# Results: reporting how and why IATI results were or were not achieved

**Note:** This suggestion addresses Principle 2 from a consultation driven by Monitoring and Evaluation experts from UK CSOs Jan – Mar 2017 – see <http://discuss.iatistandard.org/t/results-discussion-space-and-tag-2016-17-path/502/> (specific text relating to Principle 2 copied below as justification). Technical suggestions were devised by technology specialists at the Nethope Athens conference March 2017.

Technical suggestion:

1. For linking to documents:
   * Preferred suggestion:

To be consistent with iati-activity/location element (where location is defined once and referenced in results) add *document-link* (0..\*) to:

* + 1. result/description
    2. result/indicator/description

with:

* + 1. ref attribute to link to iati-activity/document-link
    2. optional free-text to describe how the document is relevant to the results or indicator
    3. *sub-ref* element (0..\*) to allow free-text reference to a particular area/section/graph/table etc. of a document acknowledging that often only part(s) of a document will be relevant to a given result or indicator.

and add ref attribute to iati-activity/document-link

* Alternative suggestion a:

add *document-link* element (0..\*) (per iati-activity/document-link) to:

* + 1. result/description
    2. result/indicator/description
* Alternative suggestion b: (If modification <http://discuss.iatistandard.org/t/results-use-of-narrative-elements/746> is not accepted (i.e. use narrative type attribute))

Any document URLs to be included directly as part of existing *narrative* elements.

1. For descriptions
   * Preferred suggestion:

Add *lessons* to the *resultNarrativeType* codelist – see suggested modification <http://discuss.iatistandard.org/t/results-use-of-narrative-elements/746>

* Alternative suggestion: (If modification <http://discuss.iatistandard.org/t/results-use-of-narrative-elements/746> is not accepted)

Information to be included directly as part of existing *narrative* elements.

Justification:

* **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?:** <https://www.bond.org.uk/resources/publishing-results-to-iati> “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 (see <http://discuss.iatistandard.org/t/results-discussion-space-and-tag-2016-17-path/502/>), 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).