Federal Public Service Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation

Special Evaluation Office of the Belgian Development Cooperation

Evaluation Capacity Building Initiative

Manual for Self-Evaluation

Franck Signoret (COTA), Corina Dhaene (ACE Europe)

December 2017

December 2017

Printed matter: FOD Printing Company

Evaluation No S4/2017/01

Legal depot: 0218/2018/009

This document is available in PDF format in Dutch and French on the websitehttps://diplomatie.belgium.be/nl/Beleid/Ontwikkelingssamenwerking/Onze_werkmethoden/Dienst_Bijzondere_Evaluatie/ or from the Special Evaluation Office.

The report will be cited as follows:

Special Evaluation Office for Belgian Development Cooperation/SEO (2017), *Initiative for Evaluation Capacity Building (ECB). Manual for Self-Evaluation*, FPS Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation, Brussels.

Foreword

This document supports and orientates an organisation (non-governmental organisation, BTC or BIO) in the process of self-evaluation. The self-evaluation is about the quality of its evaluation system and the formulation of an improvement plan. The validation by an assessor can lead to a recommendation to receive the certificate for Evaluation Capacity Building (ECB).

More information on the ECB and the validation process can be found in the following documents, available on the website of the Special Evaluation Office:

- The Special Evaluation Office of Belgian Development Cooperation / SEO (2017), Study on the elaboration of an instrument for the certification of evaluation systems of actors of Belgian development cooperation, FPS Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation, Brussels
- Special Evaluation Office for Belgian Development Cooperation / SEO (2017), Evaluation Capacity Building Initiative (ECB). Manual for the assessor, FPS Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation, Brussels

Table of contents

Acronyms

ANGS/ACNG	Non-Governmental Cooperation Actors
BIO	Belgian Investment Company for Developing countries
BTC	Belgian Technical Cooperation
SEO	Special Evaluation Office
ECB	Evaluation Capacity Building
LEADS	Little, some Elements, clear Action, largely Developed, Sustainable
RT	Reference Terms
ToC	Theory of Change

1. Introduction

1.1. Context and role of this manual

The self-assessment by an organisation of its capacity and performance in terms of evaluation is the starting point of a process to obtain an ECB certificate (Evaluation Capacity Building)[1]. The self-assessment is a condition for applying for an ECB certificate.

The formal request for a certificate of this kind is accompanied by the results of the self-assessment, as well as an improvement plan. Of course, this also includes a commitment to implement the improvement plan and follow up on its results.

External assessors draw on the results of the self-evaluation as their starting material: they analyse the material and use it to prepare the visit to the organisation.

Self-evaluation is a tool for learning. It should allow the organisation to analyse and assess its own capacity and practice in the field of evaluation. This then allows the organisation to formulate a multi-annual improvement plan.

1.2. Precautions and warnings

This tool is designed for the self-evaluation of the capacity and evaluation processes applied by the organisation, and more specifically the evaluations of the programmes funded by DGD and carried out by external evaluators. The organisation is, of course, free to use the tool also for the analysis of evaluations of other donors' programmes (e.g. European Commission, ...).

The self-evaluation looks at the organisation's monitoring system in so far as it ensures that evaluators have access to relevant, reliable and useful data. The monitoring system supports the evaluation dynamics: the system provides the data for evaluation and can also prompt specific evaluation questions. However, the tool does not look at the quality of the reporting (annual and financial reporting). The monitoring system is only considered from an evaluative point of view.

To evaluate itself, the organisation analyses the most recent evaluations[2] of the past three years. The sample contains at least two evaluations.

---

[1] The initiative for ECB is described in detail in: SEO (2017), Study on the elaboration of an instrument for the certification of evaluation systems of actors of Belgian development cooperation, FPS Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation, Brussels

[2] For clarification purposes, the definition of evaluation is repeated here as it can be found on the SEO website: an evaluation is a systematic and as objective as possible assessment of a project, a programme or a policy - whether in progress or completed - of its concept, application and results, with the aim of determining relevance, achievement of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide credible and useful information to integrate the lessons of experience into the decision-making processes, both of the beneficiaries and of the donors*. The three functions of evaluation are (i) accountability: accountability for the use of public funds, (ii) learning: drawing lessons from what works and what does not, (iii) decision-making support: reporting objective elements to support decisions.*

If an organisation only carried out one evaluation in the last three years, the sample is limited to that evaluation. If an organisation carried out more than 10 evaluations in the past years, the sample will contain 5 evaluations. It is recommended that the sample should certainly include all evaluations of DGD programmes.

1.3. Position of the self-assessment in the process to arrive at an ECB certificate

In order for a formal request for an ECB certificate vis-à-vis the Special Evaluation Office to be taken into account and for the process to start, it is essential that the organisation provide the following documents:

1. A formal letter, signed by someone with decision-making authority at management level. With this letter, the organisation formally commits to increasing its capacity and practice for carrying out quality evaluations and to implementing and following up the improvement plan.
2. An overview of the evaluations of the last three years and arguments for the choice of sample (see Annex D). This overview must be sent in Word format to the Special Evaluation Office.
3. The relevant evaluation reports with the corresponding reference terms.
4. An up-to-date organisation chart of the organisation;
5. The self-evaluation report;
6. The improvement plan.

It is recommended to submit the question only when the self-evaluation shows that the organisation achieves a high score on at least four of the six criteria representing a basic capacity in terms of evaluation, i.e. at least a 'D' according to the LEADS system, as described below.

2. Presentation of the content and organisation of the self-evaluation tool

The tool consists of three parts:

Part 1: the profile of the organisation

Part 2: the self-evaluation

Part 3: the improvement plan

Part 2 is divided into chapters with corresponding criteria for assessment. The report is done in both an Excel and a Word format.

2.1. Part 1: profile of the organisation

In the first part, the organisation enters the following information:

- The name of the organisation (full and acronym)
- The total budget of the organisation for the current year (part of the organisation dealing with development cooperation)
- The percentage of DGD budget for the current year
- The total DGD budget for the current programming period
- The amount allocated to external DGD evaluations for the current programming period
- The total number of FTEs (*full time equivalent*) of the organisation (registered office and site)
- The total number of people who have specific evaluation tasks in their profile description
- Clarification of the existence of a specific function (full-time or part-time) dedicated to evaluation or M&E: yes/no
- Clarification of the existence of a specific service for M&E: yes/no
- A brief description of the organisation's ambitions in terms of evaluation
- Overview of sample evaluations: title, budget of the evaluation, duration of the evaluation, type (intermediate, final, other), maximum 5

The organisation shall report this information in the Excel format, part 1 (see Annex C).

2.2. Part 2: self-evaluation

This part consists of three chapters:

- Chapter 1: The self-evaluation of the quality of the evaluation reports relating to the sample. This forms a concrete basis to start the evaluation of the process and the capacities.
- Chapter 2: The process that the organisation (for the relevant sample reports) has set up for the development, execution and use of the evaluation.
- Chapter 3: The capacity of the organisation to organise the evaluation function.

The second chapter "process" is divided into three phases that give the evaluation process its rhythm, namely:

- Phase 1: The development of an evaluation,
- Phase 2: The implementation of an evaluation,
- Phase 3: The use of the results of an evaluation.

The principle is that each evaluation is in line with the programme cycle:

- Development: Right from the start of the development of an intervention or programme, the organisations ensure that the objectives and the subject matter of the interventions are formulated in such a way that they can be properly evaluated (e.g. on the basis of a ToC)
- Follow-up: The organisation ensures that it collects the data that can later be used for the evaluations
- Use: Evaluation results are used to define new interventions or programmes

This means that an evaluation is not conceived when reference terms are drawn up but that it (objective, subject, usefulness and use of the evaluation) is integrated into the programme cycle.

Each chapter consists of criteria (there are 13 in total) and subcriteria (there are 42 in total). The subcriteria clarify what the criteria are about and are, in turn, explained in Annex A of this manual.

Below is an overview of the criteria.

Overview of the criteria	
Chapter 1: The Evaluation Report	
	1.1. **Validity**: the validity of the information in the report is guaranteed. 1.2. **Reliability**: the reliability of the information in the report is guaranteed. 1.3. **Useful information**: the evaluation report can be used by the user.
Chapter 2: The Evaluation Process	
Development	2.1. **Quality of the Reference Terms**: the Reference Terms meet minimum quality standards and guide the evaluation. 2.2. **Monitoring the quality of the reference terms**: the organisation guarantees a quality control of the reference terms. 2.3 **Participation in the process**: the organisation ensures the participation of internal and external parties in the evaluation process with a view to independence, quality and use of the evaluation.
Implementation	2.4. **Monitoring the quality of the implementation**: the organisation guarantees a quality control of the implementation of an evaluation.
Utilisation	2.5. **Use of the evaluation results:** the organisation uses the evaluation to improve its own practice and that of other stakeholders as well as the interventions.
Chapter 3: The capacity to organise the evaluation function.	
	3.1**.** **Orientation**: the organisation explains its choices regarding evaluation and its importance for the organisation and orientates the evaluation function. 3.2. **Structure, roles and tasks**: the organisation structures the evaluation function and defines the roles and tasks (including the partner organisations) to guarantee the quality, coordination, independence and use of evaluations by the organisation. 3.3 **Normative framework, procedures and tools**: the organisation defines and operationalises a normative framework, guarantees its implementation and quality and develops procedures and tools to facilitate the work related to evaluations. 3.4. **Leadership, management mode and values**: the leadership of the organisation stimulates the development of the evaluation function. 3.5. **Learning and strengthening competencies**: the organisation supports learning and strengthens competencies in evaluation.

There are six subcriteria in Chapter 3 (the capacity to organise the evaluation function) that are defined as 'criteria representing a basic capacity' (they are referred to as a framework in the Excel format) because they have a major impact on the independence, reliability and use of evaluations.

Before an organisation can make the official application to the SEO to be certified, it must ensure that it obtains at least a 'D' (which stands for 'largely developed' according to the LEADS system) for at least four of these six criteria.

These six subcriteria are the following:

- Subcriterion 3.1.3: Multiannual programming: this programming translates the vision of the organisation and the way in which it articulates and orientates the evaluation function. The organisation defines an evaluation programme and updates it when necessary and based on information from the monitoring system. The programme clarifies budgets and responsibilities as well as the choices in evaluation (which evaluation questions, objectives, focus and object, ...).
- Subcriterion 3.2.1.: Alignment between evaluations and decision-making: the organisation ensures that the evaluation programme is aligned with the decision-making cycles in the organisation and the strategic and programme cycles. In this way, it ensures that evaluation results are effectively used in decision-making.
- Subcriterion 3.2.2.: The organisation defines the roles and tasks of all internal and external stakeholders (including partner organisations). The organisation ensures that tasks are performed and thus guarantees quality, good coordination and independence in the management of evaluations.
- Subcriterion 3.3.1.: The organisation makes the tools, procedures and guidelines available to all stakeholders involved and monitors their implementation and effectiveness. It concerns instruments, procedures and guidelines for the preparation, execution and effective use of evaluations. In this way, the organisation contributes to the quality of the evaluation process and the quality of evaluation reports.
- Subcriterion 3.3.2.: The organisation has a monitoring and evaluation system that enables it to have relevant, reliable and useful data for the planned evaluations. In this way, the organisation contributes to the quality of the evaluation process and the quality of evaluation reports.
- Subcriterion 3.4.3.: Persons in charge and/or involved in decision-making stimulate the practice of evaluation and the use of evaluation results.

There is a clear link with the criteria of the screening for the accreditation of the ANGS/ACNG by DGD: a number of specific criteria strongly resemble criteria from the screening (the list of criteria in Annex A clarifies this). In the self-evaluation process, organisations may refer to the results they achieved in the screening process. However, it remains important that they argue their assessment well and refer to documents that have been updated.

2.3. Part 3: improvement plan

After the self-assessment, the organisation uses the results of the self-assessment to arrive at a multi-annual improvement plan to improve its capacity in terms of evaluation practices. Without this improvement plan, a formal application for an ECB certificate is inadmissible.

The organisation itself determines how it proposes its improvement plan. However, the plan must meet certain questions/criteria (see below). It is recommended to limit the improvement plan to a document between five and ten pages.

Questions	Explanatory note
1/ Overall analysis	After self-evaluation, what is the organisation's assessment of its capacity to develop and manage the evaluation function, to manage the evaluation process and to monitor the quality of evaluation reports? The organisation looks back at the results of the self-evaluation and arrives at an overall analysis[3] that addresses the following questions: • What are the main strengths and what are they based on? What should we consolidate? • What are the main weaknesses and what are they based on? Are there therefore risks (e.g. in terms of independence, reliability, evaluability, use, etc.) that we need to address? • What is our current capacity to improve ourselves (willingness, time available, human resources to be used, context of interventions, etc.). • What are the shortcomings or strengths that are related to external factors (implementing partner, for example). • What is the most pressing and what can we do fairly quickly, which processes require more time?
2/ Priorities of improvement	Based on the results of the self-evaluation and the analysis thereof, the organisation identifies the improvements that seem to take priority. The organisation lists the established priorities, supports its choice and clearly formulates the results it wants to achieve. The organisation clearly refers to the criteria/subcriteria it would like to influence. With its choices, the organisation shows that it is working on a strategic improvement plan.
3/ Implementation of the actions and calendar	For each priority, the organisation determines the appropriate actions. The organisation clarifies what concrete result it expects from these actions and how it will achieve that result (mobilisation of HR, other resources, the coordination and management and the role and task division).

[3] By way of example: the organisation can, if desired, use a tool for analysis, e.g. SWOT analysis (analysis of *Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threads*) or a different tool.

Questions	Explanatory note
	The organisation should preferably take two deadlines into account: • Short-term deadlines: what can the organisation do in the short term (e.g. 1 year) and what does it not need a lot of additional resources for? • Medium- and long-term deadlines: the organisation clarifies which actions it will need a longer period of time for.
4/ Needs in terms of (external) support and technical expertise	The organisation is aware of its strengths, but also of its limitations and identifies in its improvement plan the need for reinforcement, support/advice, technical expertise for employees, etc. for the implementation of the actions. The organisation explains how it wishes to mobilise external resources (through federations, between colleagues (peers), external consultants, thematic learning networks, etc.).
5/ Risk factors	The organisation identifies the main risks (both inside and outside the organisation) that may have an impact on the implementation of the improvement plan. The organisation indicates how it will manage these risks.
6/ Follow-up	The responsibility for the overall improvement plan lies with the organisation. The organisation indicates how it wants to create a continuous improvement dynamic within the organisation. What has the organisation planned for the follow-up of the implementation of the improvement plan and how will it adapt the plan to any changes in the context?

3. Presentation of the system of evaluation

For the self-evaluation, the organisation is asked to assess its practice and performance for each subcriterion (see Annex A). The assessment system is both narrative (free assessment) and quantitative, using a 5-point scale and an assessment according to the LEADS system.

Free assessment: narrative in which the organisation assesses its practice and performance against all subcriteria. The assessment is summarised in a Word format (see Annex B, this file can be downloaded from the website of the Special Evaluation Office). The format contains subquestions that help the organisation in its own analysis and assessment.

Assessment according to the LEADS system: assessment with regard to each subcriterion and on the basis of the narrative. This assessment is reported in the Excel format (in Annex C, this file can be downloaded from the website of the Special Evaluation Office).

3.1. Free assessment

The format for the free assessment requires the organisation to mention the following:

How is the organisation doing (with regard to the relevant subcriterion), what is going well or less well, what is a strong point and where is there room for improvement? What are the explanatory factors, if any? What is the conclusion regarding the criterion?

Which documents and practices underpin the analysis (the sources)? For example, is there a policy document about evaluation, a certain evaluation report, a structure/measure, a job description, a concrete example from practice, etc.?

The organisation is invited to briefly describe per chapter what it considers to be 'good practice' (which can serve as an example for other organisations).

3.2. Assessment according to LEADS

The assessment of each of the subcriteria follows the LEADS system:

L	Little or no elements	The practice does not exist or is very embryonic.
E	some Elements	Practice shows that some elements are present but very fragmented, unstructured and not institutionalised.
A	clear Action	The practice is developing, there are clear actions and there is an impetus to institutionalise.
D	largely Developed	The practice is highly developed, although it may not always be fully institutionalised.
S	Sustainable	The practice is fully developed and institutionalised within the organisation.

Example of application of LEADS assessment to subcriterion 2.2.1. "The reference terms clearly indicate what data are available to carry out the evaluation or indicate which data still need to be collected by the evaluator":

L = The organisation will never consider this point, unless in highly exceptional circumstances. Practice is not systematic and is not supported by a document.

E = Occasionally the reference terms pay attention to this point but it always depends on a person, it is not common practice in the organisation.

A = Attention for this point appears more clearly in the Reference Terms and is no longer dependent on one particular person. It is possible that this is still addressed in different ways in the reference terms. The organisation therefore pays more attention to it but does not yet succeed in making the point very clear.

D = The majority of the people who are involved in the evaluation show an automatic reflex to investigate this point and to take it into account in the preparation of the Reference Terms. It is possible that this may still be addressed in different ways in the reference terms, but it is always clear. However, practice has not yet been institutionalised, i.e. there is no clear guideline or document that clearly indicates to all concerned what should always be in the reference terms re this point.

S = It is a practice that is described and supported by the organisation. A document or instruments specify how this point should be addressed in the reference terms. Everyone who is/can be involved in evaluations is trained and understands what it is about and how it should be done. This ensures that there is a certain continuity, also in a turnover of personnel. The point is addressed in the same way, systematically and clearly in all reference terms.

4. Use of the tool for self-evaluation

In line with the spirit of the ECB initiative, the self-evaluation tool was developed as a substantive supporting document to facilitate analysis and **collective** learning within the organisation.

The self-evaluation can be seen as a process consisting of six consecutive steps. Below, we give some indications how the process should be organised, but the organisation should make the process its own and determine how it can be organised so that a collective analysis and reflection are possible. The organisation must consider its resources and the time it has available. It should be noted that the organisation can/should devote a considerable amount of its time to this analysis, especially if it is the first time. The test phase of the ECB initiative has shown that an organisation needs a minimum of eight full days (including the contribution of several people) to conduct a good-quality, collective self-evaluation.

Steps		**Contents**
1	**Identification of participants**	In order to support learning, it is important that self-evaluation is a collective exercise involving various individuals within the organisation. The people involved ideally have different functions at different levels (people who are operationally active, managers/leaders, support functions, partners, people from the field/headquarters, etc.). If the organisation has a Northern and a Southern component, it is essential that both are represented in the group that carries out the self-evaluation and thinks about the improvement plan. During the visit, the external assessor will pay attention to the quality of this collective process.
2	**Determination of sample of evaluations**	The organisation determines the sample of evaluations, which allows to analyse the results of its practice (capacity and process). As described above, the organisations should choose a maximum of five evaluations from the past three years. The sample contains at least two evaluations, unless the organisation has only had one evaluation performed in the last three years. Organisations that had more than ten evaluations carried out in the last three years have a sample of five evaluations. It is recommended that the sample includes all evaluations of programmes funded by DGD. The evaluations of the organisation and the sample are described in a format (see Annex D). Before the visit, the assessor will also carry out an evaluation of the quality of the evaluation reports of the sample (more specifically the reports relating to evaluations of programmes financed by DGD).

Steps		Contents
3	**Filling in the profile of the organisation**	**In the first part of the Excel file, the organisation will fill in the following data[4] :** • The name of the organisation (in full and acronym), • The total budget of the organisation for the current year (part of the organisation dealing with development cooperation), • The percentage of DGD budget for the current year, • The total DGD budget for the current programming period (five years), • The amount allocated to external evaluations for the current programming period (five years), • The total number of FTEs of the organisation (registered office and site), • The total number of people who have specific evaluation tasks in their profile description, • Clarification of the existence of a specific function (full-time or part-time) dedicated to evaluation or M&E: yes/no, • Clarification of the existence of a specific service for M&E: yes/no, • A brief description of the organisation's ambitions in terms of evaluation, • Overview of sample evaluations: title, budget of the evaluation, duration of the evaluation, type (intermediate, final, other), (maximum five).
4	**Self-evaluation**	Self-evaluation in three steps. The organisation can choose how it organises this, e.g. parallel in subteams or successively, starting with capacity (Chapter 3) or with the evaluation reports (Chapter 1). It seems most sensible to us to start with the evaluation reports (Chapter 1) because this can make some things more concrete. The evaluation is done according to the subcriteria as described and explained in Annex A. Free assessment: report according to a Word format, see Annex B. LEADS assessment: note down the assessment in the Excel format, see Annex C. Make sure that there is a coherence between the LEADS assessment and the free, narrative assessment and that it bears witness to a certain consensus between the participants of the self-evaluation. It is recommended to start with a narrative assessment

[4] It is not possible to recover these data from existing sources. Therefore, we ask the organisations to supplement these data themselves for the time being.

Steps		Contents
		so that sufficient attention is paid to the analysis and the substantiation. • Step 1: the organisation analyses the subcriteria of Chapter 1, as described in Annex A. The organisation gives each subcriterion for each report a separate LEADS assessment in the Excel format. The narrative, free assessment in the Word format may be done per criterion for all the reports. • Step 2: the organisation analyses the subcriteria of Chapter 2. The organisation gives each subcriterion for each process (linked to a certain report) its own LEADS assessment in the Excel format. The narrative, free assessment may be done per criterion in the Word format for the entire process. • Step 3: the organisation analyses the subcriteria of Chapter 3. For each sub-criterion, the organisation provides a LEADS assessment in the Excel format. The narrative, free assessment may be done for all of the criterion. In order to do this exercise properly, each participant of the self-evaluation ensures that he/she collects the necessary documents, examples and evidence. These documents can be requested by the assessor before or during the visit. As a reminder: the organisation itself decides how it carries out this exercise. The only requirement (which will also be checked by the assessor) is that it is done in the spirit of the ECB initiative and thus that it is a collective and learning exercise. That is why it is essential that different people with different profiles are involved.
5	**Identifying good practice**	With a view to learning and sharing results in the sector, we ask the organisation to indicate for itself what it considers to be good evaluation practice. For each practice, the organisation argues and explains why this practice is put forward and what its importance can be for other organisations. This section is part of the Word format for reporting (see Annex B).
6	**Definition of an improvement plan**	Once the self-evaluation has been completed, the organisation (with the same team or additional people) determines an improvement plan that considers the elements we listed earlier in point 2.3. of this manual. The improvement plan is the final part of the self-evaluation and is a condition for submitting a formal request for an ECB certificate, together with the self-evaluation report.

List of annexes

Annex A: Criteria and subcriteria with explanatory note

A1.1. Chapter 1: The evaluation report (main product of the evaluation process)

Criteria	Subcriteria (brief)	Subcriteria with explanatory note[5]
1.1. Validity The validity of the information in the report is guaranteed.	1.1.1. Described subject	1.1.1. The evaluation report describes: (1) the subject of the evaluation within its context and (2) the change theory/logical framework of the organisation (the way in which the organisation wants to contribute to change). This is a way of checking whether an evaluator has understood properly what change the organisation intends to make and how it wishes to contribute to it. • Subject: the report clarifies what the evaluator should analyse: which parts of the programme, which population groups, which types of population, which region, which period, which stakeholders. • Context: the report places the subject in the context and analyses the context as it appears to the evaluator (power relations, aspects of gender, as well as political, economic and historical elements). This means that the evaluator goes beyond what is in the reference terms; at the very least, the evaluator guarantees a critical reading of the context. • The vision on change (e.g. theory of change): the report specifies how, according to the evaluator, the organisation wanted to contribute to change, what its intervention logic was and the underlying hypotheses.
	1.1.2. Clear evaluation	1.1.2. The evaluation report specifies the evaluation questions selected and the

[5] The criteria are multidimensional and integrate various elements. The elements listed in the table are not exhaustive.

	framework	reference frameworks, concepts and criteria used by the evaluator to arrive at his/her answers and final conclusions. This allows to clarify the broad methodological orientations of the evaluation and makes the work of the evaluator and his analysis more transparent.
	1.1.3. Well-founded conclusions	1.1.3. The conclusions of the evaluation result logically from the evaluator's findings and his/her analysis of the collected data. It is essential that an evaluator not only describes the data but also analyses them.
1.2. Reliability Reliability: the reliability of the information in the report is assured.	1.2.1. Sound choice of evaluation methods	1.2.1. The evaluation methods were described and argued (with the objective of the evaluation in mind). The limits of these methods and the difficulties encountered in carrying out the evaluation were also described. • For example, it is clear that more participatory evaluation processes generally require a strong mobilisation and availability of various stakeholders. It is particularly important that collected data are sufficiently representative and useful (qualitative or quantitative). • In certain cases, this mobilisation may be very difficult or impossible. This can adversely affect the reliability of data and their usefulness. It is then important that the evaluator indicates how he/she has dealt with this and what the possible effects are on the quality of the data.
	1.2.2. Information sources	1.2.2. The selection and content of the different sources of information (in particular documents and interviewees) are independent of the stakeholders (principals, project implementers and beneficiaries). • The evaluator should indicate the source of the information/data he/she collects, which may be of a different kind (statistical data, individual interviews, documentary study, benchmarking, etc.) • It must be possible to check the information and to determine its diversity: a report that is based only on a limited number of sources or sources that are mainly 'internal' to the project is usually less reliable.
	1.2.3. Triangulation assured	1.2.3. The report explains how the data were checked and how the different sources and methods were used to collect information on the same phenomena. • It is clear that data are only reliable (or can be understood) if they have

		been crossed with other data beforehand. This is the principle of triangulation. • For example, in the case of an evaluation of the quality of a public service, it is important to know the opinion/observations of different categories of actors so that the evaluator can arrive at a picture that is as objective as possible. Not only the users will be consulted, but also the officials of the service in question and the administrative and/or political authorities, ultimately responsible for the proper functioning of the evaluated service.
	1.2.4. Neutrality of the report	1.2.4. The report does not express any prejudice. The conclusions of the evaluation are presented in a neutral and impartial manner. The evaluator never takes a personal stand against any actor or never shows any personal affinities (political opinion, religion, ...).
1.3. Useful information The evaluation report guarantees the usefulness of the data.	1.3.1. Response to objective and usefulness	1.3.1. The report repeats the objective and usefulness of the evaluation and indicates how the report, conclusions and recommendations respond to it.
	1.3.2. Answers to evaluation questions	1.3.2. The conclusions of the evaluation as well as the different recommendations form an answer to the evaluation questions.
	1.3.3. Realistic recommendations	1.3.3. The recommendations show that the evaluator has made a good analysis of their feasibility or the possibilities to implement them within the context of the intervention and taking the stakeholders into account. • The organisation ensures that recommendations are realistic and achievable within the context in which they have to work. • This means that the organisation must consult with the evaluator as to whether the recommendations can be implemented in view of the resources available (financial, human, material), the time available to the organisation but also the environment in which it must operate (developments in the development co-operation sector, main orientations of donors, implementation of a joint programme, etc.).
	1.3.4. Readability of the report	1.3.4. The report is understandable and accessible to the users who have been identified. • The style (formulation, sentence structure) and language have been

		adapted to the end users of the evaluation (be careful not to use too many technical words, evaluation jargon, etc.). • For the same reason and with a view to facilitating decision-making, the organisation provides an executive summary of the report.

A1.2. Chapter 2: the way in which the organisation carries out the evaluations (process)

The process consists of three phases: development of evaluation, implementation and use.

Development		
Criteria	**Subcriteria (brief)**	**Subcriteria with explanatory note**[6]
2.1. Quality of the reference terms The Reference Terms meet minimum quality requirements and guide the evaluation.	2.1.1. Why, what and for whom?	2.1.1. The Reference Terms (RT) describe the 'why' (the usefulness), the 'what' (the subject of the evaluation) and the 'for whom' (the users of the evaluation) and refer to the relevant documents. For the ANGS/ACNG, please refer to criterion 2.4. of the screening. • The RT explain why an evaluation is useful and the context within which it takes place and which underpins its usefulness. The context can be internal to the organisation (end of a programme cycle, period of strategic redefinition, need for reflection on the updating of the organisation's vision and mission, ...), or external (the context in the country of intervention, the context specific to development cooperation, the policies of the main donors, ...). • The 'what' clarifies the evaluation object: what should the evaluation look at? At the whole programme or part of it, at the intervention strategy of the organisation on the basis of 1 specific case, ...? The organisation can refer here to the logical framework and theory of change that clarify how the evaluation object relates to the intervention. • The RT specify who the end users of the evaluation are, the persons or organisations that will have to use the results. 2.1.2. The RT formulate a limited number of clearly understandable

[6] The criteria are multidimensional and integrate several elements, the specification is not exhaustive.

	2.1.2. Evaluation questions	evaluation questions that are consistent with the usefulness, objective, subject matter and users of the evaluation. For the ANGS/ACNG, check screening criterion 2.4. (this criterion states that RT should refer to OECD norms and standards). • An evaluation question must clarify what the organisation wants to demonstrate or prove (be accountable) or what it wants to learn from the evaluation. For example: does an organisation want to know whether, since the start of the 'access to basic health care' programme, the number of visitors to the health centres has increased or whether users believe that access to them has become easier? In addition, the organisation can ask itself which factors explain any changes? • The evaluation questions must be easy to understand. The organisation takes care of the quality of the style and the use of language. • In order to arrive at quality evaluation questions, it is important to analyse the data from the monitoring system (which evaluation questions do the data raise?), to take into account the organisation's policies (see criterion 3.1.), its vision on change (theory of change), previous evaluations and the questions that were already identified in the long-term programming.
	2.1.3. The methodological orientation	2.1.3. The RT specify the major methodological orientations of the evaluation, its alignment with the objective, the usefulness, the object and the expected use of the evaluation. If the organisation does not indicate anything about this in the RT, it argues why. Different orientations are possible depending on what the organisation wants and what dynamics it has in mind. The organisation should not describe the methodology in detail (that is the task of the evaluator in his/her technical quote) but, instead, orient it and ensures that the methodology is appropriate.

		• For example, if the organisation wants the evaluation process to become a moment of mobilisation, awareness and contribution to sustainability of interventions, it will probably opt for a more participative approach. It is then up to the evaluator to clarify how he fleshes out this participatory approach (which approach, tools, ...) to contribute to the learning process. • Another example: if the organisation wishes the evaluation to contribute to capacity development of its partners, it will probably have a preference for a more 'pedagogical' approach. • The organisation itself can also indicate to what extent it wants a combination of qualitative and quantitative data. In an ideal scenario, the organisation aims for a '*mixed-method approach'*.
	2.1.4. Profile of the evaluator(s)	2.1.4. The profile of the evaluator shall be described and shall be consistent with the methodological orientations, usefulness, objective, subject of the evaluation and evaluation questions. The profile of the evaluator depends on the methodological orientation chosen. • If an evaluation is mainly aimed at strengthening and developing competences, it is important that the evaluator has expertise on adult training processes and animation techniques. • If the evaluation focuses on how users perceive the functioning of a particular public service, then the evaluator must be able to demonstrate expertise in the field of public service provision. • If an evaluation is about the cocoa chain, it is important to have an evaluator with an economic background. • If the organisation wants a *peer evaluation*, it is useful to have an external evaluator who has specific techniques for

		facilitating multi-stakeholder workshops and guiding *peers.*
2.2. Monitoring the quality of the reference terms The organisation has carried out a quality control of the reference terms.	2.2.1. Information on available data 2.2.2. Alignment between expectations, budget and time available	2.2.1. The RT specify what data are available to carry out the evaluation and/or indicate what data still need to be collected by the evaluator. • It is up to the organisation to pay sufficient attention to this so that the subject of the evaluation is dealt with and it is possible to answer the evaluation questions. Understandable evaluation questions alone are not enough, the organisation must also ensure that all the necessary data are available and accessible. This should be done before the publication of the RT. • If the data are not available, it is the organisation that has to check if the budget and timing of the evaluation allow the evaluator to collect missing/essential data. • If this is not possible, the organisation should review and adjust the evaluation questions. If it does not do so, there is a good chance that the results of the evaluation are neither valid nor reliable. 2.2.2. The RT must be feasible: this is only possible if the expectations, the available budget and the time span of execution are aligned. For the ANGS/ACNG, refer to criterion 2.4. of the screening (this criterion relates to the importance of properly integrating budget and planning in the RT). A feasibility analysis is based on the 'magic triangle': are the resources, time and expectations aligned? The organisation therefore checks itself whether the duration foreseen for the evaluation is sufficiently long to meet the quality requirements, or whether the budget allows for effective (additional) data collection so that the evaluation questions can be answered.
2.3. Participation in the process	2.3.1. Roles are clarified	2.3.1. The organisation shall make clear in the RT who plays what role in the management of the evaluation and how it

The organisation shall guarantee the participation of internal and external parties in the process to ensure the independence, quality and use of the evaluation.		guarantees the quality and independence of the evaluation. • In order to ensure the quality of execution, independence and use of the evaluation, the organisation shall clarify what measures it foresees to guide the evaluator during the evaluation process, to cooperate with him/her smoothly and to facilitate his/her work. Regular contact during implementation can help to identify any problems quickly and to seek solutions with the evaluator so that the quality of the evaluation is not compromised. • The organisation may also take measures to assist the person responsible for the evaluation, e.g. through a steering group mandated to take decisions at each step of the implementation of an evaluation or to provide feedback on interim results as a group of experts. Some organisations set up a steering committee to facilitate the work of the evaluator (mobilising respondents, making documents and data available, etc.) rather than taking decisions. • The organisation explains who occupies what position during the execution of the evaluation (according to the roles and tasks it defined): role of the partners, role of the beneficiaries, role of the head of department, the donor, etc.
	2.3.2. Consultation on the content	2.3.2. The organisation consulted stakeholders on the content of the reference terms. • Since several people (project team) and organisations (partners, donors, etc.) are involved or play a role in an evaluation, it is important to consult them on the content of the Reference Terms, to analyse their information needs and to examine how the evaluation can meet their expectations. • The consultation phase is also ideally suited to guarantee

		that all stakeholders are mobilised during the execution of the evaluation, and thus an effective use of the results. It is also possible to agree with the stakeholders on the modalities for the use of the evaluation. • Reference terms drawn up from behind a desk (by one person) offer little/no guarantee for the ownership of the process, the mobilisation or the effective use of the results.
Implementation		
Criteria	**Subcriteria (brief)**	**Subcriteria with explanatory note**[7]
2.4. Monitoring the quality of implementation The organisation shall the quality of the implementation of the evaluation is monitored.	2.4.1. Verification of the credibility of the evaluator(s)	2.4.1. The organisation has checked to what extent the evaluator(s) is/are credible in terms of qualifications, evaluation experience and independence with regard to the subject of the evaluation. This can be done on the basis of a CV, examples of evaluation reports, an overview with track record of previous assignments or during an interview with a steering committee for example.

[7] The criteria are multidimensional and integrate several elements, the specification is not exhaustive.

		• The selection of the evaluator is, of course, the result of a selection process in which the competition has played a role (according to the legal guidelines for public procurement). • The selection of the evaluator is based on objective criteria, including the criterion of independence, which must exclude any conflict of interest. This means that an evaluator has not participated (at any level) in the formulation or implementation of the programme which is the subject of the evaluation. • The selection criteria should also make it possible to ensure a good match between the profile of the evaluator (competences, knowledge, experience) and the expectations with regard to the evaluation.
	2.4.2. Re-framing the evaluation	2.4.2. At the start of the evaluation, the organisation has taken time to re-frame and specify the process and expectations of the evaluation together with the evaluator. • It is possible that elements of the context have changed/evolved between the formulation of the RT and the start of the evaluation. It is also possible that the evaluator himself wishes to clarify certain aspects of timing or methodology with the organisation or that he / she still needs to clarify the methodology and methods for data collection (e.g. based on a document study). A meeting or briefing at the start of the evaluation allows these elements to be included in the evaluation and contributes to good relations between the organisation and the evaluator. • This meeting usually takes place within the framework of what the organisation has organised to guide and/or supervise the implementation of the evaluation.

	2.4.3. Refund 2.4.4. Monitoring the quality of the report	• What was discussed can be documented so that the expectations and agreements are clear, this can be done in a note or possibly even a kind of start report (*inception report*) or a methodological note. 2.4.3. The organisation ensures that the evaluator organises a refund with the stakeholders in the field and the organisation's registered office. • Before completion or publication of the evaluation report, the evaluator can present the main findings and results to the steering group/support committee (if any) and to the main stakeholders (e.g. partners in the field). • A refund is interesting because it allows to validate the findings and conclusions of the evaluator and to discuss the recommendations (what seems realistic and what does not). • A refund also contributes to the mobilisation of stakeholders and to guaranteeing the use of the results and recommendations. • The form of and participation in this refund obviously depends on the budget, the time available and the wish of the stakeholders to be involved. 2.4.4. The organisation has systematically checked the methodical quality of the evaluation report (validity, reliability, usefulness; see also the criteria under Chapter 1). • The organisation analyses the quality of a final report. One or more people read the report on the basis of a number of criteria that the organisation has preferably determined in advance (before the start of the evaluation). • Such a checklist should at least guarantee the validity, reliability and usefulness of the evaluation.

	2.4.5. Feedback on the content of the report	• The results of this analysis are validated internally and discussed with the evaluator. 2.4.5. The organisation will provide feedback on the content of the preliminary final report. • Several people within the organisation read the report and are given sufficient time to do so. They pass on their comments. Reading by different people allows to multiply and cross the number of opinions, which contributes to the quality of the feedback and the internal use of the evaluation results. This work can also be coordinated by a steering group. • Comments are consolidated and submitted to the evaluator. The evaluator can then respond to the comments and modify his/her report or argue why he/she does not include certain comments in the report.

Use of the evaluation		
Criteria	**Subcriteria (brief)**	**Subcriteria with explanatory note[8]**
2.5. Use of the evaluation results The organisation used the evaluation to improve its practice and that of its partners, as well as the interventions.	2.5.1. Formal response	2.5.1. The organisation has formally responded to the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation and indicates which recommendations it will continue to work with. • A formal response can be formulated as a management response, a report of an internal meeting, an overview of decisions, a note. Within the Belgian context, DGD requires a response in the form of a management response. • This document indicates which conclusions and recommendations the organisation considers to be a priority and why (argumentation). • It is a response that is binding for the organisation. Depending on the way in which the evaluation was set up, the partners may be asked to formulate their management response as well.
	2.5.2 Implementation of the recommendations	2.5.2. The organisation works on the recommendations that take priority. • The organisation shall specify how it intends to operationalise and implement the recommendations (e.g. by means of an action plan setting out the expected results, the actions required, the persons involved, the possible partners and the calendar). • The organisation provides a follow-up mechanism to ensure that the operationalisation is achieved.

[8] The criteria are multidimensional and integrate several elements, the specification is not exhaustive.

A1.3. Chapter 3: The organisation's capacity to organise the evaluation function

Criteria	Subcriteria (brief)	Subcriteria with explanatory note[9]
3.1. Orientation The organisation explains its choices regarding evaluation and its importance for the organisation. This orientates and supports the evaluation function.	3.1.1. Vision of the evaluation function	3.1.1. Vision of the evaluation function within the organisation. The organisation: • clarifies how evaluations contribute to the goal/s mandate of the organisation (what is the added value?). • integrates an evaluative dimension in the development of new programmes and interventions so that it is clear from the start what the objectives and the usefulness of evaluations are for the organisation. From the start, the organisation determines which strategic questions evaluations can answer, what the organisation wants to evaluate and how? • updates its vision based on changes in the context of the intervention, results of evaluations, new knowledge/approaches within the theme concerned or in the evaluation domain.
	3.1.2. Articulation of the evaluation function	3.1.2. Articulation of the evaluation function. The organisation: • ensures that the evaluation function has a clear place within the organisation. • explains how the evaluation function relates to the other functions in the organisation: partnership management, quality management, knowledge management, learning, etc. • explains how the evaluation function contributes to those other functions (orientation, support, interaction, ...).
	3.1.3. Multiannual	3.1.3. Multiannual programming: **Attention! This criterion forms part of an organisation's basic evaluation capacity.** The programming translates the

[9] The criteria are multidimensional and integrate several elements, the specification is not exhaustive.

	programming	vision of the organisation and articulates the evaluation function. The organisation: • defines a multi-annual programme in which the budget for the planned evaluations is clear, as well as the responsibility, subject and objective of each planned evaluation, the type, evaluation questions and planned use of the evaluation. The objective is about what the organisation wants/needs to know; the use is about what it wants to do with the results. • clarifies how the OECD DAC criteria will be used/applied. (For the ANGS/ACNG, please refer to criterion 1.1. of the screening). • ensures regular updating of this programming (e.g. following new information from the monitoring system). The way in which interventions are implemented, changes in the context (e.g. crises, new local political policies) or within the organisation itself (change of strategy e.g.) can lead to changes in the timing of evaluations or even in the objectives. To what extent does the organisation take this into account and does it sufficiently ask itself whether the evaluation programme is still adequate?
3.2. **Structure, roles and tasks** The organisation structures the evaluation function: it defines the roles and tasks of all those involved (including partners) with a view to guaranteeing quality, coordination, independence of evaluation and use at organisation level.	3.2.1. Alignment between evaluation and decision-making	3.2.1. Alignment evaluation and decision-making: **Attention! This criterion forms part of an organisation's basic evaluation capacity.** In order to ensure that evaluations are used and that decisions are taken on the basis of evaluation results, the organisation ensures that the evaluation planning corresponds as far as possible to the decision-making cycles within the organisation (on programmes, on strategy, on new opportunities). These decision-making processes can take place at different levels (international, Board of Directors, General Assembly, management committee, partner consultation, network, etc.). The programming of evaluations should therefore take into account where and when decisions are taken at: • Operational level: results of evaluations can help steer interventions; • Strategic level: evaluation results can feed reflection and help adjust the organisation's strategy (or provide input to consultations at the international level); • Donor level: evaluations ensure timely accountability to the donor.

	3.2.2. Defining roles and tasks	3.2.2. Definition of roles and tasks: the organisation specifies who plays which role and who must perform which tasks. **Attention! This criterion forms part of an organisation's basic evaluation capacity.** 'Role' = who should take what responsibility? 'Task' = who should do what to ensure that people take their responsibilities? The evaluation function and process assume that it is clear at all times who has to do what, when and who bears what responsibility and when (within the organisation and beyond). For the ANGS/ACNG: refer to criterion 2.6. (who is responsible for the management and coordination?) and according to criterion 3.1. of the screening. The organisation clarifies: • how it ensures that quality control takes place, that there is good coordination and independence in managing and managing the evaluations. For example, a person from the organisation responsible for the implementation of a programme is not a neutral person (e.g. the project leader or the coordinator of a programme) because he/she has influenced the implementation. It is therefore not a good idea for this person to be in charge of the evaluation; this can have an (adverse) effect on the objectivity of the results because he/she can also influence the evaluation process. • who participates and how? (role of the various stakeholders): it is a question of clarifying the roles and tasks within the organisational structures (the team, the decision-making bodies), as well as within a certain team (role of the director, the project leader, the animator, the financial manager, ...), and between the organisation and its partners (partners who implement, financial partners, donors, volunteers, international network, ...). Of course, this depends on the nature of each organisation. • where and how it will mobilise external expertise: within an organisation, not all the competences necessary for a high-quality evaluation are always present. Often, external expertise has to be called upon (e.g. for a screening the reference terms) or the organisation has to become a member of a network that gives it access to specific competences in other organisations (which, in turn, can make use of the expertise of their own organisation). This sometimes requires a budget that must be planned and included in the organisation's multi-annual or annual budgets.

	3.2.3. Mobilisation of the organisation	3.2.3. Mobilisation of the organisation: the organisation ensures that the management and execution of the evaluations mobilises the organisation as a whole so that the evaluation can influence the development of the organisation. For the ANGS/ACNG, see criterion 2.4. of the screening (the data generated by the monitoring and evaluation system are the subject of strategic reflections). The hierarchical position of the persons or services involved in managing the evaluation process and/or making the link with the decision-makers guarantee the use of evaluations in internal reflections on the organisation's strategy and approach. For example, is there someone in the steering committee of an evaluation who can take decisions (e.g. a director) or who has a direct link with decision-making? Or is the evaluation process entirely in the hands of a single project manager?
3.3. **Normative framework, procedures and tools** The organisation defines a normative framework, guarantees its quality execution and develops the appropriate tools to facilitate the evaluation work.	3.3.1. Tools	3.3.2. Tools: the organisation ensures that the persons and services that have a role to play/task to perform have the appropriate tools, procedures or guidelines at their disposal. **Attention! This criterion forms part of an organisation's basic evaluation capacity.** To contribute to the quality of evaluations, the organisation may develop tools that it considers useful/important (e.g. templates for formulating reference terms or checklists for analysing the quality of evaluation reports). The organisation may also develop detailed procedures to clarify the steps to be followed and the actors to be involved in the evaluation process. Guidelines, templates, tools and procedures must, of course, be adapted to an evolving context and evaluation practices. The organisation: • develops the appropriate tools, procedures and guidelines for the organisation of the evaluation function and the preparation, execution and use of evaluations. • supervises the effective use of these tools, procedures and guidelines. • supervises the quality that ensures that the instruments, procedures and guidelines remain coherent with the evaluations from the evaluation sector and with the modus operandi of the organisation. 3.3.3. The organisation has a monitoring system: **Attention! This criterion forms**

	3.3.2. Monitoring system	**part of an organisation's basic evaluation capacity.** This system: • provides relevant, reliable and useful data (at the level of output and outcome) for the planned evaluations (evaluability). The organisation pays special attention to the data collection that should make it possible to make a statement about the indicators at outcome level. • clarifies at the start of a new programme or intervention which data will be available for evaluations and answering specific evaluation questions. This contributes to a good coordination between data collection and evaluation questions. When relevant and/or requested by the donor and in order to be able to make a comparison 'before' and 'after', the system also develops a baseline for the indicators. • is geared as closely as possible to the existing systems of the partners with whom it cooperates. The organisation ensures that: • the system and the regular analysis of data, in turn, feed the policy lines and evaluation questions. • that the data are organised and easily accessible. The evaluator should be able to access relevant non-aggregated data (e.g. gender, age, etc.) in an efficient way.
3.4. **Leadership, management mode and values** The leadership of the organisation stimulates the development of the evaluation function.	3.4.1. Ethical principles	3.4.1. Ethical principles: the organisation defines and applies ethical principles that guide it in the preparation, execution and use of evaluations. • These can be ethical principles or deontological rules related to data collection: anonymity of the source in individual interviews or online questionnaires, failure to share transcripts of interviews with the client so that interviewees feel free to express themselves without fear of sanctioning, which contributes to the reliability of the data. • It can also be about ethical principles for sharing evaluation results (both negative and positive results) e.g. with partners, with beneficiaries (*'closing the feedback loop'*), the general public, etc.

	3.4.2. Sharing and integrating the vision 3.4.3. Leadership that stimulates	• And finally, it can also be about the guidelines that the organisation uses as fundamental principles during an evaluation process (e.g. involving the partners in the implementation, guaranteeing feedback to the institutional partners, or involving the target groups, ...). 3.4.2. Sharing the vision: the organisation ensures that the vision, choices and policies for evaluation are understood and shared by the staff and partners involved. • It is good that the organisation should make its evaluation policy explicit but it is even more important that this policy is understood and that staff at all levels of the hierarchy integrate it. • The staff of an organisation must be able to explain the evaluation policy at external meetings, on the move when they meet with partners or institutions of the intervening country, and thus be able to propagate the function of spokesperson for evaluations. • The organisation's main partners must be aware of the evaluation policies and choices made; it is often the partners who have data useful for evaluations or who can be asked to collect it. They may not always have the right competences to do this, which requires a certain investment in capacity development (see below under 3.5.1.). Their active involvement can also contribute to the quality of evaluations (at the level of the process, reporting and its use). 3.4.3. The managers and decision-makers stimulate the practice of evaluation and the use of the results of evaluations: **Attention! This criterion forms part of an organisation's basic evaluation capacity.** The management of an organisation can do a lot to strengthen the interest in evaluations internally, to ensure the quality of the process and to encourage the use of the results. E.g.: • by including this point in the agenda of team meetings or by raising evaluations during the annual evaluation interviews with staff. • by involving staff in the formulation of evaluation questions. • by actively disseminating an outline of the main results of evaluations within the organisation. 3.4.4. The results of evaluations give rise to, and input for, dialogue at strategic level

	3.4.4. Strategic dialogue	with partners and donors. Both success and failure or poorer results are addressed, not with a view to controlling or sanctioning but with a view to improving and identifying sustainable solutions to problems identified during the implementation.
3.5. **Learning and strengthening competences** The organisation supports learning and strengthens competencies in evaluation.	3.5.1. Analysis and development of competences	3.5.1. The organisation analyses whether the necessary competencies and knowledge (internal and with partners) are present so that the tasks and roles that have been defined can be carried out. If necessary, the organisation develops a concrete plan for capacity development. For the ANGS/ACNG, refer to criterion 3.1. of the screening (number of persons within the organisation that were trained in result-oriented management). The organisation: • identifies its strengths and weaknesses. • determines, where necessary, the priority actions for strengthening or developing competencies. This automatically entails costs (training for staff, for example) that the organisation must properly assess and anticipate. These costs must be specifically budgeted for and be visible in the annual and multiannual budgets of the organisation. • devises various types of initiatives: staff training, exchange of experience between peers, punctual support by external experts, additional recruitment. It is clear that the organisation can also strengthen its competences by cooperating more and better with other organisations (mutualisation of efforts).
	3.5.2. Reflection on methodologies	3.5.2. The managers of the organisation encourage the staff to think about the methodologies that can be applied in evaluations. They can, for example: • allow staff to participate in technical networks around evaluations or in international conferences; or encourage staff to exchange with other organisations and peers on methods or organise internal events, where external experts are invited and innovative methods, approaches and tools are presented.

		• stimulate innovation and creativity about methods by raising this issue during the annual staff review.
	3.5.3. Accessibility of results	3.5.3. The organisation ensures that the evaluation reports are easy and quick to consult in order to make good use of the results. • The reports as well as the data used are part of the knowledge management system within the organisation. • Programme managers have easy access to evaluation reports on similar topics or approaches. • An employee preparing a new project has a quick overview of all relevant evaluations related to a similar theme, region or group of beneficiaries.
	3.5.4. Sharing of results	3.5.4. With a view to promoting learning and accountability, the organisation takes the initiative to share the results of its evaluations and evaluation practice **both internally and externally**. • Management can create space within the organisation for exchange and discussion, both within the team and with partners, to facilitate collective learning (partner meetings, lunch meetings, internal seminars, etc.) and the dissemination of key lessons from the different evaluations carried out (both in terms of content and process). • The transparency requirements encourage organisations to publish the results of their evaluations and to develop appropriate formats (e.g. a summary in different languages on the organisation's website). This format is adapted to the intended users and other interested parties and to the general public. Within the Belgian context, organisations are also obliged to publish the results of the report and the management response within three months after acceptance of the report. • Apart from the legal transparency requirement, the organisation can also share the evaluation results externally for the purpose of the learning process. The organisation can use any event (forums, conferences, network meetings, workshops with participants from different organisations, ...) to communicate externally about the main lessons learned from its evaluations and evaluation practices.