Principles for improving the IATI results standard

Aim: This document suggests programmatic principles to drive changes to the IATI results standard so that it can be used to **promote wider learning and facilitate greater accountability and legitimacy**.

# Section 1: Background

In March 2015 Bond produced a paper “Publishing results to IATI”[[1]](#footnote-1) that details 7 tests that the IATI results standard must pass in order to **“promote wider learning and facilitate greater accountability and legitimacy”**. Wider learning could include, for example, looking at results across a range of similar interventions to understand what tends to work and what doesn’t under various circumstances. Accountability uses could include making results data available to citizens to verify whether results claimed by aid providers are visible on the ground, or to help determine which aid providers make the best use of funds received.”

This document, builds on the Bond paper by developing the relevant tests into 8 principles that the IATI results standard should implement in order to promote wider learning, greater accountability and legitimacy. It specifically addresses the needs identified by a UK focused CSOs consultation on the 22nd February 2017 (see section 3), and all quotes throughout the document refer to the Bond paper unless otherwise stated.

This document **does not consider the technical specifications required** to implement these principles (see <http://discuss.iatistandard.org/t/results-discussion-space-and-tag-2016-17-path/502/> for the required technical specifications). Nor does the document assume that simply improving the results standard will be sufficient for wide adoption of the reporting of results by organisations, but it does assume these improvements are a necessary to permit organisations to accurately represent their work and improve transparency.

# Section 2: What’s in the current IATI results standard?

The results standard currently allows you to report output, outcome and impact results using indicators as typically found in Logical Frameworks (LogFrames) and Theories of Change, as shown in Figure 1 (see Appendix 1 for definitions). Each indicator may have quantitative baseline (to a certain extent – see Principle 7), target and actual values for specific periods, and each value can be disaggregated - for example by gender, age etc. (to a certain extent – see Principle 4). It also allows you to specify whether the indicator is from a standardised list (see list of standardised lists in Appendix 2). Finally, you may also write free-form text to describe what each result, indicator and specific target or actual value means.

Figure 1: Current IATI Results standard.

# Section 3: CSO consultation process

This document was finalised through a workshop on the 22nd February 2017 comprising 14 UK CSOs and 2 Dutch CSOs. The group was formed through advertising with the Bond: IATI and Transparency, MEL and DFID IATI requirements working groups, as well as through Partos (a Dutch equivalent of Bond). Workshop date was selected based on highest availability. The workshop dissected a previously circulated draft version of the document by discussing each principle in detail in groups and through delegates providing both group and individual feedback. At the end of the workshop each delegate was asked whether they would endorse each principle and if so to rank each principle with relative priority. The overall results of these ranking are presented in Figure 2 and breakdowns are included for each principle in the following sections. The most pressing issues identified from the group discussions (per voting – see Appendix 3), as well individual feedback (see Appendix 4), were used to create this final document, including the addition of Principle 8.

Figure 2: Plot showing mean rank priority from endorsing participants for each principle (min score = 1, max score = 8); bars show one standard error either side of the mean. The priority score for Principle 8 is statistically significantly higher than the other seven principles (as indicated by non-overlapping error bars), revealing that this principle was the most pressing issue for the consultation group. The remaining principles all had a similar degree of priority (ranked between 4.0 and 4.9), showing that they are all important and that none were statistically significantly less important than any of the others.

# Section 4: Suggested programmatic principles

In the following we introduce 8 programmatic principles that should be used to drive changes to the IATI results standard. We first highlight an issue with the current standard, detail why this issue is a problem, then make suggestions to overcome the issue. To summarise these suggestions, the IATI results standard should do the following without the current technical workarounds:

1. **allow us to represent the full range of our initiatives**

*(e.g. to allow qualitative results not just quantitative)*

1. **allow us to explain how and why results were or were not achieved**

*(e.g. so that we have space to provide reasoning)*

1. **allow us to explain the quality of our indicators**

*(e.g. to recognise variability in our indicators)*

1. **allow us to disaggregate indicators**

*(e.g. to help ensure we “leave no one behind”)*

1. **allow us to report revisions to results**

*(e.g. to reflect an adaptive management approach)*

1. **allow us to recognise our partner’s contributions**

*(e.g. to overcome the practicalities that not all partners have capacity to publish)*

1. **be consistent**

*(e.g to allow baselines to be reported in the same way as targets and actuals)*

1. **allow us to state the scope and limitations of our IATI data**

*(e.g. to clarify what our IATI data should and should not be used for)*

#  The full range of aid-related interventions must be representable by the IATI results standard[[2]](#footnote-2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number organisations endorsed | Relative priority of principle |
| 16/16 | **78/128** |

**Issue:** Currently, only quantitative indicators (units or percentages) may be represented using the IATI standard.

**Why is this a problem?**

“There are many interventions in international development where quantitative measures are not relevant or meaningful, for example in relation to much policy-influencing work, and in some forms of capacity-development and empowerment interventions. These are common areas of work for civil society organisations. If there is not scope to report such results, at best CSOs will try to play the game and produce “sausage numbers” (taste nice, but you’d be horrified if you looked into what went into making them), and at worst it incentivises organisations to do more of the measurable work and less of the hard-to-measure work, even if the latter is vital… [T]he focus on these types of results can be reductive, and has been criticised from a number of quarters ranging from the UK’s Independent Commission for Aid Impact[[3]](#footnote-3) to the “Big Push Forward” initiative[[4]](#footnote-4).”

**Suggestions**

While some quantitative indicators can provide direct sources of learning (for example: percentage of patients that responded positively to drug X) they cannot reflect the qualitative context that is often necessary for learning and accountability. We suggest that attempting to codify the complexity and shear diversity in projects and their latent learning opportunities could over complicate the results standard and would fail to represent our work. Instead results should be enhanced to allow an optional link(s) to relevant documents/data files (and parts thereof) in addition to the existing narrative to provide the rich context and sustainability considerations that are often required. The specification of values should also be amended to draw a distinction between a 0 versus no data collection. However, even with these suggestions it should be recognised that it is often impossible to record and represent the full range of our activities and resulting impact. We suggest these limitations are clearly documented and included in the standard (see Principle 8).

# The standard should allow us to report how and why IATI results were or were not achieved[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number organisations endorsed | Relative priority of principle |
| 16/16 | **74/128** |

**Issue:** Currently, you can only describe what each result and associated indicators concern, not how and why results were or were not achieved.

**Why is this a problem?**

“Data on results cannot be used for learning or accountability without context. Just because an intervention achieved its targeted results, does not mean it will work elsewhere. There may be factors relating to the geographical area (fragile or conflict-affected, stable, undergoing a natural disaster), or the population (targeting particularly marginalised groups or more mainstream populations) and intervention modalities (direct service delivery by CSOs or government, citizen empowerment, advocacy to local government) that have a massive bearing on why particular results were achieved. Similarly, there may be valuable learning about unintended outcomes or learning from failure about why something didn’t work which is of value for learning purposes and not captured in traditional results metrics.”

**Suggestions**

Following the same logic as Principle 1, an optional additional narrative and link(s) to relevant documents (and parts thereof) should be added to results and indicators (for example to allow linking to context analysis that could include: any conflicts/ fragility, scope of influence, scale/ stage of initiative, external pressures/ trends etc.). These additions would be used to detail how and why the result or indicator has been achieved or not, any unanticipated results, and whether this has had a positive or negative affect on the overall project (in the same way that you can comment on target and actual values, but not currently on overall results and indicators).

#  Make the quality of evidence behind IATI results data transparent[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number organisations endorsed | Relative priority of principle |
| 13/16 | **53/104** |

**Issue:** At the moment there is no way to tell the provenance in which an IATI results indicator has been designed just from looking at IATI data, for example the: information source, intended accuracy, purpose or methodology that is used to produce the data.

**Why is this a problem?**

In the absence of indicator provenance, both results producers and consumers have often unnecessarily assumed that IATI results must be of absolute quality. While absolute quality is ideal for simple reporting and analysis, in practice, generating these results can be so technically and financially demanding that it would undermine the purpose of the initiative and provide poor value for money. “At the level of outcomes and impacts … [there are also] very active debates in academic circles about the best ways to generate reliable information about the contribution of interventions to observed results.” Further, “one of the main reasons given to Bond for NGOs not currently publishing results information is that they are concerned that the quality of their evidence – particularly about outcomes and impacts – is not good enough. …

Using evidence that’s quality is unknown is risky and potentially harmful. If the quality of results information published to IATI is perceived as poor or just uncertain, it will not enhance learning or accountability.”

**Suggestions**

In practice, we design results to serve the specific purpose they are intended for. For example: results from a clinical research trial that are to be used to inform subsequent activities are design to be of much higher quality than that of an advocacy activity using proxy data to roughly determine effect on communities.

A small fraction of results can be represented using standardised indicators. These indicators can be incredibly valuable as they permit a common language to understand projects, provide a means to aggregate data and demonstrate progress towards common goals such as the SDGs. While some standardised indicators can be linked to in the existing IATI results standard there are a number omitted (see Appendix 2 for suggested additions, notably the SDG indicators). There should also be an optional means to describe the provenance of the indicators within these standardised lists as this is not always apparent from the links used in the IATI results standard (although it is understood that IATI should not be expected to maintain this information).

The vast majority results are not amenable to standardised indicators. For example, they may be designed for a specific purpose only applicable for the project they are concerning. There must therefore be an optional means to describe the provenance of these non-standardised indicators in addition to the standardised indicators discussed above. The exact fields should be the subject of further consultation, but the following are suggested as a starting point[[7]](#footnote-7):

* **Purpose:** narrative describing the purpose for the indicator (as already included in the IATI results standard within the indicator description – see Section 2)
* **Method:** methodology followed to create the information, including any standard approaches (e.g. statistical methods, or “Bond Evidence Principles[[8]](#footnote-8), OECD DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation[[9]](#footnote-9) or DFID’s How to Note: Assessing the Strength of Evidence[[10]](#footnote-10)”)
* **Sources:** Who/what will provide the data
* **Limitations:** What the known and potential limitations for producing the information
* **Assessments:** How any estimates are generated, what data quality assessments / audits / evaluations are conducted and whether these are performed by the organisation or externally (e.g. how frequent, what process)
* **Audience:** Are the results only intended to be relevant to a project? To support qualitative results? For internal performance monitoring? For the Sector?
* **Confidence rating:** level of confidence in the values, choosing from an option of:
	+ Low confidence – rough figures to give ball-park estimates only
	+ Medium confidence – partially verified to within an order of magnitude
	+ High confidence – rigorously created numbers with strong evidence to back claims

#  The standard should allow IATI results to be disaggregated by issues of interest[[11]](#footnote-11)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number organisations endorsed | Relative priority of principle |
| 16/16 | **69/128** |

**Issue:** Currently, you cannot specify disaggregations for a specific indicator, other than by a technical workaround[[12]](#footnote-12) (see suggestions below).

**Why is this a problem?**

“It is recognised widely that results presented as averages for entire populations will usually mask differences within that population group, for example, by gender, wealth, disability, ethnicity, etc. The new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in particular have put this issue higher on the agenda, under the heading of “Leave no one behind”. In order to ensure equity and the inclusion of marginalised groups, it is vital that disaggregated data is collected (and many aid providers are increasingly requiring disaggregation by a number of dimensions[[13]](#footnote-13)). For IATI data to be useful, it in turn must enable the publication of disaggregated results data.”

**Suggestions**

The current practice of specifying two near identical indicators (or periods of time within indicators) for the same result leads to confusion as there is no sure way to know which values should be considered as disaggregations versus those that belong to separate indicators. It also causes duplicate information for the rest of the indicator, adding an unnecessary source of potential error and reporting burden. Instead multiple target and actual values should be permitted for a given period of an indicator, for each disaggregation.

#  IATI results should be able to change over time[[14]](#footnote-14)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number organisations endorsed | Relative priority of principle |
| 16/16 | **71/128** |

**Issue:** Currently you can only publish one set of results in IATI (for example, the most up-to-date figures, or the results that were agreed by donors, or by partners, at one point in time).

**Why is this a problem?**

“Flexibility in international development programming is a virtue. The situation can change, organisations can learn from feedback and monitoring about what is working and what is not, and they should adapt their activities and targets in response to that within the project lifetime. Adaptive management approaches are increasingly recognised as important for dealing with complexity.”

**Suggestions**

There are a number of ways in which the standard could be made more flexible to change, for example allowing different versions to exist with clear explanations for the changes and a means to identify which set(s) are current and how they relate. However, a careful trade-off must be considered between permitting flexibility at the cost of complexity. With this in mind, the following are the most important optional areas of flexibility that must be supported:

* Additional results should be allowed to be added and results deprecated (with date for each)
* An Indicator’s design (see Principle 3) should be able to change with history preserved as well as ability to comment on the change
* Target values should be able to change with history preserved as well as ability to comment on the change

These suggestions could be captured by allowing a change log narrative at the results level or by making specific additions that relate to each of the bullets in turn (and to a certain extent could be supported by provisions in Principle 2). With the changing nature of IATI results we suggest it would also be more appropriate to rename the “results” standard the “plans” standard.

# We must be able to recognise our partner’s contributions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number organisations endorsed | Relative priority of principle |
| 16/16 | **63/128** |

**Issue:** Currently attribution is only possible for entire projects, not individual results or indicators.

**Why is this a problem?**

An increasingly large proportion of our projects involve working in partnerships, be it from working with community groups, governments, other NGOs, the private sector, academia, our funders etc. This presents a practical tension for reporting IATI as the standard requires a single reporting organisation that is responsible for representing each project and for publishing these projects on their website. This tension is compounded, as there is currently no means to attribute specific project results to specific organisations, leading to a number of undesirable reporting practices. For example, some organisations are unrecognised for their input, or all implementing organisations are assumed to have inputted equally or the project is split into many smaller replicated projects (one for each combination of implementing partners). Each of these practices hinder opportunities for learning, accountability and transparency and causes confusion when trying to understand IATI data. Further they can disempower some organisations through the reporting process and they can create high reporting burden and opportunity for error through forcing organisations to artificially split their reporting of project results (and corresponding finances) into sub-projects just for the purpose of IATI.

**Suggestions**

To simplify reporting expectations, although not explicit in the standard, there is a growing convention that each organisation reports only their own results (per the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (NMFA) guidelines[[15]](#footnote-15)). Further, where there are *overarching results* (e.g. where multiple organisations’ contributions cannot be separated) these results are reported by the lead organisation (as determined by e.g. funding agreement structure). This convention helps to avoid double counting and clarifies the interrelatedness of organisations’ activities.

However, this convention only partially solves the practical tension above. For example, some organisations do not have the capacity to report directly to IATI (think of the tiny pop-up organisations that are funded to take on specific causes such as Ebola but that do not have computer/internet access). Rather than completely removing their voice from IATI publishing we suggest it is preferable that the funding/reporting organisation, which will already be collecting the required IATI information as part of their funding agreement in many cases, is able to report and recognise the organisations efforts. This is also important for overarching results, where it is common that not all results apply to all members of a consortium. Here the ability to recognise contributions to results would avoid the additional reporting burden, risk of error and confusion from artificially replicating and fragmenting projects.

Specifically, we suggest that “light touch” attribution should be possible by adding the names of participating organisations that are involved in a result, indicator or even value for a given project (in the same way that is possible for the overall project). In addition, and although not technically part of the IATI standard, the NMFA conventions should be adopted into IATI reporting guidelines to ensure universal understanding and use of the standard.

# The Principles must be consistently applied across the IATI results standard

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number organisations endorsed | Relative priority of principle |
| 16/16 | **71/128** |

**Issue:** There are a number of areas of the standard that support the underlying principles posed above, however, this capability is missing in other areas. For example, currently:

1. you can only flag if results are suitable for aggregation, not underlying indicators that make up the result.
2. indicator “baselines” cannot be reported in the same way as “targets” and “actuals” (e.g. there is no way to report disaggregation’s, or use dates rather than just years etc.)
3. there is nothing to link a “target” for a particular indicator to the corresponding “actual” (other than by inferring from the similarities in the targets and actuals which is unnecessarily error prone)

**Suggestions**

Any new changes to the standard must be applied consistently across the results standard. Likewise, inconsistencies such as above should be amended, either by enhancing the results standard so that principles can be applied consistently or by changing the structure so that the inconsistencies are not possible.

#  We must be able to include a statement describing the scope and limitations of our IATI data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number organisations endorsed | Relative priority of principle |
| 13/16 | **75/104** |

**Issue:** There is currently no means to indicate the intended purpose and limitations of IATI results data.

**Why is this a problem?**

No standard can be expected to provide all audiences with all the required information for all possible purposes. The messy and frequently sensitive nature of International Development and Humanitarian Aid interventions provide a particular set of challenges. For example, the IATI standard does not (and possibly no standard can) reflect the non-linearity of interventions that are characterized by rapidly changing, and often dangerous, contexts that frequently drive significant intervention adaptation. Without clarifying these limitations and target audiences, there can be unrealistic expectations of the data and its usage, leading to miss-interpretation, poor decision making and potential reputational damage for the IATI, and associated development stakeholders that are involved (e.g. reporting organisations, those reported upon, funding or even the sector as a whole).

**Suggestions**

There should be means to include a statement within an IATI dataset that clarifies intended scope, target audience, limitations and exclusions of the data as well as guidelines on responsible data sharing and use. This statement could be dataset, project or organisation specific or be general across the complete IATI. Although beyond the remit of this document, we also suggest the IATI secretariat and TAG develop a template statement and consider requiring this information to be made widely available across, for example, websites, tools, etc.

Appendices

# Appendix 1: Types of results

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Description** |
| Output | Results of the activity that came about as a direct effect of your work and specific, what is done, and what communities are reached. For example, X number of individuals. |
| Outcome | Results of the activity that produce an effect on the overall communities or issues you serve. For example lower rate of infection after a vaccination programme. |
| Impact | The long term effects of the outcomes, that lead to larger, over-arching results, such as improved life-expectancy. |
| Other | Another type of result, not specified above. |

# Appendix 2: standardised indicators

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Category | URL |
| WHO Registry |  | http://apps.who.int/gho/indicatorregistry/App\_Main/indicator\_registry.aspx |
| Sphere Handbook | **Humanitarian** | http://www.spherehandbook.org |
| US Foreign Assistance Framework |  | http://www.state.gov/s/d/rm/rls/dosstrat/2007/html/82981.htm |
| World Bank World Development Indicators |  | http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators |
| UN Millennium Development Goals Indicators |  | http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Host.aspx?Content=Indicators/OfficialList.htm |
| UNOCHA Humanitarian Response Indicators | **Humanitarian** | https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/applications/ir/indicators |
| HIV/AIDS Indicator Registry | **HIV/AIDS** | http://www.indicatorregistry.org |
| Reporting Organisation |  | The reporting organisation must publish a link that contains details of all organisation wide standardised indicators. |

**Suggestions**

Additional standardised indicators should include:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Category | URL |
| UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Indicators |  | <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/statcom/47th-session/documents/2016-2-IAEG-SDGs-Rev1-E.pdf> |
| Bond’s Impact Builder indicators |  | <https://my.bond.org.uk/impact-builder> |
| Department for International Development (DFID) standard indicators  |  | <https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/88400/standard-indicators.xls> |
| WHO/ UNICEF Joint monitoring Programme (JMP) | **WASH** | <https://www.wssinfo.org/> |
| Everyday Peace Indicators |  | <http://everydaypeaceindicators.org/> |
| Women Stats |  | <http://www.womanstats.org/new/codebook/> |
| Gap Minder |  | <https://www.gapminder.org/data/> |
| SDSN |  | <http://indicators.report/> |
| Open 17 |  | <http://openseventeen.org/> |
| Deliver 2030 |  | <http://deliver2030.org/?page_id=6059> |
| SDG16 Data Initiative |  | <http://www.sdg16.org/map/> |
| Dutch Development Results  |  | <http://www.dutchdevelopmentresults.nl/> |
| Health Equity Monitor |  | <http://www.who.int/gho/health_equity/outcomes/health_equity_compendium.pdf?ua=1> |
| mWater indicator library |  | <https://portal.mwater.co/#/indicators> |

# Appendix 3: Most important group issues

Discussions held during group work for each principle at the workshop were summarised by facilitators. Each delegate then voted on the most important issues. Each of these issues formed amendments to each corresponding principle in the main body of this final document, and copied here for completeness in order of decreasing importance:

* Principle 6: Flexibility on who reports (clear definition of lead partner (IATI reporter)
* Principle 1: Narrative information not just a link
* Principle 5: Change log – very specific, adding unanticipated results
* Principle 2: Option for context analysis both internal and external i.e. Scope of influence, conflicts/ fragility, inception phase, shrinking space
* Principle 1: Flexibility to report results where most appropriate (e.g. have a results data file that links to activities but isn’t part of the activity file)
* Principle 5: Suggest calling “Plans” not “Results”

# Appendix 4: Individual comments

The following comments were collected as part of the final feedback session of the workshop where each delegate was asked whether they would endorse each principle, if so to rank each principle with relative priority and provide feedback. All feedback was used to form amendments to each corresponding principle in the main body of this final document, and copied below for completeness. In addition, two delegates, although endorsed all principles noted a concern that overall the principles could lead to more reporting and increased expectations.

Comments for Principle 1 (all delegates endorsed):

* How presented is very important, especially how accessible
* Narrative, not just link. Baseline 0 is different to no baseline
* Indeed, allow for Qualitative reporting
* Need to explain how sustainability will be achieved and that some beneficiaries cost more to reach. A metric for sustainability should be included - show cost per beneficiary may rise due to attempts to create lasting change
* With caveats that "full range" isn’t possible
* Good principle but I'm not sure representing the full range of activities is within the IATI remit
* Do not agree with the specific link suggestion
* But not to be depended upon for evaluations
* Type of organisation - if you do less direct programming quantitative data not really used. Free text boxes would solve many issues.

Comments for Principle 2 (all delegates endorsed):

* Flexibility is key especially in context of where DFID is moving (fragile contexts)
* Will the results be achieved further down the line?
* Option for context analysis both internal and external option for unanticipated results
* This overlaps with Principle 5. Revisions will have a reason
* I think this is only partly covered by narrative fields already
* World is constantly changing; results should reflect limitations encountered
* Context Analysis needed
* Huge concern about the various interpretations and ability to understand by various audiences
* This is evaluation and learning (not in scope)
* For internal use only

Comments for Principle 3:

* Delegates that endorsed:
	+ Optional means (especially "Accuracy rating") very subjective. Principle 3 is very complex and needs to be couched in the idea of "needs to be clarified" i.e. the quality needs to be clarified
	+ Verified /estimate
	+ Confidence not accuracy rating
	+ Functionality within principle 3 will allow people who use the data to tick or untick low/medium/high quality is essential. This means that low quality data, or where an organisation is less confident in the data can be excluded from aggregated data. This should increase overall confidence in the aggregated data
	+ Huge concern about the various interpretations and ability to understand by various audiences
	+ Quality disputed (subjective word)
* Delegates that did not endorse:
	+ Not sure really what the implication of this is
	+ A self-assessment will bring conflict of interest
	+ This is best done with an oversight team and risks inflexible approaches around what is quality data (i.e. experimental vs case study design)

Comments for Principle 4 (all delegates endorsed):

* For projects this needs to be implemented a.s.a.p.
* Especially by age and gender
* Have definition of categories option
* As long as it isn’t compulsory it is encouraged as something that we should aim for. However, beyond basic disaggregation, there are real issues and challenges of definitions (eg disability, age) + capacity to collect. Really important that all this remains as light touch as possible providing helpful data.
* I don’t think this fully addresses "leave no-one behind"
* Very subjective

Comments for Principle 5 (all delegates endorsed):

* Clarification key due to timelines, investment of partners etc.
* After quality checks
* Change log important. Change to baseline as well as objectives and indicators
* This is the best chance of showing learning is happening
* Essential
* Suggested that currently IATI does not allow you to follow the ‘story’ of a project. E.g. IATI standard is set up so you would just see one target and one actual in IATI (i.e. the latest) you wouldn’t get the full picture – e.g. achieving 33% against a target of 50% does not look good – unless you can see how close to the Year 1 target we came and understand why the Year 2 target was then revised upwards. Having all years in one place would mean the overall trend is easy to see and understand. How can we make sure we capture the story of a programme (even including links to other relevant and/or complementary programmes?)? A big issue here is the number of revisions and the workload that will engender for staff throughout the programme lifetime.

Comments for Principle 6 (all delegates endorsed):

* Level of contribution very important
* Ability to represent implementing partners work
* Note: challenge of claiming certain results publically so need to use exclusions policy to recognise where results to politically sensitive to report. Use Buza guidance and allow flexibility. Don’t assign partner % contribution to results. Consider option to link results between partners i.e. to make clear if the numbers reported are the same, or ones that can be added.
* But this should be light touch, without them having to report
* To do otherwise is unethical and dishonest
* Make this really strong
* Very subjective

Comments for Principle 7 (all delegates endorsed):

* Plenary /workshop (NGO feedback) required to identify further suggestions.
* Difficult to achieve but not a useful tool is not
* Standards open to interpretation present greater problem in the long run
* Otherwise there would be misinterpretation and errors
* Also guidance on how reporting should work between different partners and IATI

Comments for Principle 8:

* Delegates that endorsed:
	+ This is a really important Principle. The statement needs more thinking through + rewording. Scope + limitations statement is really important.
	+ IATI results do not currently reflect everything we do but I'm not sure it can. I wonder if it would be better to acknowledge this. Need to provide guidance on responsible data sharing - what is appropriate to include in attachments and what is not (i.e. humanitarian baseline). Need to think not only how we qualify particular data/ datasets, but how that can "accompany" the data when its brought together without other pieces of information.
	+ Need revision but critical. Concern that the results standard is at the early stages of a new, clearly insufficiently developed process, with sensitive information at a very public level, globally. There is no support, information or guidance available in any language other than English, nor are any results published in any other language- reduces claims of accountability. It seems the results standard is being rolled out without nearly sufficient consideration of many factors so it seems premature to me. There needs to be much more discussion and analysis of the resource implications of implementing this, especially for smaller organisations as the % impact is greater - could be a discriminating factor in ability to secure funding
	+ Statement should reflect messiness of development and humanitarian interventions: Do you think that IATI (or probably more likely the data visualisation sites?) need to note on their website something along the lines of: development and humanitarian programming occur in sometimes rapidly changing and complex environments and contexts. INGOs, local partners and communities may adapt or change the programme intended results to take this into account. No programme is linear in its impact. To caveat not only the limitations of the data through the data disclaimer but also to remind viewers of the data that changes in projects are not a bad thing – they don’t indicate a bad project, but rather adaptation to changing contexts?
* Delegates that did not endorse:
	+ I agree with the overall Principle but not the draft statement of context
1. <https://www.bond.org.uk/resources/publishing-results-to-iati> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. this principle builds on Test 2 from the Bond paper [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See: <http://icai.independent.gov.uk/report/dfids-approach-to-delivering-impact/> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See: <http://www.ids.ac.uk/publication/the-politics-of-evidence-and-results-in-international-development-playing-the-game-to-change-the-rules> and <http://bigpushforward.net/> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. this principle builds on Test 1 from the Bond paper [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. This principle builds on Test 7 from the Bond paper [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Per DFID’s Aid Match indicator protocol <https://assets.digital.cabinet-office.gov.uk/media/565efda0e5274a74e6000009/Indicator-Protocol.doc> and <http://blog.devresults.com/proposed-indicator-definition-schema/> (the latter is in turn based loosely on USAID's Performance Indicator Reference Sheets: <http://usaidprojectstarter.org/content/pmp-performance-indicator-reference-sheet> ) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. <https://www.bond.org.uk/effectiveness/monitoring-and-evaluation#evidence_principles> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. <http://www.oecd.org/development/evaluation/qualitystandards.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. <https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/291982/HTN-strength-evidence-march2014.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. this principle builds on Test 3 from the Bond paper [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Note: technically the standard’s current provision for disaggregation (through “dimension”) provides a means to distinguish between indicators but it is not sufficient to allow unambiguous disaggregations for the same indicator – see suggestions for the current, suboptimal workaround. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. For example, DFID requires results to be disaggregated by gender and is rolling out requirements to disaggregate by disability status. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. this principle builds on Test 4 from the Bond paper [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. See section 1.2 of: <https://www.government.nl/documents/publications/2015/12/01/open-data-and-development-cooperation> [↑](#footnote-ref-15)