PART A: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background

1.1. For the first time in the history of the United Nations - a landmark, stand-alone resolution "Capacity building for the evaluation of development activities at the country level" has been approved through general consensus and cross-regional support of forty-two countries, during the UN General Assembly Second Committee meeting on 13 November 2014. UNGA Resolution A/RES/69/237 was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in the plenary session of 19 December 2014. Through this resolution, Member States agree that evaluation is an important component of development processes, and recognize evaluation as a country level tool that can help strengthen and support development results.¹

1.2. Evaluation was also explicitly mentioned in the Resolution concerning the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The SDGs were declared by world leaders in an earlier meeting in New York on 24 September 2015. The new development agenda entitled “Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”, outlines a highly ambitious agenda focussing on seventeen (17) global goals to eliminate extreme poverty by 2030, with the pledge that “no-one will be left behind” on the journey towards global peace and prosperity.²

1.3. As a follow-up action, in November 2015, EvalPartners³, the global movement to strengthen national evaluation capacities, launched the Global Evaluation Agenda (GEA) 2016-2020 or “EvalAgenda2020” to address priorities for evaluation during the first five years of the 15-year period of the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). There are four key dimensions in the global evaluation agenda to strengthen evaluation capacity. These four essential dimensions are: (1) the enabling environment for evaluation, (2) institutional capacities, (3) individual capacities for evaluation, and (4) inter-linkages among these first three dimensions. EvalPartners believe that the refreshed and strengthen evaluation can help in achieving the global goals and translating the 2030 vision into reality.⁴

2.0 Situational Analysis

2.1. According to a study conducted by Dr Barbara Rosenstein, a founding member and current Chairperson of the Israeli Association for Program Evaluation (IAPE), although

¹ www.unevaluation.org/mediacenter/newscenter/newsdetail/105
³ www.evalpartners.org/evalpartners
Malaysia has no legislation on national evaluation policy, its evaluation policy is driven through administrative circulars from the Prime Minister's Office, the Ministry of Finance, and the Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Department. Therefore, she considered Malaysia to have a semi-formalized but well-established national evaluation policy. However, this is not quite conclusive because the evaluation policy in existence mainly focuses on programmes and projects under planning and development.  

2.2 It was also reported by the UNDP study titled “Towards a Baseline Study: Insights on National Evaluation Capacities in 43 Countries” published in December 2015 that in 2009, the Malaysian government adopted an outcome-based approach for planning, resource allocation, monitoring and evaluation as part of the 10th Malaysia Plan 2011–2015 and that system requires annual formative evaluations to be carried out by every ministry on its programmes and activities. The Study also reported that “the evaluations are incorporated into planning processes and budgetary processes. The evaluations also serve as supportive information for any proposal for policy or programme adjustments through the Outcome-based Budgeting System. The approach also encourages ministries to conduct internalized self-evaluations.”

2.3 From the above, it is evident that the studies done by both UNDP and Dr Barbara Rosenstein clearly indicated that Government Administrative Circulars only governed evaluations in the public sector without considering the applicability to the private sector as well as the civil society organisations. Therefore, these administrative circulars cannot constitute as a national policy instrument.

2.4 On evaluation being practised by private sector organisations particularly those having a Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) function or a philanthropic arm, there is a dearth of information to shed light on the state of affair. While it is safe to state that civil society organisations are more involved in the evaluation of funded programmes and projects as these evaluation exercises are mostly donor-driven.

PART B: WHAT AND WHY OF EVALUATION

3.0 Differentiation between “Monitoring” and “Evaluation”

3.1 There is always the confusion on the understanding and use of the terms “Monitoring” and “Evaluation”. Sometimes, both terms are referred to as one i.e. “Monitoring and Evaluation” or in short, “M&E”. Rasappan A. & Winston J. (1999) have differentiated the two terms of monitoring and evaluation as below:

**Monitoring** refers to the process of systematic and purposive collection of data about the changes and progress in the status of specific aspects of a programme and/or project to inform programme managers and stakeholders and to support decision-making on various aspects of the programme/project such as strategies,

---

resource usage, activities, outputs, and outcomes. Monitoring uses available and new data about the performance of a policy, programme or project to report facts.

**Monitoring** is different from **Evaluation** but is a crucial pre-requisite for evaluation. Monitoring data typically forms the substance for evaluations provided it has been carefully designed as part of the M&E Plan. Evaluations become extremely difficult if monitoring data for a programme/project are not available.

**Evaluation** refers to a systematic assessment and value judgment of the appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency and/or economy of a programme, component or activity, carried out for the purpose of assisting stakeholders to better understand a programme and its results and the causal relationships between various critical success factors. It also helps provide stakeholders with key causal information to make informed decisions about the programme, its operation and allocation of resources. Evaluation uses available and new data about the performance of a policy, programme or project and causal relationships as the basis for giving an opinion.

3.5. Apart from monitoring, evaluation is also differentiated from other terminologies such as investigation/inspection, performance audit, and research. Table 1 below suggests the core elements of each in terms of the activity involved, and the objective.

### Table 1: Spectrum of Results-based Management Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspection/investigation</td>
<td>Detects wrong doing and verifies information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance audit</td>
<td>Check the validity of performance information produced by departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>On-going tracking of progress against plans and initiating corrective action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Systematic collection and objective analysis of evidence to assess issues such as relevance, performance (effectiveness and efficiency), value for money, impact and sustainability, and to recommend ways forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Testing hypotheses/propositions through observation of reality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

8 Adapted from Ajam, T (2011): “Evaluation and Performance Auditing in South Africa; Convergence of reforms?”, paper at the 4th International Conference on leadership, Governance and Policy in the Public Sector”, School for Public Management and Administration, University of Pretoria 17-18 February 2011, Pretoria
4.0 Purpose of Evaluation

4.1 There are four primary objectives of evaluation, namely:

   a) **Improving performance.** It enables programme/project managers and other stakeholders of feedback and learning that can help improve current and future policies, programmes and strategies;

   b) **Ensuring governance and accountability.** It enables the stakeholders, donors, funders and other interested parties of evidence-based findings, both positive and negative, of programmes and projects undertaken;

   c) **Generating knowledge.** It enables programme/project managers and other stakeholders to gain knowledge about what works and what does not; and

   d) **Supporting Evidence-based Decisions.** It enables various stakeholders respecting programme/project results to make evidence-based decision-making related to current and future policies, programmes and strategies.

PART C: MALAYSIAN FRAMEWORK ON EVALUATION POLICY AND STANDARDS (MyFEPS)

5.0 Need Statement

5.1 Against the backdrop of the global advocacy wave of evaluation for sustainability development gaining momentum, as well as the absence of a culture of evaluation among Malaysian organisations, the Malaysian Evaluation Society (MES) felt that Malaysia would be left behind in the development race. Emerging and developing economies that have now recognised evaluation as an important tool in their development process include countries like South Africa, Zimbabwe, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Vietnam, The Philippines and Indonesia.

5.2 In cognizance of this need, the MES initiated the drafting of the Malaysian Framework on Evaluation Policy and Standards (MyFEPS), a key component of national evaluation capacity development, to strengthen the enabling evaluation environment for sustainable growth and development.

6.0 Structure of MyFEPS

6.1 The MyFEPS framework mirrors the ASEAN Regional Framework on Evaluation Standards (ARFES). It consists of three (3) interlocking core elements - Evaluation Management, Evaluation Conduct and Evaluation Utilisation which are being enabled by three (3) key considerations present in the environment – Policy and Regulatory Frameworks, Professionalism and Ethics. These enabling environmental factors, either
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working singularly or in tandem with each other, greatly influenced the level of comprehensiveness and quality of the core evaluation elements. The dynamic interaction among these six (6) evaluation components forms the structure of the as depicted in Fig. 1 below:

7.0 Target Users of MyFEPS

7.1 MyFEPS provides a common framework to enable Malaysian organisations to commission, manage, conduct and use evaluation in support of good governance, accountability, and evidence-based decision-making. It is also aims to enable Malaysia-based training institutions and universities to design new teaching/training curricula for purposes of Continuing Professional Development as well as the professionalization of evaluation.

7.2 Therefore, the specific target users of this common framework on evaluation policy and standards include all Malaysian organisations involved in national development programmes and projects covering various sectors such as political, economic, education, health, social, cultural, spiritual and technology. Target users at individual level include all those involved in the evaluation function i.e. evaluation commissioners, evaluation managers, evaluation practitioners, and evaluation professionals.

8.0 Key Elements of MyFEPS

8.1 Evaluation Policy and Regulatory Framework

Policy and regulatory frameworks for enabling evaluation activities within an organisation should be in the form of written policy mandate requiring an evaluation be carried out on its
programmes/projects during their programme/project life cycle. The frequency and type of evaluation to be undertaken would depend on the time duration and size of a specific programme/project and also on the availability of resources, both financial and human. The four guiding principles observed when formulating a policy mandate are as follows:

**Principle 1: Clarity of Policy and/or Regulations**

- Irrespective of its form, all policies and regulations related to evaluation should be clearly worded with no room for ambiguity. The policy document itself should be accompanied by easy to understand technical guidelines with appropriate examples. Above all, policy document should be coherent in its entirety and not lend itself to different interpretations.

- The policy should elaborate on the purpose and rationale for the need for evaluation; provide details on the policy mechanisms proposed and why these policy mechanisms must be implemented comprehensively to overcome barriers to evaluation.

- Policy clarity would be greatly enhanced if an organisation’s evaluation policy is consistent and streamlined with all other existing applicable legislations or administrative mandates so as to avoid duplication or contradiction.

**Principle 2: Conformance to Acceptable Practices**

- For an evaluation policy of an organisation to be practical, it has to consider local issues and also conform to cultural norms and practices of the entity concerned. Moreover, for an evaluation policy to be credible, it also has to conform to internationally accepted principles, guidelines, standards and good practices of evaluation.

**Principle 3: Compliance to Laws, Rules and Regulations**

- An organisational evaluation policy should not be formulated strictly based on a templated or prescribed format. It should be developed based on studies of evaluation policies from various types of organisations from different sectors. The objective is to identify policy strengths and weaknesses and the necessary measures to be taken to ensure awareness and compliance to with relevant national policies, laws, rules, regulations and other legislations.

- Non-compliance to the organisational evaluation policy should be managed in accordance with the relevant legal and regulatory provisions adopted by the organisation as well as rules and procedures established by the organisation itself.

**Principle 4: Review of Policy**
There should be a continuous review process of the organisation evaluation policy to meet the changing demands and expectations of the environment, both internal and external.

8.2 Professionalism in Evaluation

Professionalism in evaluation can be defined as the strict adherence to courtesy, honesty and responsibility when dealing with individuals or departments/units within the organisation in the course of carrying out the evaluation function. This trait often includes a high level of excellence going above and beyond basic requirements. Generally, ethics rules tell us what we cannot do and professionalism deals with what we should do.

**Principle 1: Adherence to a Professional Code of Conduct**

- The professional code of conduct is a key building block of professionalism and is an essential component of professional identity. The code of conduct for professional evaluators should contain elements, among others, such as respect for people; sensitive to cultural diversity, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, disability, age and ethnicity; honesty; integrity; independence; impartiality and confidentiality.

- Evaluators must have professional integrity and should abide by a prescribed code of professional conduct. Evaluators should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relationships with all stakeholders.

8.3 Ethics in Evaluation

Ethics, the discipline of rights, morals, and principles that guide an individual behaviour, is a key consideration in the evaluation function. The reason is that evaluation involves interactions with other human beings. A number of organisations have developed ethical guidelines or code of ethics to cover the conduct of evaluation, including the responsibilities of those commissioning, managing and conducting evaluations. If professionalism deals with what persons involved in evaluation should do, ethics rules tell us what they cannot do.

**Principle 1: Adherence to a Code of Ethics**

Guided by a person’s morals and personal value system, those involved in evaluation must adhere to a code of ethics. Any code of ethics in evaluation would have principles and values such as:

- **Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare** - Those involved in evaluation are obliged to contribute to not only certain people but also general and public welfare through evaluation.
8.4 Principles and Evaluation Standards Framework

Evaluations should be guided by the principles and standards of three key elements of evaluation namely, Evaluation Management, Evaluation Conduct, and Evaluation Utilisation as outlined in the ASEAN Regional Framework for Evaluation Standards (ARFES). The Malaysian Framework for Evaluation Standards is an adaptation of ARFES. (Annexure 1).

8.5 Institutionalising and Implementing Evaluation

The institutionalisation of evaluation in an organisation should consist of the following two (2) stages:

Stage 1 - Management and Coordination of Evaluation

In order for this policy framework to be implemented, it needs a champion and also needs broad buy-in across organisation. A special evaluation technical working group headed by a member of the organisation’s Governing Board with members from key functional units should be established and tasked with the responsibility of promoting the evaluation agenda organisation-wide. This group of experienced professionals is to meet on a regular basis to discuss issues such as the evaluation plan, policy documents, technical guidelines, capacity building, and change management.

Stage 2 – Implementation of Evaluation

The implementation of evaluation comprises of the following steps:

a) Develop an annual evaluation plan. A rolling plan of 2-3 years would be ideal in identifying which evaluations would be undertaken, and the form of evaluation;

b) Incorporate evaluation as a management function so as to continuously improve performance. For a large organisation, a formal Evaluation Unit or a Management Committee on Evaluation could be established. However, for small organisations or at departmental level, evaluation should be incorporated as a permanent agenda item in weekly/monthly management meeting;
c) Ensure there is an evaluation budget in all programmes and projects. Evaluations will not be realised unless they are budgeted for. The cost of an evaluation will depend on its complexity. Frequent small evaluations which provide feedback immediately into implementation may be more useful than large ones, particularly for complex programmes where the future is unclear;

d) Optimise the limited evaluation capacity. Specific people within the organisation should be entrusted with the evaluation role, and with the required skills. Sufficient technical capacity should be established to support departments on methodology and quality. Evaluations can be outsourced to external evaluators using an accredited panel.

e) Developing evaluation capacity through organisation-wide short courses conducted by universities, training academies and private consultants. As a strategy to manage the change process, this measure is to promote evaluation and also raise awareness about evaluation among employees. Staff involved in the evaluation function and activities should be encouraged to attend training courses in evaluation and evaluation-related events as a process of their Continuing Professional Development. For those employees who want to pursue a professional career in evaluation, they should be encouraged to undertake professional evaluation competency certification courses and/or academic qualification. Sufficient funds should be allocated to assist with the human capacity development initiative; and

f) Ensure that the results of evaluations are disseminated and discussed in management meetings and used to guide planning and budget decisions, as well as general decision-making processes.

9.0 POLICY FRAMEWORK AMENDMENT

9.1 A formative evaluation of the MyFEPS would be undertaken within the second full year following the launching date of the policy document. The findings and recommendations of the formative evaluation shall inform amendments to the MyFEPS as warranted.

9.2 Similarly a summative evaluation would be completed within the fifth full year following the launching date of this policy framework document. The findings and recommendations of the summative evaluation shall inform amendments to the policy document as warranted.

Drafted by MyFEPS Drafting Team

17 May 2016
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LIST OF ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARFES</td>
<td>ASEAN Regional Framework on Evaluation Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAPE</td>
<td>Israeli Association for Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOCE</td>
<td>International Organisation for Cooperation in Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES</td>
<td>Malaysian Evaluation Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MyFEPS</td>
<td>Malaysian Framework on Evaluation Policy and Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOPEs</td>
<td>Voluntary Organizations for Professional Evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ANNEXURE 1

MALAYSIAN FRAMEWORK ON EVALUATION STANDARDS

CORE ELEMENT 1: EVALUATION MANAGEMENT (E1)

Evaluation management is the process of making decisions on the functions of planning, organizing, implementing, controlling, and reporting under evaluation. It is a key responsibility of managers.

This core element - Evaluation Management - consists of three (3) Principles and ten (10) Standards.

PRINCIPLES

1. INSTITUTIONALISATION (E1-P1)

Evaluation needs to be institutionalised. It involves setting up of institutions, procedures, functions, mechanism, and practices with adequate resources for the acculturation of evaluation.

Standard 1: Oversight & Implementation Mechanism (E1-P1-S1)

This mechanism is to ensure that evaluation management is being carried out efficiently and effectively in a timely manner. The oversight mechanism is defined by the existence of committees (such as Joint Stakeholder Steering Committee for Evaluation) which have clear responsibilities, roles, and goals to oversee the implementation of evaluation activities. Implementation mechanism should be the Task Force set up to ensure the execution of the evaluation function.

Standard 2: Resource Adequacy (E1-P1-S2)

Adequate financial and human resources for evaluation should be made available for efficient and effective evaluation function to take place. In addition, it also enables the strengthening of evaluation capacity and capability.

Standard 3: Policy Compliance (E1-P1-S3)

For evaluation management to be effective, it has to comply with existing relevant policy, regulatory or administrative mandate on evaluation. References should be made to the technical guidelines that usually accompany the issuance of such policy documents. In the case of Malaysian public sector, federal government agencies such as Ministries and Departments are obliged to carrying out evaluation of past year programmes and projects as required by the annual budgetary preparation circular issued by the Ministry of Finance. The evaluation findings would be used as justification or evidence to seek additional funding to continue an existing programme or project.

Standard 4: Evaluation Plan Incorporated into Strategic Roadmap (E1-P1-S4)

Evaluation plan should be an integral part of an entity’s strategic roadmap. It should be built-in during the process of designing the strategic roadmap. This is to ensure that planned evaluation is being carried out at an appropriate pre-determined period so that the strategic roadmap can become rational, realistic and achievable.
PRINCIPLE 2: CAPACITY & CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT (E1-P2)

To manage evaluation, adequate capacity and capability development is essential. Capacity to demand for evaluation is necessary. It is related to the environment and infrastructure of the organization to do evaluation. Capability is related to the supply of evaluative expertise to meet the demand. Emphasis on capacity and capability development is to ensure continuation of evaluation practices.

Standard 1: Evaluation Capacity & Capability Development Plan (E1-P2-S1)
An evaluation capacity and capability development plan is essential as it covers strategies, deliverables, timeline, resources, and responsibilities. It should highlight the importance of availability and capability of key evaluation players. Continuous organisation-wide promotional activities to raise awareness level of decision-makers at different management level. The capability development plan should also address the importance of continuing professional development among all employees by participation in appropriate academic and/or professional certified training courses on evaluation.

Standard 2: Skills & Competencies Requirements (E1-P2-S2)
Evaluation managers should have relevant educational background, qualification and knowledge in evaluation. Evaluation team members should be knowledgeable, skilled and competent in key aspects of evaluation.

PRINCIPLE 3: PROFESSIONALISM & TRANSPARENCY (E1-P3)

Management of evaluation should comply with applicable standards. Persons engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluation activities should display a high standard of professionalism. Both parties should be transparent in articulating and recognising whatever possible constraints or limitations of an evaluation project. Whenever possible, all information required for evaluation should be made available to the evaluation team with the understanding of confidentiality and non-disclosure. The principles of transparency should be applied in every management action in the conduct of evaluation.

Standard 1: Clear Terms of Reference (E1-P3-S1)
All parties involved in an evaluation should be clear of the evaluation purpose and the scope of work. Job clarity can be assured by having a mutually agreed set of Term of Reference (ToR) written in the form of a formal agreement.

Standard 2: Transparent Procurement Process (E1-P3-S2)
The procurement process for evaluation services should be specified and be made available to all interested parties.

Standard 3: Key Stakeholders Consultative Engagement (E1-P3-S3)
Regular scheduled engagement and consultation should be held among relevant stakeholders, evaluation managers and the evaluation team members. The consultative engagements should be held during the design, implementation, findings, and reporting stages.

**Standard 4: Disclosure & Dissemination Policy (E1-P3-S4)**

Having an explicit disclosure policy on the reporting stage of evaluation is a good practice in evaluation management as it ensures appropriate conduct with respect to ownership and disclosure of evaluation results. On the other hand, all stakeholders have the rights to be informed of the appropriate evaluation result through dissemination process. It also permits access to confidential information, if required. Privacy should be maintained during the whole process to avoid any attempt of intimidation towards the evaluation team.
CORE ELEMENT 2: EVALUATION CONDUCT (E2)

Evaluations can either be conducted by internal staff or external service providers. Internal and external evaluation has its own respective merits and demerits. Regardless of their similarities and differences, both types of evaluation conduct must follow a set of principles and standards. Most importantly, whoever conducts the evaluation process must have the necessary evaluation competencies which include subject matter knowledge, technical skills, academic and professional qualifications, experiences, and some practical managerial and personal skills.

This core element- Evaluation Conduct- has four (4) Principles and ten (10) Standards as follows

PRINCIPLE 1: EVALUATION COMPETENCIES (E2-P1)

Evaluation competencies include the qualifications, skills, experience and attributes required by those employed within the evaluation function to carry out their duties as stipulated in the TOR. Skills and competencies are required for all those engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluation activities, managing evaluators, conducting training and capacity development and designing and implementing evaluation methodologies and systems (UNEG10).

Standard 1: Evaluation Technical Knowledge & People Skills (E2-P1-S1)
Persons conducting evaluation should have specific technical skills and knowledge relevant to the focus of evaluation as well as managerial and people skills.

Standard 2: Subject Matter Expertise (E2-P1-S2)
Where an evaluation is multi-disciplined in nature, the evaluation team should consist of subject matter experts from the relevant disciplines. The type of specific expertise required in an evaluation team depends on the specific evaluation to be undertaken.

PRINCIPLE 2: EVALUATION DESIGN (E2-P2)

The design of an evaluation should be consistent with the principles of scientific inquiry and clearly described in the Terms of Reference.

Standard 1: Methodological Rigour (E2-P2-S1)
A typical evaluation design should cover the stages of planning, implementation, reporting and utilisation. Each stage has its own principles and practices to ensure rigor in producing credible, valid and reliable information. Types of methodologies to be used in evaluation design depend on the complexity of the nature of the evaluation. Methodology should also explicitly address issues of cultural diversity and sensitivity, gender, and under-represented groups, where relevant.

Evaluations should comply with validity and reliability specifications. The information sources utilized in evaluation should be described in full details to ensure reliability without any breach to anonymity and/or cultural and personal sensitivity of the informants.
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**Standard 2: Participatory and Consultative Process (E2-P2-S2)**

The evaluation process should be consultative and participatory in order to ensure maximum learning as well as avoidance of differences and conflicts. There must be regular consultative process between commissioner or manager of evaluation and persons doing evaluation.

**PRINCIPLE 3: OBJECTIVE AND CREDIBLE REPORTING (E2-P3)**

A credible evaluation report is one which is accurate, objective and comprehensive and free from bias. Any finding and recommendation contained in an evaluation report has to contextualised and localised in terms of social, political, cultural and environment aspects. Any conclusion arrived at has to be well grounded and justified with hard data and evidence to enable informed decision-making by its intended users. Evaluation report should be structured and systematic, taking into account local cultural sensitivity towards certain diversity issues.

**Standard 1: Objective and Unbiased Report (E2-P3-S1)**

The impartiality of the report should be reflected in the way the report is written so that it does not show subjectivity of those involved in its design. It is important that the report actually reflects the findings of the evaluation and be free of bias.

**Standard 2: Evidence-based Evaluation Report (E2-P3-S2)**

Evaluation findings should be supported with defensible evidence for accurate decision making. The findings of an evaluation should be evidence-based so that users especially stakeholders can appreciate them in full objectivity in order to make informed decisions.

**Standard 3: Comprehensive Reporting (E2-P3-S3)**

Evaluation reports should be comprehensive in addressing all aspects prescribed in the agreed Term of Reference. The inclusion of limitations, issues, strengths, negative findings as well as recommendations are to be considered where and when necessary.

**Standard 4: Sensitive to Social Inclusion Issues (E2-P3-S4)**

Reports should be sensitive to issues of social inclusion.

**Standard 5: Timeliness for Usage (E2-P3-S5)**

The completion and dissemination evaluation reports should be timely in order to gain support from decision-makers. Evaluation findings should be acted upon in a timely manner.
PRINCIPLE 4: INTERNALISATION OF EVALUATION (E2-P4)

Sustainable practice and utilization of evaluation must be seen as an integral part of the internal value system of an organization. The internalisation of evaluation practices drives organizations towards improved performance, greater accountability, more transparency and better governance.

Standard 1: Self Evaluation (E2-P4-S1)

Self-evaluation should be carried out as an integral performance management tool for evidence-based decision-making on policies and programmes.
CORE ELEMENT 3: EVALUATION UTILISATION (E3)

The primary purpose of an evaluation is to utilize the findings and lessons learned for evidence-based decision making. Evaluation is not just to satisfy a policy or an administrative requirement. Evaluations have to be purposive and their reports utilisation-focused. Insights gained from the evaluation results can serve as valuable learning materials. Evaluation results are used by a myriad of internal and external users. How evaluation results will be used has to be planned from the very beginning of the evaluation process.

This core element - Evaluation Utilisation - has one (1) Principle with two (2) Standards.

PRINCIPLE 1: UTILISATION-FOCUSED (E3-P1)

Evaluation should have a focus on utility. The findings, conclusions and recommendations from evaluation should be viewed as valuable lessons for better programme/project performance leading to possible up-scaling and sustainability management. The process of evaluation itself offers valuable insights to improve future evaluation designs with specific actions in mind.

Standard 1: Utilisation Plan (E3-P1-S1)
An evaluation should have a detailed utilisation plan covering the evaluation findings, follow-up actions, timelines and responsibilities. An evaluation utilisation plan should be user-specific so as to guide decision making for follow-up actions.

Standard 2: Dissemination of Evaluation Results (E3-P1-S2)
Dissemination of evaluation results should be treated on a case-by-case basis, with care given to issues of organizational confidentiality. In such events the reasons for confidentiality should be made transparent.