



Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation  
2018 Monitoring Round

**TECHNICAL COMPANION DOCUMENT**

Complementary to the 2018 Monitoring Guide

**For reference only**

**Summary:**

This technical companion document provides details on how the different Global Partnership monitoring indicators are calculated.

This document is complementary to the 2018 Monitoring Guide which is available at [www.effectivecooperation.org/2018monitoring](http://www.effectivecooperation.org/2018monitoring)

The technical companion is for **reference only**. The 2018 monitoring round data collection tool does automatic calculations of the indicators contained in this document.

## TECHNICAL COMPANION: HOW ARE INDICATORS CALCULATED IN THE "COUNTRY EXCEL"?

### Indicator 1a: Development partners use country-led results frameworks (SDG 17.15.1)

The four (4) sub-indicators generated by the programme level assessment (module 2) are calculated as follows:

**Indicator 1a.1** Alignment at objectives level: percentage of development interventions whose objectives are drawn from country-led result frameworks

For each partner country/development partner the indicator is calculated as the number of interventions that draw their objectives from national planning tools over the total number of interventions.

$$= 100 \times \frac{n. of Qp7 = "yes"}{n. of interventions}$$

**Indicator 1a.2.** Alignment at results level: percentage of results indicators contained in development interventions that are drawn from country-led results frameworks

The indicator is calculated as follows:

1. For each intervention: number of results indicators included in the result framework of the intervention that are drawn from existing government results framework divided by the total number of results indicators included in the result framework of the intervention

$$= 100 \times \frac{Qp 9a}{Qp 9}$$

2. The values obtained for each intervention are averaged to obtain the indicator for each partner country and development partner.

**Indicator 1a.3.** Alignment at monitoring and statistics level: Percentage of results indicators that will be monitored using government sources and monitoring systems.

The indicator is calculated as follows:

1. For each intervention: number of results indicators included in the result framework of the intervention that will be reported using sources of information directly provided by existing government monitoring systems or national statistical services divided by the total number of results indicators included in the result framework of the intervention

$$= 100 \times \frac{Qp 9b}{Qp 9}$$

2. The values obtained for each intervention are averaged to obtain the indicator for each partner country and development partner.

**Indicator 1a.4.** Percentage of new interventions that plan a final evaluation with government involvement.

For each partner country and development partner, the indicator is calculated as the number of interventions with government involvement in final evaluation over the total number of interventions that plan a final evaluation.

$$100 \times \frac{n. of Qp 10 a = "2", "3", "4"}{(n. of Qp 10 = "yes")}$$

where 2= government defines evaluation scope; 3= Government will contribute to financing and evaluation; 4= government defines evaluation scope and will contribute to financing and evaluation

All four (4) sub-indicators are aggregated for partner countries and development partners to the global level by averaging the values of all interventions. These averages are not weighted by the budgets of the interventions as development partners should use country-led results framework for all interventions independently from the size of the interventions.

The **SDG indicator 17.15.1** "Extent of use of country-owned results frameworks and planning tools by providers of development cooperation" is calculated by averaging the three estimates:

$$= 100 \times \frac{1a.1 + 1a.2 + 1a.3}{3}$$

The indicator can be calculated only when all three elements are available.

### Indicator 1b: Countries strengthen their national results frameworks

The scoring method for indicator 1b is as follows:

1. First, it assigns one (1) point to each sub-element if fully met or a prorated score if elements are missing.
2. Scoring for each of the four broad criteria is the result of averaging the individual scores for each sub-element, expressed as a percentage. As countries strengthen the specific function, the score approaches 100.
3. The overall score for the indicator is the results of averaging the scores for the 11 sub-elements, expressed as a percentage. As countries strengthen and sustain these building blocks, the indicator approaches 100 percent.

In assigning the scores to each sub-elements (step 1), the following rules apply:

Question	Scoring method for each sub-element/question
<b>Q1</b>	<b>1 point</b> – A standing national development strategy or government strategic plan is in place <b>0.5 points</b> – A national development strategy or government strategic plan is in preparation <b>0 points</b> – No strategy or plan in place
<b>Q2</b>	<b>1 point</b> – Parliament, civil society, private sector and subnational governments all have been consulted (at least) <b>0.75 points</b> – Three of the above stakeholders have been consulted (at least) <b>0.50 points</b> – Two of the above stakeholders have been consulted (at least) <b>0.25 points</b> – Only one of the four stakeholders above have been consulted (at least) <b>0 points</b> – None of these four stakeholders have been consulted (at least) <i>Note: Development partners are included as contextual information, but not considered in the scoring. As foreign development organisations, they cannot be part of the definition of what constitutes 'nationally-owned' development strategies.</i>
<b>Q3</b>	<b>1 point</b> – The national development strategy or government plan are publicly accessible online <b>0 points</b> – The document is not accessible online
<b>Q4</b>	<b>1 point</b> – Development priorities, targets and indicators are all included in the document. <b>0.75 points</b> – Two of the three elements are included in the document, while the missing element (targets or indicators) can found in sector strategies and plans <b>0.5 points</b> – Two of the three elements are included in the document, but the missing element is not available in sector strategies and plans <b>0.25 points</b> – Only one of the three elements is included in the document <b>0 points</b> – The document does not contain development priorities, targets or indicators.

<b>Q5<sup>1</sup></b>	<p><b>1 point</b> – The 2030 Agenda/SDGs are referred in the development strategy or government plan, or there are ongoing processes to do so.</p> <p><b>0 points</b> – There is no reference to the 2030 Agenda/SDGs yet, nor a planned processes to do so.</p>
<b>Q6</b>	<p>Sector strategies:</p> <p><b>0.5 points</b> – Most sector strategies are required to align to national strategy or government plan, by law and in practice;</p> <p><b>0.4 points</b> – Sector alignment is overseen and enforced by central authority in practice despite the absence of a legal requirement</p> <p><b>0.3 points</b> – Sector strategies tends to reflect at least core priorities in the national strategy or government plan</p> <p><b>0.15 points</b> – If only some sector strategies are aligned with the national strategy or government plan</p> <p><b>0 points</b> – If sector strategies are in general not aligned with the national strategy or government plan</p> <p>For subnational strategies: - Same scoring method as above The two scores combined (i.e. sector and subnational) provide the final score for this sub-element.</p>
<b>Q7</b>	<p><b>1 point</b> – There are progress reports on the national development strategy or government strategic plan, frequently (every 1-2 years) and publicly available</p> <p><b>0.5 point</b> – There are progress reports, but either they are not frequent (every 3 years or more) OR they are not publicly available.</p> <p><b>0.25 points</b> – There are progress reports, but they are not frequent (every 3 years or more) AND they are not publicly available.</p> <p><b>0 points</b> – There are no progress reports.</p>
<b>Q8</b>	<p><b>1 point</b> – A central unit collates all the data from different sources and produces a unified report; Or, several line ministries are responsible for collating the data; a central unit produces a unified report.</p> <p><b>0.5 points</b> – Several line ministries responsible for collating the data and producing sector/thematic report(s)</p> <p><b>0.25 points</b> – Responsibilities for data collection are fragmented across the government and only some entities have produced progress report(s).</p> <p><b>0 points</b> – No progress report has been produced yet by government entities.</p>
<b>Q9</b>	<p><b>1 point</b> – Timely, regular, accurate government data available for all the indicators</p> <p><b>0.75 points</b> – For most indicators</p> <p><b>0.5 points</b> – Mixed, for some indicators</p> <p><b>0.25 points</b> – Very few indicators</p> <p><b>0 points</b> – There are no indicators in the national development strategy or government plan</p>
<b>Q10</b>	<p><b>1 point</b> – Costed national strategy or government plan and the information is used to inform public expenditure allocations</p> <p><b>0.5 points</b> – The national strategy or government plan is not costed but it is used to inform public expenditure allocations</p> <p><b>0 points</b> – The national strategy or government plan is not used to inform public expenditure allocations, whether it is costed or not.</p>
<b>Q11</b>	<p><b>1 point</b> – The plan or progress reports are used to inform dialogue with development partners on priority areas and results, including on future allocations for development co-operation funding.</p> <p><b>0.5 points</b> – The plan or progress reports are used to inform dialogue with development partners on priority areas and results.</p> <p><b>0.25 points</b> – The plan or progress reports are used to inform dialogue with development partners on priority areas, but not on results.</p> <p><b>0 points</b> – The plan or progress reports are not used to inform dialogue with development partners.</p>

<sup>1</sup> The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development stipulates that specific arrangements for follow up and review on the SDG goals and targets should be country-led and voluntary. Therefore, in determining the overall score for indicator 1b, the extent of integration does not impact countries' scoring on indicator 1b, nor the specific ways in which should integration may be happening is judged. Therefore, this question adds one point if countries have referred to the 2030 Agenda or the SDGs in their national strategy or government plan, independently of the approach chosen by the country – or if at least the country has an ongoing plan to do so in the future.

Global results are calculated by averaging results across countries.

**Indicator 2: Civil Society Organisations operate within an environment that maximises their engagement in and contribution to development**

The position of a country in the various scales provides substantive information around the individual elements being address. To allow for easier cross-country comparison and to follow the performance of participants over time, an overall score is provided for the indicator which accounts for the possible diverging answers provided by national co-ordinators, focal points for CSOs and development partners.

To provide qualitative categories that represent the enabling environment for CSOs to maximise their engagement and contribution to development, it is suggested the following scoring and aggregation method:

**1. Module score.** For each question within each module, the position in the scale will determine the number of points according to the table below.

Position in scale	Points
<b>Level 1</b>	0 point
<b>Level 2</b>	1 point
<b>Level 3</b>	2 points
<b>Level 4</b>	3 points

Divergences in scores by participants will be illustrated graphically in the [Country Excel](#).

*Max points achievable for each module*

	Number of questions	Max points possible
<b>Module 1</b>	4	12
<b>Module 2</b>	4	12
<b>Module 3</b>	4	12
<b>Module 4</b>	4	12

*Example Country A*

	Module 1	Module 2	Module 3	Module 4
Points scored	5	9	6	10
Max points possible	12	12	12	12
<b>Standardised scores</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.83</b>

**2. Country score.** The average score among the four modules will provide the final score for each country (0-1).

	<b>Module 1.</b> Space for CSO dialogue	<b>Module 2.</b> CSOs development effectiveness	<b>Module 3.</b> Official development assistance with CSOs	<b>Module 4.</b> Legal and regulatory environment	<b>Indicator 2.</b> Enabling environment for CSOs (avg score of four modules)
<b>Country A</b>	0.42	0.75	0.50	0.83	<b>0.63</b>
<b>Country B</b>	0.08	0.20	0.56	0.58	<b>0.36</b>
<b>Country C</b>	0.67	0.80	0.78	0.83	<b>0.77</b>

Scores for each module will be visually presented to reflect possible diverging answers.

Country scores will be calculated for each stakeholder group and will translate into four qualitative categories based on the following ranges:

Range of scores	CSOs enabling environment and development effectiveness
Total score from 0 to 0.20	<b>Negligible</b>
Total score from 0.21 to 0.40	<b>Narrow</b>
Total score from 0.41 to 0.60	<b>Basic</b>
Total score from 0.61 to 0.80	<b>Moderate</b>
Total score from 0.81 to 1	<b>Extensive</b>



Global results are calculated by averaging the scores across countries.

### Indicator 3: Quality of public-private dialogue

While the position of a country in the various scales provides substantive information around the individual elements being addressed, it does not allow for a quick and direct comparison. In order to follow the performance of participants over time and to be able to compare countries, an overall score for this indicator is proposed.

The concept being measured by this indicator is the quality of public-private dialogue and whether it contributes to development. The following qualitative categories are applied:



For each question of module 2, the position in the scale will determine the number of points achieved (outlined in the table below). The sum of points will give a score that falls within a qualitative category. Scores for each of the four (4) consulted stakeholder groups are provided. Global results are calculated by averaging across countries.

Position in scale	Score
<b>Level 1</b>	0 point
<b>Level 2</b>	1 point
<b>Level 3</b>	2 points
<b>Level 4</b>	3 points

Quality of Public-Private Dialogue	Range of scores
Weak	Total score from 0 to 4
Emerging	Total score from 5 to 9
Consolidating	Total score from 10 to 13
Effective	Total score from 14 to 18

#### Indicator 4: Transparent information on development co-operation is publicly available


For the **global level transparency element**, the Global Partnership relies on assessments produced by the secretariats of each of the three systems: the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS), the OECD Forward Spending Survey (FSS), and the International Aid Transparency Initiative standard (IATI)

Each of these transparency assessments has its own distinct underlying methodology, therefore results are not directly comparable amongst themselves and will be presented separately. To facilitate interpretation of the overall scores for these three assessments, development partners are categorised on the same four-tiered scale: "excellent", "good", "fair" and "needs improvement".

#### How do the three systems assess transparency?

The three assessments place varying weight on specific dimensions such as timeliness, comprehensiveness, provision of forward-looking data, and data accuracy, according to their relevance with respect to the use of the information.

##### Transparency dimensions of the three assessments



CRS assessment uses the following weights: timeliness (5/20); completeness (3/20) and accuracy (12/20). FSS assessment uses the following weights: public disclosure of FSS data (1/7); timeliness (1/7); completeness (3/7) and accuracy (2/7).

IATI uses equal weights for its dimensions. Within the comprehensiveness dimension, three sub-components are weighted: core (50%), financial (25%) and forward-looking (25%). The IATI reporting scores are adjusted for the coverage of the financial flows reported using the following scale of coverage: Excellent: 80% or over (adjustment

factor 1); Good: greater than or equal to 60 and less than 80% (adjustment factor 0.8); Fair: greater than or equal to 40 and less than 60% (adjustment factor 0.6); and Poor: less than 40% (adjustment factor 0.4).

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

The **complementary country level element** measures the percentage of development partners providing development co-operation that are included in a government's Management Information System (MIS) or other data management tools. The data source is developing country government reporting.

$$\text{Calculation (\%)} = 100 \times \frac{\text{Number of development partners working in the country that are reflected in a country's management information system or other data management tools}}{\text{Total number of development partners working in the country}}$$

The total number of development partners shall include all bilateral and multilateral development partners of development co-operation working in the country, including South-South Co-operation.

#### **Indicator 5a: Development co-operation is predictable - Annual predictability**

**Case 1:** When disbursements to the public sector are less than or equal to what was scheduled, disbursements "as scheduled" (5a<sub>1</sub>) take the value:

$$\text{Indicator } 5a_1 (\%) = 100 \times \frac{Q^p 2}{Q^p 3}$$

and disbursements "beyond scheduled" (5a<sub>2</sub>) take the value

$$\text{Indicator } 5a_2 (\%) = 0$$

**Case 2:** When disbursements to the public sector are greater than what was scheduled, disbursements "beyond scheduled" take the value:

$$\text{Indicator } 5a_2 (\%) = 100 \times \frac{Q^p 2 - Q^p 3}{Q^p 2}$$

and disbursements "beyond scheduled" (5a<sub>1</sub>) take the value

$$\text{Indicator } 5a_1 (\%) = 100$$

Global aggregates (as well as aggregates for each development partner and each partner country) for Indicator 5a<sub>1</sub> are calculated using scheduled disbursements for the public sector as the weighting variable.

Global aggregates (as well as aggregates for each development partner and each partner country) for Indicator 5a<sub>2</sub> are calculated using actual disbursements for the public sector as the weighting variable.

#### **Indicator 5b: Development co-operation is predictable - Medium term predictability**

Indicator value for development partner P in country C

$$P_c = \frac{(Qg1 + Qg2 + Qg3)}{3}$$

For country C for 1, 2 and 3 years ahead (y=1, 2, 3)  $C_y$  = average of Qg5, Qg6 and Qg7 respectively across all development partners, weighted by the volume of the development partner's development co-operation disbursed in the reference year (Question 5aQp1 combining grants and loans).

$$C1 = \frac{\sum_{p=1}^n (Wp * Qg1)}{n}$$

$$C2 = \frac{\sum_{p=1}^n (Wp * Qg2)}{n}$$

$$C3 = \frac{\sum_{p=1}^n (Wp * Qg3)}{n}$$

Where  $W_p$  = weight assigned to each development partner P based on disbursements reported for question 5aQp1 (combining grants and loans):

$$Wp = \frac{Qp1 (ind 5a)}{\sum_{p=1}^n (Qp1 ind 5a)}$$

Note that using weighted averages is intended to provide an estimate of the scale of resources covered by indicative forward expenditure and/or implementation plans. This reflects the relative importance that a partner country attaches to obtaining forward spending information from a large co-operation vis-à-vis a small development partner.

The above indicator values for individual development partners and for partner countries will serve as a basis for global aggregation which is obtained by averaging across development partners (and partner countries) using total disbursements (5aQp1) as the weighting variable.

### **Indicator 6: Development co-operation is included in budgets subject to parliamentary oversight**

**Case 1:** When funds recorded in the government annual budget are less than or equal to scheduled disbursements for the government sector, development co-operation recorded on budget "of scheduled" (6a<sub>1</sub>) takes the value:

$$Indicator\ 6_1 (\%) = 100 \times \frac{Q^{g1} (ind\ 6)}{Q^{p3} (ind\ 5a)}$$

And development co-operation recorded on budget "beyond scheduled" (6a<sub>2</sub>) takes the value:

$$Indicator\ 6_2 (\%) = 0$$

**Case 2:** When funds recorded in the government sector annual budget are greater than scheduled disbursements for the government sector, development co-operation recorded on budget "beyond scheduled" (6a<sub>2</sub>) takes the value:

$$Indicator\ 6_2 (\%) = 100 \times \frac{Q^{g1} (ind\ 6) - Q^{p3} (ind\ 5a)}{Q^{g1} (ind\ 6)}$$

And development co-operation recorded on budget "of scheduled" (6a<sub>1</sub>) take the value:

$$Indicator\ 6_1 (\%) = 100$$

Global aggregates (as well as aggregates for each development partner and each partner country) for Indicator 6<sub>1</sub> are calculated using scheduled disbursements for the government sector as the weighting variable.

Global aggregates (as well as aggregates for each development partner and each partner country) for Indicator 6<sub>2</sub> are calculated using funds recorded in the government annual budget as the weighting variable.

**Indicator 7: Mutual accountability among development actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews**

A country is considered to have a mutual assessment review in place when at least four of five key elements, or 'dimensions', are in place. The dimensions are measured using five specific questions, each containing a 4-level scale that reflects progress towards an ideal scenario. The different levels take into account the diversity of country contexts and mutual accountability arrangements. A dimension is considered in place (i.e. present, 'yes') when the country situation for that particular issue is best described by Levels 3 or 4.

The global score reflects the percentage of countries undertaking 'inclusive and transparent mutual assessments of progress in implementing the effective development co-operation commitments' –i.e. countries with at least four out of the five dimensions in place.

At the global level, the indicator is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Indicator 7 (\% of partner countries)} = 100 \times \frac{N_c}{N}$$

where N<sub>c</sub> is the number of countries that meet at least four out of the five dimensions and N is the total number of countries participating in the respective monitoring round.

**Indicator 8: Countries have systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment (SDG 5c)**

A country will be considered to satisfy each criterion as follows:

	Requirements per criterion
A country will satisfy <b>Criterion 1</b>	if it answers "Yes" to 2 out of 3 questions in Criterion 1
A country will satisfy <b>Criterion 2</b>	if it answers "Yes" to 4 out of 7 questions in Criterion 2
A country will satisfy <b>Criterion 3</b>	if it answers "Yes" to 2 out of 3 questions in Criterion 3

The questions within each criterion are weighted equally. A country would need to satisfy the threshold of "yes" responses per criterion to satisfy a criterion.

*Country classification and computation*

Countries will be classified as 'fully meets requirements', 'approaches requirements', and 'does not meet requirements' per the following matrices (There are 8 possible combinations, Cases A-H below):

Fully meets requirements			
	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3
<b>Case A</b>	✓	✓	✓

Approaches requirements			
	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3
<b>Case B</b>	✓		
<b>Case C</b>		✓	
<b>Case D</b>			✓
<b>Case E</b>	✓	✓	

<b>Case F</b>	✓		✓
<b>Case G</b>		✓	✓
<b>Does not meet requirements</b>			
	<b>Criterion 1</b>	<b>Criterion 2</b>	<b>Criterion 3</b>
<b>Case H</b>			

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

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

*Method of computation for global aggregation of the indicator 5.c.1 is defined as follows:*

$$\text{Indicator 8} = \frac{(\text{Number of countries that **fully** meet requirements}) \times 100}{\text{Total number of countries}}$$

The following two country classification global proportions will also be reported:

$$\frac{(\text{Number of countries that **do not meet** requirements}) \times 100}{\text{Total number of countries}}$$

$$\frac{(\text{Number of countries that **approach** requirements}) \times 100}{\text{Total number of countries}}$$

Additional disaggregation by region as follows:

$$\frac{(\text{Number of countries in **region x** with country **classification y**}) \times 100}{\text{Total number of countries in **region x**}}$$

Where **x** refers to the region of analysis and **y** refers to the country classification based on the questionnaire.

### Indicator 9a: Quality of Countries' Public Financial Management Systems

The following nine PEFA dimensions are used for indicator 9a assessment:

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

For *each country*, the scores for selected PEFA dimensions from the two most recent PEFA assessments will be presented. PEFA dimension scores range from A (highest) to D (lowest).

Countries will be categorised as having made 'significant improvement', 'improvement' or 'no improvement,' using the following scoring method:

Points will be assigned for changes in the scores of selected PEFA dimensions, as follows:

- +1 point for a positive change or for maintaining a dimension score of 'A'
- + 0 points for no change
- -1 point for a negative change

Countries will then be categorised as follows:

- Significant progress = 5 or more points
- Progress = 1 to 4 points
- No overall change = 0 points
- Negative progress = -9 to -1 points

In reporting on the indicator at global level, the following country classification will be provided:

$$\frac{(\text{Number of countries showing } \mathbf{progress}) \times 100}{\text{Total number of reporting countries}}$$

$$\frac{(\text{Number of countries showing } \mathbf{no overall change}) \times 100}{\text{Total number of reporting countries}}$$

$$\frac{(\text{Number of countries showing } \mathbf{negative progress}) \times 100}{\text{Total number of reporting countries}}$$

Where  $x$  refers to the region of analysis and  $y$  refers to the country classification based on the above scoring method.

The nine selected PEFA dimensions come from the most recent version of the PEFA methodology, which was upgraded in 2016. All PEFA assessments since 2016 have been undertaken with this methodology. However, PEFA assessments undertaken before 2016, were completed using an earlier (2011) version of the methodology. Between the 2011 and 2016 versions of the PEFA methodologies, six of the selected dimensions are indirectly comparable and three of the selected dimensions are not comparable. Not comparable dimensions are PI 9.1, PI 24.2 and PI 30.1 (related to questions 4, 6 and 9 from the Global Partnership questionnaire for this indicator).

In cases where both scores were calculated using the earlier 2011 PEFA methodology, the dimensions covering the same subject areas will be used.<sup>2</sup> In cases where one PEFA assessment was completed using the 2011 methodology and one PEFA assessment was completed using the 2016 methodology, the 2016 PEFA methodology dimensions will be used for the current situation, while the evolution index will be calculated on the basis of the supplementary annex [on comparison over time, using the corresponding dimensions of the 2011 PEFA methodology](#).

In cases where only one PEFA assessment has been conducted, up to date data can be collected for selected dimensions through the questionnaire.

### **Indicator 9b: Development partners use country systems**

At country level, this indicator is calculated as follows:

---

<sup>2</sup> Using the 2011 methodology, scores of the following PEFA dimensions should be reported: 1.1, 2.1, 5.1, 10.1, 27.3, 19.2, 21.1, 25.1, and 26.1.

$$\text{Indicator 9b (\%)} = 100 \times \frac{\frac{1}{4}(Q^{p1} + Q^{p2} + Q^{p3} + Q^{p4})}{Q^{p2} (\text{ind } 5a)}$$

The same calculation is made for individual development partners in each country. At global level, development partners can calculate their overall score by adding up the four dimensions as reported across countries, and dividing the sum by the overall amount disbursed to partner countries' public sectors. This will provide a [weighted] average use of country systems for their development co-operation programme. Similarly, global aggregates are calculated by averaging values for development partners (or partner countries) weighted by the amount disbursed to partner countries' public sectors.

### **Indicator 10: Aid is untied**

This indicator uses the most recent information available at the OECD Creditor Reporting System, which is self-reported by the members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and rigorously validated by statisticians at the OECD Development Co-operation Directorate. Results are not available for development partners who do not report to the DAC.

The indicator is calculated by dividing the amount of untied ODA commitments by the total amount of ODA commitments. In the [Country Excel](#), figures are presented disaggregated by partner country and by development partner and exclude donor administrative costs and in-donor refugee costs. Amounts are provided in current prices. The underlying DAC methodology can be found [here](#).