

<b>Name of paper</b>	Improvements to Publishing Statistics Methodologies
<b>Theme (e.g. Rules &amp; Guidelines; Improvements etc)</b>	Improvements
<b>Lead author</b>	Wendy Rogers
<b>Links to other relevant information (Discuss forum; Website etc)</b>	Discuss: <a href="http://discuss.iatistandard.org/t/tech-paper-improvements-to-publishing-statistics-methodologies/545">http://discuss.iatistandard.org/t/tech-paper-improvements-to-publishing-statistics-methodologies/545</a>

## Introduction

**Publishing Statistics** are re-calculated each day to assess the quality of data being published. The methodologies employed still require some fine-tuning to ensure that the statistics produced are both fair and accurate for all publishers. The areas where improvements or new methodologies are required are in the assessment of the following:

### Existing Methodologies

- Coverage
- Forward Looking
- Treating hierarchy as single project for transactions

### New Methodologies

- IATI Standard Compliance
- Version
- Humanitarian

## Coverage

### Outline of problem(s) / issue(s)

[Coverage](#) assesses what proportion of an organisation's total operational output is published through IATI. The [current methodology](#) involves the manual collection of reference spend data by the Technical Team. This is extremely time consuming and unsustainable as a manual process.

## **Proposed solutions**

In the long term, the solution is for publishers to [self-report through the Organisation standard](#).

However, an interim measure is also required as self-reporting will take time to establish not least because publishers will need to be publishing at the version in which any new elements are introduced. Therefore it is proposed that publishers should submit the figures required for calculating coverage via an online form so that they can be used for the reporting of the [dashboard coverage](#) statistics.

As publishers move over time to report coverage figures via the organisational standard the information will be automatically pulled from the published organisation files into the same backend storage facility for use by the IATI dashboard and publishers will no longer need to submit their figures via the online form.

## **Consultation questions**

- Are there alternative interim solutions that should be considered?
- Given the reliance of providing the required figures via the organisation file in the future. Should the organisation file become a mandatory publishing requirement and the contents assessed for the publishing statistics?

## **Forward Looking**

### **Outline of problem(s) / issue(s)**

Not all activities can be expected to have forward-looking budgets. The methodology for deciding which activities are exempt from assessment needs refinement. These include fast-onset humanitarian emergencies and commercially sensitive contracts.

### **Proposed solutions**

The proposed solution is to add a new integer attribute of `@budget-exempt` to the `<iati-activity>` element to enable a publisher to indicate the reason as to why no `<budget>` element can be provided for the specific activity. Indicator values will initially include:

1. Legal restrictions
2. Rapid onset emergency

A new 'Budget Exempt' codelist will need to be created to hold the above values

Publishing statistics will therefore be amended to exclude any activity with `@budget-exempt` set with a value  $> 0$  from the calculations made for forward looking assessments

### **Consultation questions**

- Are there other criteria for when forward looking information cannot be published?
- How should the accuracy of use of the flag be policed?

## **IATI Standard Compliance**

### **Outline of problem(s) / issue(s)**

The Publishing Statistics do not currently make any assessment of how compliant the data that is being published is with the version of the IATI Standard used. Given that IATI Standard compliance is generally accepted as an important factor of publishing IATI data this would appear to be something of an oversight.

Files found to be containing errors by the [IATI Validator](#) are currently still assessed as part of the Publishing Statistics although any elements that are invalid or cannot be adequately interrogated are ignored and their values are not counted.

### **Proposed solutions**

It is proposed that a new column called 'Validation Errors' is added to the ['Core'](#) table of Comprehensiveness section of the Publishing Statistics. Publishers would be assessed as follows:

100% if all of their files are successfully validated by the IATI Validator.

60% if one or more file is found by the IATI Validator to have errors.

## Consultation questions

- Alternative solutions?

Future Transaction Dates - [see discussion here](#)