

## Results: allow disaggregation

**Note:** This suggestion addresses Principle 4 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-iat>) - also on discuss.iatistandard: <https://discuss.iatistandard.org/t/sharing-results-using-iat-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) **\*\*\*Standards day minimum suggestion\*\*\*** Change cardinality of “target” and “actual” from 0..1 to 0..\*
- 2) Implement suggestions relating to Principle 7.2 (see <http://discuss.iatistandard.org/t/results-discussion-space-and-tag-2016-17-path/502/> ) so that baselines can also be disaggregated
- 3) Update iatistandard.org to note that multiple target and actuals should only be used per period for disaggregation.

Justification:

- **Issue:** Currently, you cannot specify disaggregations for a specific indicator, other than by a technical workaround (see suggestions below).
- **Why is this a problem?:** <https://www.bond.org.uk/resources/publishing-results-to-iat>: “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 - For example, DFID requires results to be disaggregated by gender and is rolling out requirements to disaggregate by disability status). 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 (eg through “dimension”) (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.

For discussion:

- Previous discussion of topic: <http://discuss.iatistandard.org/t/disaggregation-of-results/449>