EVALUATION

OF

THE

INTERNATIONAL AID TRANSPARENCY INITIATIVE

IATI

"EVALUATION OF IATI AS A POLITICAL INITIATIVE"

FINAL REPORT

IAN C. DAVIES, CE

With the collaboration of:

Julia Brümmer
Sara Vaca
Lauren Weiss

OCTOBER 2015

Table of contents

1. Introduction 3
2. Background 3
3. Purpose 4
4. Methodology 4
4.1 Approach 4
4.2 Process 5
5. Scope 6
6. Key findings 7
6.1 Priorities 7
6.2 Aid transparency 8
6.3 IATI data 10
4.1 IATI Standard 12
7. Assessment 14
8. Specific questions 16
9. Operational recommendations 18
9.1 Monitoring 18
9.2 Visibility 18
9.3 Website. 19
10. Data sources 20

1. Introduction

This brief report summarises the findings and conclusions of the "review of IATI's performance against the original objectives set at Accra (2008) and its progress in supporting its members to meet the Busan transparency commitments."[1]

It is one of three "products" of the evaluation of IATI, i.e. Product 1, the other two being:

- Product 2: An internal working note that provides a review of IATI's institutional arrangements and its strength as a global data standard with draft recommendations that was discussed in a Steering Committee (SC) workshop in September 2015 that aimed to reach agreement on those recommendations, and any changes or additions to them, that IATI would act on.

- Product 3: A brief synthesis report that highlights and communicates the key findings of the evaluation drawn from Products 1 and 2, provides conclusions, i.e. evaluative assessments, relative to the questions and themes addressed by the evaluation, and presents the recommendations emanating from the SC workshop.

2. Background

The International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) is a voluntary, multi-stakeholder initiative that seeks to increase the transparency of development cooperation and increase its effectiveness in tackling poverty. IATI was launched at the Third High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Accra in 2008, and was designed to support donors in meeting their Accra commitments on transparency and simultaneously serve the information needs of developing countries to enable the planning and management of national budgets based on more accurate and timely information on resource flows.

The outcome document for the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (Busan, 2011) included a specific reference to IATI in paragraph 23c, requiring all Busan endorsers to, "implement a common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward looking information on resources provided through development cooperation," by December, 2015.

Today, close to 350 organisations publish development cooperation data to the IATI Standard, including traditional bilateral and multilateral donors as well as national and international NGOs, humanitarian actors, private philanthropic foundations, development finance institutions and private companies.

[1] Evaluation terms of reference.

The initiative is governed by a multi-stakeholder Steering Committee, which comprises representatives from all IATI membership categories and meets twice per year. Technical advice on the Standard is provided by an active technical community, the IATI Technical Advisory Group (TAG), which meets annually.

IATI is funded through a combination of membership fees and voluntary contributions. It is supported administratively by a virtual Secretariat located in multiple locations and led by UNDP. The Secretariat is run by a consortium including UNDP, UNOPS, Development Initiatives (DI), Sweden and Ghana. IATI was hosted by the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID) from its inception through 2013.

3. Purpose

With the Busan commitment deadline of December 2015 approaching, IATI Steering Committee members have requested an evaluation examining the progress and impact of the initiative, which will feed into the process of decision-making on its future direction. This is the first evaluation of IATI since it was established in 2008.

4. Methodology

4.1 Approach

IATI is a global multi stakeholder initiative that reflects a political consensus among development actors that transparency is a fundamental democratic value underpinning development. Development "aid" should wholly, explicitly and visibly integrate transparency into its architecture, agenda and operations.

The nature of IATI is that of a complex political process resting on a complicated technical activity, evolving in dynamic and constantly changing environments. As such it is itself a complex adaptive system for which there is little in the way of comparative benchmarks, established performance criteria or "industry metrics" that can be used to support an assessment of its performance and value.

Nor would attempting to rate performance or progress, or ascribe estimated value, to an endeavour such as IATI by measuring against pre-determined targets provide meaningful information to understand and draw on its evolution with a view to improving its value and sustainability.

At best, from a methodological point of view, this evaluation provides an assessment using a "reasonable person standard" and draws on the findings validated by the evaluation working group, as well as SC members and that emerge from the systematic and objective collection of data triangulated for reliability.

As a result, and although there is certainly value to obtaining an external and independent assessment of "performance," including against expectations no matter how general, political or subject to interpretation these may be, the thrust of this review is to provide IATI with evidence-based stock taking of its progress and value as perceived by those that matter most to it, the SC members, publishers and stakeholders.

As well, and as the findings that have emerged from the evaluation of IATI's institutional arrangements indicate, i.e. Product 2, IATI's progress and performance overall are also a reciprocal function of the way in which IATI is organised, governed and managed.

The assessment that this report presents should be understood and contextualised within the broader evaluation of IATI, that is reported in Product 3, the Synthesis Report.

4.2 Process

This review is formative, i.e. it is done to improve IATI rather than to consider whether or not it should continue.[2] As such, the process of conducting it is just as important as its results, as it provides SC members, publishers and stakeholders with structured opportunities to engage in discussion and reflection, and to formulate explicitly the ways in which IATI could be strengthened. The review process also serves to facilitate more formal discussions within IATI between its different constituents, i.e. SC members and publishers, and with stakeholders external to IATI such as Civil Society Organisations (CSO), consultants, etc.

This review is based on a participatory approach and it collected the data and information on which its findings are based using the following methods:

- Evaluator participant-observation in the TAG and SC meetings in Ottawa from May 30 to June 2, 2015.
- The IATI-administered survey of its SC members, publishers and stakeholders .
- Review of documentation on, and related to, IATI as well as more generally on transparency and aid effectiveness.
- Thirty-five semi-structured interviews[3] with SC members and publishers.
- Specific web-based research on indicators of IATI's political profile.

[2] This type of evaluation would be called "summative."
[3] Interview information is collected and used respecting Chatham House Rules.

About a fifth of the interviews were done in person over the course of the IATI meetings in Ottawa while the remaining interviews were conducted remotely. Interviews lasted on average about forty-five minutes and were framed by the following questions based on the terms of reference for the evaluation:

1. To what extent has IATI been successful in putting transparency on the international agenda?

2. How well has IATI supported its members in meeting Accra objectives and Busan commitments?

3. How good is the IATI Standard as a global data standard?

4. How could the institutional arrangements of IATI be improved in terms of governance, i.e. the Steering Committee, of management by the Secretariat, of its financing model, and any other aspects you consider important?

5. What should be in your view the two or three priorities for IATI over the next few years and how should these be pursued?

The findings for this report draw on the review of documentation, the survey data and the interview information provided to a large extent in response to questions 1, 2 & 3.

5. Scope

This review considers and assesses the performance of IATI overall as a political multi-stakeholder initiative. It does not assess the performance of the IATI Secretariat or of its staff, or of IATI members and stakeholders.

6. Key findings

6.1 Priorities

6.1.1 The priorities identified by respondents are data use and improving data quality while continuing to increase the number and diversity of publishers. These expressed priorities correspond generally to the priorities that IATI has identified for the coming years.

Respondents express a variety of potential priorities for IATI. Those priorities that reflect a general consensus and that are given repeatedly are:

- Focus on the use of IATI data: in particular, making sure that the data meets partner countries' planning needs. IATI has so far mainly focused on the publishers' side, now it should turn its attention to the users.

- Enhance the quality of data: this includes more coherence with aid information management systems and making the right choices about extensions of the standard. A few interview respondents suggest to create a mechanism whereby partner countries can let IATI know systematically and quickly when there is a problem with data quality.

These priorities correspond well to those of IATI for the coming years.

IATI's stated priorities for the future (from IATI Annual Report 2014):
IATI 2.0:
• Make Version 2 of the IATI Standard more language-neutral and involve CSOs and partner countries more closely in defining what is needed from the new version;
• Hold regional workshops on South-South Cooperation to find ways in which the standard can offer better support to providers wishing to publish to IATI.
More and better IATI data:
• Form working groups to focus on reporting humanitarian information through IATI;
• Provide clearer guidance on the publication of results.
Using IATI data:
• Foster peer learning among partner countries on use of aid information and explore publication by partner countries of data captured locally through AIMS systems;
• Support where possible the roll-out of automated data exchange between IATI and national aid management platforms;
• Identify and reduce obstacles to the effective use of IATI data at country level, and increase awareness of IATI among parliamentarians and civil society;
• Develop a registry of IATI specialists who can provide support to data users.
Outreach and External relations:
• Address current gaps in coverage (e.g. remaining G8 members) and seek opportunities to engage with BRIC and SSC countries on a voluntary basis;
• Conduct a sustained campaign of communicating outwardly to new and existing publishers and to data users, including the redesign of IATI's websites;
• Expand IATI's membership to cover not only all providers of official development finance, but as many actors as possible within the changing aid architecture and throughout the entire aid delivery chain.

Among the other priorities mentioned by individual survey or interview respondents are:

- Ensuring that transparency becomes a prominent element in the post-2015 agenda.
- Raising awareness globally on IATI through stronger marketing of the standard.
- Improving outreach and connectivity to bring in new players.

6.2 Aid transparency

6.2.1 **IATI has improved access to, and transparency of, aid data and has played a key role in creating and sustaining a global conversation on aid transparency.**

IATI has made a notable contribution to the transparency of aid data generally, as well as reinforcing and increasing the demand for better quality aid data and transparency in partner countries. Other development related transparency initiatives, e.g. open contracts, appear to have been positively influenced by the work of IATI in highlighting the role transparency plays in overall development related resource flows, including aid financing.

IATI has played a key role in creating and sustaining a global conversation on the issue of aid transparency. The perspective from a number of donors is that IATI has made concrete for them the concept and value of transparency and provided practical ways in which to increase transparency for their organisations and their partners. It has enabled a better-shared understanding of what is meant by transparency.

The view was expressed by a few respondents that IATI has contributed to a cultural shift in some organisations towards a more open approach regarding the publication of data. The narrative has shifted from "information management" to "transparency," indicating a possible paradigm shift in both partner countries and donor agencies.

There is wide ranging agreement that IATI has made transparency of aid data an essential component of aid effectiveness. For donor organisations generally membership in IATI is perceived to increase credibility and publishing to the standard is increasingly considered to be a necessary part of doing business.

IATI is also considered successful in causing others to think creatively about new tools and systems to present IATI registry data, thereby facilitating the creation of new systems to visualise transparent aid data.

IATI's Political Profile

The evaluation examined specifically IATI's efforts to cultivate a political profile while promoting transparency within the aid architecture. As there is little in the way of a standard approach for assessing this type of question, the evaluation developed the following indicators:

1. IATI's attendance at international meetings and conferences on aid transparency.
2. Events on aid transparency that IATI hosts or co-hosts and publications IATI authors or co-authors on this topic.
3. References to IATI by other groups that are part of the aid architecture through digitally-available published work, including reports, web pages, news stories, and blog posts.
4. Media references to IATI.

While recognizing the limitations of indicators, the evaluation finds the following:

1. Despite IATI's progress in establishing a political profile, there are opportunities for strengthening it, particularly with respect to monitoring and reporting its actions.

The Secretariat has already undertaken a number of important steps towards establishing a political profile. The fact that the terms of reference for this evaluation specifically asks for a review of IATI's political presence and that both the *IATI Work Plan Y2 FY14-15* and *Action Plan on Outreach and Communication* discuss ways to increase IATI's outreach suggests that the cultivation of the political profile is an important goal. However, while recognizing the difficulties the budgetary and capacity constraints place on the Secretariat, the evaluation finds that monitoring IATI's progress on the goals described in its documents could be strengthened by, for example, collecting data on the indicators selected for this evaluation or their equivalent.

2. The evaluation found through publicly available channels only partial evidence of the full-extent of IATI's political activities and hence of its political profile and "brand."

Data collected by the evaluation on conferences IATI hosts or in which it is represented suggest less activity than what can be deduced from the data provided by the Secretariat. According to the Secretariat, one to two requests per month are received for speaking engagements and IATI frequently co-hosts a number of events, including brown-bag lunches, workshops and side events at international conferences.

Online research on these types of events found only a few references to IATI. The fact that, despite the relatively narrow focus of the evaluation's search, IATI's profile is not as strong as could be expected from its level of activity in that sphere suggests that more needs to be done to raise it to the point where IATI becomes widely recognised and familiar, i.e. that it has a "brand."

Two ways in which improvements could be made are, first, to make sure that all IATI members that represent it in some fashion at international conferences include references to IATI where possible in their documentation and, second, to make sure that IATI's website presents information on the conferences IATI attends or hosts in an organized, comprehensive and user friendly fashion.

6.3 IATI data

6.3.1 There is a general consensus among IATI members and publishers that a significant increase in use of IATI data, particularly by partner countries, is critical to the growth and sustainability of IATI.

6.3.2 A recurring message from users, potential users as well as some stakeholders is that the IATI public-facing websites, including the registry, are not sufficiently user friendly and are difficult to access, navigate and understand.

6.3.3 For many intended users of IATI data, in particular partner countries, the quality of the data that are published requires significant improvement, as there are often important discrepancies between IATI data and those obtained directly from donor country offices.

6.3.4 Partner countries that use IATI data do so primarily to cross-check data entered on their AIMS (Aid Information Management Systems) as part of their planning and budgeting processes. A major obstacle to using IATI data is that it often does not meet the needs of potential users. As well, intended users express the need for more guidance on how to use the data.

Respondents stress the need for more focus by IATI on making the data more accessible to, and hence used by, partner countries rather than maintaining a primary focus on getting as many donors as possible to publish.

Respondents consider that IATI should make a stronger effort in understanding the issues around use and make sure that the data meet the needs of partner countries.

Interview respondents give a number of reasons for why IATI data are not used:

- The IATI data do not provide the information needed: e.g. insufficient disaggregation, lack of information on context and variables such as location, population groups, type of intervention, type of activities, and on aid modalities. Among others, the data are found insufficient for civil society organisations to monitor the use of donor funds by governments or to track the flow of funds from the initial donor to the final recipient.

- The IATI data are generally less reliable than those provided by country offices.

- More information and guidance are needed on how to access and use IATI data. There is a need to build the technical capacities of intended users.

Several respondents to the survey and interviews mention important, and even "huge" discrepancies between the data provided by donors directly for inclusion in a country's aid information management system or aid management platform and the IATI data.

Partner countries sometimes perceive a lack of will on the part of donors to provide complete and well-structured data. However IATI can sometimes supply countries with ways of verifying data provided to them directly by donors or obtaining information that was otherwise not accessible to them.

Partner countries that use IATI data do so to cross-check the data received from donors and entered into their Aid Information Management Systems. This was the case for most of the partner countries contacted as part of this evaluation.

At the same time, interview respondents indicated that awareness of IATI remains limited in donor organisations and in partner countries. For example donor coordination groups in partner countries still tend to use locally sourced data and information and do not systematically have the reflex of accessing IATI data first.

Other uses of IATI data are coordination of programs and projects, the development of the partner country's assistance strategy, and the production of aid reports.

Generally partner countries consider that, at this point, a significant share of IATI published data is still insufficiently complete, reliable and forward-looking for them to use systematically and reliably in their planning and budgeting processes.

Respondents pointed out that the risk of different groups publishing the same data to IATI, i.e. double or multiple counting, does not appear to be taken into account sufficiently nor addressed by IATI in a manner that is commensurate with the significance and importance of that risk, which one respondent described as the risk of ending up with "a well standardised junkyard of data."

4.1 IATI Standard

4.1.1 Members and stakeholders perceive IATI as successful in developing a common open data standard and there is now a large variety of donor organisations that publishes to IATI.

4.1.2 The IATI Standard is considered generally to be a robust open data standard. At the same time, respondents recognise that the standard does not yet fulfil all expected requirements and that it should be developed further.

"The common standard was called for in the Busan Partnership Agreement and further defined by the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and IATI and reflected in the agreement endorsed by the final meeting of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness in June 2012. This common standard consists of three complementary systems and processes: the OECD DAC Creditor Reporting System (CRS), which contains comprehensive historical statistical information; its Forward Spending Survey (FSS); and IATI."[4]

One important achievement is the development of the IATI common standard in two phases: the first was agreed to in July 2010 and the second in February 2011. Another key achievement is the creation of common platform, i.e. a digital infrastructure for publishing. In turn this realisation has spurred others to create new systems for visualising aid data or to sharpen their national aid management platforms.

There are 351 publishers to IATI at this point, including different kinds of multilateral and bilateral donors, international, regional and national NGOs, as well as private sector organisations.

IATI publishers represent an appreciable percentage share of ODA: at the end of 2014, IATI publishers accounted for 82% of global ODA/ODF (i.e. ODA plus OOF), up from 70% at the end of 2013, and for 94% of DAC ODA.[5] Consequently a large volume of data has been published, i.e. up to 270 data sets per publisher. In a number of interviews respondents commended IATI for having managed to achieve its publishing targets within a short timeframe.

There is general agreement among IATI members that IATI has reached a "critical mass" of publishers and, while continuing to pursue increases in publishers, it should now turn its attention to the priority of building up a "critical mass" of IATI data users.

[4] IATI Annual Report 2014: p.11.
[5] ODA: Official Development Assistance. ODF: Official Development Financing . OOF: Other Official Flows. For a comprehensive explanation please see http://www.oecd.org/development/stats/documentupload/Evolution%20of%20ODA.pdf

Survey and interview respondents generally express a positive view about the IATI Standard as a global data standard:

- IATI is in a position to address the needs of partner countries because they have a voice in IATI.
- The IATI Standard was carefully constructed with wide consultation and it is robust as a data standard.
- IATI is a solid and user-friendly framework that is facilitating standardisation.
- The IATI component of the common standard fully reflects the criteria in paragraph 23(c) for timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on development resources as defined in the Busan outcome document.
- IATI has recognised potential to help coordination in the field and among partners.

At the same time, and as indicated earlier, respondents suggest that the IATI Standard does not yet meet all the needs of users and should be further developed. While respondents overall agree that IATI has contributed to making more and better quality data available on aid flows, many express a need for further improving the quality of data and the level of compliance with the IATI Standard to the extent that IATI is a voluntary standard.

Many countries and donors have adapted their aid information management systems to be compatible with IATI. Technically, the transition to IATI has not always been easy. For some the transition from the first to the current version of the IATI Standard was not managed as well as it could have been, in that it consisted essentially of a redesign and that the second version was not backward compatible with the first.

Generally though respondents consider the IATI Standard robust and accept that there is an element of building it as it is going along. For example the work on the budget code is considered positive and important, and there are other "pieces of the puzzle" to tackle such as the humanitarian aid flows and climate change-related financing.

The flexibility of the standard and the consultative processes that are part of its development are considered key strengths. Generally the IATI Standard is appreciated as a useful tool for greater transparency and improved effectiveness of aid.

7. Assessment

Taking into account the politically complex nature of IATI, the complicated technical challenge inherent in developing a global open standard, particularly with respect to aid and development, and the context within which it has been evolving, it is the assessment of this review that:

- **IATI has been successful in putting aid transparency on the international agenda.**
- **IATI has appropriately supported its members in making progress towards meeting Accra objectives and Busan commitments.**

On the first item the evaluation concludes that, overall, there is a positive perception of IATI among aid transparency stakeholders as a significant and increasingly visible contributor to political and policy fora relevant to aid and development.

This said, the evaluation finds that IATI does not monitor sufficiently and systematically its political profile within the overall aid and development architecture in order to analyse it, track its progress and support management decisions in respect to its political outreach activities.

Nor does IATI appear to report systematically on this arguably important aspect of its work. In not doing so, IATI misses the opportunity to capture and communicate the full range of its efforts, i.e. the evaluation found that much of the work that IATI does in this respect is not sufficiently visible outside the Secretariat. If the full value of IATI activities is not captured, it becomes difficult to gauge progress and direction to allow for focused governance support and annual operational adjustments.

The evaluation considers that this situation is due to a significant extent to the ways in which the IATI institutional arrangements are set up, so that addressing these insufficiencies should be part of the discussion on potential changes to the way IATI is organised and functions, i.e. by way of Product 2 and the SC workshop.

On the second item, to the extent that some IATI members may lag in their international engagements and in meeting their Busan commitments by the end of this year, the reasons, responsibilities and remedies lie first and foremost with each organisation rather than with IATI, which remains a voluntary organisation.

This does not mean that IATI should refrain from providing both technical and political support to signatory and member organisations to meet Accra objectives and Busan commitments, but rather that IATI's performance in this respect should be appreciated in light of the inherent challenges it faces in exercising its "soft power."

Recognising that the bulk of the effort of IATI to date in supporting its members appears to has been more on the technical side, the extent to which and how IATI chooses to address the question of its political support and influence is a governance matter that was also part of the SC workshop discussions and should continue to be addressed by the SC.

Nonetheless, the fact remains that there are significant gaps to be addressed with respect to the quality of the data that is published by donors and to the relevance and use of IATI data for partner countries.

Accra objectives (Accra Agenda for Action – key commitments):

24 a) *We will make aid more transparent. Developing countries will facilitate parliamentary oversight by implementing greater transparency in public financial management, including public disclosure of revenues, budgets, expenditures, procurement and audits. Donors will publicly disclose regular, detailed and timely information on volume, allocation and, when available, results of development expenditure to enable more accurate budget, accounting and audit by developing countries.*
26 b) *Beginning now, donors will provide full and timely information on annual commitments and actual disbursements so that developing countries are in a position to accurately record all aid flows in their budget estimates and their accounting systems.*
26 c) *Beginning now, donors will provide developing countries with regular and timely information on their rolling three to five-year forward expenditure and/or implementation plans, with at least indicative resource allocations that developing countries can integrate in their medium-term planning and macroeconomic frameworks. Donors will address any constraints to providing such information.*

Busan commitments (Busan Outcome Document in paragraph 23c):

23. We will work to improve the availability and public accessibility of information on development co-operation and other development resources, building on our respective commitments in this area. To this end, we will:
a) Make the full range of information on publicly funded development activities, their financing, terms and conditions, and contribution to development results, publicly available subject to legitimate concerns about commercially sensitive information.
b) Focus, at the country level, on establishing transparent public financial management and aid information management systems, and strengthen the capacities of all relevant stakeholders to make better use of this information in decision-making and to promote accountability.
c) Implement a common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on resources provided through development co-operation, taking into account the statistical reporting of the OECD-DAC and the complementary efforts of the International Aid Transparency Initiative and others. This standard must meet the information needs of developing countries and non-state actors, consistent with national requirements. We will agree on this standard and publish our respective schedules to implement it by December 2012, with the aim of implementing it fully by December 2015.

8. Specific questions

The terms of reference put forward a list of specific questions for "Product 1" to which the evaluation provides the following assessments based on the work conducted for both the political profile and for the institutional arrangements.

- What progress has IATI made in increasing the publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking data on development cooperation by its members, including both public and private providers?

  IATI has made good progress in increasing the number of publishers, however the quality of data that are published remains weak from the perspective of its potential use by partner countries. Overall progress on the quality of data should be accentuated.

- What progress has IATI made in increasing accountability to taxpayers in donor countries and citizens in partner countries?

  Because of weaknesses in the quality of IATI data, which curtail its use in and by countries, and although there are some examples of how IATI data are used in conjunction with AIMS, overall progress is slow. There is however increasing progress in the development of applications to visualize IATI data in context, which has the potential to increase access, use and relevance to an expanding and increasingly diversified range of actors in countries.

- To what extent has IATI enabled the use of IATI data in national AIMS (Aid Information Management Systems) and PFM (Public Financial Management) systems?

  IATI contributes positively to the increasing use of its data in national AIMS through collaboration with member countries and providers of AIMS who are members as well. IATI is also focused on improving the use of data in PFM systems through efforts, among others, on developing a budget identifier. The weakness in data quality however remains a significant issue.

- To what extent has IATI been successful in promoting traceability by pushing transparency down the implementation chain?

  The review finds little evidence of practical traceability of implementation of projects in country beyond the use of IATI data to cross check data received from donors for inclusion in countries' AIMS.

- What are IATI's main strengths and weaknesses as a brand associated with aid transparency?

  IATI's strength is that, as a multi-stakeholder initiative that is active in international fora, it has increasingly established recognition and credibility for itself with respect to aid transparency. There is however a significant weakness in that IATI's identity, which is what its "brand" would be based on, is far from clear and agreed on within the IATI community itself.

  This lack of clarity is associated with the need for IATI to make transparent and explicit its vision and direction for the future. As well, from the perspective of "branding," the conversation on whether the words "Aid" and "Initiative" should continue to be used reflects a perceived weakness in its "brand" and a desire by an important segment of the IATI community to strengthen its relevance and increase its potential in looking ahead.

- What are the strengths and weaknesses of IATI's outreach and communications strategies at national and global levels?

  As indicated above IATI's strength rests in its multi-stakeholder nature and in its outreach and communications activities which require increased effort and engagement. The weaknesses stem from the issues in the institutional arrangements, e.g. a lack of clear vision, direction, strategic priorities and financial resources.

9. Operational recommendations

9.1 Monitoring

9.1.1 Set specific targets for the highlighted goals in IATI's documents.

It was unclear to the evaluation if the Secretariat followed up on the *IATI Work Plan Y2 FY14-15* to set a quantitative target for Indicator 5.2. In the version of the document the evaluation reviewed, it was stated that a specific target for this indicator would be determined at a later time based on the number of events held.

Likewise it was not clear to the evaluation if the Secretariat or governance of IATI continued to work on the *Action Plan on Outreach and Communication* to establish concrete targets for topics 7, 9, 12, and 13. Creating quantitative goals can help the Secretariat monitor its own progress related to cultivating IATI's political profile in a more objective and clear manner.

9.1.2 Monitor IATI's progress related to the indicators proposed in this evaluation.

It appears that the IATI Secretariat currently does not collect data in a systematic fashion on indicators of the kind that the evaluation selected for this report. As these aspects relate directly to strengthening IATI's political profile, selecting quantitative targets, e.g. how many conferences to attend per year, and collecting data in these areas would have three important benefits:

- First, it would provide the Secretariat with a basis to appropriately allocate its resources to specific actions that aim to achieve these concrete goals.
- Second, it would help the Secretariat monitor and report on its progress in these areas and adjust accordingly if they are not meeting the stated targets.
- Third, it would signal to IATI members and stakeholders that establishing a strong political profile is a priority for IATI by matching its stated interest in this goal with the appropriate attention within the Secretariat.

9.2 Visibility

9.2.1 Clarify which members attending conferences are also representing IATI.

The fact that member countries or organisations often represent IATI at conferences, and that members of IATI's SC and Secretariat are also actors in other fora within the international aid architecture, presents both an opportunity, i.e. a cost effective and efficient way for IATI to make its mark, and a risk, i.e. diluting IATI's identity.

If members are listed as attending a particular event representing only their organisation, it is not clear whether or not they are also there on behalf of IATI. Thus, it can appear to an outsider who did not attend the conference that IATI was not present.

IATI could mitigate this risk by advocating that events that publish a list of attendees or speakers make a note of which person or group is also participating on behalf of IATI. This clarification should also be added to the credits when a representatives host events or contributes to publications on IATI's behalf.

9.3 Website.

The evaluation found IATI's website difficult to navigate, which made locating information on IATI's political profile more complicated. To make sure that the website clearly publicises IATI's activities in the political sphere, two steps should be taken:

- First, the Secretariat should publish a short news piece on each conference it attends or hosts and each publication to which IATI contributes, even when a representing member carries out these functions on IATI's behalf.

- Second, IATI should better organise information on conferences it has attended, events it has hosted, and publications it has worked on so that external parties do not have to go through the process of sifting through the IATI website to learn what IATI has accomplished in the political sphere.

10. Data sources

Number of respondents, by organisation, that provided data used in the evaluation

Estimated number respondents by type of organisation										
Participant-obervation over 4 days of IATI conference (Ottawa May-June 2015)	Partner County Governments	International NGO	Bilateral governments	Mulitlateral organisations	National NGO	Private sector	Other public sector	Foundation	Academic, Training, Research	Total
Nb of organisations	11	12	11	14	7	10	5	5	2	**77**
IATI administered survey *	Partner countries	Members	Data publishers	Other data users		Other	Total			
Nb of individuals	6	18	16	6		10	**56**			
Interviews	Partner countries	International NGO	Bilateral governments	Multilateral organisations	National NGO	Other				
Nb of individuals	9	10	6	8	3	2	**38**			
SC workshop	Partner countries	International NGO	Bilateral governments	Multilateral organisations		Other				
Nb of individuals	7	8	11	14		3	**43**			

* The online platform utilized in the Secretariat survey prompted respondents to choose only one affiliation with IATI, with the result that “partner country”, “data publisher”, “other data user” or “other” categories are also Steering Committee “members”).