector categories	Provided
<b>dfid_sectorgroup</b>	DFID sector group	32 sector group categories	Provided
<b>dfid_reviewstyle</b>	DFID review style	2 categories as follows: Legacy format Pre-2012 format	Provided
<b>dfid_reviewtype</b>	DFID review type	1 category as follows: PCR	Provided
<b>dfid_overallriskscore</b>	DFID overall risk score	4 categories as follows: [blank] 0 High Low Medium	Provided
<b>dfid_totalimpactscore</b>	DFID total impact score	Score between and including 0 and 400	Provided
<b>dfid_projectpurposescore</b>	DFID project purpose score	Score between and including 1 and 5	Provided
<b>dfid_projectpurpose</b>	DFID project purpose	4 categories as follows: Likely to be achieved to a limited extent Likely to be completely achieved Likely to be largely achieved Likely to be partially achieved Unlikely to be achieved	Provided
<b>dfid_outputriskscore</b>	DFID output risk score	3 categories as follows: High Low Medium	Provided
<b>dfid_projectbudgetcurrent</b>	DFID project budget current	In local currency (GBP)	Provided

**Global Environment Fund (GEF)**

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Source</b>
gef_id	GEF ID	Provided
gef_ImplementingAgency	Implementing Agency	Provided
gef_LeadImplementingAgency	Lead Implementing Agency	Provided
gef_Listofparticipatingcountries	List of participating countries	Provided
gef_Region	Region	Provided
gef_ProjectSize	Project Size	Provided
gef_TrustFund	Trust Fund	Provided
gef_FocalArea	Focal Area	Provided
gef_phase	GEF Phase	Provided
gef_ProjectStart	Project Start	Provided
gef_grant_mil_usd	GEF Project Grant (million USD)	Provided
gef_prep_grant_mil_usd	GEF Project Preparation Grant (million USD)	Provided
gef_cofin_mil_usd_promised	Cofinancing Promised (million USD)	Provided
gef_cofin_mil_usd_actual	Cofinancing Actual (million USD)	Provided
gef_SourceofRating	Source of Rating	Provided
gef_OutcomesBinary	GEF Outcomes [Binary] Score	Provided
gef_Outcomes6point	GEF Outcomes [6 point] Score	Provided
gef_SustainabilityBinary	GEF Sustainability [Binary] Score	Provided
gef_Sustainability4point	GEF Sustainability [4 point] Score	Provided
gef_MEDesignBinary	GEF M&E Design [Binary] Score	Provided
gef_MEDesign6point	GEF M&E Design [6 point] Score	Provided
gef_MEImplementationBinary	GEF M&E Implementation [Binary] Score	Provided
gef_MEImplementation6point	GEF M&E Implementation [6 point] Score	Provided
gef_ImplementationQualityBinary	GEF Implementation Quality [Binary] Score	Provided
gef_ImplementationQuality6point	GEF Implementation Quality [6 point] Score	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Source
gef_ExecutionQualityBinary	GEF Execution Quality [Binary] Score	Provided
gef_ExecutionQuality6point	GEF Execution Quality [6 point] Score	Provided
gef_terminal_eval_overall	GEF Terminal Evaluation overall Quality [Binary] Score	Provided

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

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
<b>gfatm_project_component</b>	GFATM project component	4 categories as follows: HIV/AIDS Malaria Other Tuberculosis	Provided
<b>gfatm_grantcurrentstatus</b>	GFATM grant current status	2 categories as follows: Closed In Closure	Provided
<b>gfatm_grantcurrentsubstatus</b>	GFATM grant current sub status	5 categories as follows: Consolidated End date No Go PR Change Terminated	Provided
<b>gfatm_programstartdate</b>	GFATM program start date	In dd-mm-yyyy format	Provided
<b>gfatm_programenddate</b>	GFATM program end date	In dd-mm-yyyy format	Provided
<b>gfatm_grantsigned_amount</b>	GFATM grant signed amount (USD equivalent)		Provided
<b>gfatm_grant_title</b>	GFATM grant title	521 grant titles	Provided
<b>gfatm_principalrecipient_name</b>	GFATM principal recipient	234 principal recipients	Provided
<b>gfatm_project_subtype</b>	GFATM project subtype	10 categories as follows: CS/PS: FBO CS/PS: NGO	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		CS/PS: Oth CS/PS: PS Gov: MOF Gov: MOH Gov: Oth MO: Oth MO: UNDP Third Party	
<b>gfatm_progressupdatenumber</b>	GFATM progress update number	Update numbers between and including 1 and 27	Provided
<b>gfatm_progressupdate_startdate</b>	GFATM progress update start date	In dd-mm-yyyy format	Provided
<b>gfatm_progressupdate_enddate</b>	GFATM progress update end date	In dd-mm-yyyy format	Provided
<b>gfatm_projectdisbconst_amount</b>	GFATM project disbursement amount constant (USD 2011)		Provided
<b>gfatm_grantdisbursedamount</b>	GFATM grant disbursed amount	In USD	Provided

### German Society for International Cooperation (GiZ)

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
<b>giz_relevance_rating</b>	GiZ relevance rating	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>giz_effectiveness_rating</b>	GiZ effectiveness rating	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>giz_efficiency_rating</b>	GiZ efficiency rating	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>giz_impact_rating</b>	GiZ impact rating	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>giz_sustainability_rating</b>	GiZ sustainability rating	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>giz_leadexecagency_name</b>	GiZ lead executing agency name	127 lead executing agency names	Provided
<b>giz_leadexecagency_type</b>	GiZ lead executing agency type	1 category as follows: public	Provided
<b>giz_leadexecagency_country</b>	GiZ lead executing agency country	3 categories as follows: Not from Donor's Nation From Donor's Nation Mixed	Provided
<b>giz_leadimplementingorg_name</b>	GiZ lead implementing organization name	130 lead implementing organization names	Provided
<b>giz_leadimplementingorg_type</b>	GiZ lead implementing organization type	1 category as follows: public	Provided
<b>giz_leadimplementingorg_country</b>	GiZ lead implementing organization country	3 categories as follows: Not from Donor's Nation From Donor's Nation Mixed	Provided
<b>giz_projectsize</b>	GiZ project size	In local currency (EUR) Scaled by 1 thousand	Provided

### International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>ifad_relevance_rating</b>	IFAD relevance rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>ifad_effectiveness_rating</b>	IFAD effectiveness rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_efficiency_rating</b>	IFAD efficiency rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_sustainability_rating</b>	IFAD sustainability rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_evaluationtype</b>	IFAD evaluation type	4 categories as follows: Completion Evaluation Completion evaluation Interim Evaluation PPA	Provided
<b>ifad_approvaldate</b>	IFAD approval date	In Short Month-YY format	Provided
<b>ifad_effectivedate</b>	IFAD effective date	In Short Month-YY format	Provided
<b>ifad_operationaldate</b>	IFAD operational date	In Short Month-YY format	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>ifad_closingdate</b>	IFAD closing date	In Short Month-YY format	Provided
<b>ifad_reviseddate</b>	IFAD project revision date	In Short Month-YY format	Provided with modification to add "Feb-06" for <i>project_title</i> values "Area-Based Agricultural Modernization Programme"
<b>ifad_ruralpovimpact_rating</b>	IFAD rural poverty impact rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_innovation_rating</b>	IFAD innovation rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_overallachievement_rating</b>	IFAD overall achievement rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_hhincomeasset_rating</b>	IFAD household income and asset rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
<b>ifad_humansocialcapital_rating</b>	IFAD human and social capital rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_foodsecagriproduce_rating</b>	IFAD food security and agricultural production rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_natresourcesenvir_rating</b>	IFAD natural resources and environment rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_institutionspolicies_rating</b>	IFAD institutions and policies rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
<b>ifad_genderemp_rating</b>	IFAD gender equality and women's empowerment rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_humanassets_rating</b>	IFAD human assets (principally improvement in access to potable water and training) rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_phyfinasset_rating</b>	IFAD physical and financial assets rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_areaofhealth_rating</b>	IFAD area of health rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
<b>ifad_areaofeducation_rating</b>	IFAD area of education rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_replication_rating</b>	IFAD replication rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_replication_rating</b>	IFAD markets rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_markets_rating</b>	IFAD IFAD partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
<b>ifad_ifadpartner_rating</b>	IFAD UNOPS partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_unopspartner_rating</b>	IFAD replication rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_cafpartner_rating</b>	IFAD CAF partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_cipartner_rating</b>	IFAD CI partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
<b>ifad_boadpartner_rating</b>	IFAD BOAD partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_ngospartner_rating</b>	IFAD NGOS partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_wfppartner_rating</b>	IFAD WFP partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_ndaspartner_rating</b>	IFAD NDAS partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
<b>ifad_rccspartner_rating</b>	IFAD RCCS partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_wfpartner_rating</b>	IFAD WF partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_finagropartner_rating</b>	IFAD FINAGRO partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_iicapartner_rating</b>	IFAD IICA partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
<b>ifad_coexpartner_rating</b>	IFAD COEXECUTINGAGENCI partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_afdbpartner_rating</b>	IFAD AFDB partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_idaworldbankpartner_rating</b>	IFAD IDA World Bank partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_rpartnerspartner_rating</b>	IFAD research partners partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
<b>ifad_contractorspartner_rating</b>	IFAD contractors partner rating	5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_bankspartner_rating</b>	IFAD banks partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_cbospartner_rating</b>	IFAD CBOS partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_beneficiariespartner_rating</b>	IFAD beneficiaries partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
<b>ifad_serviceproviders_rating</b>	IFAD service providers partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_OPECcofin_rating</b>	IFAD OPEC cofinanciers rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_irishaidcofin_rating</b>	IFAD Irish Aid cofinanciers rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_asdb_rating</b>	IFAD ASDB rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
<b>ifad_creditinstBCR_rating</b>	IFAD credit institutions BCR rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_creditinstBCC_rating</b>	IFAD credit institutions BCC rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_projectmanagement_rating</b>	IFAD project management rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_privsectorpartners_rating</b>	IFAD private sector partners rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
<b>ifad_sida_rating</b>	IFAD SIDA rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_undp_rating</b>	IFAD UNDP rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_government_partner_rating</b>	IFAD government partner rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory 5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	Provided
<b>ifad_sixoverall_rating</b>	IFAD six-point overall rating	Rating scale: 6 = Highly satisfactory	Provided

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
		5 = Satisfactory 4 = Moderately satisfactory 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory 2 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Highly unsatisfactory	
<b>ifad_projectsize</b>	IFAD project size	In USD Scaled by 1 million	Provided

### Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

Variable Name	Label	Description	Source
<b>jica_borrowerimplementername</b>	JICA borrower implementer name	554 borrower implementer names	Provided
<b>jica_borrowerimplementertype</b>	JICA borrower implementer type	2 categories as follows: private public	Provided
<b>jica_primarycontractortype</b>	JICA primary contractor type	1 category as follows: private	Provided
<b>jica_primarycontractorcountry</b>	JICA primary contractor country	3 categories as follows: 0 1 2	Provided
<b>jica_relevance_rating</b>	JICA relevance rating	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>jica_effectiveness_rating</b>	JICA effectiveness rating	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>jica_efficiency_rating</b>	JICA efficiency rating	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>jica_impact_rating</b>	JICA impact rating	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>jica_sustainability_rating</b>	JICA sustainability rating	[Refer to donor-specific documentation]	Provided
<b>jica_ratingunknownreason</b>	JICA reason for unknown ratings	Reasons for unknown ratings (for 12 projects, all JICA) such as Counterparts no response to questionnaire, No data in project database, No response from executing agencies, etc.	Provided
<b>jica_ratingsimputed</b>	JICA ratings imputed	Whether ratings were imputed  2 categories as follows: 0: Ratings not imputed 1: Ratings imputed	JICA documents were, as noted above, extracted from individual JICA project evaluations. All but three of these projects listed an overall project success rating; these ratings were a simple average of rated subcomponents (e.g. impact, relevance). In the case of three projects there were subcomponent but no overall rating; in these three cases we averaged the subcomponents ourselves. However, as these ratings are calculated by us (using what we induce to be JICA's methodology) rather than assigned by JICA, these three projects are flagged as having imputed ratings.
<b>jica_projectsize</b>	JICA project size	In local currency (JPY) Scaled to 1 million	

German Development Bank (KfW)

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>kfw_effectiveness_rating</b>	KfW effectiveness rating	Ratings as follows: 1 2 3 4 5 6	Scale inverted from the original scale in which lower numbers meant less success
<b>kfw_efficiency_rating</b>	KfW efficiency rating	Ratings as follows: 1 2 3 4 5 6	Scale inverted from the original scale in which lower numbers meant less success
<b>kfw_impact_rating</b>	KfW impact rating	Ratings as follows: 1 2 3 4 5 6	Scale inverted from the original scale in which lower numbers meant less success
<b>kfw_sustainability_rating</b>	KfW sustainability rating	Ratings as follows: 1 2 3 4 5 6	Scale inverted from the original scale in which lower numbers meant less success
<b>kfw_appraisal_date</b>	KfW appraisal date	In dd-mm-yyyy format	Provided

<b>kfw_reportcompletion_date</b>	KfW report completion date	In dd-mm-yyyy format	Provided
<b>kfw_evaluation_date</b>	KfW evaluation date	In dd-mm-yyyy format	Provided
<b>kfw_officeopening_date</b>	KfW office opening date	In dd-mm-yyyy format	Provided
<b>kfw_significance_rating</b>	KfW rating significance	Ratings as follows: 1 2 3 4 5 6	Scale inversed from the original scale in which lower numbers meant less success
<b>kfw_projectsize</b>	KfW project size	In local currency (EUR)	Calculated by combining original variables <i>totaldisbursement</i> and <i>totalcost</i> , keeping the value of variable where data exists and higher values if data for both variables exist

**World Bank**

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>wb_projecttype</b>	WB project type	4 categories as follows: Dev Pol Lend Investment Not assigned UNKNOWN	Provided
<b>wb_approvaldate</b>	WB approval date	Date of project approval Example of format: "01jan2012"	Combined original variables <i>approvaldate</i> and <i>approvalyear</i>
<b>wb_government_partner_rating</b>	WB government partner rating	Ratings as follows: 1 2 3 4 5 6	Provided
<b>wb_lendingproject_cost</b>	WB lending project cost	In USD	Provided
<b>wb_lendinginstrumenttype</b>	WB lending instrument	17 categories as follows: [Blank] APL DPL DRL ERL FIL LIL NA PRC PSL RIL SAD SAL	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
		SIL SIM SSL TAL	
<b>wb_productline_code</b>	WB project line code	8 categories as follows: EP GE GU MT PE RE RN SF	Provided
<b>wb_projectline_name</b>	WB project line	8 categories as follows: Global Environment Project Guarantees IBRD/IDA Montreal Protocol Project Evaluations Rainforest Recipient Executed Activities Special Financing	Provided
<b>wb_ieg_evaluationdate</b>	WB IEG evaluation date	In mm/dd/yyyy format	Provided
<b>wb_ieg_evaluationtype</b>	WB IEG evaluation type	7 categories as follows: CSSR ES EVM PAR PCM PCN PCR	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>wb_ieg_rdoclassification</b>	WB IEG RDO classification	Risk to Development Outcome classification  6 categories as follows: # HIGH MODERATE NEGLIGIBLE TO LOW NON-EVALUABLE SIGNIFICANT	Provided
<b>wb_ieg_idimpactclassification</b>	WB IEG ID impact (disc) classification	6 categories as follows: HIGH MODEST NEGLIGIBLE NOT APPLICABLE NOT AVAILABLE NOT RATED SUBSTANTIAL	Provided
<b>wb_qualityatentry_rating</b>	WB rating quality at entry	Ratings as follows: 1 2 3 4 5 6	Provided
<b>wb_supervisionquality_rating</b>	WB rating supervision quality	Ratings as follows: 1 2 3 4 5 6	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>wb_owninstperformance_rating</b>	WB rating own institutition's performance	Ratings as follows: 1 2 3 4 5 6	Provided
<b>wb_borrowerpreparation_rating</b>	WB IEG borrower preparation (disc) classification	7 categories as follows: HIGHLY SATISFACTORY HIGHLY UNSATISFACTORY NOT APPLICABLE NOT AVAILABLE NOT RATED SATISFACTORY UNSATISFACTORY	Provided
<b>wb_borrowerimplementation_rating</b>	WB rating borrower implementation	Ratings as follows: 1 2 3 4 5 6	Provided
<b>wb_borrowercompliance_rating</b>	WB rating borrower compliance	Ratings as follows: 1 2 3 4 5 6	Provided
<b>wb_ieg_icrqualityclassification</b>	WB IEG ICR quality classification	7 categories as follows: #	Provided

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
		EXEMPLARY NOT APPLICABLE NOT AVAILABLE NOT RATED SATISFACTORY UNSATISFACTORY	
<b>wb_sustainability_classification</b>	WB IEG sustainability classification	9 categories as follows: HIGHLY LIKELY HIGHLY UNLIKELY HIGLY UNLIKELY LIKELY NON-EVALUABLE NOT APPLICABLE NOT RATED UNCERTAIN UNLIKELY	Provided
<b>wb_ieg_mequalityclassification</b>	WB IEG ME quality classification	5 categories as follows: HIGH MODEST NEGLIGIBLE NON-EVALUABLE SUBSTANTIAL	Provided

## Suggested Variables

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

Variable Name	Label	Description	Calculation Methodology														
<b>bi_overall_rating</b>	Binary overall rating	2 categories are follows: 1: Satisfactory 0: Unsatisfactory	Can be generated based on the 6-point outcome, assigning the following specifications: 1: for outcomes 4,5,6 0: for outcomes 1,2,3														
<b>relevance_rating</b>	Relevance rating	<p>The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.</p> <p>In evaluating the relevance of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent are the objectives of the programme still valid?</li> <li>• Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?</li> <li>• Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?</li> </ul> <p>Source: OECD DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance <a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dacriteriafovaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm">http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dacriteriafovaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm</a></p>	<p>Can be combined across the following 3 donors:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Donor</th> <th>Donor-Specific Variable</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>African DB</td> <td>afdb_relevance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CDB</td> <td>cdb_StrategicRelevance_rating</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DFAT</td> <td>dfat_RelevanceRating</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GiZ</td> <td>giz_relevance_rating</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IFAD</td> <td>ifad_rating_relevance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>JICA</td> <td>jica_relevance_rating</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Donor	Donor-Specific Variable	African DB	afdb_relevance	CDB	cdb_StrategicRelevance_rating	DFAT	dfat_RelevanceRating	GiZ	giz_relevance_rating	IFAD	ifad_rating_relevance	JICA	jica_relevance_rating
Donor	Donor-Specific Variable																
African DB	afdb_relevance																
CDB	cdb_StrategicRelevance_rating																
DFAT	dfat_RelevanceRating																
GiZ	giz_relevance_rating																
IFAD	ifad_rating_relevance																
JICA	jica_relevance_rating																
<b>effectiveness_rating</b>	Effectiveness rating	<p>A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.</p> <p>In evaluating the effectiveness of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:</p>	<p>Can be combined across the following 4 donors:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Donor</th> <th>Donor-Specific Variable</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> </tbody> </table>	Donor	Donor-Specific Variable												
Donor	Donor-Specific Variable																

Variable Name	Label	Description	Calculation Methodology																
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved?</li> <li>What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?</li> </ul> <p>Source: OECD DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance <a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dacriteriafovaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm">http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dacriteriafovaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm</a></p>	<table border="1"> <tr><td>AfricanDB</td><td>afdb_score_O2</td></tr> <tr><td>CDB</td><td>cdb_Effectiveness_rating</td></tr> <tr><td>GiZ</td><td>giz_effectiveness_rating</td></tr> <tr><td>IFAD</td><td>ifad_rating_effectiveness</td></tr> <tr><td>JICA</td><td>jica_effectiveness_rating</td></tr> <tr><td>KfW</td><td>kfw_effectiveness_rating</td></tr> </table>	AfricanDB	afdb_score_O2	CDB	cdb_Effectiveness_rating	GiZ	giz_effectiveness_rating	IFAD	ifad_rating_effectiveness	JICA	jica_effectiveness_rating	KfW	kfw_effectiveness_rating				
AfricanDB	afdb_score_O2																		
CDB	cdb_Effectiveness_rating																		
GiZ	giz_effectiveness_rating																		
IFAD	ifad_rating_effectiveness																		
JICA	jica_effectiveness_rating																		
KfW	kfw_effectiveness_rating																		
<b>efficiency_rating</b>	Efficiency rating	<p>Efficiency measures the outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.</p> <p>When evaluating the efficiency of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were activities cost-efficient?</li> <li>Were objectives achieved on time?</li> <li>Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?</li> </ul> <p>Source:</p>	<p>Can be combined across the following 4 donors:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Donor</th> <th>Donor-Specific Variable</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>AfricanDB</td><td>afdb_efficiency</td></tr> <tr><td>CDB</td><td>cdb_Efficiency_rating</td></tr> <tr><td>DFAT</td><td>dfat_Efficiency Rating</td></tr> <tr><td>GiZ</td><td>giz_efficiency_rating</td></tr> <tr><td>IFAD</td><td>ifad_rating_efficiency</td></tr> <tr><td>JICA</td><td>jica_efficiency_rating</td></tr> <tr><td>KfW</td><td>kfw_efficiency_rating</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Donor	Donor-Specific Variable	AfricanDB	afdb_efficiency	CDB	cdb_Efficiency_rating	DFAT	dfat_Efficiency Rating	GiZ	giz_efficiency_rating	IFAD	ifad_rating_efficiency	JICA	jica_efficiency_rating	KfW	kfw_efficiency_rating
Donor	Donor-Specific Variable																		
AfricanDB	afdb_efficiency																		
CDB	cdb_Efficiency_rating																		
DFAT	dfat_Efficiency Rating																		
GiZ	giz_efficiency_rating																		
IFAD	ifad_rating_efficiency																		
JICA	jica_efficiency_rating																		
KfW	kfw_efficiency_rating																		

Variable Name	Label	Description	Calculation Methodology								
<b>impact_rating</b>	Impact rating	<p>The positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators. The examination should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of trade and financial conditions.</p> <p>When evaluating the impact of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What has happened as a result of the programme or project?</li> <li>• What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?</li> <li>• How many people have been affected?</li> </ul> <p>Source:                      OECD DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance  <a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriafovaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm">http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriafovaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm</a></p>	<p>Can be combined across the following 3 donors:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1329 483 1785 787"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1329 483 1528 557">Donor</th> <th data-bbox="1528 483 1785 557">Donor-Specific Variable</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1329 557 1528 638">GiZ</td> <td data-bbox="1528 557 1785 638">giz_impact_rating</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1329 638 1528 711">JICA</td> <td data-bbox="1528 638 1785 711">jica_impact_rating</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1329 711 1528 787">KfW</td> <td data-bbox="1528 711 1785 787">kfw_impact_rating</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Donor	Donor-Specific Variable	GiZ	giz_impact_rating	JICA	jica_impact_rating	KfW	kfw_impact_rating
Donor	Donor-Specific Variable										
GiZ	giz_impact_rating										
JICA	jica_impact_rating										
KfW	kfw_impact_rating										

Variable Name	Label	Description	Calculation Methodology																				
<b>sustainability_rating</b>	Sustainability rating	<p>Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.</p> <p>When evaluating the sustainability of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent did the benefits of a programme or project continue after donor funding ceased?</li> <li>What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?</li> </ul> <p>Source: OECD DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance <a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dacriteriaforrevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm">http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dacriteriaforrevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm</a></p>	<p>Can be combined across the following 4 donors:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Donor</th> <th>Donor-Specific Variable</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>AfricanDB</td> <td>afdb_sustainability</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CDB</td> <td>cdb_Sustainability_rating</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DFAT</td> <td>dfat_SustainabilityRating</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GEF</td> <td>gef_Sustainability4point</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GiZ</td> <td>giz_sustainability_rating</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IFAD</td> <td>ifad_rating_sustainability</td> </tr> <tr> <td>JICA</td> <td>jica_sustainability_rating</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KfW</td> <td>kfw_sustainability_rating</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WB</td> <td>wb_sustainability_classification (qualitative)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Donor	Donor-Specific Variable	AfricanDB	afdb_sustainability	CDB	cdb_Sustainability_rating	DFAT	dfat_SustainabilityRating	GEF	gef_Sustainability4point	GiZ	giz_sustainability_rating	IFAD	ifad_rating_sustainability	JICA	jica_sustainability_rating	KfW	kfw_sustainability_rating	WB	wb_sustainability_classification (qualitative)
Donor	Donor-Specific Variable																						
AfricanDB	afdb_sustainability																						
CDB	cdb_Sustainability_rating																						
DFAT	dfat_SustainabilityRating																						
GEF	gef_Sustainability4point																						
GiZ	giz_sustainability_rating																						
IFAD	ifad_rating_sustainability																						
JICA	jica_sustainability_rating																						
KfW	kfw_sustainability_rating																						
WB	wb_sustainability_classification (qualitative)																						
<b>expost_evaluation</b>	Ex-post evaluation	<p>Whether the evaluation was carried out ex-post (i.e. after the project is closed)</p> <p>2 categories as follows: 1: Evaluation was carried out ex-post 0: Evaluation was not carried out ex-post</p>	<p>Can be generated by checking if the Lag to evaluation (eval_lag) variable is greater than some time period (suggested: 100 days)</p>																				

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Calculation Methodology</b>																				
<b>project_size_USD_calculated</b>	Project size in USD	The size of the project (projectsize_original) descaled and converted; e.g. to USD dollars (as opposed to Euros or GB Pounds, or millions of dollars).	<p>Can be generated by multiplying the appropriate exchange rate and/or scale factor with each of the respective donor’s provided values. The exchange rates used in initial conversions are included in code below (based on current exchange rates at time of first conversion) but can be updated; indeed, a better approach if using this variable as an important predictor would use historic exchange rates at time of project approval, or completion.</p> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>AfricanDB</td> <td>No modification necessary</td> </tr> <tr> <td>AsianDB</td> <td>Multiply by 1 million to de-scale</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DFID</td> <td>Multiply by 1.35 (GBP-USD exchange rate on 12/31/2017)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GEF</td> <td>Multiply by 1 million to de-scale</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GFATM</td> <td>No modification necessary</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GiZ</td> <td>Multiply by 1 thousand to de-scale multiply by 1.20 (EUR-USD exchange rate on 12/31/2017)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IFAD</td> <td>Multiply by 1 million to de-scale</td> </tr> <tr> <td>JICA</td> <td>Multiply by 10687</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KfW</td> <td>Multiply by 1.20 (EUR-USD exchange rate on 12/31/2017)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WB</td> <td>No modification necessary</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	AfricanDB	No modification necessary	AsianDB	Multiply by 1 million to de-scale	DFID	Multiply by 1.35 (GBP-USD exchange rate on 12/31/2017)	GEF	Multiply by 1 million to de-scale	GFATM	No modification necessary	GiZ	Multiply by 1 thousand to de-scale multiply by 1.20 (EUR-USD exchange rate on 12/31/2017)	IFAD	Multiply by 1 million to de-scale	JICA	Multiply by 10687	KfW	Multiply by 1.20 (EUR-USD exchange rate on 12/31/2017)	WB	No modification necessary
AfricanDB	No modification necessary																						
AsianDB	Multiply by 1 million to de-scale																						
DFID	Multiply by 1.35 (GBP-USD exchange rate on 12/31/2017)																						
GEF	Multiply by 1 million to de-scale																						
GFATM	No modification necessary																						
GiZ	Multiply by 1 thousand to de-scale multiply by 1.20 (EUR-USD exchange rate on 12/31/2017)																						
IFAD	Multiply by 1 million to de-scale																						
JICA	Multiply by 10687																						
KfW	Multiply by 1.20 (EUR-USD exchange rate on 12/31/2017)																						
WB	No modification necessary																						
<b>multi_donor</b>	Multilateral donor	Whether the project’s donor is a multilateral entity	Can be generated if the donor is World Bank, GFATM, GEF, AsianDB, AfricanDB, CDB or IFAD																				

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