Results: keep old results

Note: This suggestion addresses Principle 5 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/ (copied below as justification). Technical suggestions were devised by technology specialists at the Nethope Athens conference March 2017. In all around 30 M&E and technical specialists were involved in this consultation and it builds on a previous consultation by Bond 2015-16 (https://www.bond.org.uk/resources/publishing-results-to-iati - also on discuss.iatistandard: https://discuss.iatistandard.org/t/sharing-results-using-iati-data-standard-will-it-improve-learning-and-accountability/431).

Items beginning with ***Standards day minimum suggestion*** and highlighting in yellow indicates minimum suggestions per IATI TAG Standards Day

Technical suggestion:

1) Add optional *deprecated-on* attribute (xsd:date) to:
    i. result
    ii. result/indicator
2) to provide description of change
    - Preferred suggestion:
      Add *changes* to the narrative type 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)
      No change to the standard, instead any changes are directly included in existing *narrative* elements as appropriate

Justification:

- **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?:** https://www.bond.org.uk/resources/publishing-results-to-iati "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 of

http://discuss.iatistandard.org/t/results-discussion-space-and-tag-2016-17-path/502/) 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 of http://discuss.iatistandard.org/t/results-discussion-space-and-tag-2016-17-path/502/). With the changing nature of IATI results we suggest it would also be more appropriate to rename the “results” standard the “plans” standard.