development initiatives

February 2020

Data Use

A Briefing for DI's Strategy Process

By Tom Walker

Introduction

‘Improving Data Use for Sustainable Development’ is one of three key thematic areas of Development Initiatives’ current strategy, 2016-2020. Under this theme, DI works to better understand, engage with and remove critical barriers to data use. By doing this, DI hopes to build the enabling environment for evidence-based decision-making and improved development outcomes. (Activities conducted under this theme can be seen in Box 1)

To inform the development of its new strategy, DI has commissioned a briefing to better understand the future contribution DI can make to the ‘data use’ agenda. This briefing, based on five days of desk research, sets out trends, discourse and thinking around “data use”. In particular, it examines those which have grown in prominence since the development of DI’s previous strategy five years ago, and the competitors and donors working in this area.

It identifies four key changes in ideas about data use and six responses from donors and peer organisations to those changes.

Data use 2016-2020: what has changed?

- **Trend 1:** After a period of optimism and growth, discussions about data use are now more nuanced and focused on demonstrating impact.
- **Trend 2:** There is a general acknowledgement that initially much data was published without an understanding of its intended users
- **Trend 3:** There is heightened awareness of the need to understand and prevent data misuse
- **Trend 4:** The discourse around technical barriers to data use in development data has remained relatively consistent

How has the field responded?

- **Response 1:** Donors continue to fund efforts to promote data use
- **Response 2:** However, actors are taking a more intentional, sector-focused approach to promoting data use
- **Response 3:** Organisations are making more intensive efforts to understand data users’ needs and the political environment in which they operate
- **Response 4:** Methods for building individuals’ “data literacy” are evolving
- **Response 5:** Enthusiasm for new data sources persists, amid concerns about national statistical offices (NSOs)’ capacity to use them and a lack of standards to maintain data quality
- **Response 6:** Discussions of preventing data misuse have moved from rhetoric to practicalities

Box 1: DI's 'Data Use' work 2016-2020.

In 2016-2020 DI delivered a range of research, engagement activities and interventions structured around four pillars:

- **Understanding needs and barriers -** To improve understanding of data needs and the barriers to use of data by actors focused on poverty reduction DI has developed an overview of conceptual and practical approaches to data use; delivered a series of case studies on the barriers and opportunities for data use; conducted work in Nepal to identify aid data user needs and business data needs, and work in Kenya to identify county-level data needs.

- **Use of information -** To support the use of timely and relevant information for poverty reduction, DI has worked directly with development stakeholders to facilitate their use of data via the DI Data Support Service in Kenya and Uganda.

- **Capacity to use data -** To strengthen the capacity of key stakeholders to access and use data, DI has conducted efforts in Nepal to develop data savviness via events such as open data day celebrations and the Women in Data Conference and via training on data literacy, open data and designing for data impact. In addition, DI has conducted efforts in Kenya to grow skills in citizen-generated data.

- **Systems and structure -** To improve systemic and enabling environments that support increased data use at country level DI has encouraged Joined Up Data Standards; improved data availability via the Uganda and Kenya Spotlight data platforms; and improved the supply of open data in Nepal. DI has conducted efforts to improve data governance, including promoting supportive policies, processes, and government structures to enable data use. DI has also worked to strengthen data ecosystems, including convening key stakeholders to guide Uganda's data revolution and strengthening Nepal's community of open data pioneers.

Data use 2016-2020: what has changed?

Trend 1: After a period of optimism and growth, discussions about data use are now more nuanced and focused on demonstrating impact.

In the wake of the 2013 High Level panel and the 2014 report *A World That Counts,* there was real optimism about the potential to use data to achieve and monitor the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Organisations spoke of themselves as "helping to engineer a data revolution," and launched multiple reports on what was needed to bring about this "revolution".

The new "data revolution" paradigm connected a wide range of data concepts and placed a strong emphasis on data use. Among others, the data revolution covered issues of data governance (data policies, flows etc), data quality (disaggregation, timeliness etc), and data usability (open data, interoperability etc), as well as a wide range of data sources - both official data (census, surveys, administrative data), alternative data sources or "unofficial data" (big data, citizen generated data, etc). As a DFID email from 2013 put it: "The post-2015 process needs to bring all of these strands together to improve the quantity, quality, availability and usability of development data."

The number of organisations working on development data-related topics proliferated rapidly in the early-to-mid 2010s, a period described by the consultancy Dalberg as the sector's 'expansion phase'. Reviewing the last decade, one paper notes "the development of a rich set of supranational initiatives, national-level policies, and international non-governmental organisations (NGOs), and networks." Supportive donor policies encouraged this, for example seven international organisations dedicated to supporting the open data ecosystem — mySociety, the Sunlight Foundation, the Open Data Institute (ODI), the Open Data Charter, the Web Foundation, Open Knowledge Foundation and the GovLab — grew in part thanks to the Omidyar Network's venture capital-style approach in the mid-2010s, in which Omidyar "funded multiple individuals to solve similar problems in different ways". More than 55 different funders supported open data efforts in 28 communities of practice in this period.

This expansion phase helped to increase interest in data among actors working on development. As the Hewlett Foundation's 2018 Evidence-Informed Policymaking Strategy puts it: "Many low- and middle-income country governments, research institutions, and advocacy organizations are increasingly demanding and using evidence to inform policy. The appetite for evidence is driven in part by the success of the decade-long transparency and accountability movement." This quote typifies the ways in which the fields of open data and evidence-informed policymaking have co-existed - sometimes uneasily - during this period, sharing objectives in some areas and diverging in others.

Although many organisations agreed that increasing the supply of usable data would help achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, they had different interpretations of how this would take place. Organisations took a range of approaches, often targeting different end users for the data. While many data initiatives

promised to increase governments' accountability - as citizens and civil society used that data to monitor their performance - sustainable development data-focused efforts often involved a more technical approach centred on helping decision-makers design better policy. As long as the field kept growing and gaining funding, there were fewer incentives for organisations to adopt more specific descriptions that might limit the success of their programs.

Seeking to capitalise on political windows of opportunity, data advocates have often presented themselves as "all things to all people." Although this created momentum, it also introduced considerable practical and rhetorical ambiguity - particularly when it came to defining approaches to issues such as "data use." For example, a 2018 'state of the field' review of the fiscal transparency field found that initiatives tended to have one of three strategic goals:

1. Development effectiveness and public service delivery
2. Political participation and empowerment of citizens
3. Normative human rights-related goals, including equity and justice

Achieving these goals requires different strategies, some more technical or political than others - but many organisations nonetheless categorised themselves under the same banner.

For those working on the publication and use of data for sustainable development, the field is now undergoing what some call a "re-evaluation" and others describe as an "identity crisis." Actors working on data are now under increasing pressure to demonstrate a deep understanding of when data-focused work contributes effectively to positive change, and how their activities are supporting this.

Overall, the early optimism about the potential of data has become much more muted. With one or two exceptions, the term "data revolution" had largely fallen out of use by 2017. Although there have been significant increases in the amount of data that has been published and used in areas like the humanitarian sector, talk of revolutions has been replaced with more cautious rhetoric. Now, some actors in 2020 speak of "rekindling" the data revolution, partly because of funding gaps and partly because of perceptions that initiatives like the GPSDD are too informal to establish standards for all their partners.

Trend 2: There is a general acknowledgement that initially much data was published without an understanding of its intended users

Discussions of "ensuring data use" have been prominent since 2014-15, **often framed in the market-based language of supply (data producers) and demand (data users).** For example, the Open Data for Development programme listed "increasing re-use of open data in developing countries" as one of its five strategic pillars in 2015, seeking to support "appropriate data standards, guidelines, solution-driven applications, and demand-side capacity." As this list suggests, these earlier efforts often focused on understanding and addressing technical barriers.

On the 'supply' side, early initiatives broadly agreed on the steps needed to ensure that data *could* be used for development decision-making. These initiatives coalesced around the need to produce disaggregated data that is relevant for decision-making, support the development of standards to improve data quality, find ways to incorporate under-used and new sources of data, and build NSOs' capacity to coordinate all these activities.

Keen to correct a perceived early over-emphasis on 'supply', organisations began to focus on 'demand' from 2015. These efforts often made reference to "consulting" users about the data they needed, with relatively little guidance on how to do so. A key recommendation of the World Bank's 2016 'Open Data for Sustainable Development' report, for example, was that governments and other actors should "prioritise datasets that users want".

However, organisations too often published data without fully understanding who would use it, and how. In 2015, the Open Society Foundations commissioned the agency Reboot to investigate why "data products currently produced have had limited impact," and found that actors producing data tended to rely solely on assumptions about how imagined groups of users might use data. This critique was typified by so-called 'data graveyards' - initiatives where, as Laura Bacon of the funder Luminate puts it, "data has been released without a clear purpose, without meeting its potential, or without having the appropriate precautions, risking harming perceptions about the value of the field." This sense of disappointment is visible across multiple fields. A 2016 assessment found "few, if any examples, where [the designers of data systems for monitoring the SDGs] paid careful attention to the needs of decision-makers" and found "no frameworks for thinking about deriving decision needs from the SDGs as a whole."

An inability to demonstrate systematic impact has also tempered early enthusiasm for the potential of data-focused work. One review of data use in the humanitarian sector suggested that, partly as a result: "the open data revolution [has not] incited the expanded use of data in the area of international aid that may have been expected." In 2018, the Center for Global Development described the value of data for better policy as "still mostly unknown." Although a series of publications assessing the impact of data initiatives have been released since 2016, they have tended to consist of case studies that are difficult to generalise. As one organisation's 2017 strategy admitted: "There have been case studies which illustrate potential for impact and which demonstrate causal pathways, but few studies showing sustained results. This is feeding a growing skepticism, and affecting the work's sustainability."

Broader political and cultural shifts have contributed to this more pessimistic view. A 2018 review of the fiscal transparency and accountability field noted "signs that the 'transparency revolution' of the past two decades may have come to a halt," highlighting stalled progress towards global budget transparency, limited implementation of OGP commitments, and a lack of relevant data in open data portals. "Openwashing" - a phenomenon where governments publish only a selected set of data, without providing an environment in which that data can be used freely - remains a persistent problem, while international transparency mechanisms have been weakened as countries from the US to Azerbaijan withdraw or are suspended. The 2018 Open Data Barometer report concluded that governments often still treat open data as a side project, while there are widespread concerns that closing civic space in many countries limits the potential to safely critique official statistics.

The idea that data publication and use would make governments more accountable to their citizens - a key component of many development data theories of change - has come under particular pressure. In 2015, one of the key arguments for publication and use of data was that it would allow civil society and citizens to scrutinise government actions, and thus make governments more responsive to citizens. The Making All Voices Count programme ended in 2017 amid perceptions that it had failed to fulfil its promise of using data and technology to make government

decision-making better reflect citizens' priorities. As the end-of-programme review put it: 'The capacities needed to transform governance relationships are developed offline and in social and political processes, rather than by technologies." This was mirrored in the area of fiscal transparency and accountability, as the IBP's review describes: "Many in the field report feeling stuck in a continuing loop of technical fixes that fail to translate into accountability gains or systemic change." A series of randomised controlled trials (RCTs) also provided challenging findings, including a USD 8 million multi-country RCT that found an accountability program did not measurably improve targeted health outcomes.

Trend 3: There is heightened awareness of the need to understand and prevent data misuse

A range of organisations advocating for publishing and using development data have concluded that they "are vulnerable to well-founded arguments around invasion of privacy and harmful uses of data." As a staff member at Luminate wrote in June 2019, many early advocates "did not give sufficient attention to the risks and costs of opening data – or propose mitigation strategies to address them. These debates gain momentum as we learn more about how abuses of data use and new threats to data privacy impact citizens and institutions around the world."

In addition to the widespread public attention generated by the Cambridge Analytica scandal, a series of incidents in the development sector provoked criticism of development organisations' data collection and management procedures. Nine NGOs, including Oxfam, temporarily suspended programmes in late 2017 after an investigation found they were storing personal data on a software platform vulnerable to hackers, while in 2018 a leaked internal audit showed that the World Food Programme was sharing data with other organisations insecurely without any legal agreements and a January 2020 report showed that UN agencies had failed to disclose a major cyber-attack affecting thousands of people. The implementation of the GDPR - which is now informing data protection regimes around the world - has further moved from promoting data use, to ensuring that it is used responsibly. Although UN Global Pulse have argued that this new emphasis on misuse should not obscure the risks of "missed use," there is increasingly widespread acceptance that this is a priority - exemplified by the inclusion of a track at the UN World Data Forum on building trust in statistics, including "data privacy and security challenges in a changing data ecosystem."

Trend 4: The discourse around technical barriers to data use in development data has remained relatively consistent

In 2016, there was broad agreement that increasing data use required the following groups of activities:

- Produce more disaggregated, granular data that is relevant for decision-making.
- Use existing but under-used data sources to fill gaps, including supporting the development of strong administrative systems.
- Find ways to use new, alternative sources of data to measure the SDGs.
- Develop standards to make data more consistent and comparable across countries.
- Address barriers to the use of data, including consulting users to ensure that the data collected is relevant and in line with national priorities.

- Build the capacity of NSOs to coordinate the activities above, by helping them develop their infrastructure and the skills of their staff.

Today, debate continues to focus on the need to produce disaggregated data that informs decision-making, fill gaps using under-used data sources and new data sources, and promoting interoperability through data standards. Efforts to promote joined-up data standards continue, with the GPSDD Collaborative on Interoperability producing an 'Interoperability Guide' with the UN Statistics Division, and aiming to have the guide regularly used by at least 20 national statistical offices.

There is still agreement on the need to use and support "traditional" sources of data such as household surveys. Indeed, the Data to End Hunger project, implemented by a group including USAID, DFAT, BMZ, World Bank, FAO, IFAD and the Gates Foundation, aims to use these methods to conduct regular surveys of farming households in 50 low- and lower-middle-income countries, making the data available to governments as part of efforts to support their decision-making. Initiatives focused on subnational data use are also continuing - such as SDSN's Local Data Action Solutions Initiative, which gives grants of USD 2,000 to USD 10,000 to organizations working on sub-national SDG data solutions.

How has the field responded?

Donors and organisations have responded to the changes outlined above in five ways:

Response 1: Donors continue to fund efforts to promote data use

Donors continue to talk about the importance of data use. The Hewlett Foundation includes "Policymakers are motivated to use evidence," and "Policy-makers have the capacity to use evidence" as key ingredients for evidence-informed policymaking in its 2018 strategy (due for review in 2020). Some transparency-focused projects are continuing to be funded, such as Publish What You Fund's research into increasing transparency among development finance institutions (supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation). The Open Society Foundation's 2018-21 "People Centered Data Use for Accountability" programme, meanwhile, will research what financial information local oversight actors and policy influencers need to address problems of fiscal equity and accountability, using user-centred design workshops in "at least two countries."

Response 2: However, actors are taking a more purpose-centred and sector-focused approach

There has been a move towards publishing data with a specific purpose in mind. This is likely to be because of the ability to more narrowly define users and use cases in a specific sector, while also understanding the distinct political dynamics that affect that sector. A key event here was the Open Data Charter's move in 2018 away from "publish by default" towards "publish with purpose," based on the belief that "it can deliver more than 'publish and they will come.'" This approach has gained significant traction: as one funder said in an interview, "Purpose-driven release can help prioritize release of data that is most demanded from citizens, CSOs, and other actors who use it – which is critical given limited capacity and resources."

This approach tends to encourage a sector-specific data use approach, rather than one focused on broader standards-building or around general discussions of data for the SDGs. For example, continued donor support for transparency-focused initiatives looking at beneficial ownership data (DFID, World Bank) and open contracting data (Hewlett Foundation, Luminate, Open Society Foundations) indicates willingness to support data use work when it is tightly defined around a set of specific objectives.

Organisations are responding by promoting their expertise in specific areas. Development Gateway, for example, report that, "recent years have seen an increase in the demand for sector-specific tools, approaches, and research;" the Open Data Institute includes sector-focused programmes as one of its three strategic levers for promoting data use; and the Open Data Charter's sector-focused series of "Open Up" guides have addressed the topics of corruption and climate change to date.

Response 3: Organisations are making more intensive efforts to understand data users' needs and the political environment in which they operate

Organisations have invested increasing effort on "demand-side" research - specifically focused on defining groups of users in more detail, articulating how

they use data, and optimising products according to their needs, capacities, and constraints. In 2015-2018, a series of research products investigated decision-makers' awareness and use of IATI data and in-country aid information management systems, and focused on specific groups of users such as humanitarian actors in protracted emergencies aid sector actors, public procurement specialists, and public officials more broadly.

Research into data users' needs has become mainstream, with some attempts to systematise approaches: in 2017, the GovLab developed a 'Data Demand and Assessment Methodology' that aimed to help policy-makers "identify, segment, and engage with demand," while SDSN TReNDS launched a 'living manual' in the same year to help design data systems that are tailored to the needs of decision-makers. Today, organisations working to promote data use increasingly publish "use case" documentation as an integral part of project implementation.

Organisations are increasingly focusing on promoting data use through an understanding of the political environment and decision-making constraints that influence action. This is partly linked to the growing popularity of ideas about 'Doing Development Differently' and 'adaptive management,' which involve researching the political conditions that affect decision-making in development contexts, and incorporating flexible programme management methods that allow adaptation while an intervention is in progress. See, for example, the National Resource Governance Institute's pledge to "think more politically" in its 2019 strategy, following an evaluation that had questioned its focus on promoting the use of data. Development Gateway states that it uses problem-driven iterative adaptation (an adaptive management method) to define data needs and co-create solutions, while Global Integrity's "Treasure Hunts" methodology uses a similar approach.

Donors have shown willingness to support this work. USAID and DFID have invested almost GBP 4 million in the Global Learning for Adaptive Management (GLAM) initiative, which aims to create evidence on the effectiveness of these approaches and apply them within their own organisations. This has parallels with the "information ecosystem" in Development Initiatives' learning framework for data use - but with added emphasis on understanding political incentives and constraints related to using data.

Response 4: Methods for building individuals' "data literacy" are evolving

Keen to find other ways of bridging the perceived gap between data producers and users, in 2014-17 organisations began to support so-called "data intermediaries", or infomediaries. School of Data, an organisation that trains civil society organisations and journalists to use data, grew during this period, while the $45 million programme Making All Voices Count aimed to make governments more responsive to citizens, in part by supporting civil society organisations to use data and digital technologies. Sector-specific organisations such as Publish What You Pay developed fellowship-based programmes to promote the use of extractives sector data, while researchers were funded to identify the characteristics of successful intermediaries. However, there has been less discussion of 'intermediaries' since 2017 - perhaps because they are seen merely as one actor in a complex system, rather than as a discrete group to be targeted.

Capacity-building activities promoting data use, also known as "building data literacy", have become more complex. Hackathons have declined in popularity in the face of criticism that they rarely build skills or projects that last beyond the time period of the event. They have typically been replaced by events focused on solving a data-related problem (rather than building a technology solution), such as the 2019 Nepal "Solveathon", School of Data's Data Expeditions methodology, and DataKind's DataDives. In many cases, these techniques explicitly focus on building community and skills rather than the final product, and require significant time investments from participants beyond attendance at the event itself.

Trainers have begun defining data skills relevant for particular roles, and tailoring activities accordingly. Recent resources designed to build data literacy, notably the IFRC's Data Playbook (designed over several years on the basis of significant user research), have adopted a modular approach with individual modules and exercises closely designed around the needs of staff across the IFRC. Over time, a consensus has emerged that is less about hard skills and more about being able to engage critically with the options that data use presents, with more than 50 "maturity" frameworks seeking to systematise ways of building intuition about data across an organisation.

Some data literacy efforts have combined training in practical data skills with building an understanding of how data can be used in a specific political context. As an evaluation of a Publish What You Pay programme training individuals to use extractives sector data noted, "Capacity-building initiatives that are data-led and aim to increase the use of a particular kind of data...may not be the most effective strategy… What is important is that the person supporting capacity building begins by developing relationships and trying to understand the accountability ecosystem and different data use needs before embarking on training." Funders such as the Hewlett Foundation continue to support capacity-building organisations that support civil society organisations to use data that includes political analysis as well as data-focused approaches.

Response 5: Enthusiasm for new data sources persists, amid concerns about NSOs' capacity to use them and a lack of standards to maintain data quality

As in 2015, discussions about using alternative data sources to fill gaps are continuing. Public debates have included arguments in favour of including microdata, administrative data, geospatial data, or traffic sensors and telecom data. Some support for the integration of citizen-generated data still persists, with CIVICUS' DataShift initiative continuing into 2020. An emerging challenge in this area is understanding which types of data may be appropriate in which scenarios: the Data For Now initiative is reportedly creating a "landscape analysis" that will allow organisations to identify and assess what is appropriate for them. However, there are now calls to ensure that these new methods come with training and quality assurance measures, as SDSN cautions: "Without technical training on new methods, it can be especially problematic because many national statistical offices are unfunded and under-resourced."

Several organisations are now providing technical support to encourage the use of data from under-used sources (such as microdata) or new, alternative sources (such as satellite data). The Data for Now initiative aims to "make innovative methods for data production and analysis easily accessible to data producers and data users" and "Catalyze or take to scale new data partnerships...to increase the availability and use of timely data for decision-making on the SDGs." The Africa Regional Data Cube is

focusing on practical training on developing decision-making “products” using remote sensing data from Ghana, Kenya, Sierra Leone, Senegal, and Tanzania to address issues related to agriculture, food security, deforestation and water access.

Efforts to promote data use are often centring on ways to make these methods more inclusive. The African Gender Data Network, implemented by Open Data Watch and Data2X, is aiming to encourage the use of gender data within African national statistics systems through research reports on gaps, and webinars and in-person meetings to discuss methodologies. The Inclusive Data Charter, of which Development Initiatives is a core group member, provides example action plans for countries and case studies of existing work around disaggregated data.

There has also been increasing attention to data governance, particularly to encourage data sharing in the private sector. This has taken the form of efforts to design “data collaboratives,” defined by the GovLab as “a form of collaboration in which data held by an entity in the private sector is leveraged in partnership with another entity (from the public sector, civil society and/or academia) for public good.” This has often involved data from sectors such as telecoms and health to analyse mobility or disease outbreaks. Although the area was first defined in 2015 and has received support from Omidyar Network and UNICEF, analysing and implementing these collaboratives is still a work in progress, as the GovLab itself acknowledges.

Initiatives such as Project 8, billed by the UN Secretary-General’s office as “a global digital, community-based platform created to use data on sustainable development” now appears to be dormant. However, elsewhere, work to support technical implementation of data sharing continues to gain funding. SDSN TReNDS, funded by Hewlett, is currently researching governance and technical requirements for data sharing between public and private data producers in Cambodia and Bangladesh, and working with the GovLab and the World Economic Forum to create an online library of data-sharing agreements.

Finally and most ambitiously, the UN Environment Programme has been working to promote an overarching global governance framework for data, which they describe as a “digital ecosystem,” to “capitalize on the massive increase in data generation and processing power to help monitor and manage the state of our planet.” Although they have gathered a range of partners, the founders themselves acknowledge that their proposal lacks many key practical details, and it remains unclear when and if implementation would begin.

Response 6: Discussions of preventing data misuse have moved from rhetoric to practicalities

Funders are showing increasing interest in a responsible data approach. Their current strategy focuses on supporting organisations working to promote data rights. The Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs' 2019 Digital Agenda states that civil society organisations need to take steps to manage data responsibly; USAID and GIZ launched responsible data policies and principles in 2018; and Sida has provided funding to implement responsible data policies. DFID has also commissioned research and guidance on the subject.

In the context of data use, there are increasing efforts to develop specific guidance and set standards on responsible data - an area where the Centre for Humanitarian Data has focused in recent years. General statements about the need to respect privacy have been a feature of reports for many years, but organisations are now responding with increasingly specific efforts. Oxfam approved its global Responsible Data Policy in 2015; the IFRC developed its Responsible Data Playbook in 2017; and the Netherlands Red Cross and UN Global Pulse all have responsible data policies. UNICEF launched its Responsible Data for Children initiative in 2020, while Care has developed a Responsible Data Maturity Model for monitoring an organisation's progress.

Another area receiving increasing interest is the use of fiduciary structures to manage data - most commonly taking the form of data trusts, which establish an independent steward for data that determines who can access it. Discourse around data trusts, which has been a focus for the Open Data Institute in the last year, is now focusing more on the details of implementation.

Questions for DI

This review raises a number of important questions for Development Initiatives, for example on which issues should we pursue and not pursue, and how we might need to change in order to do this. Ahead of the staff conference please have a think about the following – there will be time to discuss your ideas at the conference:

1. **What other emerging issues are there around data use that will impact progress of the poorest (particularly in our focus countries) in the next 5-10 years? Which issues should be a key priority for the international development sector?**

2. **Which of the ideas identified in question 1 and in the above briefing should DI be working on, and which of these should we not be working on?** (e.g.

    - Identifying data needs & barriers to data use (technical, political, economic and/or social)
    - Improving data usability and supply of useable data (data standards, open data etc)
    - Growing data use capabilities (data literacy, data infrastructure etc)
    - Providing technical support to facilitate data use
    - Improving data governance to facilitate data use (policies, processes)
    - Strengthening the data ecosystems (national statistical systems and/or sector-specific systems)
    - Use of alternative sources of data
    - Preventing data misuse
    - etc)

3. **In what way can DI address the selected issues?**

    1. What specific issues, processes, datasets, sectors etc should we be focusing on?
    2. At what levels (global, national, subnational) should we be working at and where?
    3. What stakeholders should we be targeting and working with?
    4. What approaches, research, interventions or engagements could DI be doing?

Development Initiatives (DI) is an independent international development organisation working on the use of data to drive poverty eradication and sustainable development. Our vision is a world without poverty that invests in human security and where everyone shares the benefits of opportunity and growth.

We work to ensure that decisions about the allocation of finance and resources result in an end to poverty, increase the resilience of the world's most vulnerable people, and ensure no one is left behind.

Contact
Claudia Wells
Director of Data Use
Claudia.Wells@Devinit.org

To find out more about our work visit:
www.devinit.org
Twitter: @devinitorg
Email: info@devinit.org

Development Initiatives is the trading name of Development Initiatives Poverty Research Ltd, registered in England and Wales, Company No. 06368740, and DI International Ltd, registered in England and Wales, Company No. 5802543. Registered Office: North Quay House, Quay Side, Temple Back, Bristol, BS1 6FL, UK.

UK OFFICE
Development Initiatives
North Quay House
Quay Side, Temple Back
Bristol, BS1 6FL, UK
+44 (0) 1179 272 505

KENYA OFFICE
Development Initiatives
Shelter Afrique Building
4th Floor, Mamlaka Road
Nairobi, Kenya
PO Box 102802-00101
+254 (0) 20 272 5346

C/O DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH AND TRAINING (DRT)
Ggaba Road, Mutesasira
Zone, Kansanga
PO Box 22459
Kampala, Uganda
+256 (0) 312 – 263629/30
+256 (0) 414 – 269495
www.drt-ug.org

US OFFICE
Development Initiatives
1110 Vermont Ave NW,
Suite 500, Washington DC
20005, US