

IDEHA SOUTH SUDAN PILOT FINDINGS WORKSHOP REPORT

Juba, South Sudan | 17 June 2026

The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout the publication do not imply expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IOM concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

IOM is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. As an intergovernmental organization, IOM acts with its partners in the international community to: assist in meeting the operational challenges of migration; advance understanding of migration issues; encourage social and economic development through migration; and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants.

Publisher: International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Regional Office for East Horn and Southern Africa
Sri Aurobindo Avenue, Off Mzima Spring Road
Lavington
Nairobi
Kenya

This publication was issued without formal editing by IOM. This publication was issued without IOM Publications Unit (PUB) approval for adherence to IOM's brand and style standards. This publication was issued without IOM Research Unit (RES) endorsement.

Cover photo: Caption. © IOM 2026/Brian MC DONALD

Required citation: International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2026. Interoperable Data Ecosystems for Humanitarian Assistance: Workshop 2 Report. IOM, Juba.

© IOM 2026



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 IGO License (CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 IGO).

This publication should not be used, published or redistributed for purposes primarily intended for or directed towards commercial advantage or monetary compensation, with the exception of educational purposes, e.g. to be included in textbooks.

Permissions: Requests for commercial use or further rights and licensing should be submitted to publications@iom.int.

IDEHA South Sudan Pilot Findings Workshop Report

Juba, South Sudan | 17 June 2026

IOM

30 June 2026

CONTENTS

Acronyms and Abbreviations	4
Acknowledgements	5
1 Introduction	6
1.1 Background / Context	6
1.2 Rationale	6
1.3 Workshop Objectives	6
2 Methodology	7
2.1 Workshop Format	7
2.2 Facilitation Approach	7
2.3 Data Collection / Reflection Methods	7
3 Participants	8
3.1 Participant Profile	8
3.2 Organizations Represented	8
4 Workshop Proceedings	9
4.1 Opening and Project Overview (Part 1)	9
4.2 Response-Level Single Registration Form (Part 2)	10
4.3 Group Discussion: Interoperability Next Steps (Part 3)	11
4.4 Closing	12
5 Key Findings	13
5.1 What Worked Well	13
5.2 What Did Not Work Well	13
5.3 Challenges	13
5.4 Good Practices	13
5.5 Thematic Findings - Response-Level SRF	13
6 Lessons Learned	14
7 Recommendations and Next Steps	15
7.1 Immediate Actions	15
7.2 Medium-Term Actions	15
7.3 Roles, Responsibilities, and Timeline	15
7.4 Roadmap / Action Plan	15
8 Conclusion	16
Annexes	17
Annex 1: Workshop Agenda	17
Annex 2: Participant List	18
Annex 3: Presentation slides	19

Date	Wednesday, 17 June 2026
Time	09:00 – 14:00 CAT
Venue	Dembesh Hotel, Juba, South Sudan
Organizer	International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Co-funding	ECHO
Report author	Brian Mc Donald, IDEHA Project Manager
Report status	Draft - v1

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Acronym	Meaning
CC	Cash Consortium
CWG	Cash Working Group
DPIA	Data Protection Impact Assessment
DSA	Data Sharing Agreement
DTM	Displacement Tracking Matrix
ECHO	European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations
ERRM	Emergency Rapid Response Mechanism
HC/HCT	Humanitarian Coordinator / Humanitarian Country Team
AAP	Accountability to Affected Populations
HHID	Household Identifier
HoH	Head of Household
IDEHA	Interoperable Data Ecosystems for Humanitarian Assistance
IOM	International Organization for Migration
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
SRF	Single Registration Form

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

IOM thanks the humanitarian partners, coordination structures, and donor representatives who participated in the workshop and contributed their operational experience and technical feedback. Particular thanks go to the partners of the registration pilot, including ERRM and Cash Consortium members, whose engagement throughout the IDEHA project made the results presented at this workshop possible. Thanks are also due to Kumudu Sanjeewa (UN OCHA) for delivering the opening remarks. The IDEHA project is co-funded by European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) and IOM.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

The humanitarian response in South Sudan continues to require greater efficiency, stronger coordination and more coherent approaches to beneficiary data management. Repeat registration of the same households by multiple organizations, limited deduplication and data-sharing processes, and varied data standards impose costs on both responders and affected people.

In this context, the IDEHA initiative - implemented by IOM and co-funded by ECHO - has supported efforts to improve interoperability, strengthen common standards, and promote responsible data-sharing practices among humanitarian partners. In South Sudan, the project advanced along with the following: a mapping of registration practices and a data-sharing framework, a registration pilot with ERRM and Cash Consortium partners and, at response level, the development of a Single Registration Form (SRF).

1.2 RATIONALE

Workshop 1 in November 2025 established consensus among partners around the interoperability challenges and the path forward. With the project's end date of 30 June 2026 approaching, Workshop 2 was convened to move from consensus to consolidation: to review what the project delivered, validate lessons learned from the pilot, present the joint documentation developed under the initiative (DPIA, DSA, and SRF), and agree the action points partners will carry forward beyond the project period. The workshop also served as the platform to present the response-level SRF for review.

1.3 WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

The workshop aimed to:

1. Present the main work-streams, achievements, and outcomes of the IDEHA project in South Sudan;
2. Reflect on lessons learned from the registration pilot implementation;
3. Present and discuss key joint documentation developed under the initiative, including the DPIA, the Data Sharing Agreement, and the SRF;
4. Examine operational approaches, practical set-ups, and good practices that can support improved beneficiary data management;
5. Discuss the response-level SRF, including key considerations for its future use and alignment across partners;
6. Agree on priority action points and next steps to sustain progress beyond the project period.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 WORKSHOP FORMAT

The workshop was a half-day, in-person event structured in three parts: (1) a project overview and lessons learned from the registration pilot; (2) a technical session on the response-level SRF; and (3) group work on interoperability next steps, concluding with plenary feedback and closing remarks.

2.2 FACILITATION APPROACH

Sessions combined short presentations with facilitated discussion. The SRF session was run as a structured consultation around five pre-framed discussion points, with the draft response-level SRF published in advance as a public Request for Comment at interoperabledata.xyz/SRF. The final session used small-group work to draft action points, which were consolidated in plenary.

2.3 DATA COLLECTION / REFLECTION METHODS

Partner inputs were captured in real time during group discussions and transcribed onto the workshop slides; the SRF Request for Comment page remains open for continued written input after the workshop. Attendance was recorded on a signed participant sheet(see Annex 2).

3 PARTICIPANTS

3.1 PARTICIPANT PROFILE

The workshop brought together operational and technical focal points engaged in beneficiary data collection, registration, data management, coordination, and protection-related work in South Sudan. Ninety-two individuals from more than 30 organizations were invited for the workshop; per the signed attendance sheet, 20 participants attended. The attendance list, is at Annex 2.

3.2 ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED

Organizations present (signed attendance):

- **UN agencies and international organizations:** IOM, UN OCHA
- **International NGOs:** ACTED, Concern Worldwide, International Rescue Committee (IRC), Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), Save the Children, DRC
- **National NGOs and other partners:** CSD, Nile Hope, AAP TWG
- **Other:** Red Rose

Attendance thus included ERRM partners (NRC) and the Cash Consortium chair (Save the Children), alongside coordination (UN OCHA) and national partners.

4 WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS

4.1 OPENING AND PROJECT OVERVIEW (PART 1)

Following registration, opening remarks were delivered by Kumudu Sanjeewa (UN OCHA), introducing the workshop objectives and situating the event as the closing in-country milestone of the IDEHA project.



Figure 1. Opening remarks by Kumudu Sanjeewa from OCHA

The project overview retraced the journey of IDEHA in South Sudan along its two parallel tracks - the mapping of registration practices and the data-sharing framework - through the partner workshop, the registration pilot (which produced the pilot SRF, DPIA, and DSA), and the response-level SRF. The session presented five lessons learned from implementation (see Section 6) and closed with a group discussion inviting partners to add lessons from their own experience of the pilot.



Figure 2. Project Journey slide

4.2 RESPONSE-LEVEL SINGLE REGISTRATION FORM (PART 2)

The second session presented the proposed response-level SRF, published as a Request for Comment at interoperabledata.xyz/SRF, and worked through the following five discussion points with partners:

1. Are the seven categories a useful way to organize and communicate registration data? Should additional categories be introduced (e.g. a separate Assistance category distinct from Individual survey, or a Location category distinct from Biographic)?
2. The pilot draft is two-tier (Core / Optional). Should an intermediate Recommended tier be added, or does the two-tier split remain the simplest workable basis for agreement?
3. Which fields marked as Optional should be Core and Core fields that should be optional.
4. Which fields are missing that should be included and what fields could be removed?
5. Should the SRF require all-member registration as the default, with head-of-household-only allowed by exception? Or should the choice be left to the context and location?

Structure and categories. This refers to the logical grouping of the different types of data fields collected or generated during registration and associated workflows

Feedback: The seven-category structure was broadly workable, but partners asked for fuller explanation under each category (e.g. referral case data), clearer field descriptions, and clarification of metadata fields such as HHID and InvID.

Tiering. This is the proposed choice of classifying registration data fields as either Core or Optional.

Partners saw a potential need for intermediate Recommended tier alongside Core and Optional, or a possible sectoral tagging or similar that could be used to associate fields with defined use cases. The trade-offs were acknowledged: added complexity, sector-tagging raises the question of who determines and supports the tags, and whether an organization collects only its own sector's data - in which case other sectors must revisit the household anyway - or collects for all, with records in any case needing updating over time.

Core vs. Optional fields. Partners proposed separating the obligation to collect a field from the requirement to share it. GPS location (M6) should move to Core, with caveats for paper-based collection. HHID (M7)

should remain Core, but a common methodology for generating and implementing a shared HHID across organizations needs to be defined.

On this page

1 Executive Summary

2 Introduction

3 Review of different sources

4 Overlaps in Data Points

5 Categorization of Data Points

6 Core & Optional

7 Single Registration Form

8 Methodological Guidance

9 Annex 1: Glossary

Other Formats

PDF

MS Word

Other Links

SRF (printable)

SRF (xlsform)

Draft Single Registration Form — data fields

All 46 fields proposed for the Single Registration Form, grouped by category

Field ID	Field label	Record level	Core / Optional	Sources
Consent				
C1	Informed consent to collect, use, share, and refer case data	—	Core	Inter-agency + Cash Consortium + IOM
Metadata				
M1	Project / assistance programme / referring organisation	—	Core	Cash Consortium + ERRM + Inter-agency metadata
M2	Registration / data collection date	—	Core	IOM + ERRM + Cash Consortium + Inter-agency
M3	Enumerator / registrar name or ID	—	Core	IOM + Cash Consortium
M4	Referral source	—	Optional	Cash Consortium
M5	Verification status / verification code	—	Optional	IOM + Cash Consortium
M6	GPS coordinates of registration location	—	Optional	Somalia SRF
M7	Household ID (organization specific)	—	Core	Inter-agency + IOM + Cash Consortium + ERRM
M8	Individual ID (organization specific)	—	Optional	None
Biographic				
B1	Admin 1 (State)	Household	Core	Cash Consortium + ERRM + IOM
B2	Admin 2 (County)	Household	Core	Cash Consortium + ERRM + IOM
B3	Admin 3 (Payam)	Household	Core	Cash Consortium + ERRM + IOM
B4	Admin 4 (Boma) / village / block / site	Household	Core	Cash Consortium + IOM + ERRM
B5	Place of origin / initial displacement location	Household	Optional	IOM + ERRM
B6	Humanitarian profile / displacement status	Household	Core	Inter-agency + IOM + Cash Consortium + ERRM
B7	Primary recipient / head of household full name	Individual	Core	Inter-agency + Cash Consortium + IOM + ERRM

Figure 3. Single Registration Form core and optional fields

Data fields. Participants suggested adding of an additional Organization ID and the moving of GPS coordinates to be a core field.

Registration level. This refers to the discussion on the level in which registration is done, whether registration is enforced at the individual level for every household member, or whether collecting head-of-household details (with aggregate household attributes) is sufficient.

- Option A — Head of household only. Only the primary recipient (and optionally an alternate collector) is registered as an individual. Other household members are represented through aggregate fields: household size, sex-age cohort, disability screen.
- Option B — All household members. A full member roster is captured, with name, sex, date of birth and relationship for each person.

On registration scope, head-of-household-only registration was considered adequate for blanket distributions, while individual-level registration is needed where a high degree of targeting is required; cost-effectiveness is a key concern in choosing between them.

4.3 GROUP DISCUSSION: INTEROPERABILITY NEXT STEPS (PART 3)

In the final session, participants worked in plenary to define the action points needed to sustain interoperability efforts beyond the project period. The consolidated action points are presented in Section 7.

4.4 CLOSING

The closing remarks reaffirmed partners' shared commitment to standardization, interoperability, and common frameworks for humanitarian assistance in South Sudan. On the response-level SRF, participants agreed to take the matter forward at the IDEHA Regional Workshop in Nairobi (24 June 2026) and to submit a request for endorsement to the HC/HCT.

5 KEY FINDINGS

5.1 WHAT WORKED WELL

- **Form alignment is achievable.** The pilot demonstrated that partners can align registration forms, at least within a small group, producing a jointly agreed SRF. This builds upon harmonization practices already undertaken by consortium members and experience with previous interoperability initiatives.
- **Joint documentation was delivered.** The pilot produced a working set of shared tools - the SRF, DPIA, and DSA - that partners can reuse and that provide a foundation for future interoperability efforts.
- **Open consultation generated substantive technical input.** The Request for Comment format for the response-level SRF drew detailed, actionable partner feedback on structure, tiering, and field definitions.

5.2 WHAT DID NOT WORK WELL

- **Data sharing agreements remained the slowest-moving part of the process**, constraining the pace of every downstream activity that depended on them.
- **Low availability of key data fields in South Sudan context** - phone numbers, ID numbers - limited the feasibility of field-based deduplication, while the absence of photos limited the ability to adjudicate potential matches.

5.3 CHALLENGES

- The longer aligned form increases collection time, requiring implementing teams to adapt operational planning.
- Coordinating data sharing for reuse, deduplication, targeting, or referral required continuous coordination and monitoring rather than one-off meeting.
- A common HHID across organizations has no agreed generation methodology yet, an issue linked to the limitations of reliance on data-field-based deduplication in a data-field-quality constrained environment.
- Key partners were not yet part of the pilot group, while there is consensus that high level engagement from a broad base is required to tackle the collective challenge.

5.4 GOOD PRACTICES

- Capture fingerprints and photos where possible, and record any available identifiers (national, civil, or organizational IDs such as SCOPE) to strengthen deduplication.
- Match the registration approach to the use case: head-of-household registration for blanket distributions; all-member/individual-level registration where precise targeting is required.
- Separate what must be collected from what must be shared, so data protection constraints do not block form alignment.
- Keep consultation channels open (the SRF Request for Comment page) so technical alignment continues beyond workshop settings.

5.5 THEMATIC FINDINGS - RESPONSE-LEVEL SRF

The SRF consultation (Section 4.2) surfaced three structural decisions requiring follow-up: whether to introduce a Recommended tier and/or sector tags; how to define a common HHID methodology; and whether all-member registration should be the default with head-of-household-only by exception, or left to context. Partners also asked for richer documentation of categories and field definitions before wider rollout.

6 LESSONS LEARNED

Five lessons from the registration pilot were presented and validated with partners:

1. **Data sharing agreements** are still the slowest-moving part of the process.
2. **Form alignment** is possible, at least among a small group.
3. The increased **form length** requires implementing teams to adapt their planning.
4. Low availability of key data fields (phone numbers, ID numbers) in the context of South Sudan show the **limits of field-based deduplication**, while the lack of photos limits the ability to **adjudicate** matches.
5. Coordinating data sharing for data reuse, deduplication, targeting, or referral requires **continuous coordination and monitoring**.

7 RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

The following action points were agreed in group work and plenary.

7.1 IMMEDIATE ACTIONS

- Take the endorsement of the response-level SRF forward at the IDEHA Regional Workshop in Nairobi (24 June 2026) and submit a request for endorsement to the HC/HCT.
- Keep the SRF Request for Comment page open and continue collecting partner inputs.
- Request the rollout of the response-level SRF as a first step, and advocate for the support needed to take it forward.
- Finalise the DSA for the pilot, as a reusable reference for future initiatives.
- Bring in the key partners currently missing from the process.

7.2 MEDIUM-TERM ACTIONS

- Advocate for more global-level data sharing agreements to reduce repeated country-level negotiation.
- Secure endorsement of a longer-term vision for interoperability in South Sudan.
- Hold earlier dialogues with affected communities on the impacts and potential impacts of this work, and provide information to them.
- Explore government engagement and support.

7.3 ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND TIMELINE

Owners and target dates were not formally assigned to individual action points during the workshop. IOM stewards the SRF Request for Comment and DSA finalisation through project close (30 June 2026); partner-facing and endorsement actions rest with the coordination structures and the HC/HCT respectively. IOM's DTM team will continue following up on the action points beyond project closure.

7.4 ROADMAP / ACTION PLAN

The agreed first step on the roadmap is the endorsement request for the response-level SRF, carried forward through the IDEHA Regional Workshop in Nairobi (24 June 2026) to the HC/HCT. The remaining action points in Sections 7.1 and 7.2 form the continuity agenda for partners and coordination structures beyond the project period.

8 CONCLUSION

Workshop 2 closed the IDEHA project's in-country consultation cycle in South Sudan by consolidating what the project demonstrated: that form alignment among partners is achievable; that joint instruments - the SRF, DPIA, and DSA - can be produced and reused; and that the binding constraints on interoperability are less technical than institutional, above all the pace of data sharing agreements and the coordination effort that sustained data exchange requires. Partners agreed a concrete set of action points to carry this work beyond the project period, centred on rolling out the response-level SRF, strengthening the data sharing governance, widening the partnership, and engaging communities and government. The workshop reaffirmed a shared commitment to standardization, interoperability, and common frameworks for a more effective and coordinated humanitarian response in South Sudan.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: WORKSHOP AGENDA

Time	Session
09:00 – 09:30	Registration and arrival
09:30 – 09:45	Opening remarks and workshop objectives
09:45 – 10:50	Project overview and findings (with group discussion)
10:50 – 11:05	Coffee break
11:05 – 12:00	Response-level Single Registration Form (with group exercise)
12:00 – 12:45	Group work: interoperability next steps
12:45 – 13:15	Group feedback and plenary discussion
13:15 – 13:30	Closing remarks
13:30 onwards	Lunch

ANNEX 2: PARTICIPANT LIST

Transcribed from the signed attendance sheet. Contact details are held on the original sheet and are omitted here.

Table A - Attended (signed), 20 participants

#	Name	Organization
1	Kumudu Sanjeewa Warapitiya Acharige	UN OCHA
2	Hilaire Daniel	IOM
3	Jerry Delill Manas Gadi	IOM
4	Ladu Ropani Joice Sebit	IOM
5	Loku Opoka Thomas Okot	IOM
6	Mbogani Benson	IOM
7	Mc Donald Brian	IOM
8	Nabre Loyce	IOM
9	Stephen Oguwa	NRC
10	Muhammad Usman Ayub	Concern Worldwide
11	Khor Kueth	Concern Worldwide
12	Victor Geri	Concern Worldwide
13	Robert Dollar	ACTED
14	Allan Thamutho Stephen	Nile Hope
15	Thomas Benjamin	CSD
16	Pason Charles George	IRC
17	Herbert Leni.	Red Rose
18	Hannah Bolder	AAP TWG
19	Abubakar Tayib Alkali	DRC
20	Bernard Adero	IOM

ANNEX 3: PRESENTATION SLIDES

Interoperable Data Ecosystems for Humanitarian Assistance
(IDEHA)

Interoperability of registration & beneficiary management systems

Workshop 2

Dembesh Hotel | Juba, South Sudan | 17 June 2026



AGENDA

- 09:00 – 09:30 | Registration & Arrival
- 09:30 – 09:45 | Opening Remarks and Workshop Objectives
- 09:45 – 10:50 | Project Overview & Findings (with group discussion)
- 10:50 – 11:05 | Coffee break
- 11:05 – 12:00 | Response-Level Single Registration Form (with group exercise)
- 12:00 – 12:45 | Groupwork: Interoperability next steps
- 12:45 – 13:15 | Group feedback & plenary discussion
- 13:15 – 13:30 | Closing remarks

OBJECTIVES

- Present the main workstreams, achievements, and outcomes of the IDEHA project
- Reflect on lessons learned from the registration pilot;
- Present and discuss key joint documentation developed under the initiative, including the Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA), the Data Sharing Agreement, and the Single Registration Form (SRF);
- Examine operational approaches, practical set-ups, and good practices that can support improved beneficiary data management;
- Discuss the response-level SRF, including key considerations for its future use;
- Agree on priority action points and next steps to sustain progress beyond the project period.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES

- A shared **understanding** of the IDEHA project’s achievements, lessons learned, and remaining gaps;
- Increased **familiarity** with the core tools and documentation developed under the initiative;
- A clearer view of operational options and good practices for beneficiary data management in South Sudan;
- Shared **reflections** on the response-level SRF and the issues requiring further technical and operational alignment;
- An agreed set of **action points** to guide next steps and inform future interoperability efforts.

Part 1 – Project Overview/Recap

Journey of the project

IDEHA - South Sudan



LESSONS LEARNED

Lesson #1

Data sharing agreements are still the slowest moving part of the process

Lesson #2

Form alignment is possible, at least among a small group

Lesson #3

That said, the increased form length requires IOM teams to adapt their planning

Lesson #4

Low availability of key data fields such as phone numbers or ID numbers limit feasibility of data-field based deduplication, while lack of photos limit our ability to adjudicate

Lesson #5

Coordinating data sharing for the purposes of data reuse, deduplication, targeting or referral required continuous coordination and monitoring

GROUP DISCUSSION

What other lessons were learned through the pilot?

COFFEE BREAK

Part 2 – Response-level Single Registration Form

Proposed Response-level Single Registration Form Request for Comment

<https://interoperabledata.xyz/SRF>



DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Are the seven categories a useful way to organize and communicate registration data? Should additional categories be introduced (e.g. a separate Assistance category distinct from Individual survey, or a Location category distinct from Biographic)?
2. The pilot draft is two-tier (Core / Optional). Should an intermediate Recommended tier be added, or does the two-tier split remain the simplest workable basis for agreement?
3. What fields marked as Optional should be Core and Core fields that should be optional.
4. What fields are missing that should to be included and what fields could be removed?
5. Should the SRF require all-member registration as the default, with head-of-household-only allowed by exception? Or should the choice be left to the context and location?

Are the seven categories a useful way to organize and communicate registration data? Should additional categories be introduced (e.g. a separate Assistance category distinct from Individual survey, or a Location category distinct from Biographic)?

- Need more explanation under each categories. (eg. Explain referral case data)
- Field descriptions
- What is meant by HHID and InVID under metadata.
- Org ID needs to be added

The pilot draft is two-tier (Core / Optional). Should an intermediate Recommended tier be added, or does the two-tier split remain the simplest workable basis for agreement?

- Needs recommended category
 - Enumerator ID recommended
- Suggest tag by sector
 - Consequences – may need to recollect data for additional sectors/purposes
 - Who determines, supports it?
 - Do you only collect your sector data or also other sectoral (Cash).
- Question missing – in-camp or out of camp
- Question of do you collect all info or just your sector, meaning other sectors will have to visit anyway.
- Records will need to be update over time anyway

What fields marked as Optional should be Core and Core fields that should be optional. What fields are missing that should be included and what fields could be removed?

- Separating core collection from sharing requirement
- M6 GPS -> core (with caveats for paper collection)
- M7 HHID, remain core. If needs to be used with other entities. Need methodology for common HHID. Need to define how. How to implement. How common HHID generated?

Should the SRF require all-member registration as the default, with head-of-household-only allowed by exception? Or should the choice be left to the context and location?

- Fingerprint and photo taken where possible
- ID where available – Nat ID, Civil ID, Org ID like SCOPE etc.
- Offline – Spot check to ID duplicates
- Spot check requires a lot of information. Challenge with names.
- Challenge – conflict of interest.
- Deduplication requires capacity building.
- Data quality
- HoH only for blanket distributions
- Where high degree of targeting required, need ind-level
- Cost effectiveness a key concern
- Matching names need to refer to community leaders
- Need support when there is conflict of interest

Action points/asks

- Keep the SRF page open, keep adding inputs
- Ask for rollout of response-level SRF (first step)
 - Advocate for support
 - Figure out how to bring it forward
- Need to improve/create a Data Sharing Framework (improve current process)
- Finalize DPIA for pilot, potentially useful for future.
- Bring in the missing key partners
- Advocate for more global-level data sharing agreement
- Address concerns about control and biometrics.
- Get endorsement for a longer-term vision
- Need for more early dialogues with the communities on the impacts of this work. And provision of information.
- Government engagement and support

Part 3 – Interoperability next steps

FEEDBACK

IDEHA Workshop 2

