


## Netherlands, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)



SCORE:  
67.2

POSITION:  
23/50

2022  
GOOD

### OVERVIEW

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (also known as Minbuza) is the organisation responsible for Dutch bilateral development cooperation. The Netherlands-MFA was one of the founding members of IATI in 2008 and chaired the IATI Steering Committee between 2014 and 2016. It first published IATI data in September 2011. In April 2018, it became Chair of the IATI Governing Board.

Netherlands, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) 2012 (first published IATI data in September 2011. In April 2018, it became Chair of the IATI Governing Board.

2020  
GOOD

2018  
GOOD

2016  
GOOD

2015  
GOOD

2014  
FAIR

2013  
FAIR

Organisational planning  
and commitments  
10.7 / 15

Finance and budgets  
19 / 25

Project attributes  
10.7 / 20

Joining-up  
development data  
16.5 / 20

Performance  
10.4 / 20

### ANALYSIS

Netherlands-MFA remained in the 'good' category but dropped four points from 2020. Netherlands-MFA continued to publish to the IATI Registry on a monthly basis.

Netherlands-MFA's best performing component was joining-up development data, publishing data for most of the indicators. It did not disclose information on procurement, both tenders and contracts, in the IATI Standard. Netherlands-MFA always made tenders available in other formats. It did not consistently publish contracts. It dropped points on the networked data organisational reference test indicator as it only published recognised references for less than 20% of its participating organisations.

Netherlands-MFA scored well on all finance and budgets data, except project budget documents which failed our data quality checks. Budgets were either redacted or not broken down. There is also room for improvement for the disaggregated budgets indicator, as it only published two year forward-looking disaggregated budgets.

It achieved nearly full points for all organisational planning documentation, with the exception of organisation and country strategies. It did not disclose an up to date organisation strategy while many links for country strategies were broken.

Netherlands-MFA published all project attributes indicators to the IATI Registry. However, this component had the biggest drop in score by nearly eight points due to conditions, descriptions, and titles failing data quality checks. Titles and descriptions were either too brief or contained unexplained acronyms, while conditions did not contain a statement on why there were no project conditions attached to activities.

Netherlands-MFA received its worst score on the performance component but improved by over seven points from 2020. It started to publish objectives data to the IATI Registry for 61% of activities. However, it disclosed no IATI data for pre-project impact appraisals, results, and reviews and evaluations. All of these were found in other formats and scored accordingly.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

- Netherlands-MFA should improve the quality of basic information, such as project titles and descriptions. to ensure that they are fully legible and explain all acronyms in full.

- accountability to ensure that they are fully registered and explain all activities in detail.
- Netherlands-MFA should prioritise the publication of performance related data such as pre-project impact appraisals, results, and reviews and evaluations to the IATI Registry as these are already available in other formats.
- To improve its organisational planning and commitments score, it should ensure the timely and consistent publication of organisational strategies and make certain links to country strategies are working correctly.
- Netherlands-MFA should disclose project conditions where relevant or provide a clear statement on why no conditions are attached, if necessary.
- It can improve the publication of recognised organisation references for its partners using the latest guidance from the [IATI community](#) to help stakeholders identify who is implementing and/or participating in its projects.
- Netherlands-MFA should publish detailed project budgets to the IATI Registry and to its open aid data portal.
- It should start publishing searchable contract data to the IATI Registry along with tenders which are already available in other formats.

## DEEP DIVE

# Organisational planning and commitments

Score: 10.7 / 15

### ABOUT COMPONENT

This component looks at the overall aims and strategy of an organisation. We check for any public commitments to aid transparency. We also make sure audits are published and if planning documents have been published, including by parent organisations (including national governments) where applicable. We make note of any Freedom of Information laws and critically, we make sure that organisations have tried to make their information easy to access and understand. You should not have to be an expert in open data to be able to find and use this information.

#### Quality of FOI legislation

Score: 1.25




#### Accessibility

Score: 1.25



#### Organisation strategy

Score: 0



#### Annual report

Score: 1.87



#### Allocation policy

Score: 1.87




#### Procurement policy

Score: 1.87



#### Strategy (country/sector) or Memorandum of Understanding

Score: 0.67



#### Audit

Score: 1.87



# Finance and budgets

Score: 19 / 25

### ABOUT COMPONENT

This component is critical to allow you and anyone else to

#### Total organisation budget

Score: 3.24




#### Disaggregated budget

Score: 2.31



This component is critical to allow you and anyone else to follow the money. We expect to find the total budget of the organisation being assessed, right down to individual transactions for each development activity. In particular, forward-looking budgets from donors are important for partner country governments to be able to plan their own future finances.




## Project attributes

Score: 10.7 / 20

### ABOUT COMPONENT

This component refers to descriptive, non-financial data, including basics like the title and description of a project. Information like this is important as it is often the entry point for data users to quickly understand what a project is about. We also look for other information that helps to put a project in context, such as its sub-national location or the sector that the project deals with, for example, education or agriculture.



---

## Joining-up development data

Score: 16.5 / 20

### ABOUT COMPONENT

This component looks at how well an organisation's data is able to be linked and connected with other bits of information. There is a diverse nature of flows, activities and actors within the development sector. Aid and development finance data needs to be effectively linked and connected with the rest to provide a full picture for the user. This can be particularly important for partner country governments, which need to integrate information on aid with their own budgets and systems.

Flow type Score: 3



Aid type Score: 3



Finance type Score: 3



Tied aid status Score: 2.93




Networked Data - implementers Score: 3.33



Networked Data - organisation references Score: 0.77



Project procurement Score: 0.5



---

## Performance

Score: 10.4 / 20

### ABOUT COMPONENT

This component refers to the essential data and documents that assess whether a project is on track or has been achieved. This includes things like baseline surveys, progress against targets, mid-term reviews and end of project evaluations. This information is important to hold aid organisations to account and also to share knowledge with others on what worked and what did not during a project.

Objectives Score: 3.7



Pre-project impact appraisals Score: 2.5



Reviews and evaluations Score: 2.5



Results Score: 1.67

