1Linked transparency; what’s needed to set the next step

Supporting development in developing countries is almost by definition a team effort. Sustainable development can’t be the result of the efforts of a single actor in isolation. This is especially true for an international actor. Development cooperation and sustainable development are therefore the result of a networked approach in which -ideally- governments, civil society and ngo’s in developing countries, international ngo’s, multilateral organisations and donors (governmental and non-governmental) are harmonizing and coordinating their efforts on the sustainable development strategies as formulated and prioritized in and by developing countries and report on the results achieved.

The strength of the IATI standard that -at least in theory- it is capable of making this network of efforts visible and not just the efforts of the single actors/publishers. To realise this potential of -what we have termed- ‘linked transparency’, a number of requirements have to be met:

1. The dataset of the publishers have to be exhaustive, ie including ALL activities bridging the (internal) gap between receipts and disbursements and expenditures.
2. To make the relation between IATI publishers clear, the publishers have to make use (to the extent possible) of IATI identifiers in referring to each other.
3. In addition they should make use of the possibility to refer to the activity ID of the provider, either in the participating org part of our standard and/or in the transaction part.
4. Within the (full) dataset of each of the publishers, the internal relation between activities have to be reflected by making use of the related activity element. In addition it might help prevent misunderstandings if reference is made to an activity ID also in the case of an internal transaction.
5. Combining these 3 elements provides for the backbone of ‘linked transparency’. Of course, it goes without saying that the more (policy) information is included on each of these activities, the more meaningful and relevant the findings become, ie on planned disbursements, geolocation, relevance of policy markers such as gender and climate, SDG targets, results aimed for and achieved, to name but a few elements.

The analyses we are about to share at the VCE are a kind of stocktaking on where we stand on each of the point mentioned above. For that purpose we have focused on the datasets of a single donor and some of the multilateral publishers including the pooled funds since we are more than aware that extensive linkages exist. The question is: to what extent can these be found in the published datasets? In more concrete terms, we analyzed the relations between the datasets of the Netherlands (for short referred to in this paper as NL) (XM-DAC-7), IOM (XM-DAC-47066), UNDP (XM-DAC-41114) and UNPF (XI-IATI-UNPF). In total, these four datasets contain over 45.000 activities.

In addition to the findings on the level of ‘linked transparency’ between these datasets, we want to engage in discussions on recommendations if and how to move forward with respect to publishing behavior or the standard and how to support publishers eg in terms of the use of the data validator or the datastore.

1. Dataset exhaustive and complete

For the kind of analysis we are about to undertake, it is necessary to have a full dataset of each of the 5 publishers involved. Of course we could have followed the ‘royal’ road by compiling the datasets on the basis of the registry. In the case of UNPF, this would have been simple because only 1 dataset is offered. However, in the case of UNDP this would involve compiling/merging 153 datasets, with IOM (4 datasets) and NL (10 datasets) as cases in between on the easy side.

Therefore we chose the easy route of downloading the full datasets of our publishers directly from the IATI datastore. We downloaded all the datasets at the same date (9 Ocotber 2023), resulting in datasets containing 21.743 activities (UNDP), 10.747 activities (UNPF), 9896 activities (NL) and 4211 activities (IOM) respectively. Except for UNPF, all data were updated fairly recently. The last UNPF update dates back to 8 April 2021. UNDP data were last updated on 31 May 2023, probably as the result of the introduction of a completely new ERP.

Of course it is always difficult to establish whether a dataset is indeed complete and exhaustive. For primary donors such as NL it can be expected that the dataset is relatively flat in the sense that there are no parents and children, yet be exhaustive. For recipients the lack of structure is less likely to be adequate, simply because they receive programmatic support from their donors whereas direct support to their activities is the exception. In one of the following paragraphs we will touch upon this topic more extensively. In the datasets of IOM and UNPF the parent activities show the programmatic budget received from the donors, whereas the children are reflecting the concrete activities undertaken on the basis of that support.

Despite its size, the UNDP dataset seems to be suffering from a -rather crucial- lack on data with respect to programmatic incoming funds. The dataset consists ‘only’ of PROJECT and OUTPUT activities, but doesn’t contain activities mirroring the programmatic budget resources provided for by the donors. As a result of this gap it is impossible to trace the bulk of the contributions of donors, except for the direct support going to specific OUTPUT and/or PROJECT activities. As we shall see later, the result is that UNDP becomes the (internal) participating org in role 1 (funding), without reference to where these funds are coming from.

Already earlier the IATI community discussed on how to deal with assessed or non-earmarked contributions. The IOM dataset, although apparently complete and exhaustive, contains neither, simply because this budget is not provided in relation to a specific activity or programme. It is at the discretion of the recipient organization (together with its members in the case of the assessed contribution) to decide where to spend it on.

Although in quantitative way the assessed contribution for most organisations represent only a small fraction of their total income (a mere 5% for IOM and WHO for example) for others the share is much higher (almost 50% for the ILO). In a qualitative way we should consider on how to enable the IATI standards to also deal with assessed contributions and unearmarked funds. Earlier discussions, especially fed by OJ, hovered round the -in itself- logical idea to report this incoming budget in the organization file. If then part of this budget is used for funding activities, we should enable the possibility to refer in the activities file to the organization file.

1. Use of IATI identifiers

Probably the best way to illustrate why the use of IATI identifiers can be highly recommended to avoid confusion and misunderstanding is that in the UNDP dataset 3 different narratives can be found for the uniform reference to NL as XM-DAC-7 as the donor (participating organization in role 1).

* 1. Use of IATI identifiers in participating org

Analysed on the use of identifiers it can be concluded from the datasets that publishers are making efforts to also provide for references and not only narratives. However, the result is not always convincing. In the UNPF dataset there are 1330 cases of participating organizations in role 1. Out of these 1330 cases, 667 contain a reference to the donor (half of the total). In the other cases there is only a narrative. Remarkable is that examples can be found where the same donor to a specific activity can be found both with and without reference; the ‘Switzerland, Government of’ has a reference ‘CH-4’, whereas the ‘SWITZERLAND, Government of’ has to do with only a narrative and no reference.

As a side remark it can be mentioned that although almost all role 1 participating orgs are governments, except for a few private sector donors (type 70). However, instead of type 10 (government), the dataset refers to these donors as type 40 (multilateral).

In the UNFPA dataset, in 30 cases NL is reported as participating org in role 1. Neither IOM nor UNDP can be found as participating organization in role 1, which is quite logical. IOM is included in the UNPF dataset in 524 cases in role 4 as implementing participant., For UNDP the set includes 1189 references to UNDP in role 4 as implementing organization.

The IOM dataset, on the other hand, contains 4211 cases of participating organizations in role 1. This is exactly the same number as the number of activities in the dataset. Apparently there is a 1-on-1 relationship between activities and providers, suggesting that co-funding of activities is not reflected in the dataset.

On all of these activities, not only the reference is provided, but also the activity ID of the provider is included. In 376 cases the participating org in role 1 is IOM itself. Interestingly enough, in these cases there is no reference to an activity number. Thus making it unclear what the source of the funding is.

IOM refers to UNDP as the provider of funds in 34 cases, for a large part without inclusion of their activity number and in 179 cases to UNPF as the funding provider, in almost all cases including the reference to a/the MPTF activity number. In the next para we will analyze whether this reference is in line with the activity identifiers included in the UNPF dataset. Compared to the 524 cases reported by UNPF with IOM as implementing organization, the 179 cases reported by IOM with UNPF as provider seem very low. Further analysis of the datasets (among others the timeframe/coverage) might partly explain the difference.

In 50 cases IOM refers to NL as provider and also in this case the reference to the NL activity numbers is almost complete.

In the margin it should be mentioned that IOM considers itself as the accountable organization (role 2) and not as an implementing organization (role 4). The IOM dataset doesn’t include a single implementing organization.

Before a more detailed analysis of the NL dataset, the UNDP dataset adequately illustrates that the use of identifiers can also create confusion. UNDP has made every effort of providing identifiers throughout their (very extensive) dataset. This has also led to the inclusion of references that only have a meaning within UNDP.

The UNDP dataset contains 45.688 participating orgs in role 1. Of all of these orgs, a reference is provided. Just as an indication, of these references, 20.126 contain a reference to XM-DAC, and 4332 to XI-IATI. Of course, not all donors have the XM-DAC or XI-IATI prefix to their IATI ID. The issue with UNDP is they seem to have an internal system of identifiers consisting only of numbers predominantly referring to the contribution of local governments to activities in their own country (eg 11800 for the Government of St Maarten) or a contribution from a trust fund (eg 11363 for the Peacebuilding fund managed by the Multi Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTFO).

Extending on the last example, in 2905 cases the UNDP dataset refers to XI-IATI-UNPF as the participating org in role 1. The narrative is then used to indicate from which particular trust fund the funds originate. Confusing is that in 839 other cases reference is made to the Peacebuilding Fund as provider in role 1 by making use of the internal 11363 reference, although the fund is managed by the MPTFO and therefore part of the XI-IATI-UNPF dataset.

Additional complication is that some -but certainly not all- trust funds have their own OECD/DAC channel code (eg the Peacebuilding Fund - 41141 or the UN-led country based pooled funds – 41503) , as has the MPTFO itself (41401), in the latter case to enable the distinction between UNDP and MPTFO. This implies that the donors reporting to DAC and in IATI have to report separately both the DAC channel code as well as the IATI identifier. It is not sufficient for IATI publishing to simply add the XM-DAC prefix.

Linking to the latter issue, one of the challenges with respect to the use of IATI identifiers in the NL dataset is that the contributions to the trust funds managed by MPTFO are reported as contributions to UNDP. Over the years, NL has contributed substantially to the various MPTFO managed trust funds (more than 1 billion USD). Many of these contributions were unearmarked contributions to a trust fund. As a result these were/are reported as unearmaked contributions to UNDP.

Taking a closer look at the UNDP dataset in terms of the references to IOM, UNPF and NL, the data show the following. IOM is neither mentioned as funding (role 1), nor as implementing (role 4). The latter is remarkable since IOM mentions 32 cases where UNDP is the provider of funds. As can be expected, UNPF is never included as implementing organisation in the UNDP dataset. In 2847 cases UNDP refers to UNPF as the provider of funds (role 1) which is high compared to the 1189 cases where UNPF reported UNDP as the implementing organization. UNDP mentions 715 cases where NL is the provider of funds.

In a more systematic way, the NL dataset contains 9891 cases of a participating org in role 4 (implementing). Of these 9891 cases, 4363 cases (roughly 44%) contain a reference to the implementing organization, which has to be considered as a low share, not in the least since the policy of the Netherlands is to stimulate partners to become IATI publishers and most of the multilateral organizations are publishers with an IATI identifier. Out of these 4363 cases, 1066 are referred to by using the XM-DAC- prefix, 29 use the XI-IATI prefix, and 1260 cases with the NL-KVK prefix for ngo’s registered in the Netherlands.

For unclear reasons, there are many instances where only the DAC channel code is used as reference, without inclusion of the XM-DAC prefix. When searched for references starting with 41 (the UN family in DAC channel codes) 845 hits are found. Whereas IOM is properly referred to as XM-DAC-47066, UNESCO and UNFPA, for instance, are referred to as 41122 (309 cases) and 41119 (125 cases). Some ngo partners in the Netherlands are only referred to in a narrative, although they are IATI publishers and can/should be referred to by using their IATI identifier. This applies for example to Cordaid (NL-KVK-41160054) and Oxfam Novib (NL-KVK-27108436).

Earlier it was already mentioned that in the NL dataset there is no specific reference to support provided to MPTFO managed trust funds. Instead, they are reported as support to UNDP (XM-DC-41114). From the perspective of a donor reporting to DAC as well as in IATI, the challenge in this case is to include in its dataset both the proper DAC channel codes as well as the ID of the IATI publisher.

As mentioned before, the NL dataset does not refer to UNPF. In 351 cases reference is made to UNDP as implementing participant (which includes the contributions to the MPTFO managed trust funds). Compared to the 715 cases UNDP reported with NL as provider, this number is low and needs further analysis. Unfortunately IOM is also one of those organizations where NL is not referring to the IATI identifier. When searching on the narrative IOM under participating orgs in an implementing role, 92 references can be found to IOM. Taking into consideration the difference in timeframe of the datasets the 50 references in the IOM dataset give probably a fairly good match for the newer activities.

* 1. Use of IATI identifiers in transactions

At face value it could be expected that the use of references in the participating org is comparable to the use of references in the transaction providers. Of course, the number of transactions is much higher than the number of participating orgs in role 1 or 4. Although not within the scope of this paper, much more than the rather qualitative mentioning of the participating organizations and their roles, the use of identifiers in transaction providing enables a quantitative analysis of the relations between the participating orgs.

A more detailed analysis of the UNPF dataset shows that it contains in total 25.240 cases of provider org. Of these 25.240 cases, surprisingly enough, in 24.065 cases (more than 95%) this includes a reference to the provider organization. For a large part this is explained by the fact that in 22.883 of these cases (more than 90% of the total) the reference is to XI-IATI-UNPF itself as provider, testifying to the role of a trust fund manager as interlocutor for funds between donor and implementing organizations. In 1182 cases, reference is made to external providers as providers by using their IATI identifier. As was the case in the participating org part, these providers (mostly governments) are typed as multilateral organizations (type 40) instead of governments (type 10).

As far as external providers is concerned, the ratio between providers with and without reference is 1182 : 1175 or roughly 50/50, which is in line with the findings earlier on the use of the references on the participating org part.

In terms of relations between the datasets analysed, the UNPF dataset shows 57 references to NL as provider, whereas, not surprisingly, neither IOM nor UNDP are included as provider. The 57 references would imply an average of less than 2 transactions per activity in which NL is a/the funding partner. This is very unlikely to be correct.

The UNDP dataset contains a staggering 207.050 transaction providers. Of this total, 202.803 (or almost 98%) contain a reference to the provider org. Out of this total with reference, in 124.322 cases (more than 61% of the referenced cases) reference was made to UNDP as (internal) provider.

As far as external providers is concerned, the ratio between providers with and without reference is 78.481 : 4.247 or roughly 95/5. This shows that UNDP makes a serious effort to provide for references to provider orgs. And again the observation must be made that, as with the participating orgs, the dataset contains a substantial number of references that have only internal value.

In terms of relations between datasets of the publishers analysed, the UNDP dataset contains 7907 references to UNPF as provider, 84 references to IOM as provider and 1219 references to NL as provider.

In the IOM dataset, 18.459 provider orgs are included. Of these 18.458 make reference to not only the provider, but also their activity ID, which makes the IOM dataset probably the first dataset of a multilateral organization that is fully meeting the requirements for linked transparency. Out of these 18.458 references, 10.986 are references to IOM internal transactions.

In 77 cases the IOM dataset refers to NL as the transaction provider (and includes the activity ID of the provider). This would imply a mere 1,5 transactions per activity where NL is the funding partner. UNPF is mentioned as transaction provider in 264 cases and UNDP in 39 cases.

The NL dataset, finally, shows 495 cases where IOM is the recipient of a transaction and in 2247 cases UNDP is referred to as the receiver org. No references are used in these cases, only narratives. As explained earlier, the transactions to UNDP include those to the MPTFO managed trust funds.

Since NL was strongly in favor of introducing the incoming commitment as a type of transaction, the datasets were analysed on the use of that transaction type. In the UNPF, by far the largest part of the 25.240 transactions is transaction code 3 (disbursement, 22.257 cases), transaction code 1 (incoming fund, 2378 cases) and some code 4 (expenditures, 605 cases). No reference was made to code 11 incoming commitments.

The UNDP dataset contains 207.050 transaction types, of which 21.005 code 1 (incoming), 5727 code 3 (disbursement), 94.247 code 4 (expenditures) and 72.332 code 11 (incoming commitments).

The dataset of IOM, finally, contains 18.459 transaction types, of which 3.827 code 1 (incoming), 1.626 code 2 (outgoing commitment) 1.312 code 3 (disbursement), 7483 code 4 (expenditures) and 4211 code 11 (incoming commitments).

 Although the concept seems simple and straightforward (make use of IATI identifiers to refer to implementing and funding partners to the extent possible), there still is ‘some’ homework to do for the publishers analysed.

This also includes a discussion on the use of (internal) identifiers that are not known to other publishers. Since these other publishers might also make use of an internal reference list, it is very difficult or even impossible to avoid that the same partners are likely to end up with multiple identifiers. Exactly the opposite of what the purpose of an identifier is. For many years, IATI has been supportive of generating unique identifiers. A good start would be if publishers would make use to the extent possible to already existing IATI IDs when referring to each other.

1. Use of activity IDs of the provider of funds

In addition to the use of -proper- IATI identifiers, the reference to the activity id of the funding partner or the provider of funds is essential to get to the right level of detail in linked transparency. The IATI standard provides for the possibility to refer to the providers’ activity ID in these elements; participating org and transaction.

As indicated before, IOM is already making use of the possibility to refer to the activity ID for participating orgs in role 1. Since there seems to be a 1-on-1 relationship in the IOM dataset between activities and funding partners and co-funding is lacking, it is easy to retrace contributions from the funding participants.

In total, the dataset contains 4211 cases of activity IDs on 4211 activity IDs, although in a limited number of cases the activity ID is merely a copy of the IATI identifier to the provider, without the subsequent reference to an activity ID. Focusing on the publishers subject of this paper, the dataset shows 50 cases where reference is made to NL as funding participant. Of these 50 cases, 11 only contain a reference to NL, without an activity ID. Of the 39 references to the activity ID, there are some that contain minor mistakes (reference to a contract number or a budget line of NL instead of its act.id), maybe also due to unclear guidance. Not surprisingly, the same picture emerges when looking at the transactions. The dataset shows 90 cases where NL is referred to as provider, of which 14 with the mere reference to NL, without activity number and 76 with activity numbers. References in the participating org are equal to those in the transaction part as provider, also including the same mistakes.

IOM refers in 264 cases to UNPF as the provider, including an activity ID, such as ‘XI-IATI-UNPF-MPTF-133198’. Again a quick check shows that these act. IDs can’t be found in the UNPF dataset.

The UNPF dataset contains 41.035 references to activity-IDs under the transactions, of which 22.862 are so-called provider act.IDs and 18.173 are receiver act.IDs. The provider act.IDs are all references to internal (XI-IATI-UNPF act. IDs. A random check shows indeed that the activities referred to are also included in the UNPF dataset. There are no references to activity IDs of the funding participating orgs. In that sense the references to the provider act. IDs serve as an addition to the use of related activities.

The purpose of the receiver act.IDs might be to assist the recipient partner in referring to the right UNPF act.ID. in their dataset. In 5.919 cases the receiver act.ID is either empty or contains a code that doesn’t refer to an activity ID in the dataset and apparently only has an internal meaning (MULTIREF, or 94986). In the dataset, there are 12.254 cases where the receiver activity ID rule also includes reference with an IATI identifier to the recipient. In 2.793 cases reference is made to UNDP as the receiver org. The receiver act.ID seems rather meaningless for the recipient and outsiders (93102 or MULTIREF 00082440. A quick check (certainly not exhaustive) shows that UNDP did not include this reference as act.ID of the funding partner and/or transaction.

For IOM 784 cases can be found where IOM is referred to as the receiver org. In 477 cases this is also followed by a receiver activity ID which apparently seems to include a reference to the resourcing trust fund (PB for Peacebuilding Fund). Check in the IOM dataset reveals that IOM is actually using this receiver ID in the UNPF dataset (PB.0014) in their activity identifier (XM-DAC-47066-PB.0014). Random check on some other provider act.IDs, however, showed no hits.

In the UNDP dataset, 101.748 cases are found with references to an activity ID. By far the most are references in the (internal) transactions either in the form of a provider activity ID from a parent (6228 cases) and a receiver act.ID in the parent (93.337 cases).

The UNDP dataset also includes 1.913 cases where reference is made to an activity id of an external transaction provider. In 400 cases reference is made to the activity id of NL, These 400 cases represent transactions on 18 NL supported UNDP activities. Out of the 1913, 311 referred to the activity ID of UNPF as transaction provider, representing 49 UNPF supported UNDP activities.

To conclude on this topic, there is the interesting question of the relation between the two elements discussed. In case the act. ids in the participating org in role 1 and the transaction provider are included in both and are the same there is no problem. But what if there is an act.id in the participating role 1 and not in the transaction provider? Is the assumption valid that any transaction provided for by the same partner/donor and without its own act.id is originating from the activity included in the reference to the participating org in role 1. Advantage is that the participating org in role 1 is only once referred to in each activity and not many times as mostly is the case with transactions. Additional advantage is also that this approach opens up the possibility to include an activity ID only in very specific transactions, eg humanitarian transactions on on-going activities.

1. Related activities

A final element to be taken into consideration is the use of related activities to provide for structure in a dataset. The IATI definition of a related activity is that it is another separately reported activity that is related to the activity at hand. Important is to keep in mind that the related activity referred to, should also be included in the same dataset when the relation is of the type of parent, child or sibling.

Neither the NL, nor the IOM dataset make reference to a related activity. Both these files are flat in the sense that they consist of a collection of activities that are not related.

The UNDP dataset contains 145.398 related activities, of which 13.729 are references to children (recognizable by having the word ‘OUTPUT’ in their activity ID), 117.930 are siblings, the sisters of brothers of the children (also recognizable by having ‘OUTPUT’ in their identity) and finally 13.739 parents.

Since UNDP is publishing the related activity in the parents, as well as the children and the siblings, an activity with 9 children in each child there is a reference to the parent as well as its 8 siblings and in the parent the 9 children are reported. Although most of the 21.743 activities in the UNDP dataset have only 1 or 2 children per parent, there are also exceptions, running up to 150+ children for one parent.

The UNPF dataset contains 20.848 references to related activities, of which 10.424 are references to children and 10.242 are references to parents. No references are found to siblings.

Of course, the parent child relation need not be financial and can be purely programmatic or geographical. Relevant question, however, is whether it CAN be financial? Related activity type code 4 (co-funded) gives room to such thinking. In the UNPF dataset it seems logical that each of the trust funds reported (eg Peacebuilding Fund, iati-identifier XI-IATI-UNPF-MPTF00006) it seems logical that the activities funded by that fund are considered and reported as its children (which indeed is the case). Even without reference to the identifier, it might be assumed that the act.id of the participating org in role 1 as well as the transaction provider is clear and doesn’t need replication in those activities. In short, it would mean that internal participating orgs in role 1 and transactions to children always get the activity id of the parent.

Short and somewhat haphazard going through the UNPF dataset, many different varieties can be found. In some cases, indeed in the children the act.id of the parent is referred to, both with respect to the participating org in role 1. However, cases have also been found where the child is not part of the dataset and cannot be found. In yet other cases, the participating org act. id and the transaction id referred in fact to the activity itself.

1. Linked transparency as a means, not an end in itself

Although riddled with challenges, predominantly as a result of publishing behavior, the above analysis also shows that with the current state of our IATI standard we are capable of providing for linked transparency BETWEEN and WITHIN publishers. It could even be concluded that, instead of a shortage of possibilities, our standard is somewhat redundant on this area; two different elements to report on the act. ID of the provider and -for internal references- the additional possibility of indicating parent-children relationships.

Having said all this, it should be kept in mind that linked transparency is not an end in itself. Its relevance should be found in the ability to learn and progress in the -by definition- difficult and challenging attempts to support developing countries in their sustainable development or in meeting or softening the consequences of disasters.

In linked transparency it becomes clear to what extent and in which way support to fight climate change or mitigate its consequences is undertaken and -above all- what the results are. The same applies for the attempts to realize (or at least improve) gender equality or food security.

In this paper, the focus is on the linked transparency between a bilateral donor and members of the UN family. Traditionally they are committed members of the IATI community who, on top of that, have also agreed in the Funding Compact and the Grand Bargain to set meaningful steps in increased localization, results orientation and alignment with the priorities in local sustainable development strategies on the side of the multilateral system. In exchange, the donors committed to increase the level and, above all, the quality of the support provided to the implementing partners.

Transparency on what has been done to and with whom, where and which with results, on what failed and what was successful, on lessons learned, should persuade donors to refrain from micro-management of what the implementing partners are or should be doing. In that sense, transparency, preferably by making use of the IATI standard, is also a means to enable our implementing development partners to do what they are best while the donors still are capable of showing the fruits of their support.

None of the IATI publishers is on and in itself capable of making that difference. The networked approaches necessary to even have the ambition to start making such differences, requires that we work together and learn form ourselves as well as others.

Of course I would like to thank for the active engagement of all those responsible for the publication of the IATI dataset of the respective publishers. The intention never was to blame or condemn, but merely to point out that sometimes small adjustments can make a huge difference.

The above presentation also contains some issues that might encourage a discussion within the IATI community on the use of our standard and the publishing practices of a wider audience. Much can there e learned from the publishing practice of a substantive number of ngo members/publishers in IATI. They have already grown accustomed to the need of providing linked transparency in their datasets.

Finally an appeal to the IATI secretariat. Making use of the analysis above, there are probably many ways to support publishers in their efforts to increase the quality of their data from a linked transparency perspective. The ability to download complete datasets from the IATI datastore was already highly supportive. All analysis above was done ‘manually’, making use of notepad++ and excel. I am sure that automated data validation tools or configuration can serve the same purpose. In addition it might be a good idea to develop a separate linked transparency index with the aim of stimulating publishers to raise their performance and increase the quality of their dataset.