Annex 7

Secondary Data Quality and Availability

March 2018

HM Government

Prosperity Fund

Evaluation & Learning services delivered by:

wyg

LTS INTERNATIONAL

INTEGRITY

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 5

1.1 Purpose of the Secondary Data Mapping Process 5
1.2 Process for Assessing Data Sources 5

2. Contextual Sources and MR Fund-Level Indicators 7

2.1 MR Contextual Indicators 8
2.2 MR Portfolio Management Indicators 16
2.3 MR Fund Performance Indicators 16
2.4 MR Output Indicators 16

3. Programme Level Sources 17

3.1 MR Programme Level Indicators 17
3.2 Types of Programme Documentation 17
3.3 Programme Design, Approval and Business Case Stage 17
3.4 Programme Delivery Stage 22
3.5 Financial Reporting on Expenditure and Forecasts 23
3.6 Project Documentation 24

4. Implications for MREL 25

Annexes 30

Annex 1: Prosperity Fund Indicator Standards 30
Annex 2: Data Requirements Per Country and Sector 31
Annex 3 – Identified Secondary Data Sources 34
Annex 4 – Scoring of Identified Contextual Data Sources 42

Abbreviations

AIIB	Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank
BE	Business Environment
CDI	City Development Index
CPI	Corruption Perception Index
CPI	City Prosperity Initiative
DFID	Department for International Development
DIT	Department for International Trade
EL	Evaluation and Learning
EIU	Economic Intelligence Unit
EOS	Executive Opinion Survey
EQ	Evaluation Question
FAS	Financial Access Survey
FBC	Full Business Case
FCO	The Foreign and Commonwealth Office
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEM	Global Entrepreneurship Monitor
GNI	Gross National Income
HMG	Her Majesty's Government
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organisation
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
IEA	International Energy Agency
IIOC	Investment, Infrastructure and Operations Committee
ILO	International Labour Organisation
ILOSTAT	ILO Labour Statistics
IMF	International Monetary Fund
ITC	International Trade Centre
IP	Intellectual Property
IRF	International Road Federation
ITU	International Telecommunication Union
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LPI	Logistics Performance Index
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MR	Monitoring and Reporting
MTR	Multilateral Trade Rules
NIIF	National Investment and Infrastructure Fund
OBC	Outline Business Case
ODA	Official Development Assistance

OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PCR	Programme / Project Completion Review
PF	Prosperity Fund
PFMO	Prosperity Fund Management Office
PPP	Purchasing Power Parity
PTA	Preferential Trade Agreement
RAG	Red, Amber or Green system for rating
RTA	Regional Trade Agreement
SLA	Service Level Agreement
SME	Small and Medium Enterprise
SOBC	Strategic Outline Business Case
SoR	Statement of Requirements
SRO	Senior Responsible Officer
ToC	Theory of Change
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
VfM	Value for Money
WB	World Bank
WEC	World Energy Council
WEF	World Economic Forum
WJP	World Justice Project
WTO	World Trade Organisation

Version History

Document Title	Report on Secondary Data Quality and Availability		
	WYGEL6-INC-09-01	Revision	1
Revision	**Written By**	**Checked By**	**Approved By**
Revision 0	H Gunnell	L Johnson, P Abbot	PFMO
Revision 1	L Johnson	P Abbot	PFMO
Revision 2	L Johnson	M Schultz	PFMO

This report was prepared during the inception phase of the Prosperity Fund Evaluation and Learning contract. It forms an annex to the main Inception Report.

It was produced and approved by the Prosperity Fund Management Office before the main Inception Report and Workplan were finalised and agreed.

If there is any inconsistency between this annex and the main Inception Report and Workplan, the main Inception Report and Workplan provides the agreed position.

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Secondary Data Mapping Process

The objective of this secondary data mapping process is to map the secondary data environment for the Prosperity Fund (PF), setting out the availability, feasibility and quality of data sources the Evaluation and Learning (EL) functions could consider drawing on. Understanding the kind of data available is an important preliminary exercise for developing a detailed approach to responding to the Evaluation Questions (EQs), especially given that opportunities for primary data collection are likely to be limited.

The secondary data mapping draws on desk-based research to identify relevant secondary data sources for the programmes, projects and each of the sectors and geographies where the Prosperity Fund works. It also draws on engagement with the Monitoring & Reporting (MR) supplier on the data sources encapsulated in Prospero.

This mapping is intended as a living document which will continue to grow as further data sources are assessed and as such will be added to throughout implementation. Additionally, as inception moves to implementation and specific programme evaluations take shape, further detailed sectoral and/or geographic data sources will be identified.

The secondary data sources paper links to two other inception deliverables - the Evaluation Question (EQ) Matrix and the Inception Report, which will set out how the EL team will draw on the identified secondary data sources as well as the implications for primary data collection in response to identified weaknesses or gaps in the secondary data environment.

1.2 Process for Assessing Data Sources

The initial data mapping exercise started with (1) a preliminary analysis[1] of the sectors and countries covered by the programmes and projects (to assess primarily contextual, external sources) and (2) establishing the likely secondary data needs based on the requirements identified in the EQ matrix (to assess both contextual and programme-specific data).

Section 2 sets out the contextual, external sources, which are largely captured within Prospero. It describes the main categories[2] of MR indicators: at the Fund Level these encompass Contextual, Portfolio Management, Fund Performance and Output indicators; in addition, there are Programme Level indicators which draw on the specific programme logframes. Section 3 sets out the types of documentation and data to be generated by the programmes.

[1] This is based on the interim analysis of 16 Busiess Cases conducted in November / December 2017, which covered the following programmes: 1. Colombia, 2. Global Insurance and Risk Facility, 3. AIIB Special Fund, 4. India, 5. China, 6. Global Business Environment, 7. Mexico, 8. Digital Access, 9. Global Anti-Corruption, 11. NIIF, 12. Brazil, 15. Indonesia, 16. Global Infrastructure, 17. Global Trade, 18. SE Asia Clean Energy, 19. SE Asia Trade and Economic Reform. 4 Business Cases subsequently made available and to be added to this assessment are 10. Commonwealth Marine Economies, 20. Future Cities, 21. Better Health, 22. Global Finance for Inclusive Growth. The 3 still missing Business Cases are 13. Concessional Export Credit Facility, 14. Global Education, 23. IPA.

[2] As of March 2018 the number of the exact data categories remains a work in progress.

1.2.1 Assessing Contextual, External Sources

We started our assessment of contextual sources by looking at the key secondary data sources for each of the sectors where PF activities will take place (see Annex 2 for an overview by country), grouping them according to the levels of the Fund Theory of Change and the Intermediate Outcome families. We assessed each of the identified sources according to the Economic Intelligence Unit (EIU) standards presented in the HMG PF Indicator Standards Manual (see Annex 1). The purpose of this exercise was to assess the applicability of the different sources for responding to the EQs.

Each source was assessed against the seven EIU principles - clarity, specificity, reliability, frequency, availability, usefulness, coherence – shown in Table 1 below, receiving a score from 1 to 3, with 1 being the least applicable and 3 being the most applicable.

Table 1: Data source assessment criteria

	Principle	Standard
Technical merit	**1. Clarity**	The data being measured is clearly defined with reference to a consistent methodology
	2. Specificity	The data indicator is specific enough to measure the intended result(s) from Fund activities
	3. Reliability	The data source is referenced by reputable bodies and the method of measurement is clearly defined and appropriate for the given phenomenon
	4. Frequency	The frequency of data publication is clearly defined and fit for application over the implementation phase.
	5. Availability	The data is presented on a regular basis allowing frequent measurement over the course of the project implementation.
Relevance	**6. Usefulness**	6a. The data source enables specific measurement of changes targeted by the Prosperity Fund
		6b. The data source is conceptually linked to programme/project activities and indicators
		6c. The frequency of measurement is aligned with fund requirements
		6d. The data can be disaggregated by sex, age group or socioeconomic group (where applicable)
	7. Coherence	The data source consistently relates to the indicators to which it is applicable

Each data source was then assigned an overall score based on the average assigned to each standard. Table 16 in Annex 4 shows a detailed scoring of each of the data sources.

Box 1 – Overview of the Data Scores

No data source received an overall score of 1 indicating that all sources are applicable to a certain extent. While lower scoring data sources may not be applicable for the duration of the implementation given infrequent data publication, irregularity in data availability across similar indicators or a lack of gender or socio-economic disaggregation, they can still be seen as a means to establish a baseline understanding of the context prior to the intervention. However, any ongoing measurement or results in these cases will have to rely on further research into local data sources and primary data collection.

Higher scores were assigned where the source is well established, drawing on reliable and clearly defined data collection methods. Publication of data should be available on a set basis (e.g., annually or bi-annually) and, where appropriate, present opportunities for gender or socio-economic disaggregation.

Very few data sources present data at a more localised level. This has occasionally resulted in an amber score on the usefulness principle in terms of the source's applicability to attributing results from particular PF interventions.

1.2.2 Assessing the MR Indicators

Once we had identified, assessed and scored the data sources, we then referenced our findings against the longlist of MR indicators of PF primary benefit shared with the EL team on 22 December 2017. The EL team held a series of meetings with the MR team throughout January and February 2018 to discuss initial feedback on the longlist of indicators, as well as to further understand the rationale for selection and next steps. We then shared written comments on these indicators with MR on 12 February 2018 ('Comments from EL on MR Primary Benefit Indicators'). A shortlist of the contextual indicators was made available on 2 March 2018.

As part of the data mapping exercise, we specifically looked to understand the extent to which the longlist of MR indicators draws on the available secondary data we had identified and scored highly in our independent assessment, noting any gaps in coverage.

1.2.3 Assessing Programme Documentation

In response to the MREL feedback on the first draft of this paper, we spoke with the PFMO Design Team to identify the main types of programme and project documentation in Section 3. As some is in draft form and some has not been produced yet, our focus was on describing the kind of information likely to be available in these sources and its relevancy to the EQs based on guidance notes produced by the PFMO Design Team. The process for assessing programme documentation was twofold:

1. We liaised with the PFMO Design Team to compile a full list of the documents that the PFMO as well as by specific lead departments require programmes to complete for reporting purposes.

2. We indicated the required content of each type of document.

1.2.4 Considering Implications for the EL work

Section 4 considers the implications of the secondary data environment for responding to the EQs. Table 13 sets out which types of documentation, data and MR indicators are relevant for responding to which EQs.

It should be stressed that the mapping of the data environment is an ongoing process that will continue throughout implementation and needs to be done in close consultation with the MR contractor. We would suggest setting up a MR-EL Working Group on Secondary Data and convening quarterly workshops to jointly review the data environment and implications for the MR and EL work. This should be supplemented by ad-hoc meetings or calls on specific issues or change that may arise.

2. Contextual Sources and MR Fund-Level Indicators

The MR indicators are a key source of information for the EL activities, with all the EQs looking to draw on data encapsulated in Prospero. This section therefore considers the extent to which the data sources required to respond to these EQs are covered by the MR indicators and data sources.

As this is a longlist of indicators, we have kept our assessment relatively high-level and focused on the type of information to be gathered from Prospero and its applicability to

responding to the EQs. A separate paper ('Comments from EL on MR Primary Benefit Indicators') provides detailed feedback to the MR team on specific indicators from the longlist.

There are four types of indicators at the Fund level:

1. Contextual indicators, which are structured at the Impact, Outcome and Intermediate Outcome levels of the Fund Theory of Change;

2. Portfolio Management indicators (to be defined) will support portfolio management and the narrative the Fund wants to communicate externally;

3. Fund Performance indicators (to be defined) will support contractual, commercial, risk, issue and operational management of the Prosperity Fund;

4. Output indicators (to be defined) are designed to aggregate common programme output results into a fund-level result, thereby bringing together programme and project teams that are undertaking similar kinds of activities. Output data will be inputted by programme teams and aggregated at the Fund level.

The contextual indicators will draw on external secondary data sources collated in Prospero, whereas the Portfolio Management, Fund Performance Indicators and Output will draw on data generated by the Prosperity Fund itself.

2.1 MR Contextual Indicators

A set of contextual indicators developed by the MR contractor and defined at the Impact, Outcome and Intermediate Outcome levels of the Fund Theory of Change will be monitored and reported on, where relevant, by teams alongside the programme-specific indicators.

The key secondary data sources for the contextual indicators are outlined below in line with their relevance to each family, followed by an assessment of the quality of the sources. The majority of the key data sources cover most if not all countries where specific interventions will be taking place. All participating countries hold national statistics institutions which can produce relevant data, though the quality can vary. Key institutions such as the World Bank, International Labour Organisation (ILO) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) among others build on and present the available data from national institutions in one place, while also presenting tools for both longitudinal comparisons and opportunities for data triangulation via focused perception surveys and scorecards.

2.1.1 Impact Level of the Fund ToC

EQs 2-4 and 9 have identified secondary data requirements for looking at the Impact level of the Fund Theory of Change. The longlist of MR indicators and data sources of relevance to the impact level are structured according to five elements - sustainable growth, trade, investment, poverty and inequality – and provide the 'big picture' of the trajectory for country-level economic growth and inclusivity. None of the longlisted MR sources, however, provide information on assumptions in the impact level of the Theory of Change.

In our 'Comments from EL on MR Primary Benefit Indicators' paper our overall assessment of the Impact indicators was mixed:

> *"Overall, we consider that PF would be highly unlikely to contribute to any change in these impact indicators (GDP, FDI, poverty) within the timeframe of the evaluation (if at all), as there are too many steps in the causal pathways which need to take place before the PF activities effect any observable / significant change in these areas. However, arguably, these indicators may be useful as context, e.g. for the GDP indicators, current and ongoing trends in GDP may reflect external factors which also create a barrier to programme success, but it is still likely these indicators will be too high level."*[3]

EQ 10 has a requirement for secondary data disaggregated by gender or looking specifically at issues of women's access and participation. Specifically, the EQ Matrix seeks the following data:

- Women's access to services (e.g. health and infrastructure);
- Gender/ inclusion-sensitive business processes/ policies (e.g. maternity leave);
- Women-owned SMEs with higher productivity/ income/ links to bigger businesses etc.;
- Women's participation in labour market/ income generation;
- Women's labour market participation in different sectors/roles (reduction of gender-based occupational segregation);
- Women's roles in businesses/ in the workplace (where in the hierarchy);
- Women's access to income and productive assets.

The current Portfolio KPIs indicator set shared as part of MR4 and later refined for presentation at the Portfolio Board, have a number of indicators that speak to women's access and participation. Once fully defined these will also provide GNI results. Gender data is also captured in one of the longlisted MR data sources at impact level, the Gender Equality Gap Index. Data may need to be supplemented by information gathered as part of the Gender Thematic Evaluation. It should be noted that the PFMO MREL expects further work on gender indicators and data disaggregation to be done by the MR contractor.

2.1.2 Outcome Level of the Fund ToC

EQs 1-4 and 11 have identified secondary data requirements for looking at the Outcome level of the Fund Theory of Change. According to the EQ matrix, the data requirements are largely based on the MR outcome indicators. The longlisted MR indicators are structured according to five elements – competitiveness, employment, income, inequality and productivity. The MR indicators also provide useful contextual information on inequality, which is of particular relevance to EQs 4 and 11, though the latter focuses more on inclusive growth and VfM as measured by the programmes themselves rather than at national level.

In our 'Comments from EL on MR Primary Benefit Indicators' paper our overall assessment of the Outcome indicators was ambivalent about their applicability:

> *"The outcome indicators are also relatively high level and again it is unlikely that it will be possible to demonstrate a contribution of PF to these indicators e.g. will the PF will operate at such a scale to have influence on trade volumes? There is also a lack of*

[3] p.4, Comments from EL on MR Primary Benefit (2018)

disaggregation of socio-economic group, which will be necessary to include in order to answer questions related to secondary benefit"[4]

The MR contractor has noted that some of the Portfolio KPIs will support reporting on these outcomes.

1.1.1 Intermediate Outcome Level of the Fund ToC

EQs 1-3, 5, 8-9 and 11 have identified secondary data requirements for looking at the Intermediate Outcome level of the Fund Theory of Change. This section is organised by the 'families' identified in the initial portfolio analysis and mapping (see the Mapping Annex, February 2018) that contribute to the Intermediate Outcomes. Each sub-section presents the relevant secondary data sources we identified in our independent assessment followed by an assessment of how they correspond to the longlist of MR indicators.

Overall, we found that the longlist of indicators adequately capture the available secondary data relevant to each intermediate outcome. The MR indicators draw on the same secondary data sources that we identified in our independent assessment and in some cases specify additional sources.

The challenge for the EL team will be to assess the contribution of the PF interventions to any changes observed in these high-level indicators. Most of the EL activity at this level of the Theory of Change will focus on the PF programmes themselves.

In our 'Comments from EL on MR Primary Benefit Indicators' paper our overall assessment of the Intermediate Outcome indicators noted that "some of the indicators do not seem to be sufficiently tied to the content of the PF portfolio, while many of the indicators seem unlikely to provide meaningful results within the PF implementation timelines, e.g. for IO10, how likely is it that a country's infrastructure ranking (on a five-point scale) would change within four years, even with substantial investment?"[5]

IO 1 – Investment in Infrastructure

Our independent assessment of the main indicators on infrastructure, energy & low carbon and technology identified nine leading sources which provide national level data sets: the International Energy Agency, the World Energy Council, Bloomberg Energy Finance, the World Bank, the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report, the International Telecommunication Union, OpenSignal, UNCTAD and the International Road Federation. Subnational data, however, is limited across the board and given the limited clarity on the actual proposed interventions it is hard to tell whether the information available is sufficient to answer to the key EQs. In addition, a variety of city indexes that measure a range of indicators to assess the overall development and liveability of a particular city can be used to evaluate Future Cities programmes.

Table 2 below shows that these received Amber or Green scores when assessed against the EIU standards. A full description of the sources is provided in Annex 3.

[4] p.4, Comments from EL on MR Primary Benefit (2018)

[5] pp.4-5, Comments from EL on MR Primary Benefit (2018)

Table 2: Overview of data sources for Infrastructure, Future Cities, Energy & Low Carbon, Technology

Source	Relevant data available	Website	Aggregate RAG score
Energy			
International Energy Agency	Energy efficiency (annual 2011 – 2016);	www.iea.org	3
	Atlas of Energy		2
World Energy Council	Energy Trilemma Index	www.worldenergy.org/data	3
	World Energy Resources		3
	Energy Efficiency Indicators		2
Bloomberg Energy Finance	Renewable Energy Investment (annual 2017)	https://about.bnef.com/new-energy-outlook/	3
World Bank (2016)	World Development Indicators Data Bank: Access to energy (2014): Transport Telecoms	https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EG.ELC.ACCS.ZS	2
World Economic Forum	Global Competitiveness Report (2017): scorecards on Infrastructure; Institutions; Innovation	https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-competitiveness-report-2017-2018	3
International Telecommunication Union (ITU)	ICT Development Index (2017)	https://www.itu.int/net4/ITU-D/idi/2017/#idi2017comparison-tab	3
OpenSignal	Phone coverage divided by provider. Detail dependent on country.	http://opensignal.com	2
UNCTAD	Liner shipping connectivity index, annual, 2004-2017	http://unctadstat.unctad.org/wds/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?ReportId=92	3
International Road Federation	World Road Statistics 2000 - 2014	http://worldroadstatistics.org/	2

Indicators from each of these nine sources are captured in MR's longlist of contextual indicators. Five additional sources are mentioned: the Economic Intelligence Unit, the Global Infrastructure Hub / Oxford Economics, Cisco, the World Telecommunication / ICT Development Report and Database, and the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) / International Transport Forum – OECD. Our assessment is therefore that Prospero adequately captures the available secondary data in this area. Nevertheless, it will be difficult to assess changes in a country's investment in infrastructure, especially as a result of the Prosperity Fund programmes. The closest to assessing this is the Global Infrastructure Hub / Oxford Economics "Total Infrastructure Investment in US$" indicator, which covers seven infrastructure sectors.

The MR longlist of contextual indicators categorises data across four elements – energy, investment, telecoms, and transport – at national level.

IO 2 – Human Capital, Innovation and Technology

Our independent assessment of the main indicators on innovation and technology identified three leading sources which provide national level data sets: the Global Innovation Index, the International Telecommunication Union and the International Labour Organisation. Many of the projects grouped in this family also feature in other intermediate outcome areas, hence there is some overlap with the data sources identified in IO 1 and the gender indicators.

The main challenge with identifying suitable contextual indicators for this family is that many of the projects relate to developing, piloting, demonstrating, scaling up and applying new technologies across diverse sectors in different countries. There are additional projects in education and health. The high-level contextual indicators identified do not measure this process but rather comment on overall levels of innovation or information and communications technology (ICT) development in a country. The contribution of the Prosperity Fund to changes observed on these indicators will hence be difficult to establish.

Table 3 below shows that the sources identified received Amber or Green scores when assessed against the EIU standards. A full description of the sources is provided in Annex 3.

Table 3: Overview of data sources for innovation and technology

Source	Relevant data available	Website	Aggregate RAG score
The Global Innovation Index	Annual ranking of countries by their capacity for and success in innovation	https://www.globalinnovationindex.org/	3
International Telecommunication Union (ITU)	ICT Development Index (2017)	https://www.itu.int/net4/ITU-D/idi/2017/#idi2017comparison-tab	3
International Labour Organisation (ILU)	ILOSTAT Database	http://www.ilo.org/ilostat/faces/ilostat-home/home?_adf.ctrl-state=klmr2q9iy_4&_afrLoop=873080425026565#!	2

Indicators from each of these nine sources are captured in MR's longlist of contextual indicators. Six additional sources are mentioned, mainly on measuring education and health outcomes: UNESCO, UNICEF, the World Health Organisation, the World Bank, Epsicom and the World Intellectual Property Organisation. Our assessment is therefore that Prospero adequately captures the available secondary data in this area. Nevertheless, it will be difficult to assess changes in a country's level of innovation, especially as a result of the Prosperity Fund programmes. The closest to assessing this is the Global Innovation Index.

MR's longlist of contextual indicators categorises data across four elements – education, healthcare, innovation and technology adoption & skills – at national level.

IO 3 – Trade

Our independent assessment of the main indicators on trade identified four leading sources which provide national level data sets: the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report, the International Trade Centre, the World Trade Organisation and the World Bank. Table 4 shows that given data frequency, specificity and clarity all the sources received Green scores when assessed against the EIU standards. A full description of the sources is provided in Annex 3.

Table 4: Overview of data sources for trade

Source	Relevant data available	Website	Aggregate RAG Score
World Economic forum – Global Competitiveness Report (2017)	Competitiveness scorecards including: institutions (IP protection); goods and labour market efficiency; technological readiness; market size	http://reports.weforum.org/global-competitiveness-index-2017-2018/#topic=data	3
International Trade Centre	Market Access Map: Customs tariffs applied by more than 200 countries and faced by 239 countries and territories. The map also addresses tariff rate quotas; trade remedies, rules and certificates of origin; bound tariffs of WTO members; non-tariff measures and; trade flows.	http://www.macmap.org/	3
	Trade Treaties Map: Evaluation of overall participation of countries in multilateral trade rules or instruments (MTR)	www.legacarta.org	3
World Trade Organisation	Regional and Preferential Trade Agreements by country	RTAs: http://rtais.wto.org/UI/PublicMaintainRTAHome.aspx PTAs: http://ptadb.wto.org/SearchByCountry.aspx	3
World Bank	Doing Business: Trading Across Borders Database (2018)	http://www.doingbusiness.org/data/exploretopics/trading-across-borders	3
	Logistics Performance Index (2016)	https://wb-lpi-media.s3.amazonaws.com/LPI_Report_2016.pdf	3

Meanwhile sources such as the Market Access Map and the WTO databases for Regional and Preferential Trade Agreements are key information hubs for international trade agreements and as such do not rely on data but are updated as and when any actions are taken at this level.

Indicators from each of these four sources are captured in MR's longlist of contextual indicators, with one additional source (the World Integrated Trade Solution – United Nations Statistics Division Comtrade) mentioned. Our assessment is therefore that Prospero adequately captures the available secondary data in this area.

The MR longlist of contextual indicators categories data across six elements – IP protection, openness to trade, trade agreements, trade integration, trade rules and standards, and trade services and facilitation – at national level.

IO 4 – Financial and Economic Reform

Our independent assessment of the main indicators on financial and economic reform identified three leading sources which provide national level datasets: the World Bank, the IMF Financial Access Survey and the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. Table 5 below shows that these received Amber or Green scores when assessed against the EIU standards. A full description of the sources is provided in Annex 3.

Table 5: Overview of data sources for financial services

Source	Relevant data available	Website	Aggregate RAG Score
World Bank	World Development Indicators Data Bank: Domestic credit to the private sector Strength of legal rights Depth of credit information	https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/FS.AST.PRVT.GD.ZS https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IC.LGL.CRED.XQ https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IC.CRD.INFO.XQ?view=chart	2
IMF: Financial Access Survey	Annual data on indicators tracking financial access. Availability and use of financial products such as consumer and firm deposit accounts, loans, and insurance policies across the globe	https://www.imf.org/en/News/Articles/2017/10/02/pr17383-imf-releases-2017-financial-access-survey	3
Global Entrepreneurship Monitor	Expert's perception scores on finance, Government policy and entrepreneurship programmes; commercial and legal infrastructure; entry regulation etc.	http://www.gemconsortium.org/	3

Indicators from two of these three sources are captured in MR's longlist of contextual indicators, with no additional sources are mentioned. The source we identified that does not appear in the MR longlist for financial services is the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. This, however, appears in the longlist for the Ease of Doing Business indicators for measuring entrepreneurship. Our assessment is therefore that Prospero adequately captures the available secondary data in this area.

The MR longlist of contextual indicators categories data across two elements access to finance and transparency – at national level.

IO 5 - Ease of Doing Business

Our independent assessment of the main indicators on business environment and transparency and anti-corruption identified four leading sources which provide national level datasets: the World Bank, Transparency International, the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor and the World Justice Project. Table 6 below shows that these received Amber or Green scores when assessed against the EIU standards. A full description of the sources is provided in Annex 3.

Table 6: Overview of data sources for Business Environment and Transparency & Anti-Corruption

Source	Relevant data available	Website	Aggregate RAG Score
World Bank	Enterprise surveys: Corruption, Finance, Gender, Infrastructure, Innovation and Technology, Trade, Regulations and Taxes.	http://www.enterprisesurveys.org/data/	2
	World Development Indicators Data Bank: • Control of Corruption (annual 2016) • Rule of Law	http://databank.worldbank.org/data/reports.aspx?source=worldwide-governance-indicators	2
	Doing Business Ranking	http://www.doingbusiness.org/rankings	3
Transparency International	Corruption Perception Index (annual 2016)	https://www.transparency.org/news/feature/corruption_perceptions_index_2016	3
Global Entrepreneurship Monitor	Expert's perception scores on finance, Government policy and entrepreneurship programmes; commercial and legal infrastructure; entry regulation etc.	http://www.gemconsortium.org/	3
World Justice Project	Rule of Law Index (annual 2016)	https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/wjp-rule-law-index/wjp-rule-law-index-2016	3

While more specific and focused indicators are available in the World Development Indicators Data Bank, data availability varies between country contexts and there is no clear indication of the frequency of updating and suggests that it might be safer to revert to national data institutions for up to date information as relevant. Additional data might be available from national data institutes and regional development banks but might be too patchy for cross-country comparisons.

Indicators from each of these four sources are captured in MR's longlist of contextual indicators, though no additional sources are mentioned. Our assessment is therefore that Prospero adequately captures the available secondary data in this area.

The MR longlist of contextual indicators categories data across six elements – corruption, entrepreneurship, operational burdens, overall ease of doing business and regulatory burdens – at national level.

2.1.3 Gender Indicators

Our independent assessment found that few data sources present clear gender disaggregation of relevance to sustainable inclusive growth and women's economic empowerment. Two sources present reliable insights of relevance to the trade and financial and economic reform families: the World Economic Forum's Global Gender Gap Report and the International Labour Organisation. Table 7 below shows that these received Amber and Green scores when assessed against the EIU standards. A full description of the sources is provided in Annex 3. The MR contractor has noted that gender monitoring and reporting will be supplemented by other Fund level metrics, annual review information and programme-specific metrics.

Table 7: Overview of data sources for gender references

Source	Relevant data available	Website	Aggregate RAG Score
World Economic Forum	Global Gender Gap 2017: National data on Economic Participation and Opportunity, Educational Attainment, Health and Survival, and Political Empowerment for women globally	http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2017.pdf	3
International Labour Organisation	Global labour indicators across 13 subjects that can be disaggregated by gender, education and economic class.	http://www.ilo.org/ilostat/faces/ilostat-home/home?_adf.ctrl-state=epg8gp884_4&_afrLoop=447936246070379#!	2

2.2 MR Portfolio Management Indicators

Portfolio Management Indicators, in the process of being developed in conjunction with the PFMO Design Team, will "support portfolio management and the narrative the Fund wants to communicate externally".[6] These will be defined post-Inception. Once a longlist of these become available, we will assess their applicability to the EQs and feed back our comments to the MR contractor for consideration when finalising the indicators.

2.3 MR Fund Performance Indicators

Fund Performance Indicators are those that "support contractual, commercial, risk, issue and operational management of the Prosperity Fund"[7] and are to be defined post-Inception. Once a longlist of these become available, we will assess their applicability to the EQs and feed back our comments to the MR contractor for consideration when finalising the indicators.

2.4 MR Output Indicators

Output Indicators are designed to capture common results delivered in terms of outputs across the Fund, thereby bringing together programme and project teams that are undertaking similar kinds of activities. These are likely to be specific to particular 'families' of projects (cf. the Mapping Paper, February 2018) and will be developed in conjunction with the Family Synthesis Instruments (cf. Synthesis Strategy, February 2018). There are ongoing discussions between the MR and EL teams on how projects could be clustered and how output indicators can be used to track common types of activities (e.g., all technical assistance for policy reform activities vs. provision of risk capital inputs).

[6] Monitoring and Reporting Indicator Update on 19 February 2019, PA Consulting

[7] Monitoring and Reporting Indicator Update on 19 February 2019, PA Consulting

3. Programme Level Sources

3.1 MR Programme Level Indicators

Programme level results indicators are "identified and selected by programme and project teams to monitor and report on"[8] based on their respective logframes. Programme teams have flexibility in how they choose to identify, monitor and report on their programme-specific indicators. Results indicators can focus on primary benefit and secondary benefit and be associated with one or more countries where the programme is being delivered. They can be monitored and reported at all Theory of Change levels as well as expected contribution to the Intermediate Outcomes of the Fund Theory of Change. The MR contractor will be working with programme teams to encourage nested theory of change and logframe development.

Programme level reporting on outputs and intermediate outcomes, which are much more likely to be realised during the lifetime of the PF than outcomes and impacts, is more likely to be of use to the EL team in answering the EQs than Fund level data.

3.2 Types of Programme Documentation

A variety of programme documentation is produced at three main phases over the programmes' lifetime:

1. Programme teams are required to produce a range of documents as part of the process for designing and obtaining approval for their programmes. This is part of the process for preparing and finalising the programme Business Cases. The PFMO Design Team and Assurance Team have oversight of this process with the Portfolio Board- from producing / sharing guidance notes to reviewing / commenting on documents to ensure compliance with the documentation requirements - until the Outline Business Case (OBC) stage, at which point the respective HMG department delivering the programme takes on responsibility.

2. Once programmes are approved, the programme teams are required to produce various types of reports on a monthly, quarterly and annual basis. These are signed off by each programme's Senior Responsible Officer (SRO). Some of the programme reports – namely, the annual reviews – will be uploaded onto Prospero once finalised. Other reports will be uploaded at the programme teams' discretion.

3. Projects procured within each programme are required to report to the programme teams in accordance with the contractual reporting requirements specified in the Statement of Requirement or Memorandum of Understanding.

3.3 Programme Design, Approval and Business Case Stage

The PFMO requires all programmes to produce various documentation in preparing their Business Cases. The main purpose of these documents are to set out the rationale for funding

[8] Idem

interventions in the identified areas and to provide status updates on the programme design and approval process.

Table 8 provides a summary of the required documentation at the Business Case stage and their pertinence to the EL document review. Further to the PFMO requirements, programmes led by other HMG Departments (e.g., DFID and DIT) have their own assurance requirements and processes that concept notes, Strategic Outline Business Cases (SOBC), Outline Business Cases (OBC) and Full Business Cases (FBC) need to fulfil in their approval process. As such, different levels of documentation are required by each HMG Department. For example, in the FCO, cover sheets are required for each stage of the departmental approval process; however, this could vary by Department.

Table 8: Summary of PFMO required programme documentation at Business Case stage[9]

#	Type of Documentation	Timing[10]	Responsible for Oversight	Required for EL document review?
1	Concept Note	Once	Portfolio Board	
2	Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) plus Transition Funding (TF) bid[11]	Once	Portfolio Board	
3	Outline Business Case (OBC)	Once	Portfolio Board	
4	Full Business Case (FBC)	Once	Respective HMG Department and Cabinet Office / HMT where programme meets specified threshold[12]	√
5	Presentations to the Portfolio Board	Once	Portfolio Board	
6	Statement of Requirements (SoRs) or Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) or Accountable Grants – depending on how service delivery is being procured	Once	PFMO Assurance Team and Portfolio Board	√
7	Quarterly Reports to PFMO	Quarterly	Respective HMG Department	
8	Status updates for monthly highlight report	Monthly	Respective HMG Department	
9	Risk Potential Assessments – which are now Quarterly Risk Registers	Quarterly	Respective HMG Department	
10	Non-ODA bids	Once	Portfolio Board	
11	Transition funding risk pro-forma	Once	PFMO Assurance Team and Portfolio Board	

[9] This list of required documentation was provided to the EL team by the PFMO on 27 February 2018.

[10] Note that revisions / various iterations may be required for the types of documentation intended to be produced once, rather than on a recurring basis. For example, if a Concept Note or SOBC is not accepted by the Portfolio Board, it may have to be amended and resubmitted.

[11] For Transition Funds, programmes have had to submit further TF bids as there have been extensions to allocations.

[12] Cabinet Office / HMT approval is a requirement for certain priority programmes and/or FCO programmes over £10m and DFID programmes over £50m.

#	Type of Documentation	Timing[10]	Responsible for Oversight	Required for EL document review?
12	Non-ODA risk pro-forma	Once	PFMO Assurance Team and Portfolio Board	
13	Submissions to Ministers for business case sign off	Once	Respective HMG Department	

The EL team will collect copies of all programme documents. Certain types (e.g., those that contain information most relevant for the EQs) will be a required part of the EL document review, whereas others will be reviewed according to the specific needs of individual evaluations. The most relevant documentation for the EL team is the Full Business Case and the Statement of Requirements (SoR) / Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for procured projects as these will provide the most information on the programmes themselves and activities carried out to deliver them. Where possible, it will be desirable for the EL to work with final, approved versions of these documents (rather than earlier iterations) for the most up to date information on the programmes.

3.3.1 Full Business Cases

Each Full Business Case (FBC) is structured according to five broad areas (see Table 9, though within each section there is variability in the kind of content that is covered. There is variation in the amount of detail and document length, ranging from 23 pages (for the AIIB Special Fund) to 173 pages (for the China Programme, Phase One).

Table 9: Content of the Business Case Sections[13]

Section	Content
Strategic Case	Makes the case for the intervention by setting out the overarching context and the problem to be addressed. It describes what the programme will do (impact & outcome) and how, drawing on evidence. It should set out the sectors and countries chosen for the intervention and consider how the UK can provide value. It should draw out relevant data sets and evidence relating to economic growth, poverty analysis, social-political context and gender.
Appraisal Case	Explores how the programme will address the need presented in the Strategic Case by appraising options for achieving the objectives, including high level commercial choices. The appraisal considers deliver mechanisms including capability and capacity, costs and benefits, risks and likelihood of success. It concludes with a summary VfM statement for the preferred option. The appraisal case also looks to draw on data sets and credible evidence to forecast impact and develop an economic model. The sources identified could be relevant to the programme evaluations.
Commercial Case	Provides detail on implementation by setting out the procurement approach and requirements and proposed funding instrument. It considers the market response to the intervention with an explanation of how supplier performance would be managed. It sets out the procurement policies, capabilities and systems of the third party entity to ensure VfM.
Financial Case	Sets out issues of affordability and the sources of funding. It includes a high level budget and sets out how funds will be disbursed and how expenditure will be monitored, reported and accounted.

[13] Based on the DFID Smart Guide for Business Cases

Section	Content
Management Case	Focuses on governance and management arrangements and the ability to deliver. It outlines the expected roles and responsibilities, including the FCO's own resourcing strategies (SRO, programme team, etc). It sets out how it will respond to changes in context and the key elements of the Delivery Plan, key milestones and decision points where we can course correct. It includes a consideration of the programme risks and risk appetite.

The FBCs are a relatively good source of information on the country or sector context (presented in the Strategic Case). The FBCs also provide a large amount of information on the procurement routes considered and the different options for delivering the programme.

3.3.2 Statements of Requirements (SoR)

Each programme is required to produce a Statement of Requirements (SoR) or Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) detailing the scope of work for each project that is delivered by an external supplier or implementing partner. While the purpose of the FBC is to set out the rationale for delivering an intervention in an area, the purpose of the SoR is to provide more clarity on the project activities and scope of work once the FBC has been approved and the programme begins planning for delivery. This is relevant to the EL team, particular in Year 1, for defining the shape of each project.

The SoR "should not include significant text copied from the Business Case"[14] but should provide more detail on specific activities / workplanning that respond to the contextual issue(s) identified in the FBC, what gender means for the programme activities in practical terms and monitoring and reporting requirements. In particular, the SoR should describe in practical terms:

- The project's broad intent and trajectory (the 'Objective')
- The boundaries of the service to be delivered by the suppliers (the 'scope').
- The required end point of the journey and of what the project should achieve (the 'Deliverables and Outputs').[15]

The PFMO Design Team have prepared a template for SoRs which provides guidance on the content to be written in 17 standardised sections, summarised in Table 10 below.

[14] p.2, PFMO Statement of Requirements Guidance Note (December 2017)

[15] p.3, idem

Table 10: Statement of Requirements (SoR) Template Summary[16]

#	Section	Guidance on the content
1	Background	Describe the context of the issue which the Programme/project is addressing, the current state, and what the Programme Activity is trying to achieve?
2	Objective	This section will heavily refer to the Theory of Change outcome & impact section within the Business case and the logframe. Set out succinctly what this component is trying to achieve in relation to its primary purpose.
3	Scope of Services (Includes sub-sections on Delivery, Advisory and Management Services)	This section should provide bidders with the broad scope of the contract and should cover what is included AND excluded. This should be a general description to set the contract in context setting out the main requirements for this work and what the supplier will be responsible and accountable for. You should outline who the direct and indirect beneficiaries of the programme components are e.g. the ultimate beneficiary of this programme will be overseas country government and their business/ energy/ financial/ health etc. (as appropriate) reform process. Ensure that the language in this section reflects the pro-poor and gender requirements of IDA. You should ensure there is a clear link back to the primary purpose i.e. poverty reduction and inclusive growth so that the benefits of growth and access to economic opportunities are spread broadly across society, support gender equality and women's economic empowerment and help to ensure no one is left behind. Make this as specific to the component as possible – rather than generic statements.
4	Deliverables and Outputs / Detailed Requirements	This section is required to define exactly what the bidder needs to know in order to deliver the right services at the right time, in the right place, in the right quantity, quality and at the right price, e.g. volumes, timescales, deliverables, quality expected, reporting structures, resources available from the contracting authority, governance arrangements, requirements for contingencies/business continuity etc. This tells the supplier what they need to achieve and how they will be measured. It should give as much detail as possible of the end point. The supplier will design a methodology around achieving the detail of this section. Consider whether it is appropriate to create a SoR which defines every activity, standard, delivery method etc. (input based) or whether concentrating on the actual service and the end result (output based) would be more effective or a combination of the two. It is highly likely that PF SoRs will be more output based or a combination. These requirements define the tasks or desired result by focusing on what is to be achieved, rather than by describing the way it is to be achieved. Specify in terms of outputs or functions to give the opportunity for innovation. This ensures the responsibility for the solution/ delivery approach meets the requirements and sits firmly with the bidder – not the contracting authority.
5	Performance Requirements	These will detail the performance required of the solution by setting out details of inputs and outputs and specifying relevant quality standards and KPIs.
6	Mandatory Requirements	Some requirements may be considered mandatory and these should be clearly detailed. Ensure Gender Equality Act requirements are outlined in this section and make sure gender equality and women's economic empowerment dimensions are meaningfully integrated across the SoRs.
7	Service Levels and KPIs, Monitoring and Evaluation	The programme must be able to measure the supplier performance delivery and the SoR must provide information on any KPIs and/or SLAs the supplier will be monitored against. KPIs should, where possible, include results disaggregated by sex and different socio-economic groups to ensure we can measure impact on inclusive growth and gender equality.

[16] Based on the PFMO Statement of Requirements Guidance Note (December 2017)

#	Section	Guidance on the content
8	Contract Management and Review	Standardised text
9	Continuous Improvement	
10	Contract Period	
11	Point of Delivery	Where services need to be delivered from
12	Budget	
13	Risk	Standardised text
14	Conflict of Interest	
15	Ethical Walls	
16	Transparency	
17	Duty of Care	

3.4 Programme Delivery Stage

Table 11 below describes the main types of programme reporting during delivery. Programme reports are a useful source of information on the status of the programme activities and deliverables and provide narrative explaining the achievement of primary and secondary benefits captured in the MR programme-level indicators.

Table 11: Programme Reporting during Delivery

Report Type	Content	Responsibility for Approval	Timing	Available on Prospero?
Quarterly Progress Report	Provides information on the workstreams and projects within the programme, drawing on information provided by the suppliers and project implementing partners. Should show progress of delivery and consider the challenges / risks for the future of delivery. Should include the relevant key deliverable milestones for the programme and am changes in timing. RAG ratings on delivery confidence, finance (forecast to budget variance), staffing, and timing are used in portfolio board dashboards "to signpost where they may wish to review delivery or identify potential areas to support programmes."[17]	Programme SRO, with oversight from the PFMO	Quarterly, mirroring the quarters of the Financial Year	√
Annual Reviews	DFID Annual Review Template Project Annual Reports will be used by FCO to undertake Annual Reviews using the DFID Annual Review Template. This will include reviews of Delivery Partner performance, in line with standard departmental requirements and based on the logframe.	Programme SRO	Annually, defined as every 12 months since the programme commenced, meaning that the timing across the portfolio is staggered throughout the year	√
Programme Completion Review[18]	Assesses the programme's performance and processes to identify and log lessons learned	TBC	Once, at the end of the project	TBC

3.5 Financial Reporting on Expenditure and Forecasts

The PFMO requires all programmes to produce financial reports on a regular basis.

During the Business Case design and approval process, programmes are required to produce financial reports on a monthly basis (corresponding to # 8 in Table 8 above). During the Business Case design and approval process, programmes are required to send the PFMO updated forecasts each month highlighting potential under / overspend risks and producing commentary to explain how those risks are being managed / mitigated.

As programmes enter the delivery stage they will need to draw on their suppliers and the project implementing partners to provide them with the required information. The PFMO have explained that as a minimum the programme financial reporting during delivery should include:

[17] p.4, PFMO Programme Quarterly Transition Funding Report (2017)

[18] The Programme Completion Review documents have not yet been developed as of March 2018.

- Regular financial forecasts that link in or reconcile to the programme workplan;
- Reports that provide information on cash balances;
- All donor financial information where there is more than one donor;
- Formal reporting at agreed intervals, for example, quarterly or biannual;
- Annual audited accounts.

The budget / forecast data provided by Suppliers / Lead Implementers will need to be entered into Departmental Financial Systems each month. Each Department will be responsible for submitting financial data to the FCO in a pre-agreed format. This will then be entered into the FCO's finance system. The MR Hub will receive this finance data monthly from FCO via a .csv file, which will then be loaded into Prospero. Prospero will differentiate between ODA and Non-ODA projects/funding. IATI / DAC data is sent from the programmes to the PFMO.

Financial information is primarily relevant for the VfM analysis and for the mapping work, which considers the size of families, programmes, projects, activity types and geographic spend.

3.6 Project Documentation

The individual projects within programmes are expected to generate the several types of documentation, summarised in Table 12 below. The information contained within these reports are likely to be relevant to the programme evaluations.

Table 12: Summary of Project Reporting Requirements

Report Type	Content	Responsibility for Approval	Timing	Available on Prospero?
Inception Report[19]	Sets out the plan of action and timeline for delivery the contracted services	HMG Programme Team	Once, usually within the first 3-6 months of the project start	Yes, but at the discretion of programmes
Quarterly Progress Reports[20]	Summarise progress made that quarter against agreed work plans, including details of resources deployed and any relevant updates to the logframe indicators.	HMG Programme Team	Quarterly, mirroring the quarters of the Financial Year	√
Annual Reports[21]	Detailing how the programme is performing against the agreed work plan, and key indicators, outputs and outcomes in the logframe. The Report should evidence how successful delivery of outputs will positively contribute to the relevant outcomes and impacts.	HMG Programme Team	Annual, defined as at the end of each 12 month period and timed to inform the Annual Reviews	√
Project Completion	Assesses the programme's performance and processes to identify and log lessons learned	HMG Programme Team	Once, at the end of the project	√

[19] Inception Reports are conditional on whether projects will have an inception phase. The assumption is that most projects will have an inception phase, but uploading the reports onto Prospero will be at the programmes' discretion.

[20] p. 9, PFMO Statement of Requirements Guidance Note (December 2017)

[21] p. 9, PFMO Statement of Requirements Guidance Note (December 2017)

Report Type	Content	Responsibility for Approval	Timing	Available on Prospero?
Review - TBC[22]				

4. Implications for MREL

Our data mapping exercise found there is a range of reputable international data sources in relation to the different sectors and 'families' as well as several online tools and analyses of specific contexts. Such sources include the World Bank Doing Business Ranking, International Monetary Fund (IMF) Financial Access Surveys and the World Economic Forum's Competitiveness and Gender Gap reports. These provide annual insights and global comparisons on key indicators relating to at least some of the PF key sectors.

While our assessment found that the MR Fund-level contextual indicators had generally adequate coverage in capturing the available secondary data relevant to each family, we note that it will be a challenge to bridge the gap between high level contextual indicators and programme or project specific data. The data sources provide overarching views of the context, generally at the national level, and as such would have to be triangulated with more context specific analysis to enable attribution of any observed changes to the respective PF intervention(s).

However, the Fund-level impact and outcome indicators could potentially provide a useful frame of reference when answering the EQs on the factors leading to programmes being more and less successful and why, or as indicators of context that help the team test contextual assumptions about the preconditions existing / necessary for PF projects / programmes to work (and they therefore might be useful for EQ7 on the validity of assumptions).

Two further caveats on the contextual data are:

1. While awareness of ensuring gender disaggregation in national data collection is improving and data availability alongside this, the availability of data disaggregated by gender varies across the PF sectors.

2. Many reputable international institutions presenting interactive data tools at the country level do not present localised information. In many instances specific locations (e.g., countries for multi-country programmes or cities / states within countries) are generally not specified in the programme Business Cases and will be identified at a later stage. It will therefore be important to revisit the secondary data sources once specific locations for PF activities become apparent (for example, in the Statement of Requirements of procured projects or in the implementers' project inception reports). This will most likely involve analysing regular reports produced by national data bureaus and reviewing how they present localised data and its relevance to the indicators in question.

[22] Requirements for project completion reviews have not yet been finalised.

Programme level reporting on outputs and intermediate outcomes, which are much more likely to be realised during the lifetime of the PF than outcomes and impacts, is therefore more likely to be of use to the EL team in answering the EQs. This will be captured in Prospero through the Fund-level Output and Programme-level Indicators and detailed in programme and project quarterly reports and annual reviews.

Table 13 below considers the types of secondary data sources required to respond to the Evaluation Questions (EQs) as identified in the EQ Matrix.

Table 13: Secondary Data Sources in the EQ Matrix

Evaluation Questions	Programme Documentation				Project Reporting	MR Fund-Level Indicators				MR Programme-Level Indicators	Summary EL Activities
	Business Case	SoR	Programme Reporting	Financial Reporting		Contextual	*Portfolio Management - TBD*	*Fund Performance - TBD*	Output		
EQ1: What evidence is there that the Prosperity Fund is likely to contribute to the intended outputs and intermediate outcomes in the ToC, as well as any unintended or unexpected effects?			√		√	√			√	√	Fund, Family, Programme and Thematic Evaluations
EQ2: Which types of interventions, sectors and country settings have been more and less successful in contributing to the achievement of *primary benefits*?	√	√	√		√	√			√	√	Fund, Family, Programme Evaluations Typology of interventions and contexts from Year 1 mapping
EQ3: Which types of interventions, sectors and country settings have been more and less successful in contributing to the achievement of *secondary benefits*?	√	√	√		√	√			√	√	Family, Programme Evaluations Typology of interventions and contexts from Year 1 mapping
EQ4: What evidence is there that the changes supported by the Prosperity Fund interventions will be sustainable and ensure environmental sustainability, will be self-financing and lead to inclusive growth that reduces inequality?	√	√	√	√	√				√	√	Family, Programme, Thematic Evaluations Annual Fund Report VfM Assessment

Evaluation Questions	Programme Documentation				Project Reporting	MR Fund-Level Indicators				MR Programme-Level Indicators	Summary EL Activities
	Business Case	SoR	Programme Reporting	Financial Reporting		Contextual	*Portfolio Management - TBD*	*Fund Performance - TBD*	Output		
EQ5: What factors have contributed to the achievement of primary and secondary benefits?			√		√	√			√	√	Draws on material from EQs 2 & 3 Fund, Family, Programme, Thematic Evaluations ToC Review Findings
EQ6: How has the balance and relationship between primary and secondary outcomes across the portfolio influenced the achievement of results?	√	√	√		√	√			√	√	Draws on material from EQs 2, 3 & 5 Fund, Family and Thematic Evaluations
EQ7: Which assumptions and the causal pathways outlined in the ToC remain valid, which have been adapted and what refinements need to be made?			√		√	√			√	√	Fund, Family and Programme Evaluations Literature Review / Context Mapping
EQ8: To what extent is the institutional governance set-up of the Prosperity Fund more or less effective in achieving i) primary benefits; ii) secondary benefits; iii) other results?			√	√			√	√			Draws on material from EQs 2 & 3 Fund, Thematic and Programme Evaluations Portfolio Analysis VfM Scorecard ToC Review Findings
EQ9: What types of programmes, approaches and governance and management arrangements have been more and less effective for achieving results and demonstrate	√	√		√			√	√	√	√	Draws on material from EQs 4-6, 8-9 Fund, Family, Thematic, Programme Evaluations VfM benchmarking against other programmes / funds

Evaluation Questions	Programme Documentation				Project Reporting	MR Fund-Level Indicators				MR Programme-Level Indicators	Summary EL Activities
	Business Case	SoR	Programme Reporting	Financial Reporting		Contextual	*Portfolio Management - TBD*	*Fund Performance - TBD*	Output		
good approaches to supporting inclusive growth and VfM?											
EQ10: To what extent have the Prosperity Fund interventions contributed to results that support gender equality, women's economic empowerment and social inclusion in line with the UK's Gender Equality Act and the Prosperity Fund Policy and Guidance and the Prosperity Fund Gender and Inclusion Framework?		√	√		√	√			√	√	Fund, Thematic and Programme Evaluations
EQ11: How is the Prosperity Fund learning and why is action on this learning happening more and less successfully?			√		√		√	√			Fund, Thematic, Programme Evaluations
EQ12: Which Prosperity Fund lessons in translating outputs into intermediate outcomes are sufficiently robust for wider learning?			√				√	√			Fund, Programme, Thematic Evaluations

Annexes

Annex 1: Prosperity Fund Indicator Standards

Table 14: The Economist Intelligence Unit's Prosperity Fund Indicator Standards

	Principle	Standard
Technical Merit	1. Clarity	1a. The indicator has a clearly defined description
		1b. The indicator's components are all unambiguously defined
	2. Specificity	2a. The indicator is specific enough to measure only the intended result(s)
		2b. The indicator only measures the direct results of Fund activities, discounting changes resulting from unrelated external factors
	3. Reliability	3a. The indicator is based on well-established sources
		3b. The method of measurement is clearly defined and appropriate for the given phenomenon
	4. Frequency	4a. The measurement frequency for the indicator is clearly defined
		4b. The measurement frequency is fit to capture the results of the Programme/ project activities
	5. Availability	5a. The indicator can be measured in practice
		5b. There are financial resources available for the data collection process
		5c. There are adequate human resources for the data collection process
Relevance	6. Usefulness	6a. The indicator specifically measure changes targeted by the Prosperity Fund
		6b. The indicator is conceptually linked to programme/project activities(s)
		6c. The frequency of measurement is aligned with fund requirements
		6d. The indicator can be disaggregated by sex (where applicable) 6e. The indicator can be disaggregated by age group (where applicable) 6f. The indicator can be disaggregated by socioeconomic group (where applicable)
	7. Coherence	7a. The indicator is complementary to the other indicators in the set
		7b. The indicator set covers all results of the activities(s) to which it is linked

Annex 2: Data Requirements Per Country and Sector

Table 15: Matrix of data needed per country and sector

Country	Respective Programme and/or Project	Locations within country if specified (e.g. city or region)	Business Environment	Education and Health	Energy & Low Carbon	Financial Services	Future Cities	Infrastructure	Technology	Trade	Transparency & Anti-Corruption
Afghanistan	*Potentially:* 9. Global Anti-Corruption										Y
Argentina	*Potentially:* 9. Global Anti-Corruption										Y
Bangladesh	*Potentially:* 2. Insurance and Risk Facility					Y					
Brazil	12. Brazil Prosperity Programme *Potentially also:* 6. Global BE; 8. Digital Access; 17. Global Trade	**Future Cities:** Sao Paulo; Recife.	Y		Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	
Burma	*Potentially:* 2. Insurance and Risk Facility; 3. AIIB; 9. Global Anti-Corruption					Y		Y		Y	Y
China	5. China Prosperity Facility *Potentially also:* 17. Global Trade		Y		Y	Y		Y			
Colombia	1. Colombia *Potentially also:* 3. AIIB 6. Global BE; 9. Global Anti-Corruption; 16. Global Infrastructure	**See EY report: Regions:** Antiqoia; Caldas; Meta; Santander; Magdalena; Sucre; Valle de Cauca; Cundinamarca **Cities:** Santa Marta; Cartagena; Valledupar; Pereira; Buenaventura; Ibague; Bucaramanga; Barrancabermeja; Neiva; Manizales	Y			Y		Y			Y
DRC	*Potentially:* 9. Global Anti-Corruption										Y
Ethiopia	*Potentially:* 9. Global Anti-Corruption					Y					Y

Country	Respective Programme and/or Project	Locations within country if specified (e.g. city or region)	Business Environment	Education and Health	Energy & Low Carbon	Financial Services	Future Cities	Infrastructure	Technology	Trade	Transparency & Anti-Corruption
Ghana	*Potentially:* 9. Global Anti-Corruption										Y
India	4. India; 11. NIIF;		*Y*	*Y*	*Y*	*Y*	*Y*	*Y*		*Y*	*Y*
	Potentially also: 3. AIIB; 9. Anti-Corruption; 17. Global Trade										
Indonesia	15. Indonesia PF Bilateral		Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
	Potentially also: 2. Insurance and Risk Facility; 3. AIIB; 6. Global BE Prog; 8. Digital Access; 9. Global Anti-Corruption Prog; 16. Global Infrastructure Prog; 17. Global Trade Prog										
Kenya	*Potentially:* 2. Insurance and Risk Facility; 8. Digital Access; 9. Global Anti-Corruption					Y			Y		Y
Kyrgyzstan	*Potentially:* 9. Global Anti-Corruption										Y
Liberia	*Potentially:* 9. Global Anti-Corruption										Y
Malawi	*Potentially:* 9. Global Anti-Corruption										Y
Maldives	*Potentially:* 3. AIIB							Y			
Mexico	7. Mexico Programme		Y		Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
	Potentially also: 6. Global BE ; 9. Global Anti-Corruption; 17. Global Trade										
Mozambique	*Potentially:* 2. Insurance and Risk Facility; 9. Global Anti-Corruption					Y					Y
Nepal	3. AIIB							Y			

Country	Respective Programme and/or Project	Locations within country if specified (e.g. city or region)	Business Environment	Education and Health	Energy & Low Carbon	Financial Services	Future Cities	Infrastructure	Technology	Trade	Transparency & Anti-Corruption
Nigeria	*Potentially:* 2. Insurance and Risk Facility; 6. Global BE; 8. Digital Access; 9. Global Anti-Corruption		Y			Y			Y		Y
Pakistan	*Potentially:* 2. Insurance and Risk Facility; 3. AIIB; 6. Global BE		Y			Y		Y			
Peru	*Potentially:* 6. Global BE		Y								
Philippines	*Potentially:* 2. Insurance and Risk Facility;					Y					
South Africa	*Potentially:* 6. Global BE; 8. Digital Acces; 17. Global Trade		Y						Y	Y	
South East Asia	18. SE Asia Clean Energy/ Low Carbon; 19. SE Asia Trade & Ec Reform *Potentially also:* 17. Global Trade;		Y		Y	Y				Y	
Sri Lanka	*Potentially:* 2. Insurance and Risk Facility; 3.AIIB					Y		y			
Tanzania	*Potentially:* 9. Global Anti-Corruption										Y
Tajikistan	*Potentially:* 9. Global Anti-Corruption										Y
Turkey	*Potentially:* 6. Global BE; 17. Global Trade		Y							Y	
Vietnam	*Potentially:* 3. AIIB; 16. Global Infrastructure; 17. Global Trade							Y		Y	
Yemen	*Potentially:* 9. Global Anti-Corruption										Y
Zambia	*Potentially:* 9. Global Anti-Corruption										Y

Annex 3 – Identified Secondary Data Sources

Investment in Infrastructure Secondary Data Sources

International Energy Agency, Energy Efficiency:

Presents annual progressions on a range of data sets for energy efficiency across key sectors and investment in data efficiency. All indicative PF intervention countries aside from Southeast Asia are covered.

International Energy Agency, Atlas of Energy:

An interactive energy data map with yearly comparisons up to 2015 on CO2 emissions from Fuel Combustion, Electricity, Energy Indicators, Oil, Coal, Energy Balance, Natural Gas and Renewables. Most countries icluded (Laos, Timor Leste, Brunei not included out of Southeast Asia). The frequency of data updating is not clear and as such makes this difficult for results comparison.

World Energy Council, Energy Trilemma Index:

Produced in partnership with Oliver Wyman, ranks countries on their ability to provide sustainable energy through the three dimensions of Energy security, Energy equity (accessibility and affordability), and Environmental sustainability. The ranking measures overall performance in achieving a sustainable mix of policies and the balance score highlights how well a country manages the trade-offs of the Trilemma with "A" being the best. Annual scoring available from 2014 – 2017 for all indicative countries.

World Energy Council, World Energy Resources:

This tri-annual data source presents key figures for reserves and production from the most recent World Energy Resources report with the option of searching by resource, region or country. The diagrams offer a variety of perspectives on the various resources. Data is available from 2008, 2011 and 2016 with the next datasets being available in 2019.

World Energy Council, Energy Efficiency Indicators:

50 energy efficiency indicators are presented covering the main world regions and World Energy Council member countries. Areas covered are: Power sector, Industry, Transport, Households, Services and Agriculture. Last updated in May 2016 but rankings show comparisons between 2000, 2010 and 2014.

Bloomberg Energy Finance, Renewable Energy Investment:

A 2017 report on investment in renewable energy globally with progressions since 2004. Provides regional overviews as well as country specific insights for indicated project countries - India, Mexico, Brazil and China. This is not available for Indonesia and Southeast Asia. The frequency of reporting is however not clear.

World Bank Development Indicators Data Bank:

An analysis and visualisation tool that contains collections of time series data on a variety of global development indicators. The data predominantly builds on information from national data institutes and as such is dependent on each country’s gathering and publication of different data sources. While the source indicators are applicable as noted above, the most

recent data dates to 2015 with no clear indication of when the data sources will be updated. Furthermore, while the topics are very broad we find limited gender disaggregation or subnational focus.

World Economic Forum Global Competitiveness Index:

Annually tracks the performance of close to 140 countries at the national level, including indicative PF intervention countries, on 12 pillars of competitiveness, assessing the factors and institutions identified by empirical and theoretical research as determining improvements in productivity. The 12 pillars are: institutions; infrastructure; macroeconomic environment; health and primary education; higher education and training; goods market efficiency; labour market efficiency; financial market development; technological readiness; market size business sophistication; and innovation.

International Telecommunications Union, ICT Development Index:

The index has been updated annually since 2009, it is a composite index that combines 11 indicators into one benchmark measure. It is used to monitor and compare developments in information and communication technology (ICT) between countries over time. The indicators used address ICT infrastructure and access, ICT usage and ICT skills, while also addressing the gender gap with regional references, although no country-specific equality references are available.

UNCTAD, Liner Shipping Connectivity Index: Business Environment and Transparency & Anti-Corruption

Applicable to the ‘Infrastructure’ and ‘Trade’ sector to some extent this index presents annual data from 2004 - 2017 indicating a country's integration level into global liner shipping networks thus providing an indication of the countries' access to the world market.

International Road Federation, World Road Statistics:

A paid for data source providing insights on road networks, traffic, vehicles in use, accidents, road expenditures etc. Data is sporadic depending on the country in question and is only available up to 2014. While the data source could provide an insight into certain infrastructure needs at the start of implementation, this could not be applied for assessing progress.

OpenSignal, Phone coverage by provider:

The tool measures mobile phone signal around the world through an app. OpenSignal is a leading organisation in this field, although country information is varied. Specific country reports from 2017 are available for: Brazil, Colombia, Indonesia, Mexico, India, Philippines, South Africa, Peru, Argentina. This source can provide insights on infrastructure and technology to a certain extent, although given the reliance of the application of the app in relevant countries to measure connectivity, this is not a reliable tool to measure progression of connectivity.

City Indexes

A variety of city indexes that measure a range of indicators to assess the overall development and liveability of a particular city can be used to evaluate Future Cities programmes. Examples of indexes include:

- The City Development Index (CDI) is defined at the city level and measures the average well-being and access to urban facilities by individuals. It is a composite index based on five separate sub-indices – city product, infrastructure, waste, health and education – the values of which range from 0 to 100. It is considered the best single measure of the level of development in cities.
- The City Product per person, which is analogous to the GDP at the city level, gives the economic output of the city.
- The United Nations City Prosperity Initiative (CPI) assesses six dimensions: productivity, infrastructure development, quality of life, equity and inclusion, environmental sustainability, governance and legislation.
- Global City Scorecards and Comprehensive Indices which use quality of infrastructure as an indicator of city liveability, sustainability, competitiveness, ease of doing business and resilience.
    - Cities of Opportunity 6, PricewaterhouseCoopers
    - Hot Spots 2025, Economist Intelligence Unit
    - Global Cities Index and Emerging Cities Outlook, A.T. Kearney
    - Global Power Cities Index, Mori Memorial Foundation
    - World's Most Competitive Cities, IBM (audience: business site selection)
    - Sustainable Cities Index, ARCADIS (perspective: sustainability)
    - Global Financial Centres Index, Z/Yen Group (city selection: financial centres)
    - Global Cities of the Future, fDi Intelligence (perspective: FDI)
    - Resilient Cities, Grosvenor (audience: real estate clients)
    - A summary of the liveability ranking and overview, Economist Intelligence Unit (audience: companies relocating employees)
    - City RepTrak, Reputation Institute (perspective: reputation)
    - Quality of Living Survey, Mercer (audience: companies with an international workforce)
    - The Wealth Report Global Cities Survey, Knight Frank (audience and perspective: real estate and attraction of high net worth individuals)
    - City Momentum Index, Jones Lang LaSalle (audience: real estate clients)
    - Global MetroMonitor, Brookings Institution
    - Urban World: Mapping Economic Power of Cities, McKinsey Global Institute

Human Capital, Innovation and Technology Secondary Data Sources

The Global Innovation Index

The index provides an annual ranking of countries by their capacity for, and success in, innovation based on detailed metrics about the innovation performance of 127 countries and

economies around the world. Its 81 indicators explore a broad vision of innovation, including political environment, education, infrastructure and business sophistication.

International Telecommunications Union, ICT Development Index:

The index has been updated annually since 2009, it is a composite index that combines 11 indicators into one benchmark measure. It is used to monitor and compare developments in information and communication technology (ICT) between countries over time. The indicators used address ICT infrastructure and access, ICT usage and ICT skills, while also addressing the gender gap with regional references, although no country-specific equality references are available.

The International Labour Organisation ILOSTAT Database

Annual global labour indicators divided across 13 specific focus areas from 2005 – 2016. However, data availability varies across indicators. The interactive data tools enable disaggregation by gender, education and economic class among others.

Trade Secondary Data Sources

World Economic Forum Global Competitiveness Index:

Annually tracks the performance of close to 140 countries at the national level, including indicative PF intervention countries, on 12 pillars of competitiveness, assessing the factors and institutions identified by empirical and theoretical research as determining improvements in productivity. The 12 pillars are: institutions; infrastructure; macroeconomic environment; health and primary education; higher education and training; goods market efficiency; labour market efficiency; financial market development; technological readiness; market size business sophistication; and innovation.

International Trade Centre Market Access Map:

Part of the Transparency in Trade Initiative the Map was developed to support the needs of exporters, trade support institutions, trade policy makers and academic institutions in developing countries. It provides information about customs tariffs (including tariff preferences) applied by more than 200 countries, also providing information on tariff rate quotas, trade remedies, rules and certificates of origin, bound tariffs of WTO members, non-tariff measures and trade flows to help users prioritize and analyse export markets and prepare for market access negotiations. Funded by the European Commission, DFID, the World Bank, the Ministry of Finance of the Russian Federation and donors to ITC's trust fund the data source is clear and reliable although the frequency of updating is not clear.

International Trade Centre Trade Treaties Map (LegaCarta):

An interactive tool presenting a core group of around 250 multilateral trade instruments with references to approximately 450 amendments and protocols, in addition to legal maps, ratification tables, accession statistics and country analysis and technical assistance tools. While LegaCarta offers national authorities, trade promotion organisations, private sector organisations and educational institutions a global picture of the multilateral rules that impact trade, the frequency of updating the available information is not clear making it difficult to assess its relevance for measuring results.

World Trade Organisation database of Preferential and Regional Trade Agreements:

This database contains information on the preferential trade arrangements (PTAs), understood to mean non-reciprocal preferential schemes, that are being implemented by WTO Members. The database was established as an outcome of the decision establishing the Transparency Mechanism for PTAs. Meanwhile the RTA information on only those agreements that have either been notified, or for which an early announcement has been made, are recorded. The interactive database shows agreements by country/ territory divided by sectors or by specific topics while also offering overviews and analyses for countries or particular agreements.

World Bank Doing Business Ranking:

Annual reports that measure regulations that enhance and constrain business activity globally, setting out rankings on the ease of doing business in 190 economies worldwide. Each nation's ranking is built on an established series of ten indicators on starting a business, getting credit, protecting minority investors, trading across borders and enforcing contracts, among others. Furthermore, subnational reports benchmarking business regulations have been produced for a number of indicative countries involved in the PF but with varying utility as they are produced sporadically with only Colombia (2017), Mexico (2016) and South Africa (2015) benefiting from subnational reports post 2012 again presenting some scope for solid data for establishing the operational context, but no guarantee of more localised data for results measurement.

World Bank Logistics Performance Index (LPI):

International scorecards produced bi-annually since 2007 with the latest publication in 2016. LPI presents data on efficiency of clearance at borders, quality of infrastructure, ease of arranging international shipments, quality of logistics services, tracking and tracing, and timeliness of shipments reaching destinations. LPI follows an established methodology with approximate 80% confidence intervals.

Financial and Economic Reform Secondary Data Sources

World Bank Development Indicators Data Bank:

An analysis and visualisation tool that contains collections of time series data on a variety of global development indicators. The data predominantly builds on information from national data institutes and as such is dependent on each country's gathering and publication of different data sources. While the source indicators are applicable as noted above, the most recent data dates to 2015 with no clear indication of when the data sources will be updated. Furthermore, while the topics are very broad we find limited gender disaggregation or subnational focus.

International Monetary Fund, Financial Access Survey (FAS):

The FAS has been conducted annually for 18 years, funded by the Netherlands' Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The FAS collects annual data on indicators tracking financial access providing insights on the availability and use of financial products such as consumer and firm deposit accounts, loans, and insurance policies across the globe, which more recently includes national gender gap data. The national level information is based on administrative data collected from both traditional (e.g., commercial

banks or other deposit-taking institutions) and digital (e.g., mobile money) financial service providers.

Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM):

A trusted annual resource on entrepreneurship used by key international organisations such as the United Nations, World Economic Forum, World Bank, and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). GEM provides custom datasets, special reports and expert opinion. Adult population and national expert surveys are conducted annually by national teams in each participating country with the objective of analysing: the entrepreneurial behaviour and attitudes of individuals; the national context and how that impacts entrepreneurship. Reports are published on an annual basis, but country specific data sets and GEM indicators are only made available to the public three years after data collection. Access to more up to date reports needs to be requested from the relevant GEM national team.

Ease of Doing Business Secondary Data Sources

World Bank Enterprise Surveys:

Conducted on a sporadic basis in collaboration with regional development banks, they present insights on the business environment, reviewing access to finance, infrastructure, crime, competition and performance from a representative sample of the economy's private sector. While the surveys have been conducted since 1990, country reports are not produced on a regular basis and indeed the majority of the indicative country reports date between 2010 and 2014, with only Ethiopia, Indonesia, Myanmar and Liberia being more recent (2015 – 2017), while DRC is not listed. The surveys however follow a clear established methodology with any discrepancies being indicated. As such they present for some countries a relevant tool for establishing a baseline view, while the measurement of results would most likely have to rely on primary data collection i.e. interviews/ surveys with a representative sample of the private sector.

World Bank Development Indicators Data Bank:

An analysis and visualisation tool that contains collections of time series data on a variety of global development indicators. The data predominantly builds on information from national data institutes and as such is dependent on each country's gathering and publication of different data sources. While the source indicators are applicable as noted above, the most recent data dates to 2015 with no clear indication of when the data sources will be updated. Furthermore, while the topics are very broad we find limited gender disaggregation or subnational focus.

World Bank Doing Business Ranking:

Annual reports that measure regulations that enhance and constrain business activity globally, setting out rankings on the ease of doing business in 190 economies worldwide. Each nation's ranking is built on an established series of ten indicators on starting a business, getting credit, protecting minority investors, trading across borders and enforcing contracts, among others. Furthermore, subnational reports benchmarking business regulations have been produced for a number of indicative countries involved in the PF but with varying utility as they are produced sporadically with only Colombia (2017), Mexico (2016) and South Africa (2015) benefiting from

subnational reports post 2012 again presenting some scope for solid data for establishing the operational context, but no guarantee of more localised data for results measurement.

Transparency International Corruption Perception Index (CPI):

The CPI scores and ranks countries based on how corrupt a country's public sector is perceived to be. It is a composite index applying a combination of surveys and assessments of corruption applying a standardised established methodology. The most widely used indicator of corruption worldwide, the most recent CPI is calculated using 13 different data sources from 12 different institutions that capture perceptions of corruption within the past two years. The different data sources include the African Development bank, governance and transformation indices from the Bertelsman Foundation, the Economist Intelligence Unit's Country Risk Rating, the World Economic Forum Executive Opinion Survey (EOS) 2016 and the World Justice Project Rule of Law Index 2016 among others. The CPI provides a national and regional insight on perceived corruption, but more specific insights at the local level, disaggregated by gender or socioeconomic class are not available.

Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM):

A trusted annual resource on entrepreneurship used by key international organisations such as the United Nations, World Economic Forum, World Bank, and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). GEM provides custom datasets, special reports and expert opinion. Adult population and national expert surveys are conducted annually by national teams in each participating country with the objective of analysing: the entrepreneurial behaviour and attitudes of individuals; the national context and how that impacts entrepreneurship. Reports are published on an annual basis, but country specific data sets and GEM indicators are only made available to the public three years after data collection. Access to more up to date reports needs to be requested from the relevant GEM national team.

World Justice Project Rule of Law Index:

Annually published since 2008, the Index is based on more than 110,000 household and expert surveys to measure how the rule of law is experienced and perceived in practical, everyday situations by the general public worldwide. Performance is measured using 44 indicators across eight primary rule of law factors, each of which is scored and ranked globally and against regional and income peers: Constraints on Government Powers, Absence of Corruption, Open Government, Fundamental Rights, Order and Security, Regulatory Enforcement, Civil Justice, and Criminal Justice. The Rule of Law Index does not cover DRC, Maldives, Mozambique, Tajikistan and Yemen out of the indicative intervention countries.

Gender Secondary Data Sources

World Economic Forum, Global Gender Gap Report:

An annual framework for capturing the magnitude of gender-based disparities across four thematic dimensions: Economic Participation and Opportunity, Educational Attainment, Health and Survival, and Political Empowerment. This data has been produced since 2006 the reports also enable the tracking their progress over time at the national and regional level as well as different income groups, covering 144 countries in 2017 on their progress towards gender parity on a scale from 0 (imparity) to 1 (parity).

International Labour Organisation, ILOSTAT:

Annual global labour indicators divided across 13 specific focus areas from 2005 – 2016. However, data availability varies across indicators. The interactive data tools enable disaggregation by gender, education and economic class among others and can be utilised to understand any changes in women's participation in the formal economy for example.

Annex 4 – Scoring of Identified Contextual Data Sources

Table 16: Detailed scoring of secondary data sources

Source	Subsection	Clarity	Specificity	Reliability	Frequency	Availability	Usefulness	Coherence	Total score
World Bank	Enterprise Surveys	3	2	3	1	1	3	2	2
	Doing Business Ranking	3	1	3	3	3	2	3	3
	Logistics Performance Index	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3
	World Development Indicators Data Bank	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	2
World Economic Forum	Global Competitiveness Index	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
	Global Gender Gap Report	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
Transparency International	Corruption Perception Index	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3
Global Entrepreneurship Monitor		3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3
World Justice Project	Rule of Law Index	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3
International Trade Centre	Market Access Map	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3
	Trade Treaties Map	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3
World Trade Organisation	Regional Trade Agreements	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3
	Preferential Trade Agreements	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3
International Energy Agency	Energy Efficiency	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3
	Atlas of Energy	3	3	2	1	1	3	3	2
World Energy Council	Energy Trilemma Index	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3
	World Energy Resources	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3
	Energy Efficiency Indicators	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2

Bloomberg Energy Finance	Renewable Energy Investment	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3
International Telecommunications Union	ICT Development Index	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3
UNCTAD	Liner Shipping Connectivity Index	2	3	2	3	3	2	2	2
International Road Federation	World Road Statistics	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2
OpenSignal	Phone coverage by provider	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	2
International Monetary Fund (IMF)	Financial Access Survey	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3
International Labour Organisation	ILOSTAT	3	3	2	1	1	2	2	2