Background

In September 2013 the current consortium hosts of IATI led by UNDP and joined by UNOPS, a UK-based NGO Development Initiatives, and the governments of Ghana and Sweden assumed the Secretariat functions previously led by the UK’s Department for International Development (DFID). This multi-stakeholder consortium was selected by the Steering Committee in March 2013 based on the recommendation of a sub-committee of IATI members following a thorough competitive process, in which the multi-stakeholder composition of the consortium was seen to bring significant value. The term of the current hosts was set at three years with the possibility of renewal at that point. The consortium assumed its functions in September 2013 and the three year period therefore comes to an end in August 2016.

Evaluation recommendation on hosting

The independent evaluation of IATI undertaken in 2015 concluded that IATI and its Secretariat should have a single institutional home, adding that respondents perceive the current arrangement as ‘complex’ and ‘transitional’, with the multi-stakeholder nature of the arrangement seen as both a strength and a weakness. While the evaluation found general agreement among members that IATI needs an institutional home, there is as yet no consensus as to where that home should be, nor the timeframe in which such arrangement should be established.

The Members Advisory Group has therefore examined options in relation to hosting and has concluded that requirements for longer term hosting of IATI will become clear only once vision, strategic direction of IATI are agreed.

Current consortium

MAG members acknowledge the valuable contributions in kind that have been made and continue to be made by all five consortium member organisations. In considering the existing arrangements, the MAG has seen that the consortium’s goal has always been to be more than the sum of its constituent parts: it aims to ensure that all of IATI’s stakeholders - bilateral and multilateral donors, partner countries and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) are equal partners in the future management of the initiative and leverage their own contribution to implement a shared vision for IATI. Each member of the consortium brings a unique set of strengths evident through their own adherence to IATI standards and broader efforts to improve them. These complementary efforts reinforce the consortium members’ commitment to promote openness and contribute to better aid and development. The diversity of the
consortium members and the different skillsets they bring fully cover all the aspects necessary to further advance IATI implementation (data quality and completeness, use of IATI data, new signatories, engaging partner countries, etc).

MAG Proposal
The MAG wishes to propose a continuation of the current hosting arrangements during the forthcoming period of significant governance restructuring. The proposed extension is for a further maximum period of two years up to August 2018, to allow sufficient time to transition to permanent arrangements. The MAG further recommends that during this period the governing body examines the future needs for hosting of IATI in light of the new vision and governance set-up, and proposes a process for the establishment of hosting arrangements that meet those needs.

As part of its deliberation the governing body is invited to recommend a process that keeps operational disruption to a minimum in transitioning to permanent arrangements. An analysis of the current hosting situation should be undertaken in the context of any new vision, strategy and governance arrangements in order to establish the outlines of a new arrangement and the type of selection process to be applied. Within this analysis consideration should be given to whether the strategic priorities of IATI would be best served by a single hosting institution or a consortium or other type of partnership arrangement.

The MAG proposes that the current consortium of UNDP, UNOPS, Development Initiatives and the Governments of Ghana and Sweden be asked to continue their service for a further period of up to a maximum of two years. During this extension period the governing body is expected to recommend and implement a process for permanent hosting arrangements. Do members agree with this approach?