Global Protection Cluster
Mine Action AoR

Workshop on Data Sharing

between Mine Action and other Humanitarian Sectors

Report Summary

Jordan, 20-21 March 2019

I. Background

UNMAS and GICHD organized a workshop on data sharing in Jordan on 20-21 March 2019 under Strategic Objective Four of the Mine Action Area of Responsibility Work Plan, *'to promote and enable sharing of data on mine action, including victim assistance and other protection issues with Global Protection Cluster partners to improve analysis and protection strategies'.* Working towards this objective, the workshop brought together representatives from the mine action, protection, and wider humanitarian community to answer the following key questions:

- Why share data?
- Who has what relevant data?
- How can it be accessed?
- What can or could we do with this data?

The workshop addressed these objectives through group work, presentations, and hands-on technical training. It was held in Jordan to encourage attendance from field staff in the region. Invitations were sent through the Mine Action AoR mailing list.

II. Workshop participants

In total, there were 36 participants with a mix of policy, operational and information management staff attending from: ACAPS, FDS, GICHD, HALO Trust, Humanity and Inclusion, ICBL-CMC, ICRC, IMMAP, MAG, NPA, IOM, OCHA, OHCHR, UNHCR, and UNMAS. The participants list is available upon request.

III. Summary of Proceedings

The data sharing workshop was an initiative of the Mine Action Area of Responsibility to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of mine action as a sector through learning about best practices and tools for improving data information availability and analysis. It was also an opportunity to present how the United Nations Mine Action Strategy 2019-2023 will contribute to protection and build relationships with participants for future outreach and initiatives.

Participants learnt what other humanitarian organizations have in terms of data and vice-versa. Group work discussed what data could and should be shared and approaches to improve information management and increase effectiveness and efficiency in the respective sectors. Participants discussed the ways in which different data holdings could be linked. One key take-away was that there are many rich sources of data/information already, and the key will be exploring how to better link with and maximise these sources.

While technology could enable these linkages from a technical viewpoint, several participants explained the political and institutional limits to data sharing. In relation to data protection, OCHA announced newly launched guidance on data responsibilities. The guidelines offer a set of key actions, outputs, and tools for data responsibility at each step in the data management process, from collecting and storing to disseminating and destroying as well as on data sensitivity - a hot topic for mine action activities being undertaken especially in conflict areas. One of the main objectives of the Guidelines is to help staff better assess and manage the sensitivity of the data they handle in different crisis contexts.
https://centre.humdata.org/introducing-the-working-draft-of-the-ocha-data-responsibility-guidelines/

The workshop was structured in three parts: i) information needs and challenges, ii) tools for information sharing, and iii) solutions to meet the information needs and challenges.

1. Why share data? – Identifying information needs and overcoming challenges

Mine action is an enabler that should be planned for and prioritised based on humanitarian and development priorities and therefore needs to better access and better use of humanitarian and development data.

- Maria Vardis provided an overview of the UN Mine Action Strategy 2019-2023, highlighting how protection has been integrated into strategic outcome areas;
- Groups discussed real life examples of data sharing between mine action and other protection actors and identified what worked well and challenges faced;
- Discussion also extended to the UN Strategy Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Mechanism and information needs.

Comments/Observations:

- Differentiate between data and information – i.e. the base data itself and the analysis conducted based on that data;
- Good information sharing ideally constitutes the following: clarity on the decision to be made; access to the information/analysis that helps answer that question; access to the base data upon which that analysis is based to assess the quality of the analysis; good, trusting relationships with the data/information provider that best efforts have been made to delivery meaningful information;
- Challenges: Tension between national ownership of data and need for sharing; Availability of information/analysis without base data to assess how conclusions were reached; Recognition of the existence of incomplete data and tolerance for estimation and extrapolation; Insecurity about data comprehensiveness and data quality inhibiting confident sharing.

2. Who has what relevant data out there and how can it be accessed? (technical and institutional considerations) – Tools for data sharing

The next set of presentations were on tools available to the humanitarian sector to facilitate data sharing and analysis:

- ***Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX)*** – a platform managed by OCHA Humanitarian Data Centre for distributing data about humanitarian crises and responses; HXL – a mark-up language which can be used to tag and display data to improve interoperability and reporting;
- ***Common Operational Datasets*** – Core datasets on geographical information such as country/district/community boundaries, place names, population statistics for countries worldwide that can be used to ensure interoperability of geographical datasets;
- ***Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM)*** – IOM's tools to monitor IDPs/migration movements and needs through an extensive network (tens of thousands) of key informants across key countries – multi-sectoral location assessment and emergency event tracking. This could help us to target risk education based on population movement. DTM covers mobility tracking, registration, flow monitoring and surveys.
- ***IMSMA Core and UNMAS Programmes IMS*** – Briefing on the opportunities available with the new IMSMA platform;
- ***Brief navigation and discussion of other sites*** in which humanitarian data and/or information is distributed: Humanitarian Insights, Humanitarian Response including 4Ws (Who does What Where and for Whom), INFORM Impact Survey, ReliefWeb, JIPS, ACAPS, Protection Information Management, logcluster.org, REACH.

4. What can/could we do with this data? – Solutions to meet information needs and overcome challenges;

Groups met together to identify practical next steps. These suggestions were across a range of challenges and included:

- **Advocacy efforts** with national authorities and donors (MASG, GICHD donor seminar) to encourage data sharing;
- **Standardization efforts**, such as developing a template of mine action information needs for data and protection needs of mine action within the clusters in Geneva that can be rapidly customized in the event of an emergency intervention to feed into research for the humanitarian needs overview;
- **Sharing best practices**: Mine action AOR to develop and share examples within cluster system of how mine action can contribute to other protection activities and vice versa;
- **Monitoring efforts**: add indicators on data and information sharing to the MA Cluster/AoR workplan.

Presentations

The presentations made during the workshop are available at:

- https://gichd.box.com/s/yjj8pr6ldit5krb3f6dk0iek7cc4ydse

IV. Key issues and Next Steps

In the wrap-up session at the conclusion of the workshop, participants identified the following challenges and proposed lines of actions to address them:

Problem	Suggested Lines of Action
1. How to reconcile national ownership of mine action data with humanitarian need for transparency and independence of action?	
It is clear that national authorities own mine action data. Sharing of this data is not always consistent or easily accessible. This often leads to humanitarian actors, including operators, having an incomplete view of the problem, which in turn makes planning and coordination difficult.	• Building on reporting obligations of States Parties, engage national authorities in dialogue on data sharing and organise a joint UNMAS/GICHD event during the Fourth Review Conference of the APMBC in Oslo. • Advocate with donors through the MASG to emphasize the importance of data sharing with all funding recipients and to insert more specific requirements, as appropriate. • Showcase national authorities that have been able to advance humanitarian responses and promotion of SDGs through data sharing (e.g. Afghanistan, Cambodia, Tajikistan and Ukraine). • Facilitate peer-to-peer learning. • Work with national NGOs and civil society in country.
2. How do we make mine action data and information more discoverable, accessible by, and useful for the broader humanitarian community?	
The broader humanitarian community can be unaware of what information is held by the mine action sector, and vice versa. Mine action data is difficult for humanitarian organisations to access, including in some cases peer organisations within mine action. In all cases this affects planning, implementation and impact monitoring. There is a lack of standard mine action products that can be shared with other humanitarian partners.	• Improve coordination of data and information requirements. • Use multi-sector needs assessment undertaken as part of the Humanitarian Needs Overview for joint analysis. • Propose a methodology to estimate People in Need (PIN) of mine action. • Develop model MoUs for data sharing, minimum data schema, an analytical framework, and menu of indicators. • Develop standard gridded risk products for use where detailed data sharing is not appropriate. • In next update of IMAS IM standard include review of the format and requirement for data exchange as well as security guidance.
3. What are the key questions the Mine Action community needs to ask of humanitarian data?	
The broader humanitarian community has developed many useful information-management platforms and tools that provide information about the context, the people affected by the crisis, and the response. It can be difficult to select the most relevant for mine action operators.	• Identify stakeholders and key coordination mechanisms. • Share good practice, checklists of considerations, standard approaches and go to references. • Review IMAS and the possibility of mandating the use of Common Operational Datasets.

Problem	Suggested Lines of Action
In addition, the mine action community has not developed systematic analytical methods to use this data effectively, such as in prioritisation, impact analysis etc. There is a need to develop and distribute these methodologies so that they can be mainstreamed into programme and operational management	• Prepare and deliver an operations analysis course in 2020 to raise awareness of use of humanitarian data. • Prioritize which humanitarian information platforms to connect to IMSMA and engagement strategies.
4. How can we access and improve the quality of timely casualty data collection?	
The mine action community lacks timely accurate casualty data in many contexts especially in conflict zones and remote areas.	• Increase capacity to collect, analyse and share data. • Promote existing tools and processes. • Identify champions to address this challenge. • Obtain commitment for sharing casualty data from relevant actors. • Explore technology for secure data collection and sharing. • Review guidelines on data protection from OCHA and ICRC.
5. How do we measure whether data or information sharing is improving in mine action?	
No current measure of data sharing.	• Use common platforms, such as HDX to collect metrics on data use. • Record the number of IMSMA Core instances that incorporate broader humanitarian/development data sources. • Use the upcoming Global Awareness of Mine Action (GAMA) platform to place mine action data in the broader HumDev context. • Include indicators related to information and data sharing in the current planning cycle. These indicators can be direct, or implicit for example number of victims referred for assistance. • Liaise with GPC information management officer to explore how to connect mine action data in overall protection monitoring.
6. What is the role of donors in promoting data/info sharing and defining information requirements?	
Several participants noted that donors could be more pro-active in requiring data sharing and openness. They have the power to influence their grantees and to request sharing of data collected and produced.	• Use donor leverage to influence national mine action authorities and humanitarian actors to share data. • Standardise reporting requirements, for example widening use of the IATI standard. • Utilise GICHD GAMA to share mine action data with donors, as demonstrated at the Afghan donor workshop (March 2019).

Problem	Suggested Lines of Action
	• Raise issue with donors, e. at the MASG and at the 2020 GICHD donor seminar.

V. Sources of potentially relevant data

Source Name	Responsible	Type of Data	Description	How to Access
Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX)	Managed by OCHA's Humanitarian Data Centre	About the context, people and response	"An open platform for sharing data across crises and organisations." Three ways of sharing depending on sensitivity (includes private sharing).	https://data.humdata.org/dataset
Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM)	IOM	About the context, people and response	"Tracks and monitors displacement and population mobility… It is designed to regularly and systematically capture, process and disseminate information to provide a better understanding of the movements and evolving needs of displaced populations, whether on site or en route."	https://www.globaldtm.info/ It was agreed that the MA AoR will work with IOM to explore how the DTM can be adapted to meet MA needs.
	Components of the DTM: 1. Mobility tracking: Multi-Sectoral Location Assessment & emergency event tracking 2. Registration: e.g. for beneficiary selection 3. Flow monitoring: High Mobility Location Assessment & flow monitoring registry 4. Surveys: capture return intention, community perception, displacement solutions, etc.			
Monitoring data from humanitarian response plans	CCCM	About the response	Can include indicators on Explosive Ordnance Risk Education (EORE) if included at planning stage. For instance, the 2019 HRP for Syria includes indicators for # of people receiving EORE from	https://www.globalcccmcluster.org/

			humanitarian risk education advisors and from public service providers, and the # of people trained to conduct EORE.	
Humanitarian Insight	OCHA	About the context, people and response	Houses the Global Humanitarian Overview (GHO), "the most authoritative and comprehensive assessment of global humanitarian needs and presents coordinated and prioritized plans for responding to those needs."	https://www.hpc.tools/
Humanitarian Response	OCHA	About the context, people and response	Operational information about humanitarian responses, including assessments, 3W/4W matrixes, maps, situation reports, humanitarian needs overviews and humanitarian response plans.	https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/
Inform Impact Survey		About the context and people	"A global, open-source risk assessment for humanitarian crises and disasters". Categories on hazard & exposure, vulnerability and coping capacity. Could be worth exploring whether EO risk information could be included.	http://www.inform-index.org/
ArcGIS Hub	ESRI		Open data from ESRI	

Christelle Loupforest, Maria Vardis, Olivia Selbie, Olivier Cottray, Andrew Kesterton, Kaitlin Hodge

16 May 2019