development
initiatives

June 2018

supporting Grand Bargain signatories in meeting commitments to greater transparency

progress report 1

Contents

Executive summary

"The more we know about how money is channelled through the global humanitarian system, the better equipped we are to allocate resources effectively and measure results. For donors to provide more flexible and predictable funding they need reliable, real-time, prioritised, comparable and open data on the needs that they are being asked to finance and the results produced by their funding" – Too important to fail – addressing the humanitarian financing gap, High-Level Panel Report on Humanitarian Financing, January 2016

The Grand Bargain commitments to greater transparency are fundamental for improving the operational efficiency, effectiveness and accountability of humanitarian action. Timely, reliable and comparable information on how humanitarian financing is being spent can enable organisations to better coordinate and target their efforts. Greater traceability of funding can improve evidence-based analysis of the efficiency of the humanitarian response and the effectiveness of its impact. Making this information open and available to all can support efforts to strengthen the accountability of governments and aid organisations to citizens in donor constituencies and, most importantly, in affected communities.

A push by the Grand Bargain signatories towards open data publication is key to improving the quality, availability and timeliness of information for decision-making and delivery, as well as highlighting responsibility and accountability gaps in humanitarian financing. Signatories committed to publishing timely, transparent, harmonised and open high-quality data on humanitarian funding within two years of the World Humanitarian Summit in May 2016. The International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) Standard was considered the most advanced option for a shared open data standard. If all signatories published timely data to IATI, it would allow comparable information on humanitarian funding and activities to be exchanged, connected and used by many different stakeholders much faster than ever before.

The transparency workstream has focused initial efforts on supporting signatories in meeting their commitment to publish open data on their humanitarian funding. As referenced in the Grand Bargain annual independent report 2018,[1] this approach has paid off and there has been good progress by signatories on this

commitment area. Since we published our baseline report in June 2017, the number of Grand Bargain signatories that are publishing open data on their humanitarian financing and providing much more useful and usable data on their activities has significantly increased.[2] As at 1 May 2018:

- 44 of 59 Grand Bargain signatories (75%) were publishing open data using the IATI Standard.[3] An additional 7 organisations (or their members or affiliates) have started publishing to IATI since publication of the baseline report in June 2017.
- Of the 44 signatories publishing open data using the IATI Standard
  - 36 (82%) were publishing open data on their humanitarian activities; 5 more organisations (or their members or affiliates) have started publishing their humanitarian activities than a year ago.
  - 8 (18%) were providing more granular humanitarian data, such as information on humanitarian response plans or clusters. No organisations were publishing this data in June 2017.

The IATI Standard has been further enhanced to enable Grand Bargain signatories to publish the data they need to be able to track progress in these commitment areas. Released in February 2018, version 2.03 enables signatories (and other IATI publishers) to provide even more granular reporting on humanitarian funding, for example by showing levels of earmarking, pledges, cash-based programming[4] and whether funding is channelled via local and national responders.

- 31 organisations or 70% of the Grand Bargain signatories publishing to IATI are now using either version 2.02 or 2.03 of the IATI Standard, both of which allow for some degree of detailed humanitarian reporting. An additional 15 organisations (or their members or affiliates) have made improvements to their internal systems by upgrading to a more recent version of IATI since the baseline report of June 2017.

The progress by Grand Bargain signatories in publishing their humanitarian data to IATI is encouraging and many organisations who have improved their IATI reporting over the last year have commented positively on its potential benefits – such as improving organisational performance, efficiency, opportunities for collaboration, evidence-based decision-making, accountability and transparency. However, the process of publishing to IATI for the first time can appear daunting to both large and small organisations – and this may hinder further progress. Feedback from those with experience of implementing IATI has underscored the importance of:

- Securing senior management understanding and buy-in at the outset of the IATI implementation process – this can help technical teams overcome

challenges in coordinating across multiple departments, information management systems and, in some cases, affiliated organisations and legacy systems

- Aligning the process with other organisational and operational technical priorities where possible, such as systems reviews and upgrades

- Engaging in community discussion and accessing guidance and technical support.

Being able to demonstrate efficiency savings by enabling organisations to use their IATI data for multiple reporting purposes, for example via the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)'s Financial Tracking Service (FTS) and the EU's European Emergency Disaster Response Information System (EDRIS)[5] will be a key incentive for further progress on the Grand Bargain transparency commitments. This was also reflected in the self-reports by multiple Grand Bargain signatories[6] from the different stakeholder constituencies. OCHA's FTS is working towards using the data that is published to IATI on its digital platform. FTS, the Centre for Humanitarian Data, the IATI Technical Team and Development Initiatives (DI) are collaborating on a project that aims to simultaneously demonstrate:

- A reduction in the reporting burden for participating organisations, in support of the Grand Bargain commitment to harmonise and simplify reporting requirements – which stands to represent further cost efficiencies [7]
- That disaggregated and open data, published to IATI, is easier to compare and faster to process than bespoke manual reporting; this can be re-shared in analysis and visualisations available from the platform and elsewhere.

The next phase of the Grand Bargain transparency workstream should ensure that published data is relevant and accessible to potential users and that Grand Bargain signatories and the wider humanitarian community are supported in using IATI data for better analysis and decision-making, including through monitoring progress towards greater transparency. This requires a greater collective understanding of how data can or might support key processes within humanitarian response, at what stage, and by whom – as well as a commitment to providing the underlying data that can support such analysis. Demonstrating the benefits of using humanitarian data for better decision-making and learning by building an active community of data users and infomediaries, whose role it is to turn data into information, analyse and communicate findings will be an important next step.

Published immediately prior to the annual Grand Bargain meeting in June 2018 and based on data available as at 1 May 2018, this report aims to review the

progress made by signatories in implementing the transparency commitments, share lessons learnt and propose recommendations for the way forwards. The findings of this report informed the recent workshop 'Towards greater transparency in the humanitarian sector' held at the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in Geneva on 20 May 2018 and will feed into discussions with the Grand Bargain co-conveners and signatories on how to further support Grand Bargain signatories in implementing their transparency commitments.

Introduction

Agreed in May 2016, the 'Grand Bargain'[8] is a package of reforms to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of humanitarian action.[9] These reforms aim to change the way that the humanitarian community, including donor governments, multilateral and UN agencies, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and the Red Cross Red Crescent (RCRC) movement work together to respond to humanitarian crises. It includes commitments to increase cash-based programming, provide greater funding for and support to local and national responders and to reduce and harmonise reporting requirements. Donors and aid organisations have committed to providing more un-earmarked money and increasing multi-year funding to ensure greater predictability and continuity in humanitarian response.

Underpinning all of this is the commitment to greater transparency, which was identified by the High-Level Panel Report for Humanitarian Financing as a prerequisite for more efficient and effective humanitarian action. (See box 1 'Key commitment aims, issues and concepts', below, for further details.)[10]

The drive towards greater transparency is fundamental to improving the data and evidence available as well as highlighting responsibility and accountability gaps in humanitarian financing and delivery. If all Grand Bargain signatories published timely data to IATI, it would allow comparable information on humanitarian funding and activities to be exchanged, connected and used by many different stakeholders much faster than ever before. Donors, agencies, NGOs and affected governments at international, national and local levels could have timely visibility of forward spending plans and pipeline flows; funding could be traced through the system to delivery; evaluations and narrative reports could be published, automatically, just once without the need for duplicate stakeholder reporting; and data scientists and analysts could work alongside policymakers and stakeholders to combine and deliver information that could help improve the outcomes of crisis-affected people.

"Transparency of funding, processes and results is fundamental to building trustful relationships – an enabler for several other Grand Bargain and Agenda for Humanity commitments. Taking steps to improve transparency, with long-term commitment to continuing to become more transparent, can help to build and strengthen

There are clear links between transparency and the implementation and monitoring of other commitments in the Grand Bargain. For example, greater visibility on how funding is channelled to national and local implementing partners can enable efforts to provide "more support and funding tools to local and national responders" (Grand Bargain, 2016). If organisations publish better data on who their implementing partners are it will not only help track progress in meeting this commitment, but also make the data open and available for local and national organisations to access and use.

More and better data on different financing modalities can enable the humanitarian community to monitor progress against Grand Bargain commitments in these areas, such as the commitment to "increase the use and coordination of cash-based programming" or to "reduce the earmarking of donor contributions" (Grand Bargain, 2016). Similarly, more standardised and comparable data, including on the systematic reporting of results can support efforts to "harmonise and simplify reporting requirements" (Grand Bargain, 2016), reducing the burden of organisations needing to publish data in multiple formats and on multiple platforms.

DI, the IATI Secretariat, the FTS of the UN OCHA and the Centre for Humanitarian Data are working with the transparency workstream co-conveners the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the World Bank Group to support Grand Bargain signatories in implementing and monitoring their commitments to greater transparency.[11]

This progress report is part of the DI project 'Monitoring the Grand Bargain commitment on transparency', funded by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. DI is supporting the transparency workstream co-conveners and Grand Bargain signatories in three key areas:

- **Publication –** Raising awareness of the transparency commitments, identifying the major incentives and challenges for organisations to publish more and better data on their humanitarian funding and supporting organisations in publishing to the IATI Standard.
- **Data use –** Working with OCHA FTS and the IATI Technical Team to pilot the automated use of published IATI data as a primary data source for FTS.

- **Monitoring progress –** Supporting the transparency workstream and Grand Bargain signatories in monitoring progress in meeting the Grand Bargain commitment to publishing open data on their humanitarian funding.

In June 2017 DI published a *Baseline report: Implementing and monitoring the Grand Bargain commitment on transparency*, which provided an initial assessment of how Grand Bargain signatories are meeting their commitment to publish open data on their humanitarian funding. The report identified some of the challenges donors and aid organisations are facing and presented proposals on how these could be overcome. It also proposed a shared monitoring framework, comprising a monitoring methodology[12] supported by an online dashboard[13] to enable organisations to better capture their progress in this area of transparency. Finally, the report set out a roadmap for the Grand Bargain transparency workstream in taking forward the commitment area.

Almost one year on – and just before the annual Grand Bargain meeting in June 2018 – this report reviews the progress made by the transparency workstream and Grand Bargain signatories in implementing the transparency commitments, shares lessons learnt and proposes recommendations for the way forwards.

Box 1: Key commitment aims, issues and concepts

The Grand Bargain commitments to greater transparency provide an opportunity for increased political momentum and practical action to improve the quality, availability and use of data on crisis-related financing. This offers potential benefits to all involved – from the donors that fund humanitarian programmes and the international organisations and national actors that implement them, to those receiving assistance on the ground.

- Timely, reliable and comparable information on who is doing what, where, and when can enable organisations to resource crises more effectively and efficiently by revealing duplication or funding gaps. Combined with other data, such as that captured in 3Ws,[14] it can help coordinate and target efforts where they are needed most.

- Greater traceability of funding throughout the delivery chain as far as the final responders and, where feasible, affected people can improve evidence-based analysis of the efficiency of the humanitarian response and the effectiveness of its impact.

- Making this information available to all as open data can support efforts to strengthen the accountability of governments and aid organisations to citizens in donor constituencies and in affected communities.

- Organisations involved in delivery stand to benefit from efficiency gains in terms of openly publishing their data to IATI rather than reporting the same information to multiple stakeholders for multiple purposes.

Current challenges to achieving this include:

- Gaps and inconsistencies in the information available for analysis – for example:

  - There is currently no way of viewing up-to-date information on the full range of international resources, including but not limited to humanitarian assistance, within a given context

  - There is no way of being able to see financing flows through the humanitarian system from donor to crisis-affected people

  - There are system-wide inefficiencies with organisations reporting to different standards and platforms, not reporting at all, or providing manual reporting requiring significant investigation and curation.

- Data from different sources is all too often not compatible, limiting the ability to join up and compare data to build a richer and more detailed overview

- Reporting on decisions/allocations is not always timely enough to support coordination or give a 'real time' picture.

What are the Grand Bargain commitments to greater transparency?[15]

"Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. Publish timely, transparent, harmonised and open high-quality data on humanitarian funding within two years of the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul. We consider IATI to provide a basis for the purpose of a common standard.

2. Make use of appropriate data analysis, explaining the distinctiveness of activities, organisations, environments and circumstances (for example, protection, conflict-zones).

3. Improve the digital platform and engage with the open-data standard community to help ensure:

- accountability of donors and responders with open data for retrieval and analysis;

- improvements in decision-making, based upon the best possible information;

- a reduced workload over time as a result of donors accepting common standard data for some reporting purposes; and

- traceability of donors' funding throughout the transaction chain as far as the final responders and, where feasible, affected people.

4. Support the capacity of all partners to access and publish data."

(www.interagencystandingcommittee.org/greater-transparency)

The initial focus of the Grand Bargain transparency workstream has been on area 1. The availability of timely, transparent, harmonised and open high-quality data on humanitarian funding will be critical for supporting organisations' commitment to use the data for better analysis (2) and to improve the digital platform (3) to ensure greater accountability, better decision-making, a reduced workload and greater traceability.

What is open data?[16]

Open data is data that can be freely used, shared and built-on by anyone, anywhere, for any purpose. In most cases, open data needs to be processed to enable people to use it – a dashboard, platform or online decision-making tool can do this. The IATI Standard was identified as the most advanced open standard for making humanitarian aid more transparent[17] following the World Humanitarian Summit in May 2016.

What is IATI?[18]

Launched in 2008, IATI is a multi-stakeholder initiative and an international open data standard that aims to improve the transparency and openness of both development and humanitarian financial flows. IATI provides a mechanism for the regular, automated publication of open data on financial flows and also enables organisations to publish information on their project or programming activities, including information on monitoring, evaluations and results. When combined with different data, such as needs assessments and more contextual analysis, this kind of open information has the potential to drive better decision-making.

Released in February 2018, the latest version of the IATI Standard (2.03) enables organisations to publish more granular data on their humanitarian activities such as levels of earmarking, pledges, cash-based programming and whether funding is channelled via local and national responders.

Nearly 800 humanitarian and development organisations, including government donors, multilateral and UN agencies and international and local NGOs currently use the IATI Standard to publish information on who funds them, where the money goes and the impact or outcome of their activities.

What is 'the digital platform'?

The Grand Bargain commitment refers to 'the digital platform' and highlights the UN OCHA's FTS as a "well-established, voluntary information platform for recording international humanitarian contributions".[19]

The FTS has been tracking humanitarian aid since 1992 in follow up to the UN General Assembly Resolution 46/182[20], *Strengthening of the coordination of humanitarian emergency assistance of the United Nations* – a resolution that created a framework for humanitarian assistance and coordination that remains the basis of UN OCHA's mandate.[21] It makes financial contributions visible and provides a platform for others to explore and interrogate the data via data visualisations and a data search function. Its core function is to enable the monitoring of funding progress against UN-coordinated humanitarian response plan and appeal requirements – but it also provides data on funding outside these plans. Capturing over US$20 billion in assistance over each of the last three years, to date FTS has been dependent on manual data collection, 'bridges' with the EU's EDRIS and the voluntary participation of governments, NGOs and UN agencies.[22] There are gaps and inconsistencies in the information reported to it, leaving an incomplete and patchy picture of resources available and making it difficult to trace funding flows throughout the delivery chain. As signatories follow up on their Grand Bargain commitments to publish data openly, so FTS (amongst others, including donors) will have a wider and more standardised set of data to draw on rather than 'seek and sort out'.

It is anticipated that this will eventually reduce the reporting burden on contributors (who can auto-publish one set of data rather than preparing bespoke reports on the same activities for a range of donors, internal stakeholders and FTS), reduce the need for FTS to chase reports and follow up on missing information – and increase the amount of time available to focus on information and analysis rather than data cleaning. FTS, the IATI Technical Team, DI and the Centre for Humanitarian Data are running a project to help a selection of IATI publishers/FTS contributors to publish their data using the IATI Standard and to further develop guidelines and share lessons more broadly.[23]

Chapter 1

Progress on the commitments to greater transparency

In this chapter we provide a summary of the overall progress that has been made on each of the Grand Bargain's transparency commitments.

Publishing open data on humanitarian funding

The transparency workstream has focused initial efforts on supporting signatories in meeting their commitment to publish open data on their humanitarian funding. It is clear that the availability of timely, transparent, harmonised and open high-quality data on humanitarian financing is critical for taking forward the commitments to use this data (alongside other data sources) for better analysis and to improve the digital platform to ensure greater accountability, better decision-making, a reduced workload and greater traceability. As referenced in the Grand Bargain annual independent report 2018, the workstream has been successful in this approach and there has been good progress by signatories on this commitment area since the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016.

To support the Grand Bargain transparency workstream and signatories in meeting this commitment, DI carried out a number of activities to raise awareness of the transparency commitments, identify the major incentives and challenges for organisations to publish more and better data on their humanitarian funding and to support organisations in publishing to the IATI Standard. These included:

- A series of workshops and bilateral meetings (in Geneva, New York and Washington DC), an online survey and face-to-face interviews. In total over 150 people from 85 organisations across 26 countries participated in the outreach process.
- A webinar series on how to publish to IATI which was attended by over 70 participants from Grand Bargain organisations and which has been watched over 600 times.
- Specific guidance for humanitarian actors which has been downloaded 89 times to date.
- An extensive consultation process with the humanitarian community on how to enhance the IATI Standard to better meet their needs and on a proposed

monitoring framework, to support signatories in assessing their own progress against this commitment.

Who is publishing open data?

Since DI published its baseline report in June 2017 the Grand Bargain has been endorsed by an additional 8 organisations increasing the number of signatories from 51 to 59 as of 1 May 2018. These are ActionAid, France, the NEAR Network, New Zealand, OECD, Save the Children, World Health Organization (WHO) and ZOA International. As Table 1 below shows, there has been a significant increase in the number of Grand Bargain signatories that are publishing open data on their humanitarian financing and providing much more useful and usable data on their activities. As at 1 May 2018:

- 44 of the 59 Grand Bargain signatories (75%) were publishing open data using the IATI Standard. An additional 7 organisations (or their members or affiliates) have started publishing to IATI since the baseline report of June 2017.

Of the 44 signatories publishing open data using the IATI Standard:

- 36 (82%) were publishing open data on their humanitarian activities. 5 more organisations (or their members or affiliates) have started publishing their humanitarian activities since a year ago.
- 31 (70%) are using version 2.02 or version 2.03 of the IATI Standard. An additional 15 organisations (or their members or affiliates) have made improvements to their internal systems by upgrading to a more recent version of IATI since the baseline report of June 2017. Version 2.03 of the Standard (the latest version) will, in time, enable organisations to use IATI to publish data on their Grand Bargain commitments.
- 8 signatories or their members or affiliates (18%) were providing more granular humanitarian data, such as information on humanitarian response plans or clusters. No organisations were publishing this data in June 2017.

Further details are provided in Annex 1.

Table 1: Comparison of progress by Grand Bargain signatories in publishing their data to IATI over the period June 2017–May 2018

	Baseline assessment: 1 June 2017 (51 signatories)	Assessment as of 1 May 2018 (59 signatories)	Change since baseline assessment
Publishing open data using the IATI Standard	37 organisations or their members or affiliates (73%)	44 organisations or their members or affiliates (75%)	Additional 7 organisations
Of these:			
Publishing open data on their humanitarian activities	31 organisations or their members or affiliates (84%)	36 organisations or their members or affiliates (82%)	Additional 5 organisations
Using v2.02 of the IATI Standard or later	16 organisations or their members or affiliates (43%)	31 organisations or their members or affiliates (70%)	Additional 15 organisations
Providing more granular data (Humanitarian Response Plans, cluster information)	–	8 organisations or their members or affiliates (18%)	8 organisations

To support donors and aid organisations to monitor their own progress in meeting the transparency commitment to publish open data on their humanitarian funding, DI has developed the Grand Bargain Transparency Dashboard as a public, online tool. According to the dashboard, over 50% of signatories have made progress in meeting this commitment since the baseline report in June 2017.[24] In addition, as Table 2 (below) and Annex 2 show, the number of signatory agencies in the 'fair' to 'very good' performance categories has significantly increased by 14 percentage points – from 25% in June 2017 to 39% in May 2018.

Table 2: Comparison of progress by Grand Bargain signatory agencies in meeting the transparency commitment over the period June 2017–May 2018

Performance category	Baseline assessment on 1 June 2017 *(67 signatory agencies)*	Assessment as of 1 May 2018 *(66 signatory agencies)*
Very good (80%–100%)	0%	0%
Good (60%–79%)	3% (2 agencies)	9% (6 agencies)
Fair (40%–59%)	22% (15 agencies)	30% (20 agencies)
Poor (20%–39%)	24% (16 agencies)	15% (10 agencies)
Very poor (0–19%)	51% (34 agencies)	45% (30 agencies)

The data shows that a number of organisations have been able to demonstrate considerable progress in meeting this commitment in a very short period of time. As indicated in Table 3 below, these include the International Rescue Committee (IRC), OCHA, the Italian Agency for Development Cooperation (AICS), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), Care International in Zimbabwe and World Vision Zimbabwe – none of whom had published humanitarian data using the IATI standard prior to May 2016.

Table 3: Progress by Grand Bargain signatory agencies in meeting the transparency commitment as of 1 May 2018

Organis-ation	First published	Time-liness	Forward looking	Compre-hensive	Coverage	Humanitarian	Total	Progress	Base-line
IRC	2017-09-12	100	68	85	0	52.0	66.04	66.04	0
IRC UK	2014-02-11	100	58	80	0	51.7	63.72	63.72	0
OCHA	2014-06-26	100	33	57	0	50.0	55.05	55.05	0
AICS	2017-10-18	63	0	78	0	25.0	41.5	41.5	0
World Vision Zimbabwe	2017-12-05	38	0	69	0	50.0	39.25	39.25	0
IOM	28 Feb 2018	25	0	71	0	50.0	36.5	36.5	0

Source: Grand Bargain Transparency Dashboard. Available at: http://46.101.46.6/dashboard (accessed 1 May 2018)

Notes: AICS: Agenzia Italiana per la Cooperazione allo Sviluppo / Italian Agency for Cooperation and Development; IOM: International Organization for Migration; IRC: International Rescue Committee.

Some organisations, such as the ICRC, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) – while not yet publishing to IATI – have carried out internal feasibility studies in order to assess internal systems and capabilities. The next version of the dashboard, which is still currently in beta version, will enable organisations to provide information on the steps they are taking to become more transparent, such as an implementation plan or data policy, information on a feasibility study, or a link to their IATI Registry account.[25]

How is the IATI Standard evolving to meet humanitarian needs?

While the IATI Standard already enabled organisations to publish basic information on their humanitarian financing, such as the location of their activities, types of implementing partners and the intended and actual results of their actions, version 2.02 of the IATI Standard, released in December 2015, enabled publishers to distinguish funding that has been allocated to 'humanitarian' activities and the specific appeal or emergency an activity related to. It also enabled publishers to link their data to global humanitarian cluster groups or a specific disaster or humanitarian response plan. DI facilitated consultations between Grand Bargain signatories and relevant workstreams and the IATI community to support the further development of the Standard to ensure that it continues to meet the needs of the humanitarian community. The latest version of the IATI Standard, version 2.03, now enables publishers to identify: unearmarked funding, pledges and cash-based programming and to flag whether funding is channelled via local and national responders. The changes should also enable FTS to use IATI data as its primary data source rather than bespoke reporting; a project is now underway to help organisations use their IATI data to report to FTS.[26]

The IATI website lists a number of different publishing tools and services available to help organisations create their data files with different levels of support, automation and pricing.[27] In the next chapter we outline some examples of good practice from organisations that have overcome internal challenges to make progress in this area.

Making use of data analysis

According to the 2017 Grand Bargain Report the use of data analysis is viewed as an area where signatories are expected to make progress without support from the transparency work stream.[28] However, while the quality, reliability and openness of data are all essential to enabling analysis, without use of data for analysis much of its value will not be realised.

The UN's Centre for Humanitarian Data ('the Centre') in The Hague is playing a key role in increasing the use and impact of data in the humanitarian sector. It is focused on providing data services to make data more accessible, so people can find it, developing data policies to ensure data is used responsibly, supporting data literacy to increase people's capacity to access and use data and building an active data community.

"The center's key performance indicators, [...] acknowledge that 'it is not within the center's mandate to be responsible for how data can lead to better decisions.' Rather, the hope is that by improving the quality and interoperability of data, users can discern new insights for themselves."[29]

The Centre's data services work includes direct management of the Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX),[30] an open platform for sharing data from a range of partners and across multiple crises. The goal of HDX is to make humanitarian data easy to find and use for analysis. The Centre also focuses on gaining adoption of data standards, including for the Humanitarian Exchange Language (HXL) and IATI.[31]

As outlined in the section 'Improving the digital platform', efforts are under way to connect IATI to the FTS platform, which provides access to data on humanitarian funding flows.

As illustrated in the case study below, ultimately civil society organisations, researchers, journalists, local responders and citizens in crisis-affected countries need access to a wide range of tools that translate data into accessible information relevant to their needs. National platforms such as the 2015 Nepal Earthquake: Open Data Portal[32] or the Foreign Aid Transparency Hub (FAiTH) set up by the Government of the Philippines following Typhoon Haiyan are examples of how data can be used by a local audience.

Box 2: Combining disaster risk reduction and IATI data in the Philippines[33]

In 2017 HumTech Lab at TU Delft and Cordaid Philippines, supported by the Cross-Over fund from The Hague Humanity Hub, partnered in the Data To Action project to investigate how community-focused efforts for improved resilience and disaster risk reduction could be facilitated through data-driven analysis. They worked closely with the urban community of Jagobiao in the Philippines, including local social and church groups, as well as local disaster management agencies, with the aim of combining hazard and capacity data for both localised vulnerability and needs analysis as well as evidence in policy discussions.

The team developed a data-driven tool that combines household survey, geographic mapping and IATI data. Central to the tool are the local knowledge and community perceptions of disasters, risks and capacities. IATI data provides a source of information on international organisations working on disaster relief and reconstruction in the Philippines who might be potential partners in resilience and response activities. The tool allows switching between hazard scenarios, showing where the community is most vulnerable, which capacities exist, and which are lacking.

The combined data allows an assessment of priority needs for stronger resilience prior to a disaster and for reconstruction and relief in the disaster aftermath. The integration of IATI enables easier progress tracking of development and humanitarian interventions. The project team has started to develop a process that comprises steps for data collection, training on use of the tool as well as privacy and information rights concerns. Cordaid, as a member of the global Partners for Resilience network, coordinates the ongoing process.[34]

Further reading: Turning Data into Action[35]

Improving the digital platform

Current efforts are focused on improving the **supply** of information – granularity, frequency, consistency, volume – via the adoption of IATI, which is an open data standard. This would give those seeking to use the data (including but not limited to FTS) a standardised and open pool of data to draw on – rather than requesting it in the form of bespoke reporting and then manually processing it and liaising with data suppliers with queries in order to make the data comparable and usable.

FTS and the IATI Technical Team have been working to enable the automated use of published IATI data as a primary data source for FTS. DI, the IATI Technical Team, and the Centre for Humanitarian Data are working together with OCHA FTS to pilot this approach with selected Grand Bargain signatories including donor governments, UN agencies and NGOs. Findings from the pilot will also be used to update joint IATI-FTS Best Practice Publishing Guidelines and will be shared with the Grand Bargain, IATI and humanitarian communities more broadly. Potential benefits for organisations of being involved are:

- Internal cost and efficiency savings – organisations that currently publish separately to both IATI and FTS will no longer need to do so as only IATI reporting will be required

- Being able to demonstrate progress on both the IATI publication and data use components of their Grand Bargain transparency commitments
- Internal capacity-building on data literacy, which can potentially lead to identifying further opportunities for how similar data exploitation can improve operational ways of working.[36]

Supporting the capacity of all partners to access and publish data

The 2017 baseline report identified bespoke technical support, peer support and learning as key enablers to support Grand Bargain organisations that are new to the IATI Standard with support in publishing and using IATI data.

The IATI Technical Team has continued to provide bespoke technical support to Grand Bargain organisations on how to improve the quality of the humanitarian data they publish. The support provided ranges from one-to-one calls with organisations, reviews of the Grand Bargain Transparency Dashboard and feedback on data improvements. The team also worked with signatories that were not yet publishing to IATI resulting in three more organisations (IOM, AICS and WHO) now publishing open data to IATI. Since June 2017, the IATI Technical Team supported eight Grand Bargain signatories to successfully move to version 2.02 of the IATI Standard, allowing them to publish better humanitarian data.

Building synergies with Grand Bargain workstreams

While not part of the transparency commitments, the 2017 Grand Bargain report highlighted the need to increase synergies across the different workstreams, which was also reiterated at the first Annual Grand Bargain meeting.[37] The transparency workstream has reached out to other relevant Grand Bargain workstreams to assess how they can best be supported in their objectives. In particular the IATI Technical Team and FTS have liaised with the workstreams on cash programming, support to local and national responders, and reduced earmarking to ensure that that the IATI Standard enables Grand Bargain signatories to publish the data they need to be able to track progress in these commitment areas. Following the 2.03 upgrade process, an earmarking code-list has now been added to the Standard using the Grand Bargain definitions and work is underway to develop a cash and voucher code-list.

More work will be required during 2018 to ensure that further definitions and classifications that are developed can be operationalised and consistently included in any future guidance for humanitarian actors, as part of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Humanitarian Financing Task Team (HFTT)[38] work plan.

"IATI data can help inform country level and crisis analysis. In time, [this] data can provide a useful source to assess progress against Grand Bargain commitments, including on localisation if data on partners and second layer transaction partners is sufficiently complete and comparable" – Representative from DFAT Australia, January 2018

Chapter 2

Lessons learnt

"We are on a journey that starts with meeting industry best practice and contributing to a global initiative, which in turn enables us to meet donor requirements. In the future, we can look at the resource that we and our peers have created and learn from the insights" – Representative from the IRC, February 2018

Our assessment of the data published to IATI over the period 1 June 2017–1 May 2018 shows that Grand Bargain signatories are making progress against their commitment to publish timely, transparent and open data on humanitarian funding. These include agencies with very different organisational structures and operating models from both donor governments and aid organisations.

We contacted a number of signatories from donor governments, UN agencies and NGOs that have taken steps to substantially improve the publication of their humanitarian data to IATI and asked them to provide feedback on this process and to share some of the lessons they have learnt with the wider community.

What were the common challenges faced by organisations?

Securing organisational buy-in

Translating a political commitment to publishing open data on humanitarian funding into concrete action proved challenging for many of the organisations we spoke to. They highlighted the importance of gaining backing from their Senior Management Team or senior decision-makers at the beginning of the process. Once there is clear organisational buy-in, organisations are more willing to view this as an organisational change process, allocating resources and investing in long-term and sustainable solutions.

IRC and DFAT emphasised that aligning publication with other organisational priorities, such as systems reviews and upgrades can be an enabling factor for organisations to invest in a more sustainable approach to data publication. Using

data quality tools, such as the Grand Bargain Transparency Dashboard and Publish What You Fund's Data Quality Tester[39] can also incentivise progress.

Increasing the understanding by signatories of the **benefits** (as outlined below) of detailed, accurate and timely funding data for coordinating an effective international humanitarian response and IATI's role in enabling this could help organisations to view IATI as a valuable organisational asset rather than a reporting requirement.

Box 3: How do organisations benefit from open data on humanitarian financing?

Improving effectiveness – Organisations identified improving effectiveness as a key benefit of publishing open data on their humanitarian financing – enabling them to have more open discussions with stakeholders both internally and outside their organisation on the effectiveness of their aid programme and individual investments.

"In the longer term, the goal is to be able to track financial transaction chains from donors to humanitarian actors to sub-national partners and affected people and subsequently being able to match this financial data against results for programming, accountability and learning" – Representative from DFAT Australia, January 2018

Increasing efficiency – Having better information on how others are allocating their funding – and, for federations, on how their members or affiliates are operating – enables organisations to better target their resources to minimise waste and duplication. It also makes reporting to different platforms more consistent and the process more efficient for technical and programme staff. The representative from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) highlighted the opportunity to use IATI data as a primary data source for FTS reporting – and potentially for reporting to the EU's EDRIS platform, thereby reducing the reporting burden as a key incentive:

"We really hope the 'publish once, use often' principle of IATI will apply here. This would save our organization a lot of time and facilitate keeping a high quality of data" – Representative from Sida, January 2018.

Improving opportunities for collaboration – Publishing information as open data, using the IATI Standard, means that organisations can share information on their activities more easily with other actors in humanitarian response and in development programming – such as government officials (where appropriate) or local and national first responders to prevent silos emerging, and contribute data to the global community.

> **IATI is a great opportunity to establish a 'go-to' place for data, this will serve as a data source for everyone, which will eventually improve the global transparency of humanitarian data" – Representative from UN OCHA, January 2018**

Contributing to evidence-based decision-making – The increased availability of standardised, quality, timely data on humanitarian funding and activities stands to contribute to the humanitarian community's evidence base. The planned import of IATI data by FTS – whose users include humanitarian country teams, operational organisations, governments, UN agencies and funds as well as media and think tanks – will amplify the use and usability further still. Elsewhere, individual organisations, such as World Vision, are using data to inform their grant portfolio and monitoring systems.

Improving transparency and accountability – All the organisations we contacted highlighted how publishing their data to IATI has enabled them to take practical steps to implement their Grand Bargain commitment to transparency, build trust and increase accountability towards key stakeholders (donors, taxpayers and affected populations) by sharing more information on their activities and financial transactions.

> **"Publishing this data enables us to be accountable to the Australian people and to the communities we seek to assist. This is an important step towards putting affected people at the centre of our humanitarian assistance, including when determining needs, in allocation and delivery of relief and when assessing impact" – Representative from DFAT Australia, January 2018**

Addressing organisational challenges

Publishing to IATI should be an integral part of the operational process, however organisations sometimes struggle to develop a systematic approach when they are coordinating across multiple departments and information management systems. This is particularly the case for confederated or federated organisations, which often have separated legacy systems.

As part of the process for implementing IATI sustainably organisation-wide, many organisations take the approach of forming a working group or 'task force' in order to bring together all the relevant parts of the organisation such as colleagues working in finance, programming, IT or communications. In most situations this group should be formed early in the process of working on IATI implementation, to integrate the ideas and practical plans for publishing IATI data. Italy is taking this approach one step further and is planning to train all its staff on the importance of IATI and the need to provide high-quality information when designing aid initiatives.

> **"Each IATI Publisher should ensure that they have a comprehensive, scheduled method for publication, with clear lines of communication and responsibilities. Ideally, each organisation would have a dedicated member of staff who can focus on IATI – at least in the early stages" – Representative from the IRC, February 2018**

Technical considerations

Using version 2.02 of the IATI Standard is the first step to enable organisations to be transparent about their humanitarian funding. Australia was already publishing information on its development financing and activities to IATI and used the upgrade process as an opportunity to assess and redevelop its systems and publication process.

> **"From a systems perspective we found that moving to a more visible system to manipulate our data and create files gave us more ownership and confidence in the final output. Although we would need to clean up and document our code and process, Australia is willing to share our methodology and assist other organisations" – Representative from DFAT Australia, January 2018**

Sida faced particular challenges on merging the publication of their humanitarian and development data which had different levels of detail and developing a different publication routine to enable them to publish their humanitarian data more frequently in the event of a rapid on-set emergency. They highlighted the need for better guidance for humanitarian publishers in particular for the newer elements of the Standard such as on cash or localisation which require further definitional work, and which the FTS-IATI interoperability pilot aims to address. They also encouraged newer humanitarian publishers to focus on publishing what they can, based on what is readily available, and to aim to improve over time.

> **"Don't be discouraged by the new reporting requirements. Most organizations follow up and report on their activities so take it one step at a time and look for low hanging fruits, whatever information you can publish is of use even if it isn't complete" – Representative from Sida, January 2018**

IRC recommended moving towards automated publication if possible, so that staff can focus on analysing, rather than collecting or creating, the data and emphasised the importance of continuing to improve data quality.

> **"Once the data is published, the job is not yet finished. A process of quality review should be built in, to ensure that the IATI Standard is being best used to represent the organisation" – Representative from IRC, February 2018**

World Vision also recommended sharing the resulting information with staff, to identify potential uses or identify any data quality issues.

How can organisations access further support?

There is a wealth of support internally within organisations, among peers and/or within the IATI publisher community, and from the IATI Technical Team. All the organisations we contacted emphasised the community of support available to IATI publishers and the importance of creating spaces for dialogue and sharing best practice.

> **"If people working on IATI are unsure about how to progress, they can join and organise communities of practice around IATI, in order to**

> **develop case studies for communicating with partners, using data or how to argue the benefits of IATI. They can look to organisations such as the IATI Technical Team, InterAction and Bond to support them. Any organisation in IATI should also communicate with the donors who make this a requirement, and pressure them for clear guidance"**
> **– Representative from the IRC, February 2018**

World Vision and IRC are drawing on the experience of other members or affiliates within their organisation that are already publishing to the IATI Standard. Sida highlighted the opportunity for collaboration among peers within the wider humanitarian and IATI communities.

> **"We have also consulted the IATI community several times and done brainstorming and received help from peers. Now that more organizations are publishing humanitarian data to IATI we can learn from the solutions and adaptations they have done to improve the humanitarian reporting" – Representative from Sida, January 2018**

How can the Grand Bargain transparency workstream support further progress?

While the overall signs of progress on the Grand Bargain transparency commitments indicate steps in the right direction, more work needs to be done to encourage further open publication of granular data and to ensure that the data can be used to meet information needs, particularly in fast-onset and rapidly escalating crises. The transparency workstream would benefit from further research in mapping out broad data needs in key humanitarian decision-making functions and processes, including: planning and coordination; funding and financing; programme quality; system performance; resource mobilisation and accountability/engagement with key decision-makers.

Demonstrating how data on humanitarian financing can and is being used will also be a crucial enabling factor for maintaining and deepening the commitments by Grand Bargain signatory organisations to greater transparency. As highlighted below, all the organisations we spoke with identified a number of different ways in which they are using or plan to use data on humanitarian financing. These range from analysing humanitarian funding to a specific country or emergency situation in order to inform their organisation's resource allocation and response, to analysing donor financing trends to inform resource mobilisation, to making the data available to civil society and the general public via a specific portal.

Box 4: How are organisations planning to use the IATI data they publish?

- Analysing humanitarian funding to a specific country or emergency situation to inform our resource allocation and response.

- Matching financial data against results for programming, accountability and learning

- Demonstrating and communicating our operations to stakeholders and donors (current and potential)

- Making data available to civil society and the general public through a specific portal

- Analysing donor financing trends to inform resource mobilisation/ fundraising efforts

- (In the long term) tracking financial transaction chains from donors to humanitarian actors to sub-national partners and affected people

- Analysing and monitoring grant portfolios

- Using IATI data for FTS reporting and reducing the reporting burden.

More work also needs to be done to explore how the transparency workstream might increase its support to other Grand Bargain workstreams. This could include working with users to develop tools and analysis to help monitor progress on Grand Bargain commitments such as cash-based programming, earmarking, multi-year planning and funding and localisation. Another area could be exploring how IATI could be used to support organisations participating in the harmonised narrative reporting pilot to publish their results information using the common '8+3' template.[40]

Conclusion and recommendations

The Grand Bargain transparency workstream has focused its efforts to-date on building an enabling environment for increasing the availability of data on humanitarian financing. It has done this by supporting capacity development, addressing barriers (such as improving the IATI Standard to better meet the needs of humanitarian stakeholders), by harnessing incentives for organisations to publish more and better data on their humanitarian financing and by monitoring progress.

There has been a significant increase in the number of Grand Bargain organisations that are publishing open data on their humanitarian financing and that are providing much more useful and usable data on their activities. The majority of Grand Bargain signatory agencies have made some progress in meeting the commitment to publishing open data on their humanitarian funding since the baseline report in June 2017. This includes government donors, multilateral and UN agencies and INGOs – all with different internal operating procedures and systems, organisational structures, resources and capacities. More work will be required to support Grand Bargain signatories still needing to publish, and those wishing to improve their existing data to ensure that it can be used to meet information needs, particularly in fast-onset and rapidly escalating crises.

Change is possible and needed. Nevertheless, some signatories are still facing challenges in implementing their political commitment, which would suggest that they have not fully bought-in to the workstream's approach and its focus on improving and using the IATI Standard in order to publish more and better data on humanitarian financing. Showing how this data can and is being used will be a crucial enabling factor for maintaining and deepening the commitment by Grand Bargain signatory organisations to greater transparency.

Being able to demonstrate efficiency savings with the automatic import of IATI data by UN OCHA's FTS and supporting participants in the harmonised narrative reporting pilot to publish their results to IATI will be key incentives for progress. More work is also required to explore whether/how the data being published as part of organisational reporting requirements and commitments can be re-used to

help monitor commitments across the humanitarian community – including those made in relation to cash, localisation and multi-year planning and funding.

The next phase of the Grand Bargain transparency workstream should continue to support Grand Bargain signatories in publishing open data on their humanitarian financing while ensuring that published data is relevant and accessible to potential users. This requires a greater collective understanding of how data can or might support key processes within humanitarian response, at what stage, and by whom – as well as a commitment to providing the underlying data that can support such analysis. Demonstrating the benefits of using humanitarian data for better decision-making and learning by building an active community of data users and infomediaries, whose role it is to turn data into information, analyse and communicate findings will be an important next step.

Moving forwards, we suggest a number of key areas where the Grand Bargain transparency workstream and the wider humanitarian community could focus their efforts.

Publication

- Continue to support Grand Bargain signatories still needing to publish open data on their humanitarian financing, and those wishing to improve their existing data
- Adapt existing IATI publisher tools and guidance to meet the needs of the humanitarian community
- Reach out to humanitarian organisations operating at the local level and local and national organisations to increase knowledge and understanding of IATI
- Measure, monitor and communicate evidence on efficiency gains and opportunity costs associated with IATI publication and greater transparency.

Data use

- Continue to support the connecting of FTS ('the platform') and IATI ('the Standard') data through completion and extension of the current pilot
- Work with other Grand Bargain workstreams (cash, localisation, earmarking, multi-year planning and funding) and support FTS in helping to monitor progress on these commitment areas
- Map out broad data needs in key humanitarian decision-making functions and processes, with a particular focus on the field/country level, and drive demand for data, applications and services that meet these needs
- Explore how the Grand Bargain transparency workstream can support signatories in publishing more and better information on monitoring, evaluation and results and engage users of this information to improve programming and organisational learning

- Conduct further research on how IATI can complement and support other open initiatives within the humanitarian ecosystem, such as the Humanitarian Exchange Language (HXL) and the Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX).

Monitoring progress

- Continue to improve the Grand Bargain Transparency Dashboard to ensure it meets the needs of the Grand Bargain and humanitarian communities.

Notes

[1] ODI Grand Bargain annual independent report 2018: www.odi.org/publications/11135-grand-bargain-annual-independent-report-2018

[2] Development Initiatives 2017. Baseline report: Implementing and monitoring the Grand Bargain commitment on transparency. Available at: http://devinit.org/post/baseline-report-implementing-and-monitoring-the-grand-bargain-commitment-on-transparency/

[3] Since DI published its baseline report in June 2017 the Grand Bargain has been endorsed by another 8 organisations increasing the number of signatories from 51 to 59 as of 1 May 2018. These are ActionAid, France, the NEAR Network, New Zealand, OECD, Save the Children, World Health Organization (WHO) and ZOA International.

[4] Once agreement on definitions and code-lists has been reached

[5] For more information on EDRIS see: https://ec.europa.eu/echo/resources-campaigns/online-databases/edris-european-emergency-disaster-response-information-system_en

[6] See: IASC Grand Bargain website and 2018 self-reports from Canada, ILO, Ireland, France, Save the Children, UK, UNDP and WorldVision International, among others: www.interagencystandingcommittee.org/resources?og_group_ref_target_id=19568&sort_by=field_published_date_value&sort_order=DESC&og_subspaces_view_all=1&og_subspaces_view_parent=0

[7] Participants currently include the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the International Rescue Committee (IRC), OCHA's country-based pooled funds (see: www.unocha.org/our-work/humanitarian-financing/country-based-pooled-funds-cbpfs) and the UK Department for International Development (DFID)

[8] Inter-Agency Standing Committee. www.interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-hosted-iasc

[9] Inter-Agency Standing Committee, Independent Grand Bargain Report. www.interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-hosted-iasc/documents/independent-grand-bargain-report

[10] The High Level Panel Report on Humanitarian Financing, January 2017. Too important to fail – addressing the humanitarian financing gap. Available at: www.interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-hosted-iasc/documents/too-important-fail-addressing-humanitarian-financing-gap-high

[11] Development Initiatives, www.devinit.org; IATI, www.aidtransparency.net/governance/secretariat; FTS, https://fts.unocha.org; Centre for Humanitarian Data, https://centre.humdata.org; the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, www.government.nl/ministries/ministry-of-foreign-affairs; World Bank Group, www.worldbank.org

[12] See Chapter 3, Baseline report: www.devinit.org/post/implementing-and-monitoring-the-grand-bargain-commitment-on-transparency/

[13] See the Grand Bargain Transparency Dashboard: http://46.101.46.6/dashboard

[14] Humanitarian Response, 3W - Who does What, Where? Available from: www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/applications/tools/category/3w-who-does-what-where

[15] IASC. Available from: www.interagencystandingcommittee.org/greater-transparency

[16] The International Open Data Charter outlines the principles for how data should be published: www.opendatacharter.net/principles/

[17] www.interagencystandingcommittee.org/greater-transparency

[18] Development Initiatives. www.devinit.org/post/an-introduction-to-iati-for-humanitarian-actors/

[19] See: www.interagencystandingcommittee.org/greater-transparency

[20] www.un.org/documents/ga/res/46/a46r182.htm

[21] See: https://fts.unocha.org/content/faqs-about-fts

[22] EDRIS is a web-based information system managed by the European Commission's Directorate General for European Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) which tracks the European contributions to a disaster response operation. Information on EU funding is transferred from EDRIS to the FTS team via a 'bridge'. See: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/hac/

[23] See: Connecting IATI and FTS for streamlined humanitarian reporting, IATI-FTS project, 16 May 2018 https://centre.humdata.org/connecting-iati-and-fts-for-streamlined-humanitarian-reporting/

[24] See Annex 3 which was sent to Grand Bargain signatories for endorsement in December 2017. Three of the 59 Grand Bargain signatories (UNHCR, IFRC and ICRC) have raised objections and discussions are currently ongoing between these organisations and the co-conveners.

[25] See www.iatiregistry.org/publisher

[26] See IATI: www.aidtransparency.net/news/iati-upgrade-to-version-2-03-goes-live

[27] See IATI: www.iatistandard.org/203/guidance/how-to-publish/select-publishing-tool/ and www.iatistandard.org/203/guidance/how-to-publish/publishing-help/

[28] See IASC: www.interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-hosted-iasc

[29] Can the UN's Centre for Humanitarian Data stand out? Vince Chadwick, Devex. See: www.devex.com/news/can-the-un-s-centre-for-humanitarian-data-stand-out-92435

[30] Humanitarian data Exchange: https://data.humdata.org

[31] See: https://centre.humdata.org/our-services/

[32] https://opendata.klldev.org/#/

[33] Case study kindly provided by TU Delft. See conference paper for further details: www.researchgate.net/publication/324171780_Turning_data_into_action_supporting_humanitarian_field_workers_with_open_data

[34] See: HumTech Lab at Delft University of Technology Cordaid Philippines, www.tudelft.nl/tbm/over-de-faculteit/afdelingen/multi-actor-systems/research/humtech-lab/humtech-lab/

[35] www.researchgate.net/publication/324171780_Turning_data_into_action_supporting_humanitarian_field_workers_with_open_data

[36] In order to take part in the IATI-FTS pilot, organisations need to be: a Grand Bargain signatory (optional but preferred and can be a member or affiliate of a federated organisation); already publishing to IATI using at least version 2.02 of the Standard; willing to use the main humanitarian elements of the IATI Standard for most or all published humanitarian activities; able to allocate technical and/or other resources to make changes to published IATI data in a timely way as required by project findings. Organisations that participate in the pilot will receive bespoke technical support from the IATI Technical Team, the Centre for Humanitarian Data and FTS.

[37] See Chair's Summary 1st Annual Grand Bargain meeting: www.interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-hosted-iasc/documents/chairs-summary-1st-annual-grand-bargain-meeting

[38] IASC HFTT: www.interagencystandingcommittee.org/humanitarian-financing-task-team

[39] Publish What You Fund's Data Quality Tester: http://dataqualitytester.publishwhatyoufund.org

[40] For more information see: https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/-_common_83_template_donors_version_08_172.pdf

Acknowledgements

Acronyms

DFAT	Department for Foreign Affairs and Trade (Australia)
DI	Development Initiatives
EC	European Commission
ECHO	Department of Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (EC)
FAiTH	Foreign Aid Transparency Hub
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization (UN)
FTS	Financial Tracking Service (UN OCHA)
HDX	Humanitarian Data Exchange
HFTT	Humanitarian Financing Task Team
HXL	Humanitarian Exchange Language
IATI	International Aid Transparency Initiative
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
ICVA	International Council of Voluntary Agencies
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
ILO	International Labour Organization
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IRC	International Rescue Committee
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN)
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SCHR	Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response
TAG	Technical Advisory Group (IATI)
UN Women	UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
UNDP	UN Development Programme
UNFPA	UN Population Fund
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	UN Children's Fund
UNRWA	UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization

Annex 1

Grand Bargain signatories publishing open data on their humanitarian funding at 1 May 2018

Grand Bargain signatory organisation	Publishing open data using IATI	Data first published**	Publishing humanitarian activities	Using IATI version 2.02 (or later)	Publishing more granular data
1. ActionAid*	✓	2013	✓	✓	
2. Australia	✓	2011	✓	✓	✓
3. Belgium	✓	2014	✓	✓	
4. Bulgaria					
5. CAFOD	✓	2012	✓	✓	
6. Canada	✓	2012	✓		
7. CARE International*	✓	2012	✓	✓	

8. Catholic Relief Services	✓	2015		✓	
9. Christian Aid*	✓	2013	✓	✓	
10. Czech Republic					
11. Denmark	✓	2012	✓	✓	
12. Estonia					
13. European Commission (ECHO)	✓	2013	✓	✓	✓
14. FAO	✓	2017	✓	✓	
15. Finland	✓	2011	✓	✓	
16. France	✓	2014	✓		
17. Germany	✓	2013	✓	✓	
18. Global communities					
19. ICRC	P				
20. ICVA					
21. IFRC	P				
22. ILO	✓	2016		✓	

23. InterAction	✓	2015	✓	✓	
24. IOM	✓	2018	✓	✓	
25. IRC*	✓	2014	✓	✓	✓
26. Ireland	✓	2013	✓		
27. Italy	✓	2017	✓		
28. Japan	✓	2014	✓		
29. Luxembourg					
30. Mercy Corps*	✓	2012		✓	
31. Netherlands	✓	2011	✓		
32. NEAR					
33. New Zealand	✓	2013	✓		
34. Norway	✓	2015	✓		
35. NRC	✓	2013	✓	✓	✓
36. OCHA	✓	2014	✓	✓	✓
37. OECD					

38. Oxfam*	✓	2012	✓	✓	
39. Relief International*	✓	2012			
40. Save the Children*	✓	2014		✓	
41. SCHR					
42. Slovenia					
43. Spain	✓	2011	✓	✓	
44. Sweden	✓	2011	✓	✓	✓
45. Switzerland	✓	2013	✓		
46. Syria Relief Turkey					
47. UNDP	✓	2011	✓	✓	
48. UNFPA	✓	2013	✓	✓	
49. UNHCR	P				
50. UNICEF	✓	2013	✓		
51. United Kingdom	✓	2011	✓	✓	
52. United States	✓	2013	✓	✓	✓

53. UNRWA					
54. UN Women	✓	2012		✓	
55. WFP	✓	2013	✓	✓	✓
56. WHO***	✓	2017			
57. World Bank	✓	2011	✓		
58.World Vision International*	✓	2012	✓	✓	
59. ZOA International	✓	2016		✓	

Notes: * indicates that data included from member or affiliated organisations; ** Where multiple members or affiliated organisations are publishing to IATI, the earliest publishing date is used; P indicates the organisation plans to publish to IATI; *** No data was available from WHO at time of writing. CAFOD: Catholic Agency for Overseas Development; ECHO: European Commission Department of Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection; FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization (UN); ICRC: International Committee of the Red Cross; ICVA: International Council of Voluntary Agencies; IFRC: International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies; ILO: International Labour Organization; IOM: International Organization for Migration; IRC: International Rescue Committee; NRC: Norwegian Refugee Council; OCHA: Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN); SCHR: Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response; UNDP: UN Development Programme; UNFPA: UN Population Fund; UNHCR: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; UNICEF: UN Children's Fund; UNRWA: UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East; UN Women: UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women; WFP: World Food Programme; WHO: World Health Organization

Annex 2

Grand Bargain Transparency Dashboard values at 1 May 2018

Organisation	First published	Timeliness	Forward looking	Comprehensive	Coverage	Humanitarian	Total	Progress	Baseline
AICS – Agenzia Italiana per la Cooperazione allo Sviluppo / Italian Agency for Cooperation and Development	10/18/2017	38	0	80	0	25.00	35.75	35.75	0
Australia – Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)	9/2/2011	88	17	84	0	52.17	57.74	20.24	37.5
Belgian Development Cooperation	12/15/2014	75	58	72	0	50.00	55.05	31.1	23.95
British Red Cross	8/16/2012	75	38	66	0	25.00	45.3	5.8	39.5
Bulgaria	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0

Canada – Global Affairs Canada | Affaires mondiales Canada	10/31/2012	100	54	90	0	25.00	59.15	5.7	53.45
CARE International in Zimbabwe	12/8/2017	25	0	65	0	50.00	35	35	0
CARE International UK	10/29/2012	63	0	70	0	50.00	45.75	7.75	38
CARE Nederland	4/28/2016	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (CAFOD)	3/21/2012	75	0	71	0	25.00	42.75	-3	45.75
Catholic Relief Services (CRS)	4/9/2015	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
Christian Aid	1/9/2013	25	0	84	0	50.00	39.75	-0.5	40.25
Christian Aid Ireland	7/1/2016	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	-3.25	3.25
Czech Republic – Czech Development Agency	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
Denmark – Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Danida	12/21/2012	100	1	80	0	25.00	51.35	6.35	45
Estonia	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
European Commission (EC) – DG Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO)	9/26/2013	100	44	92	0	67.54	69.29	5.19	64.1

Finland – Ministry of Foreign Affairs	11/25/2011	88	45	73	0	25.00	51	14.85	36.15
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	5/3/2017	75	1	79	0	25.00	44.85	9.25	35.6
Germany – Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)	3/28/2013	88	36	80	0	25.00	51.85	10.1	41.75
Global Communities	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
InterAction	3/19/2015	25	0	55	0	25.00	26.25	0.5	25.75
International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
International Labor Organization (ILO)	4/18/2016	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
International Organization for Migration (IOM)	2/28/2018	25	0	71	0	50.00	36.5	36.5	0

International Rescue Committee (IRC)	9/12/2017	100	68	85	0	52.03	66.06	66.06	0
International Rescue Committee (IRC) UK	2/11/2014	100	58	80	0	51.67	63.72	63.72	0
Ireland – Department of Foreign Affairs & Trade (Irish Aid)	7/31/2013	13	0	0	0	25.00	9.5	3.25	6.25
Japan – Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)	6/30/2014	0	0	61	0	25.00	21.5	-4.25	25.75
Luxembourg	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
Mercy Corps Europe	7/2/2012	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
Netherlands – Ministry of Foreign Affairs	9/19/2011	100	1	87	0	25.00	53.1	-1.05	54.15
Netherlands Red Cross	4/29/2016	63	0	83	0	61.04	51.76	7.76	44
Norad – Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation	12/18/2015	38	4	79	0	25.00	35.9	9.3	26.6
Norway – Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)	3/8/2013	75	20	66	0	28.30	44.33	10.33	34

Oxfam GB	8/8/2012	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
Oxfam IBIS	4/27/2016	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
Oxfam India	9/24/2013	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
Oxfam Novib	5/8/2014	13	0	0	0	0.00	3.25	-51.3	54.55
Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre	5/3/2016	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
Relief International UK	10/30/2012	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
Slovenia Ministry Of Foreign Affairs	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
Spain – Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation	11/17/2011	0	0	77	0	25.00	25.5	-3.5	29
Sweden – Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)	11/11/2011	88	96	84	0	29.76	60.04	4.99	55.05
Switzerland – Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)	11/11/2013	0	0	65	0	25.00	22.5	0	22.5
Syria Relief Turkey	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0

UK – Department for International Development (DFID)	1/29/2011	88	43	86	0	25.00	54.05	-0.15	54.2
UK – Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO)	7/8/2013	25	0	0	0	25.00	12.5	-19.75	32.25
United Nations Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)	2/9/2016	100	0	55	0	71.04	56.51	5.01	51.5
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)	6/7/2013	88	60	96	0	25.00	58.25	1.15	57.1
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	11/22/2011	100	74	89	0	25.00	60.9	4.55	56.35
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)	6/26/2014	100	33	57	0	50.00	55.05	55.05	0
United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)	7/2/2013	38	0	86	0	25.00	37.25	-14.5	51.75

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA)	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
United Nations Women (UN Women)	11/20/2012	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
United Nations World Food Programme (WFP)	6/11/2013	100	92	85	0	72.34	73.54	3.54	70
United States	1/2/2013	25	0	78	0	74.94	44.48	17.23	27.25
US Agency for International Development (USAID)	4/27/2017	75	0	71	0	25.00	42.75	9.75	33
World Bank, The	3/14/2011	63	86	85	0	25.00	51.85	0.5	51.35
World Vision International (WVI)	10/16/2015	25	0	60	0	50.00	33.75	27.5	6.25
World Vision Netherlands	6/20/2016	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	-3.25	3.25
World Vision UK	6/13/2012	0	0	63	0	25.00	22	0	22
World Vision Zimbabwe	12/5/2017	38	0	65	0	50.00	38.25	38.25	0

Annex 3

Proposed monitoring framework for the Grand Bargain transparency commitment to publish open data on humanitarian funding (revised as of 1 May 2018)

Introduction

Implementing the Grand Bargain commitments on transparency provides an unprecedented opportunity for increased political momentum and practical action to improve the quality, availability and use of data on crisis-related financing. There are potential benefits for all involved: donors, who want to know how efficiently and effectively their funding is being spent and aid organisations, to improve their decision-making processes and support advocacy efforts to mobilise additional resources. Being able to demonstrate the results of humanitarian action and the positive impacts of humanitarian financing can also strengthen public trust and support of foreign aid budgets. Most importantly, open access to information is a key part of making humanitarian action accountable to affected people – allowing communities to see how much assistance is being provided and whether it is reaching them in the most efficient and effective way possible.

Towards more transparency in crisis situations

There are growing demands for more and better data on the range of resources provided in crisis situations in order to provide a more efficient and effective response to affected populations. The High Level Panel Report on Humanitarian Financing[1] highlighted the need for "greater transparency from implementing organisations so that everyone can 'follow the money' on its journey from donor to recipient. A global data platform to provide open and transparent data would help reduce transaction costs and increase effectiveness." In the Grand Bargain

---

[1] See 'Too important to fail: addressing the humanitarian financing gap' https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-hosted-iasc/documents/too-important-fail-addressing-humanitarian-financing-gap-high

donors and aid organisations committed to strengthening the transparency of the humanitarian system. As a first step, they agreed to publish timely, transparent, harmonised and open high-quality data on humanitarian funding within two years of the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit and identified the IATI Standard as the best way to do this. In so doing, they have set a clear direction for improving the availability of humanitarian data on humanitarian financing to enable greater accountability and more informed decision-making.

It is important to monitor the progress made by donors and aid organisations in meeting their transparency commitments. Visible and public improvements in the humanitarian aid data being published to IATI will encourage signatories to improve their performance. To support donors and aid organisations to monitor their own progress in becoming more transparent, a monitoring framework has been proposed. The framework consists of a Grand Bargain Transparency Dashboard[2] and a monitoring methodology.

How the dashboard can help donors and aid organisations in becoming more transparent

The dashboard is a public online tool. It enables donors and aid organisations to monitor the humanitarian data they publish to the IATI Standard and to identify those areas where further improvements might be necessary.

The results aim to enable Grand Bargain signatories to assess their progress towards meeting their commitment to publish timely, high-quality, harmonised and transparent data on humanitarian funding. The dashboard results will inform the Grand Bargain's annual independent monitoring reports.

Future revisions of the dashboard will enable donors and aid organisations to provide further information on the steps they are taking to become more transparent, such as implementation plans, feasibility studies, or open data policies.

Monitoring methodology

The proposed monitoring methodology has been developed by DI with the support of the IATI Technical Team and following an extensive consultation process, which was carried out during the course of 2017 involving over 150 people from 85 organisations across 26 countries. The methodology monitors the

---

[2] Grand Bargain Transparency Dashboard: http://46.101.46.6/dashboard

humanitarian data an organisation publishes to the IATI Standard against **five performance measures**. Each of these performance measures has been given a **percentage weighting** that reflects its importance and/or relevance for the humanitarian community, based on feedback received through the consultation process. The weighting and methodology for each performance measure is outlined in Table A1 below.

Table A1: Performance measures

Performance measure	Purpose	Weighting	Methodology
1. Humanitarian	To assess the use of the specific humanitarian elements added to the IATI Standard at v2.02	25%	http://dashboard.iatistandard.org/humanitarian.html#h_narrative
2. Timeliness	To assess both the frequency (how often the data is updated) and the time lag (how up-to-date the data is) of published information	25%	http://dashboard.iatistandard.org/timeliness.html#h_narrative
3. Comprehensiveness	To assess how much of the IATI Standard is being used	25%	http://dashboard.iatistandard.org/comprehensiveness.html#h_narrative
4. Coverage	To assess the percentage of an organisation's total operational spend on all humanitarian programming that is published to IATI	15%	http://dashboard.iatistandard.org/coverage.html#h_narrative Additional information will be required from publishers
5. Forward-looking	To assess how much information on activity budgets is available for the next three years	10%	http://dashboard.iatistandard.org/forwardlooking.html#h_narrative

An organisation's data is classed as **humanitarian** if either of the following applies:

- The activity includes a DAC sector code in the range 72010 to 74010.
- The activity humanitarian attribute is set. (Note that the humanitarian attribute is only available to publishers using V2.02 or later of the IATI Standard.)

Understanding the Grand Bargain Transparency Dashboard

How should one read the dashboard? The Grand Bargain Transparency Dashboard is based on the monitoring methodology outlined above and uses the data that organisations publish to the IATI Standard on the IATI registry. The dashboard is updated on a daily basis and the values under each column are calculated automatically.

The **Total** column shows the current total value for each organisation and is calculated based on the sum of the values for each performance measure, once the weighting has been applied. This value can be used to assess the extent to which an organisation has met their transparency commitment in accordance with the overall assessment ratings outlined in Table A2 below.

The **Baseline** column shows the fixed total value calculated for each organisation on 1 June 2017.

The **Progress** column shows the difference between the organisation's current total value and fixed baseline value. Any value greater than zero is coloured green and shows that an organisation's data has improved, compared with their Baseline value at 1 June 2017. The higher the figure the more progress an organisation is making at that given point in time.

Making progress towards meeting the transparency commitments

An organisation's overall assessment is based on the total value by quintile ratings in accordance with the table below. If a signatory organisation has met the Grand Bargain transparency commitment, it achieves an assessment of 'good' (60–79%) or above.

Table A2: Overall assessment ratings

Quintile	Assessment
80%–100%	Very good
60%–79%	Good
40%–59%	Fair
20%–39%	Poor
0%–19%	Very poor

The specific case of federated/confederated organisations

The operational models of some organisations with highly federated or confederated structures can present significant challenges for implementing organisation-wide IATI publishing. National members or affiliates often have independent governance structures and are subject to differing legal requirements depending on national laws. This presents difficulties when measuring their performance and presenting a single score for individual Grand Bargain signatory organisations. National or affiliated members of Grand Bargain signatory organisations that publish their humanitarian aid data to IATI will be individually assessed and values made available on the Grand Bargain Transparency Dashboard.

Further information

For further information on the Grand Bargain transparency workstream please see www.interagencystandingcommittee.org/greater-transparency.

Where can I get help?

If you would like to be included in the Grand Bargain Transparency Dashboard, or for further information on the proposed monitoring framework and methodology please contact Liz Steele at liz.steele@devinit.org.