



**Strategic Plan
2026-2030**

**Annex I:
IATI Integrated Results and
Resources Framework 2026–2030**

Introduction

The Integrated Results and Resourcing Framework (IRRF) is a core accountability tool for IATI's Strategic Plan 2026–2030. It defines the results the initiative will work towards, sets out the resources needed, and establishes the principles for monitoring, evaluation, and learning. The IRRF provides a clear line of sight between IATI's vision and mission, the two outcomes to be achieved by 2030, the four Action areas, and the enabling functions required to deliver them.

The framework is both results-driven and resource-conscious. It ensures that ambitions are underpinned by sustainable financing, disciplined management, and diversified resource mobilisation. It also recognises that achieving transformational outcomes will require sharper prioritisation, more strategic engagement with members, and more effective use of limited resources.

Resourcing Context

The Strategic Plan comes at a time of both challenge and opportunity.

- **Funding pressures.** Development cooperation budgets have been under sustained pressure in recent years, with major cuts in some donor countries. Several IATI members have reduced their participation, and membership fees (unchanged since 2016) have eroded in real terms. The independent evaluation of the 2020–2025 Strategic Plan warned that without significant reforms, IATI could face financial insolvency.
- **Membership renewal.** Membership growth has slowed, and some constituencies remain underrepresented, especially development finance institutions, private foundations, South–South Cooperation actors, and partners in Latin America, South Asia, and Small Island Developing States.

- **Opportunities.** At the same time, the international community has renewed calls for transparency. The 2025 Sevilla Commitment on Financing for Development recognised IATI as a key enabler of accountability in international financial architecture. Climate agreements and the SDGs highlight the centrality of transparent tracking of resources. Donors, partner governments, and civil society are asking for reliable, comparable data to inform policy, respond to crises, and build public trust. This context creates significant opportunities for IATI to leverage its comparative advantages and attract investment.

The IRRF is designed to balance realism with ambition: consolidating what works, fixing persistent weaknesses, and positioning IATI as a trusted global public good for transparency and accountability.

Principles and Criteria Shaping the IRRF

The IRRF has been shaped by five interlinked criteria identified during consultations and through lessons from the Evaluation of the IATI Strategic Plan 2020–2025:

- 1. Responsiveness to the global landscape.** Indicators and targets capture IATI's contribution to pressing challenges (e.g. climate finance, humanitarian crises, South–South Cooperation) while remaining flexible to adapt to shocks and emerging needs.
- 2. Evolving IATI's model and mission.** The IRRF embeds reforms in governance, financing, and technical standards to ensure that IATI's institutional performance supports its strategic vision.
- 3. Meeting country and stakeholder needs.** Results and resources are geared towards enhancing national systems, civil society use, and cross-stakeholder accountability. Success

is measured by uptake and integration of IATI data into decision-making, not only by volumes of data published.

4. Leveraging comparative advantages.

IATI's neutrality, near real-time data, and multi-stakeholder character are unique assets. The IRRF uses these strengths to position IATI as a backbone for transparency in the international financial architecture.

5. Alignment with global agendas.

Results are mapped to SDG 16 on accountable institutions, the Financing for Development agenda, and commitments under the Pact for the Future and climate agreements.

These criteria are operationalised through core principles for results-based management and resourcing:

- SMART indicators with baselines and clear, time-bound targets.
- Prudent budget management and diversification of funding sources.
- Leveraging in-kind contributions and partnerships to stretch resources.
- Embedding monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) in all activities.
- A disciplined approach to risk management, ensuring adaptability.

Summary of 2020–2025 Financial Performance

Financial sustainability was a critical challenge during the 2020–2025 period.

- **Reserves depletion.** Nearly all of IATI's financial surplus was used to finance the transition to new hosting arrangements and governance reforms, costing over \$1 million.

- **Flat membership fees.** Fees remained at 2016 levels, effectively declining in value by one-third due to inflation. Fee collection was inconsistent, and some constituencies required waivers.

- **Narrow donor base.** Voluntary contributions declined, with limited diversification beyond core government donors.

- **Rising costs.** Internal reforms and institutional strengthening, together with the increase in global cost of living has led to higher costs.

As a result, the evaluation concluded that the 2020–2025 business model was unsustainable without urgent reforms.

2026–2030 Funding Outlook

The next five years will be decisive for IATI's financial future. Projections point to three imperatives:

- **Revised funding model.** Membership contributions must be adjusted and diversified. New models may include tiered contributions, premium services for paying members and partners, and pooled trust fund arrangements.

- **Broader donor base.** IATI must engage new contributors, including multilateral banks, climate funds, foundations, and private sector actors, who benefit from transparent data.

- **Long-term stability.** Multi-year commitments, possible endowment arrangements, and programmatic collaboration with Members are avenues to reduce reliance on annual cycles.

The IRRF is based on a conservative anticipation of moderate growth in overall resources through a re-balanced and diversified financial model. The Strategic Plan can be realised within conservative resource estimates, with scope to scale and strengthen IATI's work and deepen its impact where additional resources can be leveraged and mobilised.



The 2026–2030 Resource Plan

The Resource Plan is aligned within the Results Framework to form a fully Integrated Results and Resources Framework (IRRF). Its approach is to:

1. **Link resources directly to results.** Budgets will be aligned with Action Areas and outcome targets, ensuring that resources follow strategy.
2. **Diversify and leverage.** New funding streams, partnerships, and in-kind contributions will supplement core member contributions.
3. **Ensure value for money.** Cost-efficiency, shared services, and careful prioritisation will maximise the impact of every dollar spent.
4. **Enable long-term planning.** A stable financial base will allow IATI to invest in strategic initiatives—such as standard modernisation, AI-driven tools, and country data-use systems—without disruption.

Integrated Results and Resources Architecture 2026-2030

| Impact | Vision: Better Outcomes for People and Planet | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Outcomes | Outcome 1: Enhanced Data Use | | Outcome 2: More Accountable and Effective International Cooperation | |
| Est. Total: \$17,000,000 | | | | |
| Action Areas | Action Area A: Strengthening country data-use systems through IATI data | Action Area B: Enhancing IATI infrastructure to increase quality and usability of data | Action Area C: Championing transparency and accountability for development effectiveness | Action Area D: Promoting the use of IATI data to inform policy dialogues |
| IATI Core: | \$2,040,000 | \$5,100,000 | \$1,105,000 | \$1,020,000 |
| IATI Non-Core: | \$935,000 | \$935,000 | \$0 | \$765,000 |
| Total IATI Core: \$14,365,000 Total IATI Non-Core: \$2,635,000 | | | | |
| Organisational Effectiveness and Efficiency | Institutional Performance | | | |
| | Governance & Administration | Financial Sustainability | Operations Systems | Strategic & Institutional Direction |
| IATI Core: \$5,100,000 | | | | |

| Budget Line | Core 5-year | Non-Core 5-year | Total 5-year total |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Action Area A: Strengthening country data-use systems through IATI data | \$3,740,000 (22.0%) | \$935,000 (5.5%) | \$4,675,000 (27.5%) |
| Action Area B: Enhancing IATI Infrastructure to increase quality and usability of data | \$4,250,000 (25.0%) | \$935,000 (5.5%) | \$5,185,000 (30.5%) |
| Action Area C: Championing transparency and accountability for development effectiveness | \$1,105,000 (6.5%) | \$0 (0.0%) | \$1,105,000 (6.5%) |
| Action Area D: Promoting the use of IATI data to inform policy dialogues | \$1,020,000 (6.0%) | \$765,000 (4.5%) | \$1,785,000 (10.5%) |
| Institutional Performance: Core governance, administrative, financial, and operational systems | \$4,250,000 (25.0%) | \$0 (0.0%) | \$4,250,000 (25.0%) |
| Sub-Total | \$14,365,000 (84.5%) | \$2,635,000 (15.5%) | \$17,000,000 (100%) |
| UNDP GMS 8% | \$1,149,200 | \$210,800 | \$1,360,000 |
| Management fees – UNOPS 3.95%* | \$567,418 | \$104,083 | \$671,500 |
| GRAND TOTAL | \$16,081,618 | \$2,949,883 | \$19,031,500 |

Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning

The IRRF establishes a strengthened MEL approach. Progress will be tracked through measurable indicators in the Results Framework, with annual reporting to the Members' Assembly and Governing Board. Independent evaluations and data-use assessments will provide accountability, learning and feedback loops to drive adaptive management and continuous improvement, and inform data quality support and custodianship of the IATI Standard. The MEL system will also capture IATI's contribution to broader global outcomes, recognising that transparency has effects, as both a direct driver and secondary enabler of accountability and effectiveness.

Conclusion

The Integrated Results and Resourcing Framework is the bridge between ambition and delivery. It ensures that IATI's mission is translated into measurable outcomes, backed by sustainable resources, and delivered with institutional discipline. The framework reflects the lessons of the past five years and the demands of the future. With endorsement and commitment by the IATI membership, it will enable IATI to seize the opportunities of a fast-changing landscape and deliver on its promise: better data, better decisions, and more accountable cooperation by 2030.

Integrated Results and Resourcing Framework

| Outcome-Level Impact | Indicator |
|---|--|
| <p>Outcome Statement 1: Enhanced Data Use</p> <p><i>“Systematically enhanced data use by all stakeholders fosters transparency, accountability and effectiveness.”</i></p> | <p>Outcome Indicator 1.1</p> <p>Number of organisations or country systems demonstrating systematic IATI data use in national planning, budgeting, coordination, monitoring, or advocacy processes.</p> <p>Verification: Desk review of country reports IATI survey data, workshop feedback, institutional engagement logs, and case studies.</p> <p>Definition: Assesses the institutionalisation of IATI data use by a broad range of stakeholders – including partner country governments, development partners, multilateral agencies, and CSOs.</p> <p>Disaggregation: By organisation type, region, LDC/SIDS status (for governments). By data use type (e.g. Dashboard, AIMS/PFMS integration, citation in reports)</p> <p>Rating Scale: average attendance and engagement with materials.</p> <p>Target: ≥50% of board members attend and engage with documents at each meeting.</p> <p>Frequency: Annual</p> |
| | <p>Outcome Indicator 1.2</p> <p>Percentage of data users who perceive IATI data as trustworthy and actionable for decision-making, coordination, planning, or advocacy.</p> <p>Verification: Annual IATI Data User Survey</p> <p>Definition: This indicator measures user confidence in the quality, reliability, and practical utility of IATI data. It reflects whether users across stakeholder types believe IATI data contributes meaningfully to improving transparency, coordination, effectiveness, and accountability in development and humanitarian efforts.</p> <p>Disaggregation: By stakeholder type (e.g. partner country government, donor/provider, CSO, multilateral, private sector); By region</p> <p>Target: Achieve at least a 20% increase (from the baseline of the 2026 IATI Data User Survey) in users expressing high or very high levels of trust and perceived actionability of IATI data across each stakeholder group BY 2030.</p> <p>Frequency: Annual</p> |

| Outcome-Level Impact | Indicator |
|---|--|
| <p>Outcome Statement 2: More Accountable and Effective International Cooperation</p> <p><i>“An open, trusted, comprehensive, dynamic and usable evidence base informs more transparent, accountable and effective international cooperation.”</i></p> | <p>Outcome Indicator 2.1</p> |
| | <p>Percentage of official OECD-DAC Creditor Reporting System reporters and identified South-South Cooperation (SSC) providers that also publish data to IATI.</p> |
| | <p>Verification: Cross-reference of annual OECD-DAC Creditor Reporting System reporting list with IATI publishers registry; SSC publisher list drawn from: UNCTAD/TOSSD.</p> |
| | <p>Definition: This indicator measures IATI’s coverage and uptake among two major provider types:</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Traditional development cooperation providers reporting to the OECD DAC-CRS system |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – South-South Cooperation providers identified through recognised mechanisms (e.g. UNOSSC, UNCTAD, country lists) |
| | <p>It reflects the extent to which IATI is becoming a common standard for both traditional and non-traditional cooperation reporting.</p> |
| | <p>Target: At least 85% of DAC-CRS reporters also publish to IATI; and at least 50% of SSC providers identified through global/ regional mappings published to IATI by 2030</p> |
| | <p>Frequency: Annually</p> |
| | <p>Outcome Indicator 2.2</p> |
| <p>Number of countries and stakeholders demonstrating inclusive, multi-stakeholder partnerships to support the 2030 Agenda, as measured by SDG Indicator 17.16.1</p> | |
| <p>Verification: Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation</p> | |
| <p>(GPEDC) monitoring reports; including country-level and global assessments of SDG 17.16.1</p> | |
| <p>Definition: This indicator draws directly from SDG 17.16.1, which tracks the extent to which provider and recipient countries are implementing effective, inclusive partnerships for sustainable development. It uses the Global Partnership Monitoring Exercise as its main data source; IATI will not independently measure this outcome, but rather adopt and report on what is published through the GPEDC monitoring cycles, highlighting its own contribution or relevance where cited.</p> | |
| <p>Target: Track SDG 17.16.1 results across all GPEDC participating countries; Highlight cases where IATI data or support is cited as a contributor to inclusive partnerships or mutual accountability.</p> | |
| <p>Frequency: Annual</p> | |

| Result | Indicator |
|--|--|
| Action Area A: Strengthening country data-use systems through IATI data | |
| A.1 Country System Integration and Support Country systems for planning, budgeting, and monitoring increasingly integrate IATI data through Secretariat-supported engagements and adaptable technical solutions. | A.1.1 – Secretariat-Supported Integration of IATI data on public finance management systems. |
| | Indicator: Number of countries receiving Secretariat-supported technical assistance to explore implementing the integration of IATI data into national digital planning, budgeting, or monitoring systems. |
| | Verification: Secretariat engagement logs (missions, virtual support, TORs); Government confirmations (letters, MoUs, workshop participation) |
| | Definition: "Engagement" refers to structured, demand-driven support provided by the IATI Secretariat, including but not limited to: data mapping exercises; piloting integration scripts or templates; technical scoping missions; and collaboration with national coordinators, IT units, or digital transformation focal points to strengthen data use in public management systems. |
| | Rating Scale: Count of unique countries engaged per year |
| | Target: ≥ 5 countries supported by 2026 (with priority given to countries categorised among the top 25 Least Developed Countries (LDCs) most in need, based on development effectiveness and transparency gaps. |
| | Frequency: Annually |
| | A.1.2 – Country-Level Integration of IATI Data |
| | Indicator: Number of countries with IATI data embedded in national systems through manual, semi-automated, or automated integration pathways. |
| | Verification: Confirmation via Annual Data Use Survey/interviews on frequency and method of integrations. |
| Definition: Assesses the establishment and maintenance of country-led IATI data integration – whether fully integrated or partially manual – in national planning, budgeting, monitoring, or AIMS platforms. | |
| Disaggregation (optional): Conceptual (scoping); In development; Operational | |
| Rating scale: 0 = No integration process initiated 1 = Manual import or ad hoc data pulls 2 = Recurring manual use 3 = Semi-automated process 4 = Fully automated pipeline | |
| Target: ≥ 6 countries using IATI data for national systems at stage 2 or higher by 2026 ≥ 3 Least Developed Countries (LDCs) included among those at level 2 or above | |
| Frequency: Annually | |

| Result | Indicator |
|--|---|
| <p>A.2 Strengthened Human Capacities & Data Use Feedback</p> <p>National and local actors — including government institutions and civil society organisations — have the skills, tools, and opportunities to access, analyse, and apply IATI data in decision-making, supported by feedback mechanisms that link data use to data quality improvements.</p> | <p>A.2.1 – Stakeholder Capacity Building & Engagement</p> |
| | <p>Indicator: Number of organisations receiving direct support on IATI data access, analysis, and use.</p> |
| | <p>Verification: Secretariat training logs and participant records; Follow-up engagement tracking (if repeat engagement occurs).</p> |
| | <p>Definition: Captures structured capacity support such as trainings, workshops, one-on-one technical assistance, or mentorship — at national or subnational level — aimed at strengthening the ability to use IATI data in planning, coordination, monitoring, or reporting. Includes institutions participating in both in-person and virtual modalities.</p> |
| | <p>Disaggregation: By organisation type (donor, partner country government, CSO etc.)</p> |
| | <p>Rating scale: Simple count of unique institutions supported per year (disaggregated by institution type and country, if feasible)</p> |
| | <p>Target: 5% annual increase based on 2025 baseline</p> |
| | <p>Frequency: Annually</p> |
| | <p>A.2.2 – Capacity Outcomes & Feedback Utilisation</p> |
| | <p>Indicator: Percentage of supported institutions reporting improved capacity to use IATI data and/or having their feedback contribute to data quality or tool improvements.</p> |
| <p>Verification: Post-training follow-up surveys; Secretariat feedback loops (surveys, helpdesk logs, user–publisher dialogues); Documented cases of improvements made (e.g., publisher updates, Dashboard/tool changes)</p> | |
| <p>Definition: Tracks the effectiveness of capacity-strengthening support and the degree to which institutions report tangible improvements in their ability to access, analyse, and use IATI data. Also captures whether structured user feedback (via surveys, helpdesk, or dialogues) results in actionable improvements by publishers or the Secretariat.</p> | |
| <p>Rating scale: 0 = No follow-up or response recorded 1 = Reported capacity improvement or feedback submitted 2 = Feedback contributed to a documented improvement</p> | |
| <p>Target: ≥ 60% of supported institutions reporting capacity improvement ≥ 10 documented feedback-informed changes by 2026</p> | |
| <p>Frequency: Annually</p> | |

| Result | Indicator |
|--|--|
| <p>A.3 Country Policy Influence and Knowledge Exchange</p> <p>IATI contributes to enabling environments for data use by actively engaging in global and country-level policy platforms and facilitating structured knowledge exchange among stakeholders. Secretariat-led initiatives help embed IATI into development cooperation dialogues, strengthen political buy-in, and promote peer learning.</p> | <p>A.3.1 – Policy Dialogue and Advocacy</p> |
| | <p>Indicator: Number of global, regional, or country-level policy dialogues where IATI data, tools, or practices are presented, promoted, or applied through Secretariat-led engagement.</p> |
| | <p>Verification: Secretariat participation logs; Policy Dialogue reports; Meeting agendas citing IATI.</p> |
| | <p>Definition: Captures instances where the IATI Secretariat actively positions IATI in policy-relevant spaces to influence decision-making, strengthen enabling environments, or align with related frameworks (e.g., GPEDC, FfD, INFF, SDG financing platforms, national cooperation strategies).</p> |
| | <p>Rating scale: Count of distinct dialogue engagements per year</p> |
| | <p>Target: ≥ 3 policy dialogue engagements by 2026</p> |
| | <p>Frequency: Annually</p> |
| | <p>A.3.2 – Secretariat-Facilitated Peer Learning</p> |
| | <p>Indicator: Number of structured peer learning initiatives or knowledge products facilitated by the IATI Secretariat to promote country-level data use.</p> |
| | <p>Verification: Secretariat event and working group reports; Published knowledge products and case studies.</p> |
| <p>Definition: Measures Secretariat-led efforts to promote peer exchange and transfer of good practices through convenings (e.g., regional workshops, working groups) or documentation (e.g., case studies, guidance notes), particularly focused on applying IATI data in national development and aid management contexts.</p> | |
| <p>Target: ≥ 2 structured learning initiatives or case examples by 2026</p> | |
| <p>Frequency: Annually</p> | |

| Result | Indicator |
|--|--|
| Action Area B: | |
| Enhancing IATI Infrastructure to increase quality and usability of data | |
| B.1 Standard Custodianship The IATI Standard is maintained through transparent, participatory governance and remains responsive, interoperable, and fit for purpose. | B.1.1 – Standard Proposals Reviewed and Acted Upon in Accordance with Revision Control Procedures |
| | Indicator: Number of proposals to revise the IATI Standard reviewed and acted upon through revision control procedures (e.g. through consultation with the IATI Standard Oversight Committee (SOC), and documented publication in the IATI Gazette. |
| | Verification: Standard Oversight Committee meeting minutes, Secretariat records, IATI Gazette publications. |
| | Definition: Includes any proposals submitted via official channels and considered through the governance process (e.g., schema changes, codelist updates, vocabulary additions) |
| | Disaggregation: By proposal type / impact level (e.g. technical/minor; policy/major) |
| | Rating scale: 0 = No proposals; 1 = Proposals submitted; 2 = Under review by SOC; 3 = Approved and published in the Gazette; 4 = Implemented in a Standard version update |
| | Frequency: Every two years |
| B.2 Publishing Tools and Integrations IATI publishing systems are streamlined, user-friendly, and interoperable, with modular extensions that enable publishers to meet multiple reporting requirements. | B.2.1 – Publisher Satisfaction and Perceived Efficiency |
| | Indicator: Percentage of publishers reporting satisfaction with IATI publishing tools and services, including perceived usability, efficiency, reduced duplication of effort, and the value of available system integrations. |
| | Verification: Annual IATI publisher survey / Rolling user feedback / banner survey |
| | Disaggregation: By publishing organisation type (provider, INGO, national NGO, etc.) |
| | Rating scale: 1 = Dissatisfied; 2 = Somewhat Dissatisfied; 3 = Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied; 4 = Somewhat Satisfied; 5 = Satisfied. |
| | Target: ≥ 70% satisfaction by 2027 |
| | Frequency: Annually |

| Result | Indicator |
|--|--|
| <p>B.3 Global data use tools</p> <p>User-friendly, policy-facing digital tools and dashboards make IATI data accessible for diverse stakeholders.</p> | <p>B.3.1 – Satisfaction and Perceived Usefulness of IATI Data Use Tools</p> |
| | <p>Indicator: Percentage of users reporting satisfaction and perceived usefulness of IATI’s official data tools (e.g., Datastore Search / API, d-Portal, Country Development Finance Data (CDFD), IATI Tables, etc.) in terms of usability, efficiency, and support for policy or coordination needs.</p> |
| | <p>Verification: Annual IATI Data User Survey / In-tool feedback</p> |
| | <p>Disaggregation: By tool/platform; By organisation type (partner country government, donor, CSO, etc.)</p> |
| | <p>Rating scale: 1 = Dissatisfied; 2 = Somewhat Dissatisfied; 3 = Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied; 4 = Somewhat Satisfied; 5 = Satisfied.</p> |
| | <p>Target: ≥75% satisfied or very satisfied by 2027</p> |
| <p>Frequency: Annually</p> | <p>B.3.2 – Usage and Uptake of IATI Data Tools</p> |
| | <p>Indicator: Annual number of active users and documented use cases of IATI’s global data tools, demonstrating both platform reach and downstream relevance.</p> |
| | <p>Verification: A.) Quantitative Usage Metrics: Web analytics (e.g. plausible) and API usage logs; B.) Qualitative Use Cases/Uptake: IATI Secretariat monitoring and synthesis of case studies, citations, and user stories</p> |
| | <p>Disaggregation: By tool/platform</p> |
| | <p>Target: 15% year-on-year growth in usage across core platforms 5–10 new documented use cases per year</p> |
| | <p>Frequency: Usage (Quarterly tracking) / Use cases: (Annual compilation)</p> |

| Result | Indicator |
|---|---|
| <p>B.4 Unified Digital Platform and User-Centered Design</p> <p>A cohesive infrastructure supports scalable digital services, improved documentation, and seamless multilingual support across IATI’s tools.</p> | <p>B.4.1 – Implementation of Unified Technical Architecture</p> |
| | <p>Indicator: Number of infrastructure upgrades and tool integrations implemented under a unified backend and frontend architecture — including consolidation of services.</p> |
| | <p>Verification: Implementation logs (e.g. GitHub commits); Software Architecture Decision Records + Diagrams / Release notes for major tool updates; Public Documentation</p> |
| | <p>Rating scale: 0 = No progress; 1 = Architecture scoped and partially implemented; 2 = Design System + backend integration in 2–3 tools; 3 = Design System + SSO + unified backend across 5+ tools; 4 = Full implementation across tools and services</p> |
| <p>Target: ≥ 3 major tools integrated, upgraded under unified architecture annually</p> | |
| <p>Frequency: Annually</p> | |
| <p>B.4.2 – Enhanced IATI Support Efficiency and Improved User Autonomy</p> | |
| <p>Indicator: Change in volume, complexity, and resolution method of support requests received via the IATI Support Desk, demonstrating reduced friction due to simplified registration, consistent User Interface, and enhanced documentation.</p> | |
| <p>Verification: Zendesk analytics and ticket categorisation / Resolution methods (manual vs. documentation link vs. self-resolved – (a.i./agent?)) / Analytics on Help Docs access and usage / Satisfaction surveys linked to support interactions.</p> | |
| <p>Disaggregation: By support desk tag (registration, publishing, data use, validation, API, etc.) / By org type (INGO, small publisher, bilateral donor, etc.)</p> | |
| <p>Rating Scale: 0 = No reduction in support burden. Repetitive support requests remain high; no evidence of improved documentation or self-service use. 1 = Minimal reduction (<10%) in repetitive support queries. Early-stage improvements to documentation or user guides underway. 2 = Moderate reduction (10–20%) in support volume. Some common queries now addressed via documentation or self-service features. 3 = Significant reduction (20–40%). Most common queries are redirected to improved documentation, FAQs, or tooltips (a.i. agent?). 4 = High-level efficiency: >40% reduction in repetitive tickets. Majority of users resolve issues via self-service. Multilingual, integrated documentation widely used.</p> | |
| <p>Target: ≥ 20% reduction in repetitive support tickets (baseline: 2024–2025 Zendesk analysis); ≥70% of common queries resolved via documentation or self-service by 2026</p> | |
| <p>Frequency: Quarterly</p> | |

| Result | Indicator |
|---|---|
| <p>B.5 Strengthening Data Quality Through Targeted Engagement and Diagnostic Tools</p> <p>IATI strengthens data quality and usability through a dual approach: proactive engagement with high-volume publishers and the continuous refinement of diagnostic tools. By focusing on tailored outreach and strategic improvements to the IATI Dashboard, the initiative enables stakeholders to assess, improve, and apply IATI data more effectively—reframing data quality as a shared responsibility anchored in usability, trust, and real-time feedback.</p> | <p>B.5.1 – Targeted Engagement with Top 20% of IATI Publishers (by Volume of data)</p> |
| | <p>Indicator: Number of the top 20% of IATI publishers by volume of published data that receive Secretariat engagement on data quality through activities such as State of the Data reviews, one-to-one outreach, tailored guidance, or training workshops.</p> |
| | <p>Verification: Secretariat engagement logs including calls, emails, event attendance</p> |
| | <p>Rating scale: Count of unique organisations engaged per year</p> |
| | <p>Target: Engage at least 80% of the top 20% of IATI publishers (by volume of published data) in targeted data quality outreach annually.</p> |
| | <p>Frequency: Quarterly</p> |
| | <p>B.5.2 – % of top 20 IATI publishers by spend volume that demonstrate improvements in key data quality metrics (timeliness, comprehensiveness, forward-looking).</p> |
| | <p>Indicator: Deployment and use of enhanced dashboard functionality that enables both publishers and data users to assess improvements in IATI data quality over time, including publication frequency (timeliness), completeness of critical fields, and differentiated diagnostics aligned with specific use cases.</p> |
| | <p>Verification: IATI Dashboard publishing statistics and publisher-level diagnostic reports.</p> |
| | <p>Definition: Tracks top IATI publishers (by total annual disbursements) showing improved or sustained performance in data quality.</p> |
| <p>Disaggregation: Metric parameter, publisher category, spend category</p> | |
| <p>Rating Scale: 0 = No Dashboard changes implemented 1 = Consultation and scoping complete; minimal updates live 2 = New metrics and filters for 2+ user types; limited diagnostics piloted 3 = Full rollout of redesigned dashboard with user-type filtering and live diagnostics 4 = AI-assisted feedback, integrated help docs, and continuous updates based on State of the Data cycles</p> | |
| <p>Target: ≥ 75% of top publishers show year-on-year improvement or maintain highest tier scores by 2028.</p> | |

| Result | Indicator |
|---|--|
| Action Area C: Championing transparency and accountability for development effectiveness | |
| C.1 Strengthening Strategic Partnerships and Advocacy IATI strategically promotes the value of transparency by deepening partnerships, engaging in policy forums and platforms and influencing agendas, and promoting investment in transparency and public data infrastructure. These efforts help embed transparency and IATI in the development effectiveness discourse, positioning IATI as a global digital public good. | C.1.1 – Strategic Advocacy Engagements |
| | Indicator: Number of national, global or regional advocacy and policy platforms where IATI transparency tools, data, or methodologies are promoted or applied. |
| | Verification: Secretariat participation logs; Speaking engagements; References in communiqués, reports, or policy outcomes |
| | Definition: Captures IATI Secretariat-led participation in international, regional or national platforms, events, and dialogues where transparency is positioned as a core driver of development effectiveness. Includes engagements with GPEDC, UN Finance for Development Follow-up forums, and thematic initiatives (e.g. Global Alliance for Food Security), etc. |
| | Rating Scale: Count of strategic engagement instances per year |
| | Target: ≥ 4 engagements annually |
| | Frequency: Quarterly |
| | C.1.2 – Strategic Partnership Development |
| | Indicator: Number of new or deepened IATI partnerships with organisations advancing transparency, open data, and accountability agendas. |
| | Verification: Partnership agreements, MOUs, joint project documents, co-organised events |
| Definition: Measures the expansion and consolidation of partnerships with actors including traditional donors, civil society networks, philanthropic initiatives, private sector platforms, or statistical communities committed to transparency and open governance. | |
| Disaggregation (optional): Conceptual (scoping); In development; Operational | |
| Rating scale: Count of strategic partnerships per year | |
| Target: ≥ 2 new or deepened partnerships annually | |
| Frequency: Annually | |

| Result | Indicator |
|---|--|
| <p>C.2 Expanding and Diversifying IATI Membership and Community</p> <p>IATI will grow and diversify its membership base, engage broader constituencies, and strengthen inclusive community participation through targeted outreach, communications, and recognition of member efforts.</p> | <p>C.2.1 – Membership Growth and Diversification</p> |
| | <p>Indicator: Net growth of IATI members joining per year, including disaggregation by stakeholder type and region.</p> |
| | <p>Verification: Membership registry; onboarding documentation</p> |
| | <p>Definition: Tracks growth in formal IATI membership, with an emphasis on including underrepresented regions, LDCs, local actors, and new constituencies (e.g. philanthropy, private sector, parliamentarians).</p> |
| | <p>Disaggregation: By organisation type (donor, partner country government, CSO etc.) and region.</p> |
| | <p>Rating scale: Simple count of unique institutions supported per year (disaggregated by institution type and country, if feasible).</p> |
| | <p>Target: 2 new members annually</p> |
| | <p>Frequency: Annually</p> |
| | <p>C.2.2 – Community Engagement and Recognition</p> |
| | <p>Indicator: Number of Secretariat-led activities recognising, engaging, or convening IATI community members to celebrate transparency efforts and promote peer collaboration.</p> |
| <p>Verification: Community Event records; post-event surveys</p> | |
| <p>Definition: Tracks Secretariat-led efforts to engage and recognise the IATI community, including convening members through events and fostering collaboration across constituencies.</p> | |
| <p>Rating scale: Count of community events held annually</p> | |
| <p>Target: ≥ 2 community events annually</p> | |
| <p>Frequency: Annually</p> | |

| Result | Indicator |
|---|--|
| Action Area D: Promoting the use of IATI data to inform policy dialogues | |
| D.1 – National Accountability and Research Partnerships IATI Secretariat facilitates and supports structured policy dialogues, national-level consultations, and collaborative research that promote the strategic use of IATI data in development cooperation discussions, planning processes, and sector reviews. | D.1.1 – National Dialogues on Development Cooperation & Humanitarian Action Using IATI Data |
| | Indicator: Number of structured national or subnational policy dialogues, consultations, or sector reviews supported by the Secretariat where IATI data was used or showcased. |
| | Verification: Event documentation (agendas, presentations, participant lists); Secretariat reports. |
| | Definition: Includes structured, formal processes (e.g., country-level forums, action dialogues, sector coordination meetings) where IATI data informed decision-making, alignment, or discussion on aid effectiveness. |
| | Rating Scale: Count of unique national or subnational dialogue events |
| | Target: ≥ 2 Annually |
| | Frequency: Annually |
| | D.1.2 – Collaborative Research and Academia Partnerships |
| | Indicator: Number of joint research initiatives or academic partnerships that utilise IATI data, supported or facilitated by the Secretariat. |
| | Verification: Research output (papers, reports, blogs); Project logs |
| Definition: Tracks initiatives with universities, think tanks, or research consortiums using IATI data in policy-relevant analysis, particularly where the Secretariat played a convening, technical advisory, or funding role. | |
| Disaggregation (optional): Conceptual (scoping); In development; Operational | |
| Rating scale: Count of research partnerships or outputs | |
| Target: ≥ 1 research partnerships annually. | |
| Frequency: Annually | |

| Result | Indicator |
|--|---|
| <p>D.2 – Global Visibility and Policy Influence</p> <p>IATI actively engages in global forums to promote transparency, data-driven dialogue, and uptake of IATI in broader policy initiatives and frameworks.</p> | <p>D.2.1 – IATI Contributions to Global Policy Processes</p> <p>Indicator: Number of global policy processes or international events where IATI data, methodologies, or Secretariat contributions informed strategic discussions.</p> <p>Verification: Event records & participation; Published submissions or presentations.</p> <p>Definition: Captures Secretariat participation or formal submissions in global platforms (e.g., Financing for Development Follow-up forum, UN HLPF, UN Secretary-General reporting, GPEDC, COPs, UNCTs, DCF), and instances where IATI is referenced or integrated into official outputs.</p> <p>Rating scale: Count of distinct global processes engaged annually</p> <p>Target: ≥ 2 high-level policy engagements per year</p> <p>Frequency: Annually</p> |
| | <p>D.2.2 – Secretariat-Curated Evidence for Global Audiences</p> <p>Indicator: Number of curated data insights, contributions, or briefing materials produced by the Secretariat for global policy audiences.</p> <p>Verification: Published briefs, infographics, dashboards, or internal submissions; Citations in global reports.</p> <p>Definition: Includes issue briefs, talking points, visualisations, or other synthesised outputs derived from IATI data and tailored to specific high-level events, dialogues, or partner requests.</p> <p>Rating scale: Count of insight products or contributions per year</p> <p>Target: ≥ 1 curated evidence products annually.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually</p> |

| Result | Indicator |
|--|---|
| <p>D.3 – Insight Generation and Knowledge Products</p> <p>IATI generates and promotes practical, user-centered knowledge products to demonstrate data value, foster adoption, and support learning across stakeholder groups.</p> | <p>D.3.1 – Thematic and Country-Focused Insight Products</p> |
| | <p>Indicator: Number of thematic or country-level insight products developed in partnership with stakeholders that demonstrate the use of IATI data.</p> |
| | <p>Verification: Published knowledge products (e.g. case studies, policy briefs, regional analysis); IATI website or partner platforms.</p> |
| | <p>Definition: Includes insight papers, narratives, or use cases highlighting how IATI data is applied in practice, targeting specific stakeholder interests (e.g., SSC, climate finance, localisation, gender, etc.).</p> |
| | <p>Rating scale: Count of published products</p> |
| | <p>Target: ≥ 1 publications Annually.</p> |
| | <p>Frequency: Annually</p> |
| | <p>D.3.2 – Structured Dialogue Platforms and Convenings</p> |
| | <p>Indicator: Number of thematic or regional convenings organised or co-hosted by the Secretariat to promote cross-country or cross-sectoral data use learning.</p> |
| | <p>Verification: Event reports, participant lists, agendas.</p> |
| <p>Definition: Includes workshops, webinars, or policy roundtables convened by IATI or in partnership with others, with the explicit aim of discussing data use and insight generation across countries or sectors.</p> | |
| <p>Rating scale: Count of convenings per year.</p> | |
| <p>Target: ≥ 1 annually.</p> | |
| <p>Frequency: Annual</p> | |

| Result | Indicator |
|---|--|
| Institutional Performance: Core governance, administrative, financial, and operational systems are in place that enable the IATI Secretariat to effectively deliver on its action areas and sustain the functionality, legitimacy, and responsiveness of the initiative. | |
| 1. Governance & Administration Effective governance mechanisms and administrative functions uphold transparency, inclusive participation, and institutional compliance. | 1.1 – Board Governance and Accountability |
| | Indicator: Percentage of Governing Board members who attend each quarterly meeting and engage with agenda documents (e.g. confirmation of review, submission of comments, or participation in decision-making). |
| | Verification: Board meeting attendance logs; voting records; document access logs |
| | Rating Scale: 0 = <= 50% average attendance and engagement with materials |
| | Target: 100% of board members attend and engage with documents at each meeting |
| | Frequency: Quarterly |
| | 1.2 – Coordination of IATI Members' Assembly |
| | Indicator: Timely organisation and execution of the IATI Members' Assembly with appropriate documentation and member participation. |
| | Verification: Meeting reports; participant list; session agendas; satisfaction survey |
| | Disaggregation: By constituency category |
| | Target: Annual Members' Assembly convened with >75% member participation |
| | Frequency: Annual |
| 1.3 – Number of Facilitated Working Groups | |
| Indicator: Number of active IATI Working Groups supported by the Board and the Secretariat. | |
| Verification: Group constituents roster; meeting notes; TORs; deliverables produced | |
| Definition: This indicator tracks the number of active thematic or technical Working Groups convened and facilitated by the IATI Secretariat and/or Board, with clearly defined objectives, participation rosters, terms of reference (TORs), and regular activities. These Working Groups serve as structured mechanisms for inclusive stakeholder engagement, policy development, and technical refinement across priority areas of IATI's work. A group is considered "active" if it has met at least once within the reporting year and has ongoing work aligned with a Secretariat or Board-approved mandate. | |
| Target: Secretariat activation and facilitation of working groups as requested. | |
| Frequency: Annual | |

| Result | Indicator |
|--------|---|
| | 1.4 – Membership and Agreement Management |
| | Indicator: Percentage of membership and voluntary contribution agreements, as well as waiver requests, adequately managed. |
| | Verification: Agreements and amendments signed by members, waiver requests processed by the Governing Board, information published in the IATI Financial Monitoring Dashboard. |
| | Definition: Measures the management of membership and contribution agreements, including negotiation of clauses with members/potential members, amendments related to dates and/or contribution amounts, and the systematic monitoring of agreement implementation to ensure compliance and alignment with IATI policies; measures the management of contribution waiver requests. |
| | Disaggregation: By organisation/constituency type-category; region |
| | Rating scale: Percentage of agreements and waivers duly managed (agreements signed by UNOPS, amendments processed, implementation monitored within required timelines and waivers followed up on) and reflected in the IATI Financial Monitoring Dashboard. |
| | Target: 100% |
| | Frequency: Annually |
| | 1.5 – Legal Advice |
| | Indicator: Percentage of requests for legal advice responded to within agreed timelines. |
| | Verification: Records of legal guidance provided, including review and clearance of membership and contribution agreements, governance documents, Board decisions, and documentation of due diligence and engagement acceptance processes for new contributors. |
| | Definition: Measures UNOPS’s provision of legal support and advisory services to ensure that membership and contribution agreements, governance documents, and Board decisions comply with policies and align with IATI’s SOPs, including management of due diligence and engagement acceptance processes for new contributors. |
| | Rating scale: Percentage of legal requests and processes duly managed (advice provided, agreements and documents reviewed, due diligence conducted) within agreed timelines. |
| | Target: 100% |
| | Frequency: As required. |

| Result | Indicator |
|--|---|
| <p>2 – Financial Sustainability</p> <p>Robust financial management systems ensure timely reporting, member confidence, and full audit compliance.</p> | <p>2.1 Management of Cash Flow</p> |
| | <p>Indicator: Percentage of months in which sufficient cash is available to cover at least three months of projected expenditures.</p> |
| | <p>Verification: UNDP/UNOPS financial records, updated IATI Financial Monitoring Dashboard.</p> |
| | <p>Definition: Measures the effective management of cash inflows and outflows to maintain liquidity and ensure that contributions and expenditures are aligned with IATI’s financial requirements. Includes monitoring of actual cash balances, preparation of forecasts, and proactive measures to address potential shortfalls.</p> |
| | <p>Rating scale: Percentage of months in which cash balances meet the three-month coverage threshold; Percentage of audits duly completed and submitted on time.</p> |
| | <p>Target: 100%</p> |
| <p>Frequency: Monthly.</p> | |
| | <p>2.2 Financial Reporting and Projections</p> |
| | <p>Indicator: Percentage and timeliness of required financial reports and statements submitted.</p> |
| | <p>Verification: Annual financial report, quarterly financial reports, IATI Financial Monitoring Dashboard, and ad-hoc analyses; audit reports, related documentation, and records of follow-up actions.</p> |
| | <p>Definition: Measures the management and consolidation of financial data to ensure the preparation and timely submission of quarterly and annual financial reports, the regular updating of the IATI Financial Monitoring Dashboard, and the delivery of ad-hoc analyses in response to requests from the Secretariat, Governing Board, and IATI members; measures the management of audits related to voluntary contributions, internal UNOPS processes, or audits agreed within the Secretariat.</p> |
| | <p>Rating scale: Percentage of reports and statements duly produced and submitted on time; percentage of required audits completed and submitted on time.</p> |
| | <p>Target: 100%</p> |
| <p>Frequency: Regularly (quarterly/annually) for scheduled reports and as required for ad-hoc requests; as required for audits.</p> | |

| Result | Indicator |
|---|--|
| 3 – Operational Systems Operational systems and logistical planning ensure Secretariat effectiveness and timely delivery of workplan activities. | 3.1 – Procurement and Logistics |
| | Indicator: Percentage and timeliness of required procurement actions executed. |
| | Verification: Procurement records, purchase orders, email exchanges between UNDP and UNOPS. |
| | Definition: Measures the procurement of translation and interpretation services for events, as requested by UNDP, ensuring actions are executed in line with UNOPS procurement policies and within agreed timelines. |
| | Rating scale: Percentage of procurement actions completed in compliance with policy and within agreed timelines. |
| | Target: 100% |
| 4 – Strategic and Institutional Direction IATI develops and maintains core implementation strategies based on evaluation recommendations, to guide institutional direction, technology architecture, and engagement pathways. | 4.1 – Implementation Strategy Development (Phased) |
| | Indicator: Development of institutional strategies based on evaluation recommendations to ensure IATI remains fit for purpose. |
| | Verification: Scoping documents; Annual Reporting, Work Planning, Strategic Plan Mid-Term Review, Strategies developed and implemented (e.g. Partnership & Engagement Strategy; Technology Strategy; Organisation Change Strategy) |
| | Definition: Tracks whether IATI develops and operationalises core institutional strategies that guide governance, engagement, and technical architecture. This ensures recommendations from evaluations and reviews are systematically translated into actionable strategies with clear milestones. |
| | Rating scale: 0 = No strategies scoped. 1 = Strategies scoped, not yet drafted. 2 = Draft strategies under consultation. 3 = Strategies approved and published. 4 = Strategies under implementation and monitored. |
| | Target: At least 3 institutional strategies (covering engagement, technology, and organisational change) developed, approved, and under implementation by 2028. |
| | Frequency: Annual |



iati  International
Aid Transparency
Initiative

iatistandard.org