



Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting, And Learning (MERL) Policy

Table of Contents

1.0	INTRODUCTION	2
	PURPOSE OF MONITORING, EVALUATION, REPORTING, AND LEARNING (MERL).....	2
1.1	SCOPE.....	2
1.2	KEY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	3
1.3	IMPLEMENTATION, AMENDMENT AND REVIEW	4
1.4	CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.....	4
2	MONITORING	6
2.1	MONITORING TOOLS	6
2.2	LOGICAL FRAMEWORK REQUIREMENTS.....	7
2.3	MONITORING CRITERIA	7
3	EVALUATION	7
3.1	PURPOSE	7
3.2	GUIDING PRINCIPLES, NORMS, AND STANDARDS	8
3.3	CRITERIA	9
3.4	CATEGORIES AND TYPES OF EVALUATION	9
3.5	EVALUATION PLANNING, COSTING AND MANAGEMENT	10
3.5.1	EVALUATION PLANNING	10
3.5.2	EVALUATION MANAGEMENT.....	11
4	MONITORING AND EVALUATION REPORTING.....	11
4.1	REPORT FORMATS.....	11
4.2	REPORTING TOOLS AND REQUIREMENTS	12
4.3	MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF ADVOCACY PROJECTS	13
5	KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT	14
5.1	KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING	14
5.2	DISSEMINATION AND DISCLOSURE.....	14

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Centre for Environmental Stewardship (CES) is a national Kenyan Public Benefit Organization (PBO). It was founded in the year 2003 by a team of professionals in the fields of environment, biodiversity, natural resources management, health and theology. From its inception in 2003, CES has had an impact-level history. This has been through influencing behaviour change to create environmental stewards and supporting local communities to sustainably manage their environment for improved livelihoods. Sustainable landscape and ecosystem restoration is critical for addressing environmental degradation, pollution, biodiversity loss, climate change and loss of livelihoods. The goal of CES is to accelerate approaches that address the key drivers of degradation in Forests, Agro-ecosystems, Rangelands, and Wetlands to prevent, halt and reverse landscape and ecosystem degradation and improve livelihoods. CES seeks to address these through its four pillars. i.e., Institutional strengthening, Landscape and Ecosystem Restoration, Advocacy and Nature Based Enterprises for improved livelihoods.

Purpose of monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and learning (MERL)

The purpose of a monitoring, evaluation, reporting and learning policy is formulated to create a framework that will assist CES achieve its vision and mission through the promotion of institutional accountability, continuous learning, and transparent sharing of project and programme evaluations both internally and externally. Implementation of this Policy will provide decision makers at all levels within CES and its partners with relevant information, analysis, and recommendations to inform and improve planning, programming, and implementation. The Policy is designed to promote: -

- a) Systematic collection, documentation, and dissemination, both internally and externally, of lessons learned and impacts of CES projects and programmes.
- b) Opportunities for stakeholders, especially the poor with whom CES works, to present their honest perceptions and assessments of CES's activities.
- c) Opportunities for CES employees to reflect upon and share experiences and lessons learnt.
- d) Transparent sharing of evaluations with all stakeholders in forms and formats amenable to their needs, and
- e) Examination of progress made and challenges in achieving strategic priorities to achieve better organizational results.

1.1 Scope

The framework applies to all CES's programmes, projects, and activities of the Secretariat and those of its member Community Forest Associations. The policy is limited in scope, however, as concerns projects, activities or other activities which are implemented in collaboration with partners or executed entirely by partners on behalf of CES.

In cases where projects or other undertakings are implemented jointly, CES should inform implementing partner(s) and development partners of this policy and carry out consultations with a view to determine appropriate indicators for measuring results and modalities for evaluation. Should monitoring and/or evaluation modalities deviate from the present policy framework because of such consultations, programme management should inform the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer.

1.2 Key roles and responsibilities

a) CES Board

The Board makes policies on monitoring and evaluation, oversees the monitoring and evaluation function and creates an enabling environment for monitoring and evaluation of CES's programmes, projects, and activities.

b) The Chief Executive Officer

The Chief Executive Officer provides overall direction, leadership, and management of CES. The roles and responsibilities of the Chief Executive Officer are: -

- Prepare and submit CES's results-based programme budget to the Board for approval.
- Submit to the Board for review CES's Strategic Plan, Programme Performance Reports and Organization Evaluation Reports; and
- Identify projects and undertaking for and requests the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer/Unit to perform evaluations.

c) Monitoring and evaluation officer

The Monitoring and Evaluation Officer acts as the custodian of the monitoring and evaluation functions. The section's roles and responsibilities are the following: -

- Oversees the application of this policy framework, identifies challenges and constraints, and makes recommendations for updating the requirements or other elements of the framework, in line with international good practice, lessons learned as well as the evolving programming and operational needs and characteristics of CES.
- Facilitates regular in-house engagements between the Management Team and staff, collects feedback and facilitates learning on the framework.
- Conducts research and engages in critical and analytical reflection as well as issues recommendations to management for compliance with the framework.
- Prepares and circulates guidelines, checklists, templates, and other tools to facilitate the application of the framework.
- Develops and promotes standards for evaluation and quality assurance.
- Conducts and/or manages evaluations at the request of the Chief Executive Officer, programme officers and departments.
- Undertakes periodic and selective monitoring for quality assurance purposes.
- Prepares, maintains, and monitors the implementation of an annual evaluation plan based on scheduled evaluations.
- Prepares a synthesis and maintains a compilation of Programme Performance Reports based on submissions from programme management team.
- Prepares an annual Organizational Evaluation Report based on a review of completed evaluations.
- Maintains a public depository of evaluation reports with a view to ensure transparency and facilitate the integration of lessons learned and best practices into the broader concept of knowledge management.
- Promotes knowledge management, organizational learning and lessons learned by keeping abreast of innovative practices in the field of evaluation and monitoring, identifying relevant state-of-the art techniques, tools, and methods, and providing departments, programmes, and projects with guidance on the use of respective tools and methods.

- Commits to sharing best practices and lessons learned for the purpose of enhancing the quality of CES's programmes, projects, and activities, and
- Collaborates and coordinates with partner organizations on issues related to monitoring and evaluation.

d) Programme officer

- Undertake monitoring and evaluation functions in accordance with this policy framework, including monitoring progress towards results, as well as planning and conducting self-evaluations.
- Inform donors and implementing partners of CES's evaluation requirements when preparing and negotiating project agreements and modalities for cooperation and ensures that monitoring and evaluation modalities are specified in project documents or related agreements.
- Budget resources for the planning and undertaking of self- and/or independent evaluations in line with applicable evaluation requirements.
- Incorporate evaluation into annual work planning and schedule evaluations on a rolling basis.
- Submit copies of results and/or reports of evaluations undertaken to the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer upon completion.
- Follow-up on findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons-learned of independent evaluations in the form of a management response.
- Implement recommendations of evaluations if they are relevant and actionable, and indicates expected dates for completing implementation, and,
- Commits to sharing best practices and lessons learned for the purpose of enhancing the quality of the Institute's products and services.

1.3 Implementation, Amendment and Review

The implementation of the framework may include the issuance of amendments to account for adjustments in requirements or other elements based on the evolving nature of monitoring and evaluation functions and taking into consideration international good practices.

CES will review this policy biennially.

1.4 Concepts and definitions

- 1) Activity
Any action undertaken or work performed with the objective of transforming inputs into measurable outputs.
- 2) Appraisal
An assessment of the potential value of an undertaking during the conception phase.
- 3) Audit
An assessment of management controls and compliance with administrative rules, regulations, and policies.
- 4) Baseline
Data describing a situation to be addressed by an activity which serve as the starting point for measuring performance.
- 5) Beneficiaries

Individuals, entities, or groups which may be targeted or not and which may benefit directly or indirectly from a programme, project or activity.

- 6) Best practices
Planning, organizational and/or managerial methods, processes, techniques, or other practices which have produced consistent superior results to those achieved by other means.
- 7) Effectiveness
The extent to which a programme, project or other undertaking achieves its planned results (outputs outcomes and/or goals).
- 8) Efficiency
The cost effectiveness of transforming actions into outputs, taking into consideration alternative paths.
- 9) Evaluability
The extent to which an activity, project, programme, or other undertaking can be subject to evaluation in a credible and reliable manner.
- 10) Evaluation
The systematic assessment of the design, implementation and/or results of a programme, project, activity, policy, strategy, or other undertaking. The intention of evaluation is to provide credible and useful information with a view to determine the worth or significance of the undertaking, incorporate lessons learned into decision-making and enhance the overall quality of the CES's programming and operations.
- 11) Ex ante evaluation
An evaluation performed prior to the implementation of a programme or project.
- 12) Ex post evaluation
An evaluation performed after the implementation of a programme or project.
- 13) Indicator
A quantitative or qualitative measure of programme, project or activity performance that is used to demonstrate change and which details the extent to which results are being or have been achieved.
- 14) Intermediate outcome
Subsequent effects of the implementation of activities, for instance, knowledge and skills applied on the job because of training.
- 15) Impact
The totality and/or long-term effects of a programme, project, or activity. The effects may be positive or negative, intended, or unintended.
- 16) Investigation
An examination or enquiry into irregularities or wrongdoing.
- 17) Knowledge management
A range of strategies, processes and techniques used to create, share, and manage knowledge.
- 18) Logical framework
A results-based project framework design based on a causal relationship linking inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impact, with objectively verifiably indicators to measure progress towards the achievement of results.
- 19) Monitoring
A routine process of collecting and recording information to track progress towards expected results.

- 20) Organizational evaluation
Independent evaluations undertaken and/or managed by the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer.
- 21) Output
The immediate result of a programme or project activity.
- 22) Outcome
The specific changes, benefits, or results that a project or program is intended to achieve.
- 23) Project
A set of planned and interrelated activities designed to achieve specific objectives within a given budget, time, and operating framework.
- 24) Programme
A set of sub-programmes, projects and/or activities producing outputs and accomplishments with a defined budget and under a set of specific objectives linked to CES's mandate and goals.
- 25) Review
- 26) A rapid assessment of the performance of an activity, project, or programme in absence of evaluation criteria e.g., usually operational issues.
- 27) Self-evaluation
Self-assessment evaluations conducted by programmes or other entities of the CES.
- 28) Undertaking
A general term for any programme, project, activity, policy, strategy, etc. which may be subject to evaluation.
- 29) Summative Evaluation
A type of evaluation intended to provide information about the merit, worth and impact of a programme or project. Summative evaluation is usually conducted at the end of a programme or project to determine if anticipated results were achieved.

2 MONITORING

2.1 Monitoring tools

There are several tools that CES uses to monitor progress of its programmes, projects, and activities. These tools include: -

- a) Strategic planning
At the organization level, strategic plans shall be prepared every five years providing direction on several strategic priority areas with pre-defined indicators of achievement.
- b) Budgeting
Programme budgets are prepared on an annual basis outlining objectives and expected results. CES's programme and project officers are required to monitor and report progress on achieving pre-defined performance indicators.
- c) Annual work planning
CES Programmes and Departments are required to prepare and monitor annual work plans based on the approved budget.
- d) Individual work planning
All Programme and Project officers are required to prepare and monitor individual work plans.

2.2 Logical framework requirements

CES recognizes the usefulness of logical frameworks as a tool to manage for programme and project results. Programme and project proposals shall include logical frameworks or other appropriate results formulations and specify major activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts.

Performance indicators, means of verification and risks and assumptions should be specified for output and outcome level results; for projects or other undertakings in which an impact evaluation is to be performed, indicators of achievement and means of verification should also be specified for intended impacts. Performance indicators should include baseline and target measures for expected results. In the event baseline information may not be available in the design phase or at the submission time of a proposal, managers should plan to obtain baseline or other relevant information within a reasonable period from project start-up (e.g., inception workshop) to ensure evaluability of results. When projects or undertakings are to be implemented jointly, logical frameworks should be discussed and agreed with respective partners.

2.3 Monitoring criteria

For effective results-based monitoring and to ensure evaluability, indicators should be formulated using SMART criteria.

a) Specific

The indicator is sufficiently clear as to what is being measured and specific enough to measure progress towards a result.

b) Measurable

The indicator is a reliable measure and is objectively verifiable. Qualitative measures should ideally be translated into some numeric form.

c) Attainable

The indicator can be realistically met.

d) Relevant

The indicator captures what is being measured (i.e., it is relevant to the activity/result).

e) Time-bound

The indicator is expected to be achieved within a defined period.

3 EVALUATION

3.1 Purpose

Evaluation serves several purposes including: -

a) Promoting organizational learning and quality improvement

Evaluation provides an opportunity for CES to learn how to do things better, more effectively, with greater relevance, with more efficient utilization of resources and with greater and more sustaining impact. The results of evaluations need to contribute to knowledge management and serve as the basis for enhancing the quality of its programmes, projects, and activities.

b) Ensuring accountability

As an organization receiving funds in the form of voluntary contributions from public and private donors, in addition to self-generated income, CES is answerable to its development partners and stakeholders to deliver results.

- c) Improving informed decision-making
Results from evaluations provide the basis for informed, responsible decisions. Such decisions may include, for example, scaling up, replicating, or phasing out a programme, project, or undertaking; adjusting learning objectives; redesigning content, changing methodologies, assessment activities or modes of delivery; etc.
- d) Providing leverage to mobilize resources for programmes, projects, and activities
One of the constraints facing CES is the tendency of donors to provide activity-based funding as opposed to results-based funding. This severely constrains CES's capacity to follow-up with beneficiaries to determine whether changes have taken hold. CES thus views evaluation as an opportunity to provide leverage to mobilize sufficient resources for its programmes, projects, and activities.

3.2 Guiding principles, norms, and standards

CES has adopted several guiding principles and good-practice norms and standards to ensure that evaluations meet quality requirements. The following are some of the principles, norms, and standards adopted as part of CES's evaluation policy framework.

- a. Utility
Evaluation should be planned and conducted with a view to serve the information needs of its intended users, be they CES's internal or external stakeholders. The recommendations from evaluation should flow logically from findings, be actionable and be presented in a clear and timely manner with the intention of incorporating results into learning and decision-making processes.
- b. Accuracy and credibility
Evaluation should be conducted with the necessary professional expertise and be based on the principle of impartiality. Evaluation should use appropriate data collection and analysis which produce accurate, valid, and reliable information. Findings should be open to reporting strengths and weaknesses as well as successes and failures.
- c. Feasibility
Evaluation should be as practical, viable and cost effective as possible, and should take into consideration time and financial and human resource requirements.
- d. Consultation, access to information and transparency
Evaluation should be conducted in a transparent manner with stakeholder consultation and access to relevant information. To the extent feasible, stakeholders should be engaged and contribute to the evaluation process by providing views, and such views should be reflected in evaluation findings in an impartial and balanced way. Consultants and others undertaking independent evaluation should have unrestricted access to information of the concerned programme, project or undertaking subject to evaluation, including project documents; terms of reference; training material; beneficiary views; results of decentralized evaluations, if relevant; and financial statements and reports, unless such information is considered by CES to be sensitive or confidential.
- e. Propriety
Evaluation should be undertaken in a legal and ethical manner regarding the rights and welfare of those involved in and affected by assessments. Stakeholders invited to contribute to evaluation processes should be made aware of the purposes for and potential consequences of evaluation, and CES should seek their consent prior to them taking part in any evaluation exercise.

3.3 Criteria

CES adopts the five widely recognized criteria for evaluation, namely: -

- a) Relevance
The degree to which a programme, project or activity responds to the needs and priorities of the targeted beneficiaries, a contextual situation to be addressed and donor priorities.
- b) Effectiveness
The extent to which an undertaking has achieved its objectives.
- c) Efficiency
The cost effectiveness of transferring inputs into outputs taking into consideration alternative approaches.
- d) Impact
The cumulative and/or long-term effects of a programme, project, or activity which may produce positive or negative, intended, or unintended changes.
- e) Sustainability
The likelihood of benefits derived from an undertaking will continue over time after its completion.

CES recognizes that not all criteria apply to all evaluations and that decisions on which criteria shall apply to a given situation should be based on the type of evaluation, the main evaluation questions and considerations related to methodology and feasibility.

3.4 Categories and types of evaluation

Table 1: Categories and types of evaluation

Category	Definition	Examples
Organizational	Independent evaluations or reviews undertaken or managed by the M&E Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic and policy evaluations • Thematic evaluations • Independent evaluation of programmes or projects • Reviews of self-evaluations
Department, Programme, Project, or activity	Self-assessments conducted by departments, programmes, units, sections, or offices	Programme or sub-programme level, including project and activity evaluations (baseline studies, formative evaluations, outcome evaluations, etc.)

Evaluation may be performed at different times and address different elements of the results chain, from assessing needs or determining baseline conditions at project conception to evaluating the impacts of a project's contribution to conservation and socio-economic goals. Evaluation may, therefore, include formative or other types of process-related assessments, evaluations of outputs, and/or summative evaluations focusing on different levels of outcomes.

The table below summarizes different types of evaluations based on timing and the level of the results chain.

Table 2: evaluations based on timing and the level of the results chain.

Timing	Types	Levels of Results	Remarks/Sample Evaluation
Before the undertaking (ex ante)	Appraisal, quality at entry; baseline study, needs assessment	N/A	Depending on the scope of the project, evaluation may vary from a thorough examination of the entire results chain logic to a (rapid) assessment of needs and/or determining baseline data indicators.
During the undertaking (process)	Real-time, formative, midterm evaluation	Inputs	E.g., To what extent are human, financial, and material resources adequate?
		Actions	E.g., How relevant is the course to learning needs of beneficiaries?
After the undertaking (ex post)	Summative evaluation	Outputs	E.g., How relevant, and effective were the delivered products (action plan) or services (training)? How efficient were outputs produced?
		Intermediate (short-term) Outcomes	The first level effect of products and services delivered, directly attributed to outputs. E.g., How much knowledge increased? Did skills improve? Was awareness raised?
		Institutional (medium-term) outcomes	Subsequent effects of products or services delivered? E.g., Was there retention and/or on-the-job application of knowledge/skills? Have organizational capacities increased? Are policy instruments more efficient?
		Impact	What is the impact of the outcomes? Were project goals met? How durable are the results over time?

3.5 Evaluation planning, costing and management

3.5.1 Evaluation planning

All projects, activities and other undertakings should be conceived in a results-based manner to ensure evaluability.

- a) All donor-funded projects or other undertakings should include a clause in the project document specifying evaluation requirements and relevant modalities (e.g., joint evaluation, participatory evaluation; self-evaluation, independent evaluation; and type(s) of evaluations in relation to process and/or level(s) of results). In the event a project document is not required, the relevant letter or memorandum of agreement should specify monitoring and evaluation requirements.
- b) Evaluation of CES's self-financed undertakings should be included in the work planning of Departments or Programmes from which the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer will

prepare and maintain on a rolling basis, an organizational evaluation plan. Evaluation plans should include information related to the category of evaluation (e.g., organizational, Departmental), type, methods, budget, scheduling, and reporting.

- c) Relevant terms of reference will be prepared for independent, external evaluations, using international standards and good practice, and include the context and purpose of the evaluation, scope, main evaluation questions, methodology (data collection tools and analysis), work plan, learning products of the evaluation, intended use of results and qualifications.
- d) Costs to carry out evaluation vary and depend on the purpose, type, and scope of the evaluation, main evaluation questions and data collection methods. Sufficient resources should, therefore, be identified and made available for both organizational and project/programme evaluations (including internal and/or external independent evaluations).
- e) Evaluation costs should be adequately budgeted in project and/or activity proposals by the relevant Programmes and Departments.

3.5.2 Evaluation management

CES acknowledges that there exist different evaluation designs as well as quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods for data collection and analysis. The most appropriate design(s), method(s), approach(es) and/or technique(s) should be selected, taking into consideration the evaluation question(s), scope, criteria, human and financial resource requirements, and availability, as well as guiding principles and good practice standards.

All independent evaluations should include a response from management in relation to the evaluation's findings, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned.

4 MONITORING AND EVALUATION REPORTING

4.1 Report formats

Monitoring and evaluation reports are to be recorded in the format of either: -

- Programme Performance Reports,
- Results Summaries,
- Completion Reports,
- Organizational Evaluation Reports and
- Self-evaluation Reviews.

Other types of reporting formats such as inception reports, mid-term reports, annual reports, impact evaluation reports, etc. may be used in addition to (or, where relevant, in lieu of) these formats if required by donor or partner.

a) Programme Performance Reports (PPRs)

They record programme performance based on expected accomplishments, indicators of achievement and performance measures, as recorded in results-based budgets. PPRs should be prepared by all Programmes and submitted to the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer by the end of the period using a standard reporting template. To

monitor progress, an interim report will be prepared and submitted at the mid-point of the evaluation period.

b) Results Summaries

The report summarizes results at the output and outcome level in relation to performance targets.

c) Completion Reports

Record findings, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned (if relevant) from evaluations and focus on the output and/outcome levels of results. Completion Reports should be prepared by all programmes and other entities if an evaluation of results is required.

d) Corporate Evaluation Report (CER)

They should be prepared by the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer at the end of each year based on a review of completed organizational, programme, project, or activity evaluations. The CER will highlight outcome-level results and summarize recommendations and lessons-learned, as well as provide an assessment of how evaluation processes have generated learning, quality improvement and enhanced decision-making. The CER should be presented to CES Board on an annual basis.

e) Self-Evaluation Reviews

They are independent reviews conducted by the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer primarily for the purpose of quality assurance.

4.2 Reporting tools and requirements

Table 3: Reporting tools and requirements

Report Type	Definition	Primary use	Requirements	
			Who	When
Programme Performance Report	Focuses on measuring expected accomplishments as indicated in the results-based budget, and provides a general assessment statement and lessons learned	Programme accountability and monitoring/self-evaluation tool to track progress on achieving results, identify challenges and lessons learned	All Programmes	Full report by the end of the first quarter, Interim report at the mid-term review
Results Summaries	A concise reporting template summarizing results at the output and outcome level for programmes and projects	Accountability and activity/project performance reporting	All programmes and projects	Periodically, within three months of project completion
Completion Reports	A detailed project evaluation report focusing on the attainment of	Learning and enhanced decision making and quality improvement. Also	All programmes and projects	Periodically, within three months of project

	results for programmes and projects	for accountability purposes		completion
Organization Evaluation Report	Provides a review of completed programme and organization evaluations	To aggregate main findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned	M&E Officer/Unit	Annually years
Self-Evaluation Reviews	Provides independent review of self-evaluations	Quality assurance and application of standards and guidelines	M&E Officer/Unit	Mid and end of term

4.3 Monitoring and evaluation of advocacy projects

The bulk of CES's projects and activities are linked to advocacy for sustainable management of forest resources through campaigns for better environmental policies, public and community sensitization on forest issues, and promotion of sustainable forest management practises (including training, technical backstopping, and material support).

Monitoring of advocacy activities will ensure that there is adequate information to support real-time, ongoing adaptation in response to evolving situations, including changes resulting from advocacy activities, as well as changes in the external environment. In monitoring and evaluating its advocacy work, CES will seek evidence of the following outcomes: -

Changed awareness, attitudes, and opinions	Raising awareness of an issue or helping decision-makers or the public to understand issues in greater depth. The intention is to persuade people to change their minds, attitudes or opinions.
Change in discourse	Changes in the way people discuss issues or use language.
Agenda setting	This may involve getting an institution to agree to develop a new proposal or sponsor a new policy. It might also mean ensuring that issues are discussed publicly.
Policy change	The introduction of a new policy, the amendment of an existing policy or, in some circumstances, opposition to a new, proposed policy.
Policy implementation	The funding, implementation and sometimes enforcement of policies. They may be new policies that have just been introduced, or existing policies. Outcomes may also cover how policies are represented in strategies, programmes, and plans.
Policy impact	The impact that policies, when implemented, have on peoples' lives – particularly the people and communities an advocacy intervention is designed to help. Policy impact might also focus on changes to the economy or the environment.
Strengthened base of support	Changes in the extent to which the public, institutions, or key decision-makers support (or oppose) specific policies.
Enhanced organisational capacity	Enhanced capacity of CSOs or coalitions to plan and carry out advocacy work. Capacity development may focus on many

	different areas of work, such as advocacy skills, leadership, or strategic planning.
Strengthened alliances	The extent of coordination and collaboration amongst local, regional, or international groups that support (or oppose) a policy or set of policies. It might include the extent to which different groups present common messages or pursue common goals.
Changes in democratic space	Enhanced participation of CSOs in policy dialogues, increased political legitimacy, or the improved attitudes and behaviours of public officials towards civil society involvement.
Changes in social norms	Lasting shifts in relationships, control and influence, and radical change in areas such as whose agendas are recognised, whose voices are heard, and whose are excluded.

5 KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

5.1 Knowledge management and organizational learning

As one of the main purposes of evaluation, the creation, storage, management, and dissemination of knowledge is essential. In view of promoting organizational learning and contributing to quality improvement of CES's programmes and projects, activity reports will be consolidated into project, programme or departmental reports and shared internally with the Management Team, and relevant stakeholders, including development partners where applicable.

In addition, an annual learning forum will be organized to share lessons learned on evaluation processes and outcomes. The learning forum will be organized by the Management Team and the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer.

5.2 Dissemination and disclosure

Reports will be accessible in a public depository with a view to ensure transparency and facilitate knowledge management and application of lessons learned. There are various platforms that CES can use to store and disseminate information to various stakeholders including its website, print and electronic media (Newspaper, radio, Television), social media (Facebook, Twitter, WhatsApp) as well as Information Communication Technologies (e.g., brochures, calendars, pamphlets).