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Background

Who conducted the survey and how will the results be used?
The **Sub-Group on Data Responsibility in Humanitarian Action** was initiated in January 2020 under the auspices of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Results Group 1.

The Sub-Group is co-led by the OCHA Centre for Humanitarian Data, the International Organization for Migration (IOM), and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

The resulting document will be submitted for endorsement by the IASC in late 2020. Once endorsed, this guidance will serve as a benchmark for key actions and accountabilities vis-a-vis data responsibility at the response level.
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OBJECTIVES OF THE SUB-GROUP

➔ Develop joint system-wide operational guidance on data responsibility through a consultative process

➔ Secure IASC endorsement of the operational guidance

➔ Devise a strategy for implementation of the operational guidance following formal endorsement

➔ Build a community of practice around data responsibility in humanitarian action
GOALS OF THE PUBLIC-FACING SURVEY

➔ **Inform the development** of joint, system-wide Operational Guidance on data responsibility

➔ **Support the prioritization of key themes and areas of action** for inclusion in the Operational Guidance

➔ **Expand the network of practitioners** involved in shaping the Operational Guidance at the global and operational level, with emphasis placed on field-level colleagues
Overview

Who responded to the survey?
15 survey questions

396 responses

78 countries represented
TYPE OF ORGANIZATION

International NGO staff represented the greatest proportion of respondents (44.9%), followed by staff from United Nations entities (42.4%).

The remaining respondents (12.6%) were split across donors, academic/research institutions, the Red Cross and Red Crescent movement, other international organizations (non-UN), and national NGOs.

UN and international NGO staff represented 87.3% of the total respondents.
Organisation ("other")

What type of organization do you work for?

Number of total respondents from different organization types categorized as "other" in previous slide.

TYPE OF ORGANISATION

The remaining respondents (12.6%) represented a variety of organization types.

Donors, academic/research institutions, and International Organisations (Non-UN) made-up the majority of this group. The Red Cross and Red Crescent movement was also well represented.
Nearly half (48%) of respondents came from Headquarters offices, with the next largest proportion of respondents coming from Country - national level offices (26%).

Country-level (national and sub-national) colleagues represented one third (33.8%) of all respondents.

The 4.4% of respondents represented as “Not applicable” indicated a variety of office types, including “home-based”, “stand-by partner”, and “remote-working”.

Colleagues from various field office locations accounted for 46.4% of all respondents.
Geography

In which country are you based?

GLOBAL REACH
Respondents from 78 countries completed the survey.

The top five countries with the most respondents were the United States (n=51), Switzerland (n=35), the United Kingdom (n=34), Kenya (n=17), and Iraq (n=14).

Colleagues from HRP countries represented 20% of all survey respondents.
Respondents from 19 of the 23 HRP countries completed the survey. Iraq and Yemen had the highest number of respondents within this group of countries. Colleagues from HRP countries represented 20% of all survey respondents.
Role or Focus Area

How would you describe your role or area of focus?

ROLES

Data-oriented staff represent a significant proportion of respondents (26%), however there is strong representation from humanitarian advisors/experts (14.65%) and program management staff (9.6%).

41 respondents identified themselves as ‘other’, with a variety of roles identified that spread evenly across the other roles / functional, areas indicated in the survey.

Overall, there was a balance between data-oriented staff (data & IM, M&E, Analyst) and staff in the various other humanitarian functions listed.
Principles and Themes

What principles and key themes were identified as most relevant to the Operational Guidance?
The twelve principles below received the highest number of votes in the survey.

1. Data Confidentiality
2. Data Security
3. Do No Harm
4. Data Quality
5. Informed Consent
6. Accountability
7. Respect for Data Subject’s Rights
8. Transparency
9. People-Centred and Inclusive Approaches to Data
10. Risk Prevention and Mitigation
11. Fair and Legitimate Data Processing
12. Competency and Capacity for Responsible Data Management
Principles

Please select the ten most important principles for ensuring responsible approaches to data in the field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Confidentiality</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>Competency and Capacity for Responsible Data Management</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Security</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>Purpose Specification</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do No Harm</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>Proportionality and Necessity of Data Activities</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Quality</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>Lawful Data Processing</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed Consent</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>Data Retention and Destruction</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>Impartiality</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Data Subjects’ Rights</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>Data Minimization</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>Neutrality</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People-Centred and Inclusive Approaches to Data</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>Respect for and Adaptation to Context</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Prevention and Mitigation</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>Humanity</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and Legitimate Data Processing</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of total respondents who identified each principle as ‘most important’

PRINCIPLES FOR DATA RESPONSIBILITY

14 of the 22 principles presented to respondents received a considerable number of ‘votes’ (between 40% - 72.7% of all respondents).

Data Confidentiality and Data Security were selected by the highest proportion of respondents (72.7% and 71.5% respectively) as most important.

All of the principles received at least 23.5% of respondents’ ‘vote’, showing the perceived importance of the entire set of options.
Principles by Role

Please select the ten most important principles for ensuring responsible approaches to data in the field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Data Confidentiality</th>
<th>Data Security</th>
<th>Do No Harm</th>
<th>Data Quality</th>
<th>Informed Consent</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Transparency</th>
<th>People-Centred and Inclusive Approaches to Data</th>
<th>Risk Prevention and Mitigation</th>
<th>Fair and Legitimate Data Processing</th>
<th>Capacity for Responsible Data Management</th>
<th>Purpose Specification</th>
<th>Proportionality and Necessity of Data Activities</th>
<th>Lawful Data Processing</th>
<th>Data Retention and Destroy</th>
<th>Impartiality</th>
<th>Data Minimization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyst</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Coordinator</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data and Information Management</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Director</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian – Technical Sectoral</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Expert</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of respondents within each 'role' group who identified a principle as 'most important'
Principles

If there are any other principles you believe are missing from the list above and should be included, please suggest them here.

- The majority of free-text suggestions are addressed by the definitions of the principles that respondents were asked to choose from.
- Some of the suggestions were too specific to include in general operational guidance.
- Several suggestions are covered by other content in the draft operational guidance, such as the specific actions at different levels of a response.
The eight themes below received the highest number of votes in the survey.

1. Data Protection
2. Data Ethics
3. Assessing Benefits, Risks and Harms of Data Management
4. Data Sharing
5. Data Management Procedures and Processes
6. Data Security
7. Roles and Responsibilities for Responsible Data Management
8. Competency and Capacity Requirements for Responsible Data Management
### Themes

Based on your understanding of data responsibility and the purpose of this operational guidance, please select the seven most important themes that you believe should be included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Protection</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>Competency and Capacity Requirements for Responsible Data Management</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Ethics</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>Technical Tools for Responsible Data Management</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Benefits, Risks, and Harms of Data Management</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>Data Governance</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sharing</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>Data Rights</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Security</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>Legal and Regulatory Issues</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management Procedures and Processes</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>Data Classification</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and Responsibilities for Responsible Data Management</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of total respondents who identified the themes as ‘most important’

### THEMES FOR THE OPERATIONAL GUIDANCE

Of the thirteen themes or topic areas presented, eight themes were identified by at least 50% of respondents as important to include in the Operational Guidance.

The clear priority themes were Data Protection (75%), Data Ethics (67.7%), Assessing Benefits, Risks and Harms (67.2%). And Data Sharing (66.2%).

All of the themes received support from at least 22.2% of the respondents.
# Themes by Role

*Please select the seven most important themes that you believe should be include.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyst</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Coordinator</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data &amp; Information Management</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Office</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Experts (Sector)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Advisor</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of respondents within each ‘role’ group who identified a theme as ‘most important’
Actions for Data Responsibility

What types of recommended actions should the Operational Guidance offer at different levels of humanitarian response?
Levels of Action

In addition to Response-Wide guidance, should the Operational Guidance recommend actions for data responsibility at the following levels?

Overall, respondents saw value in the Operational Guidance presenting recommendations for actions that support data responsibility at all three levels (cluster/sector, organization, and single data management exercise).

However, while the utility of cluster/sector-level and organization-level recommendations is clear, nearly 45% of respondents either weren’t sure (‘don’t know’) or did not see the value of recommendations at the level of a single data management exercise.
Response-Wide Actions

Please rank the different areas or categories of recommended actions for data responsibility in order of importance (1 = most important, 4 = least important).

PRIORITIZATION
At the Response-Wide Level, respondents identified Data Governance as the clear priority area. Roles and Responsibilities and Procedures and Processes followed in order of importance. Compared to these other areas, Technical Tools were seen as least important at this level.

Interestingly, this is the highest ranking for Data Governance and the lowest ranking for Technical Tools across the four different levels of response that survey respondents were asked to consider.

Scores were calculated using weighted ranking to generate an overall prioritization. A ranking of 1 = 1 point, 2 = .75 points, 3 = .5 points, and 4 = .25 points.
Cluster/Sector-Level Actions

Please rank the different areas or categories of recommended actions for data responsibility in order of importance (1 = most important, 4 = least important).

Scores were calculated using weighted ranking to generate an overall prioritization. A ranking of 1 = 1 point, 2 = .75 points, 3 = .5 points, and 4 = .25 points.

PRIORITIZATION

At the Cluster/Sector-Level, respondents identified **Roles and Responsibilities** as the most important area for recommendations. Data Governance and Procedures and Processes followed in order of importance.

Not surprisingly, given the nature of data management at the Cluster/Sector level and the role that the Clusters/Sectors play, **Technical Tools** were seen as least important at this level.
Organization-Level Actions

Please rank the different areas or categories of recommended actions for data responsibility in order of importance (1 = most important, 4 = least important).

PRIORITIZATION

At the Organization-Level, respondents again identified Roles and Responsibilities as the most important area for recommendations. Procedures and Processes and Data Governance followed in order of importance.

Once again, recommendations regarding Technical Tools were seen as least important at this level, perhaps because many organizations already have preferred tools and approaches for managing the technical aspects of data management.

Scores were calculated using weighted ranking to generate an overall prioritization. A ranking of 1 = 1 point, 2 = .75 points, 3 = .5 points, and 4 = .25 points.
Single Data Management Exercise-Level Actions

Please rank the different areas or categories of recommended actions for data responsibility in order of importance (1 = most important, 4 = least important).

PRIORITIZATION
At the Single Data Management Exercise-Level, respondents identified Procedures and Processes as the most important area for recommendations. Roles and Responsibilities and Technical Tools followed as the most important area for recommendations.

Data Governance was seen as the least important area for recommendations at this level. This may be due to the fact that individual data management exercises typically fall under Organization- or Cluster/Sector-Level governance frameworks.

Scores were calculated using weighted ranking to generate an overall prioritization. A ranking of 1 = 1 point, 2 = .75 points, 3 = .5 points, and 4 = .25 points.
Resources and Templates

What resources and tools/templates should be included or referenced in the Operational Guidance?
Resources, Tools & Templates

What resources and tools/templates should be included or referenced in the Operational Guidance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool/Template</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Responsibility Diagnosis Tool</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sharing Protocol Template</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sensitivity Classification Protocol Template</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sharing Agreement Template</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management Process Template</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks, Harms, and Benefits Assessment Template</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Protection Impact Assessment Template</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Incident Management Protocol</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Subject Request Response Protocol</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample size and % of total respondents

DEMAND FOR RESOURCES, TOOLS, AND TEMPLATES
All of the proposed resources, tools and templates received broad support (at least 60% or more respondents said every tool should be included, with the exception of the ‘data subject request response protocol’).

The most popular tools and templates (Templates for an Information Sharing Protocol, a Data Sharing Agreement, a Data Sensitivity Classification, and a Risks, Harms, and Benefits Assessment) are arguably the most broadly applicable in different response contexts.
Resources to Inform the Operational Guidance

What existing resources do you believe should be used to inform the development of the Operational Guidance on Data Responsibility?

- Respondents shared a variety of resources, many of which were already included in the desk review conducted to inform the Operational Guidance.

- 12 of 85 suggested resources relate to national or regional privacy and data protection legislation.

- More than 50% (45 of 85) of the responses refer to guidelines and policies developed by humanitarian organizations.

- The sub-group will publish a resource list specific to data responsibility in humanitarian action later in the year.
Additional Feedback

What additional comments or recommendations should the Sub-Group consider in developing the Operational Guidance?
Comments and Recommendations

Please share any additional comments or recommendations you believe the Sub-Group should consider in developing the Operational Guidance on Data Responsibility.

- 65 respondents offered substantive comments and recommendations.

- Roughly 20% of these related to communicating with and/or including affected people in humanitarian data management.

- A number of respondents pointed to the need for clear guidance on how to navigate the variety of regulatory frameworks to which different organizations are subject.

- Many respondents noted the importance of multi-stakeholder approaches and collective action on data responsibility, and also noted that the Operational Guidance should complement other inter-agency initiatives already underway.

- Some respondents suggested including examples and recommended strategies for implementing the operational guidance in the final document.
Questions?

Contact:
Stuart Campo
Team Lead - Data Policy
OCHA Centre for Humanitarian Data
campo2@un.org