

# Eval Factsheets: A Structured Framework for Documenting AI Evaluations

Florian Bordes<sup>1</sup>, Candace Ross<sup>1</sup>, Justine T Kao<sup>1</sup>, Evangelia Spiliopoulou<sup>1</sup>, Adina Williams<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>FAIR at Meta

The rapid proliferation of benchmarks has created significant challenges in reproducibility, transparency, and informed decision-making. However, unlike datasets and models—which benefit from structured documentation frameworks like Datasheets and Model Cards—evaluation methodologies lack systematic documentation standards. We introduce **Eval Factsheets** (EFS), a structured, descriptive framework for documenting AI system evaluations through a comprehensive taxonomy and questionnaire-based approach. Our framework organizes evaluation characteristics across five fundamental dimensions: **Context** (Who made the evaluation and when?), **Scope** (What does it evaluate?), **Structure** (With what the evaluation is built?), **Method** (How does it work?) and **Alignment** (In what ways is it reliable/valid/robust?). We implement this taxonomy as a practical questionnaire spanning five sections with mandatory and recommended documentation elements. Through case studies on multiple benchmarks, we demonstrate that **Eval Factsheets** (EFS) effectively captures diverse evaluation paradigms—from traditional benchmarks to LLM-as-judge methodologies—while maintaining consistency and comparability. We hope **Eval Factsheets** are incorporated into both existing and newly released evaluation frameworks and lead to more transparency and reproducibility.

**Date:** December 4, 2025

**Code:** <https://github.com/facebookresearch/EvalFactsheets>



## 1 Introduction

Self-supervised learning, large language models, and multimodal systems have achieved remarkable performance across diverse tasks, yet a critical challenge persists: evaluating these systems requires methodologies as advanced as the models themselves. A single state-of-the-art model might be assessed through hundreds of benchmarks spanning multiple modalities, evaluation paradigms, and fairness or safety criteria. Despite this proliferation of benchmarks, evaluation methodologies lack the systematic documentation standards that have become common for datasets (Gebru et al., 2021) and models (Mitchell et al., 2019), creating opacity in how AI systems are actually assessed and compared.

This documentation gap for evaluation manifests in three concrete challenges. First, evaluation methodologies often embed hidden assumptions about data distributions, access paradigms, and validity conditions. Because these assumptions are rarely explicitly stated, it can lead to misapplication and misinterpretation of results. Second, the absence of standardized reporting prevents meaningful comparison across evaluations: two benchmarks claiming to measure “reasoning capability” may implement this construct in fundamentally incompatible ways. Third, reproducibility suffers when critical details—e.g. judge selection, contamination checks, statistical validation procedures—remain undocumented or described inconsistently across papers.

Existing documentation frameworks address adjacent but distinct concerns. Datasheets for Datasets (Gebru et al., 2021) document data provenance and composition, but not the evaluation methodologies applied to that data. Model Cards (Mitchell et al., 2019) document system capabilities and limitations, but treats evaluation as a secondary component. Recent comprehensive evaluation frameworks like HELM (Liang et al., 2022) and BIG-bench (Srivastava et al., 2022) provide extensive benchmark suites, but focus on breadth of coverage rather than documentation standards. While these efforts have improved AI transparency, none provides a general-purpose framework specifically designed for documenting evaluation methodologies themselves.

To address this gap, we introduce **Eval Factsheets** (EFS), a structured framework for documenting AI evaluation methodologies through a systematic taxonomy and questionnaire-based approach. The key insight behind **Eval Factsheets** is that evaluation methodologies, despite their diversity, share fundamental characteristics that can be organized into five orthogonal dimensions: **Context** (Who made the evaluation and when?), **Scope** (What does it evaluate?), **Structure** (With what the evaluation is built?), **Method** (How does it work?) and **Alignment** (In what ways is it reliable/valid/robust?). We provide the detailed taxonomy in [Section 3](#) and how we operationalize the taxonomy into the **Eval Factsheets** framework in [Section 4](#). Lastly, in [Section 5](#), we demonstrate the framework’s applicability through diverse case studies. Across these cases, the framework maintains consistent structure while accommodating paradigm-specific requirements.

Our main contributions are:

1. **A five-dimensional taxonomy** organizing evaluation characteristics across Context, Scope, Structure, Method and Alignment, providing a systematic framework for categorizing evaluation methodologies.
2. **A structured questionnaire** to easily generate **Eval Factsheets**, implementing 27 questions that balance mandatory requirements with flexible optional elements to accommodate diverse evaluation types.
3. **Comprehensive case studies** on widely used benchmarks (ImageNet, HumanEval, MT-Bench) demonstrating that the framework effectively captures evaluations spanning traditional benchmarks, execution-based testing, and LLM-as-judge paradigms.
4. **Practical resources** including templates, HTML forms, completion guides, and integration recommendations for adoption in research and deployment contexts.

## 2 Related Work

Our work builds on a growing body of research advocating for systematic documentation of machine learning artifacts. We position **Eval Factsheets** within this broader ecosystem and discuss their relationship to evaluation methodology research.

### 2.1 Documentation Frameworks for AI Systems

Several frameworks address AI system documentation. Datasheets for Datasets ([Gebru et al., 2021](#)) introduced structured questionnaires covering data provenance, composition, and uses, establishing the template our work adapts for evaluations. Building on this foundation, [Bender and Friedman \(2018\)](#) developed Data Statements for NLP datasets emphasizing demographic representation, while [Pushkarna et al. \(2022\)](#) created Data Cards for TensorFlow datasets with interactive visualization. [Holland et al. \(2020\)](#) proposed Dataset Nutrition Labels providing at-a-glance summaries of dataset characteristics.

Model Cards ([Mitchell et al., 2019](#)) document trained model characteristics, intended uses, and performance across demographic groups, emphasizing fairness considerations. [Arnold et al. \(2019\)](#) developed FactSheets for enterprise AI systems, providing comprehensive technical specifications alongside accountability considerations. More recently, System Cards ([Gursoy and Kakadiaris, 2022](#)) have emerged to document complete AI systems holistically, including training data, model architecture, and deployment context.

While these frameworks have significantly improved AI transparency, they treat evaluation as a component to be reported rather than a methodology requiring independent documentation. Model Cards, for instance, include performance metrics but provide no structured approach for documenting how those metrics were obtained, what assumptions underlie their interpretation, or how to compare across different evaluation methodologies. **Eval Factsheets** fills this gap by providing evaluation-specific documentation with the same rigor previously applied to datasets and models.

### 2.2 Comprehensive Evaluation Frameworks

Recent efforts have developed comprehensive benchmarks evaluating models across multiple dimensions. HELM ([Liang et al., 2022](#)) assesses language models with emphasis on standardized evaluation protocols.

VHELM (Lee et al., 2024) similarly focuses on a standardized taxonomy, expanding to vision-language models. These taxonomies of evaluation scenarios share conceptual similarities with our evaluation taxonomy, though they focus on (vision-)language model capabilities rather than evaluation documentation. BIG-bench (Srivastava et al., 2022) crowdsources tasks targeting behaviors believed beyond current model capabilities, emphasizing diversity in evaluation. GEM (Gehrman et al., 2021) provides evaluation frameworks for natural language generation with detailed annotation protocols and multiple evaluation paradigms.

These frameworks make important contributions to evaluation breadth and standardization but focus on benchmark creation rather than evaluation documentation. HELM provides detailed methodology for its own evaluations but not a generalizable framework for documenting arbitrary evaluation methodologies. Our work is complementary: while HELM standardizes how to conduct certain evaluations, **Eval Factsheets** standardizes how to document any evaluation, including HELM itself. This distinction allows our framework to span traditional benchmarks, execution-based testing, human evaluation, and emerging paradigms like LLM-as-judge.

### 2.3 Evaluation Methodology and Meta-Evaluation

Growing attention to evaluation methodology has identified critical challenges. Benchmark saturation and contamination threaten validity as models are increasingly trained on test data (Sainz et al., 2023; Brown et al., 2020). Construct validity—whether evaluations measure what they claim—remains underexamined (Raji et al., 2021). LLM-as-judge methodologies introduce new considerations around evaluator bias and agreement with human judgment (Zheng et al., 2023).

Our taxonomy directly addresses these concerns through dedicated dimensions. The **Alignment** category systematically organizes contamination risks, validity threats, and sources of variance while the **Method** category (§3.4) provides structured documentation for emerging paradigms including model-based judges. By operationalizing these meta-evaluation concerns into concrete documentation requirements, we transform methodological critiques into actionable improvements.

### 2.4 Domain-Specific and Reproducibility Efforts

Reproducibility initiatives have developed checklists and reporting standards for machine learning research (Pineau et al., 2021; Dodge et al., 2019). Domain-specific guidelines address unique evaluation challenges in medical AI (Wiens et al., 2019), autonomous systems, and fairness assessment (Mitchell et al., 2021). While valuable for their domains, these efforts lack a unified framework spanning evaluation types.

**Eval Factsheets** provides this generalization while maintaining compatibility with domain-specific requirements. Our questionnaire includes optional sections that can be extended with domain-specific elements, and our taxonomy’s flexibility accommodates specialized evaluation paradigms. Rather than replacing domain standards, **Eval Factsheets** offer a common foundation that domain guidelines can build upon, creating an interconnected ecosystem of ML documentation.

## 3 Our Evaluation Taxonomy

We propose a taxonomy that decomposes any evaluation along five orthogonal dimensions: **Context** addresses who creates the evaluation and when; **Scope** defines what properties and capabilities are measured; **Structure** specifies the data sources and organization used to build the evaluation; **Method** describes the operational procedure for conducting evaluation; and **Alignment** encompasses reliability, validity, and robustness concerns. This decomposition enables consistent documentation across evaluation paradigms ranging from traditional supervised benchmarks to emerging LLM-as-judge arenas.

Our taxonomy emerged from analyzing hundreds of existing evaluations across computer vision, natural language processing, speech recognition, multimodal systems, and reinforcement learning domains. We identified recurring patterns in how evaluations are designed, validated, and deployed, which we distill into these five fundamental dimensions. The following subsections detail each dimension with formal definitions and concrete examples illustrating the distinctions.

### 3.1 Context: Who and When

The **Context** dimension captures the provenance and purpose of an evaluation—who created it, when it was released, and why it exists. Understanding evaluation context is crucial because the same measurement approach may be appropriate for one purpose but inadequate for another.

*Provenance and Attribution.* Evaluation provenance establishes accountability and expertise claims. We document the *organization, university, company, laboratory, or research group* responsible for the evaluation, along with specific *authors or contributors*. This attribution enables assessment of domain expertise, potential conflicts of interest, and institutional backing. The *release date* provides temporal context, as evaluation standards evolve over time—what constituted rigorous evaluation in 2018 may be inadequate by 2024 standards. Associated *research papers* and *code repositories* provide detailed methodology and enable replication.

*Purpose and Stakeholders.* We identify four primary evaluation purposes, each serving distinct stakeholders with different requirements:

- *Development-focused* evaluations guide model training and improvement, emphasizing rapid iteration, diagnostic granularity, and actionable feedback. These serve researchers and engineers actively developing systems, requiring fast execution and detailed error analysis over absolute performance numbers.
- *Selection-focused* evaluations help choose between competing models for specific applications. Decision-makers require robust comparison capabilities, clear performance differentials, and alignment between evaluation tasks and deployment scenarios.
- *Deployment-focused* evaluations assess production readiness, often emphasizing safety, robustness, and edge-case behavior. Operators and regulators require comprehensive coverage of failure modes, with particular attention to rare but consequential errors.
- *Research-focused* evaluations advance scientific understanding of model capabilities and limitations. The broader research community requires rigorous construct validity, reproducibility, and generalizability over immediate practical utility.

The same evaluation may serve multiple purposes, but design priorities often conflict. Development evaluations favor speed and diagnostic detail; selection evaluations favor standardization; deployment evaluations favor conservatism; research evaluations favor theoretical grounding. Explicitly documenting intended purpose helps users assess appropriateness for their needs.

### 3.2 Scope: What Is Measured

The **Scope** dimension defines what specific properties, capabilities, and principles an evaluation assesses. Clear scope specification prevents misinterpretation of evaluation results and enables meaningful comparison across different measurement approaches.

*Capabilities and Principles.* Evaluations target specific *capabilities*—cognitive or functional competencies that models may possess. Examples include intuitive physics (understanding object permanence and motion), common sense reasoning (leveraging implicit world knowledge), mathematical problem-solving (manipulating formal systems), or creative generation (producing novel coherent outputs). These capabilities often map to cognitive science constructs or practical task requirements. We distinguish capabilities (what models can do) from the data modalities used to test them (how we probe those capabilities).

*Model Properties.* Beyond task-specific capabilities, evaluations assess broader *model properties* that cut across domains:

- *Performance:* Fundamental task accuracy, precision, recall, or task-specific metrics reflecting primary objectives.
- *Quality:* Multi-faceted quality assessment including fluency, coherence, factuality, relevance, or domain-specific quality criteria.

- *Robustness*: Performance stability under perturbations, distribution shifts, or adversarial manipulation.
- *Calibration*: Alignment between model confidence and actual accuracy, crucial for decision-making applications.
- *Adversarial Robustness*: Performance on inputs specifically designed to elicit failures, testing security and reliability.
- *Memorization*: Distinguishing genuine learned patterns from memorized training examples, important for privacy and generalization.
- *Fairness*: Equitable performance across demographic groups, protected attributes, or population segments.
- *Safety*: Avoidance of harmful, toxic, or dangerous outputs across diverse prompt types.
- *Leakage and Contamination*: Detection of inappropriate influence from evaluation data appearing in training.
- *Privacy*: Protection of sensitive information, both in training data and user interactions.
- *Interpretability*: Understandability and explainability of model decisions and internal representations.
- *Efficiency*: Computational, memory, and energy requirements for training and inference.
- *Retrainability*: Ease of updating models with new data or adapting to evolving requirements.
- *Meta-Learning*: Adaptation speed to new tasks or domains with limited examples.

*Modality Specification.* The *input modality* defines what the model receives (text, vision, audio, video, code, structured data, or multimodal combinations), while the *output modality* defines what the model produces (text, generated images, audio, code, actions, embeddings, or multimodal combinations). The same capability (e.g., reasoning) may be tested through different modality combinations (text-to-text logical puzzles versus vision-to-text visual reasoning). Modality choice affects accessibility (what systems can be evaluated), difficulty (how challenging measurement becomes), and ecological validity (how well evaluation reflects real usage).

Comprehensive scope documentation enables users to understand exactly what claims an evaluation supports and what falls outside its purview. An evaluation may rigorously measure mathematical problem-solving (narrow scope) without saying anything about creative writing, multimodal reasoning, or robustness (excluded from scope).

### 3.3 Structure: Data Composition and Organization

The **Structure** dimension describes how evaluation data is sourced, organized, and maintained. Structural choices profoundly affect evaluation validity, difficulty, and susceptibility to contamination.

*Input Data Sources.* Evaluation inputs may derive from multiple sources, each with distinct implications:

- *Existing datasets*: Leveraging established benchmarks (e.g. MS COCO, ImageNet, Wikipedia, Common Crawl, GitHub repositories) enables comparison with prior work but risks contamination as these datasets appear in training corpora.
- *New datasets*: Purpose-built evaluation data released with the benchmark provides control over difficulty and content but requires significant annotation effort.
- *Proprietary/closed datasets*: Private data prevents contamination but limits reproducibility and community participation.
- *Synthetic/generated data*: Programmatically or procedurally generated inputs enable unlimited scale and precise control over properties.

- *Crowdsourced data*: Contributed by non-expert users, providing diversity but requiring quality control.
- *Expert-curated data*: Domain specialists create challenging, high-quality examples but at significant cost.
- *Real-world deployment data*: Actual usage examples provide ecological validity but raise privacy concerns and may be unrepresentative.

*Output Reference Sources.* Ground truth or reference outputs against which models are compared may originate from:

- *Human annotations*: Expert or crowdsourced labels provide authoritative references but introduce annotator variance and potential biases.
- *Existing dataset labels*: Inherited from source datasets, providing consistency with prior work but potentially propagating annotation errors.
- *Programmatic generation*: Rule-based or simulation-derived ground truth offers perfect consistency but may oversimplify complex phenomena.
- *Execution-based verification*: For code or action outputs, functional correctness determined by interpreters or simulators provides objective grounding.
- *Model-generated references*: Using strong models to generate references enables scale but introduces model biases and potential circularity.
- *Reference-free evaluation*: Some properties (diversity, fluency) can be assessed without explicit ground truth, though validity concerns intensify.

*Size and Scale.* Evaluation size profoundly affects statistical power and practical feasibility. We categorize:

- *Small* (< 1K samples): Enables deep analysis but provides limited statistical power; common for expensive expert evaluation.
- *Medium* (1K–100K samples): Balances coverage and feasibility; typical for most benchmarks.
- *Large* (100K–1M samples): Provides robust statistics and diverse coverage; requires automation.
- *Very Large* (> 1M samples): Comprehensive coverage but may include redundancy; primarily for core capability assessment.
- *Infinite*: Continuously generated evaluation data, enabling detection of overfitting to fixed test sets.

*Data Organization.* Evaluations may also define *splits* serving different purposes:

- *Fine-tuning/Development sets*: Used for task-specific model adaptation, requiring separation from evaluation data.
- *Validation sets*: Public data for model selection and hyperparameter tuning, enabling fair comparison.
- *Test sets*: Held-out data for final evaluation, ideally used sparingly to prevent indirect overfitting.
- *Private/Hidden test sets*: Never-released data preventing direct optimization, though limiting reproducibility.

*Temporal Characteristics.* The *evaluation data type* captures temporal dynamics:

- *Static data*: Fixed test sets enabling direct comparison over time but vulnerable to contamination and saturation as models optimize for known benchmarks.
- *Dynamic data*: Adaptive generation based on model responses, procedural creation, or periodic refresh. Prevents overfitting but complicates comparison across time.

- *Composite*: Combining static and dynamic components.

### 3.4 Method: Operational Procedures

The **Method** dimension describes the technical implementation of evaluation: who or what judges outputs, what access to models is required, and how the evaluation protocol operates.

*Judge Types.* The choice of evaluation judge represents one of the most consequential methodological decisions, directly affecting validity, cost, and scalability:

- *Human evaluation—Expert judges*: Domain specialists provide authoritative assessment of complex outputs (medical diagnoses, legal reasoning, creative writing). High validity but expensive, slow, and limited scale. Inter-rater reliability requires multiple experts per item.
- *Human evaluation—Representative samples*: Crowdworkers or general population provide judgments aligned with typical users. More scalable than experts but requires careful quality control and may miss subtle errors.
- *Automatic evaluation—Reference-based*: Comparing model outputs to ground truth using metrics like exact match, F1, BLEU, or learned similarity functions. Highly scalable and reproducible but validity depends on metric-target alignment.
- *Automatic evaluation—Reference-free*: Assessing intrinsic properties without ground truth (perplexity, diversity, coherence scores). Enables evaluation when references are unavailable.
- *Automatic evaluation—Execution-based*: Testing functional correctness by running code, executing actions in simulators, or checking logical consistency. Objective for well-defined tasks but limited to executable domains.
- *Model-based evaluation—Expert models*: Fine-tuned or specialized models trained for evaluation (reward models, trained preference predictors). Can capture nuanced criteria but inherits biases from training data.
- *Model-based evaluation—General LLMs*: Using powerful language models as judges. Highly scalable and applicable to open-ended tasks but introduces judge model biases, variance, and potential circularity when evaluating similar models.
- *Hybrid evaluation*: Combining multiple judge types (e.g., automatic filtering followed by human evaluation of edge cases) to leverage complementary strengths.

For model-based judges, additional documentation should specify the judge model, prompting strategy, temperature settings, and measured inter-judge agreement when using multiple judge models or comparing to human judgments.

*Evaluation Protocol.* The *protocol* defines the step-by-step procedure for evaluation:

1. Input selection and preprocessing
2. Model prompting or query formatting
3. Output generation parameters (temperature, top-p, max length)
4. Post-processing and normalization
5. Scoring or judgment procedures
6. Aggregation across examples
7. Statistical analysis and reporting

Detailed protocol specification enables reproducibility and reveals potential confounds. For instance, whether examples are evaluated independently or model state persists across examples affects performance on context-dependent tasks.

*Model Access Requirements.* Different evaluations require different levels of system access:

- *Output-only access*: Requires only the ability to query a model and observe outputs, applicable to commercial APIs where model internals are unavailable. Enables broad participation but limits evaluation to behavioral assessment.
- *Partial access*: Requires intermediate representations, gradients, attention weights, or hidden states. Enables probing internal mechanisms and understanding model reasoning but unavailable for most production systems.
- *Full access*: Requires complete access to architecture, weights, training procedures, and potentially training data. Enables comprehensive analysis including gradient-based robustness testing, interpretability analysis, and thorough contamination detection, but limited to open models.

Access requirements directly affect evaluation applicability—output-only evaluations apply broadly but partial or full access evaluations provide deeper insights for systems that permit such access.

*Held-out Private Test Sets.* Many evaluations maintain *private test sets* never released publicly to prevent direct optimization. Key considerations include:

- *Size and composition*: What fraction of data is held out? Is it representative of public splits?
- *Access restrictions*: Is the private set used for periodic leaderboard updates, one-time challenges, or continuous evaluation services?
- *Update frequency*: How often are private tests refreshed to prevent indirect optimization through repeated submissions?
- *Purpose*: Preventing overfitting, detecting contamination, or ensuring fair comparison?

### 3.5 Alignment: Reliability, Validity, and Robustness

The **Alignment** dimension assesses whether an evaluation reliably measures what it claims to measure and whether conclusions drawn from results are warranted. Even well-designed evaluations can produce misleading results if sensitive to arbitrary choices, susceptible to contamination, or failing to measure claimed constructs.

*Measurement Validation.* *Measurement validation* establishes that an evaluation actually assesses its intended construct. Validation approaches include:

- *Expert review*: Domain specialists verify that evaluation items appropriately test target capabilities.
- *Pilot studies*: Testing evaluation with known-good and known-bad systems to verify discriminative power.
- *Correlation with established measures*: Demonstrating that new evaluation scores correlate with accepted benchmarks when measuring similar constructs.
- *Ablation studies*: Removing evaluation components to verify they contribute to measuring target properties.
- *Construct validity analysis*: Systematic examination of whether evaluation design aligns with theoretical understanding of measured capabilities.

Recent work by [Bean et al. \(2025\)](#) provides a comprehensive construct validity checklist for model evaluations, covering threat identification, measurement alignment, and validity argument construction. Evaluations meeting all checklist conditions provide stronger evidence for their claimed measurements.

*Baselines and Points of Comparison.* Evaluation scores gain meaning through comparison. *Baselines* provide reference points:

- *Random performance*: Chance-level accuracy establishes a lower bound.
- *Simple heuristics*: Rule-based or retrieval systems demonstrate whether learning is necessary.
- *Prior state-of-the-art*: Previous best results contextualize current performance.
- *Human performance*: Expert or crowd performance indicates task difficulty and headroom for improvement, though human-model comparison requires careful consideration of different capabilities.
- *Specialized models*: Domain-specific systems provide comparison points for general models.

*Robustness Measures.* Evaluation robustness concerns whether results remain stable under reasonable variations. We distinguish several robustness dimensions:

*Input robustness* captures sensitivity to prompt formatting, instruction phrasing, example ordering, or paraphrasing. Robust evaluations should yield consistent results for semantically equivalent inputs. Testing approaches include:

- Multiple prompt templates for the same underlying task.
- Randomized example ordering.
- Paraphrased instructions preserving semantic content.
- Varied formatting (whitespace, capitalization, delimiters).

*Output robustness* captures variability from model stochasticity. For probabilistic models, multiple evaluation runs with different random seeds reveal output variance. Reporting confidence intervals or standard deviations from multiple runs provides more complete performance characterization than single-run point estimates.

*Evaluation procedure robustness* tests sensitivity to arbitrary methodological choices:

- Multiple runs per sample with different random seeds
- Temperature and sampling parameter variations
- Different output length limits
- Repeated evaluations over time

*Judge robustness* becomes critical for human or model-based evaluation. Measures include:

- Inter-rater reliability (agreement between multiple human judges)
- Inter-model agreement (consistency across different judge models)
- Judge-human alignment (correlation between model judges and human assessments)
- Sensitivity to judge prompt variations

*Statistical robustness* ensures conclusions don't depend on specific samples:

- Confidence intervals and standard errors
- Statistical significance testing with appropriate corrections
- Effect size reporting (beyond just p-values)
- Bootstrapping or cross-validation for uncertainty quantification

*Confound controls* verify that evaluation measures intended properties rather than spurious correlations:

- Ablation studies removing supposedly critical components
- Negative controls that should not improve performance

- Minimal pair testing (inputs differing in single targeted aspects)
- Adversarial examples designed to exploit potential shortcuts

*Known Limitations and Sensitivities.* Even after robustness testing, evaluations have *known limitations*—documented sensitivities and failure modes that affect interpretation:

- *Format sensitivity*: "Performance varies  $\pm 5\%$  depending on prompt formatting"
- *Domain specificity*: "Results may not generalize beyond formal written text"
- *Demographic bias*: "Evaluation data underrepresents certain populations"
- *Temporal validity*: "Evaluation uses 2023 knowledge cutoff; may not reflect current information"
- *Self-preference bias*: "GPT-4 judge may favor outputs stylistically similar to GPT-4"
- *Contamination risk*: "Public dataset may appear in training corpora"

*Related Work and Differentiation.* Evaluations exist in an ecosystem of related benchmarks. *Similar evaluations* should be documented along with key differences:

- What prior benchmarks measure similar capabilities?
- How does this evaluation differ in scope, structure, or method?
- What specific gaps does this evaluation address?
- When should users prefer this evaluation over alternatives?

Clear positioning helps researchers select appropriate evaluation tools and understand how new evaluations advance the field.

## 4 The Eval Factsheet Framework

Operationalizing the taxonomy into a practical questionnaire requires balancing competing objectives: comprehensive coverage of all dimensions versus usability constraints, flexibility across evaluation types versus standardization for comparability, and mandatory requirements versus optional adaptability. We address these trade-offs through a structured design process that maps taxonomy categories to concrete questions while maintaining hierarchical organization.

### 4.1 Design Principles

Our framework adheres to six design principles derived from taxonomy requirements and anticipated use cases:

1. **Comprehensiveness**: Cover all five taxonomy dimensions to ensure complete evaluation characterization (addresses transparency goal).
2. **Flexibility**: Accommodate diverse evaluation types through mandatory/optional question hierarchy (addresses adoption barrier).
3. **Accessibility**: Use plain language and provide extensive guidance (reduces completion burden).
4. **Actionability**: Generate concrete documentation enabling informed decisions (justifies completion effort).
5. **Comparability**: Maintain consistent structure across evaluation types (enables meta-analysis).
6. **Reproducibility**: Require sufficient detail for evaluation replication (supports scientific validity).

These principles sometimes conflict—comprehensiveness versus accessibility, flexibility versus comparability. Our resolution strategy prioritizes mandatory elements addressing reproducibility while making comprehensive coverage optional, allowing users to balance documentation depth with available resources.

## 4.2 Questionnaire Structure

*Derivation from Taxonomy.* Table 1 shows the mapping between taxonomy dimensions and questionnaire sections. Each taxonomy category generates at least one question, with complex categories expanding into multiple questions or sub-questions. For instance, Context (§3.1) maps to the Basic Information section with questions about provenance, authorship, release date, and purpose; Scope (§3.2) maps to the What Does It Evaluate section with questions about capabilities tested, model properties evaluated, and input/output modalities; Structure (§3.3) maps to the How Is It Structured section with questions about data sources, size, splits, and design; Method (§3.4) maps to the How Does It Work section with questions about judge type, evaluation protocol, and model access requirements; and Alignment (§3.5) maps to the Quality & Reliability section with questions about measurement validation, baselines, robustness measures, and known limitations.

**Table 1** Mapping between taxonomy categories and questionnaire sections

Taxonomy Category	Questionnaire Section(s)
Context	Basic Information
Scope	What Does It Evaluate
Structure	How Is It Structured
Method	How Does It Work
Alignment	Quality & Reliability

## 4.3 Integration with Existing Frameworks

Eval Factsheets complements existing documentation frameworks through composition rather than replacement. Datasheets document datasets used in evaluations (referenced in the How Is It Structured section), Model Cards document systems being evaluated (referenced in the Basic Information section), and System Cards document complete deployments including evaluation results (include Eval Factsheets as a component).

A complete transparency ecosystem involves all four frameworks. Model Card documents the model, Datasheet documents training data, and Eval Factsheets document each assessment methodology. This modular approach enables reuse—a single Eval Factsheet can be referenced by multiple Model Cards or System Cards, avoiding duplication while maintaining comprehensive documentation.

## 5 Case Studies

To validate that Eval Factsheets effectively captures diverse evaluation paradigms, we present three case studies spanning traditional benchmarks (ImageNet (Deng et al., 2009)), execution-based testing (HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021)), and emerging LLM-as-judge methodologies (MT-Bench (Zheng et al., 2023)). Each case study demonstrates how the unified questionnaire structure accommodates paradigm-specific characteristics while maintaining consistency and comparability.

## 5.1 Example 1: ImageNet (Computer Vision Benchmark)

EVALUATION CARD

### ImageNet

ImageNet enables large-scale visual recognition research and provides a standardized benchmark for comparing computer vision models across diverse, hierarchically-organized object categories.

**Priceton University**

**Paper:** <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/5206848>

**Code:**

**Date:** 2009

#### What Does It Evaluate?

**Purpose:** Research; Model Selection

**Principles Tested:** Object Recognition; Visual Understanding

**Functional Properties:** General Capability (object recognition)

**Input** Images

**Output** Class predictions

#### How Does It Work?

**Judge:** Automatic (Reference-based)

**Model Access:** Black-box (outputs only)

**Held-out Test Set:** Yes

Test set: 100K images with labels withheld on evaluation server

**Protocol:** 1) Model receives image 2) Model outputs class predictions 3) Automatic scoring against ground truth labels

#### How Is It Structured?

**Input Source:** Curated dataset (publicly available)

**Splits:** Development set: 1.2M images

Validation set: 50K images

Test set: 100K images (labels withheld on server)

**Output Source:** Human annotated

**Size:** Large (>100K samples): 14 million images total

**Design:** Static benchmark

#### Quality & Reliability

**Alignment Validation:** Human performance establishes ceiling: 94.9% top-5 accuracy. Images organized hierarchically using WordNet taxonomy.

**Baseline Models:**

**Similar Benchmarks:** ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge (ILSVRC)

**Robustness Measures:** Extensive annotation procedures; Multiple validation rounds

**Known Limitations:** Label noise ( 5% estimated error rate); Geographic and cultural bias toward Western contexts; Outdated categories; Test set saturation and contamination concerns; Not suitable for fine-grained recognition, medical imaging (domain shift), or fairness assessment

## 5.2 Example 2: HumanEval (Code Generation Benchmark)

EVALUATION CARD

### HumanEval

HumanEval evaluates functional correctness of code generated by language models through execution-based testing, addressing gaps in existing evaluations that focused on code similarity rather than correctness.

OpenAI

Paper: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03374>

Code: <https://github.com/openai/human-eval>

Date: 2021

#### What Does It Evaluate?

**Purpose:** Research

**Principles Tested:** Algorithmic problem-solving; Language-specific syntax; Edge case handling

**Functional Properties:** General Capability (code generation); Correctness (passes unit tests)

**Input** Text (programming    **Output** Code (Python functions)  
problems)

#### How Does It Work?

**Judge:** Automatic (Execution-based)

**Model Access:** Outputs

**Protocol:** 1) Model generates function implementation from problem description  
2) Generated code is executed against unit tests  
3) Scored as pass/fail per test

#### How Is It Structured?

**Input Source:** New dataset (released with eval)

Splits:

**Output Source:** Programmatically generated (unit tests)

**Size:**

**Design:** Static benchmark

#### Quality & Reliability

**Alignment Validation:** Problems hand-written by experienced programmers. Each problem verified with multiple test cases covering edge cases.

**Baseline Models:** Performance varies by model; prompt formatting affects performance by 10%

**Similar Benchmarks:** HumanEval+ (extended test suite); MultiPL-E (multi-language variant)

**Robustness Measures:** Minimal pairs tested for similar problem variations; Multiple test cases per problem

**Known Limitations:** Python only; Only algorithmic problems (no system design); Small-scale (164 problems); Sensitive to prompt formatting (instructional vs. completion style); Test cases are public, enabling contamination; Not suitable for production code quality assessment (no tests for style, documentation, security), multi-language comparison, or complex system design

### 5.3 Example 3: MT-Bench (Conversational AI Arena)

## MT-Bench

MT-Bench evaluates multi-turn conversational ability using LLM-as-judge methodology, addressing limitations of single-turn benchmarks that don't capture dialogue coherence and context-tracking.

**UC Berkeley**

**Paper:** <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.05685>  
**Code:** [https://github.com/lm-sys/FastChat/tree/main/fastchat/llm\\_judge#mt-bench/](https://github.com/lm-sys/FastChat/tree/main/fastchat/llm_judge#mt-bench/)  
**Date:** 2023

**What Does It Evaluate?**

**Purpose:** Research

**Principles Tested:** Conversational coherence; Instruction following; Multi-turn context tracking

**Functional Properties:** General Capability (conversation); Quality (helpfulness, coherence)

**How Does It Work?**

**Judge:** Model-based (LLM judge: GPT-4)

**Model Access:** Outputs

**Protocol:** 1) Model A and Model B answer same question 2) GPT-4 compares responses pairwise 3) Winner determined; Elo rating computed from pairwise comparisons

**How Is It Structured?**

**Input Source:** Curated dataset

**Splits:** Each question has 2 turns Categories: writing, roleplay, reasoning, math, coding, extraction, STEM, humanities

**Output Source:** Human annotated

**Size:** Small (<1K samples): 80 multi-turn questions across 8 categories

**Design:** Dynamic data-driven (continuous arena with periodic updates)

**Quality & Reliability**

**Alignment Validation:** GPT-4 judgments correlate with human preferences at 80% agreement rate. Questions carefully crafted to avoid common knowledge.

**Baseline Models:** Elo ratings computed from pairwise comparisons; Public leaderboard updated weekly

**Similar Benchmarks:** Chatbot Arena, AlpacaEval

**Robustness Measures:** Position bias controlled via swapping; Inter-judge reliability: Claude-2 shows 75% agreement with GPT-4; Prompt sensitivity tested: stable across 3 judge prompt variations

**Known Limitations:** Judge model bias (prefers certain styles); Limited to English; Small question set may enable memorization; Not suitable for domain-specific expertise evaluation, safety assessment (doesn't test for harmful outputs), or fine-grained capability measurement (coarse Elo ratings)

**EVALUATION CARD**

## 6 Conclusion

We introduced **Eval Factsheets** a structured framework for documenting AI evaluation methodologies through a five-dimensional taxonomy and comprehensive questionnaire. Our framework addresses a critical gap in AI transparency: while datasets and models benefit from standardized documentation, evaluation methodologies—equally important for understanding AI capabilities and limitations—have lacked systematic documentation standards.

Through three diverse case studies (ImageNet, HumanEval, MT-Bench), we demonstrated that **Eval Factsheets** effectively captures evaluations spanning traditional benchmarks, execution-based testing, and emerging LLM-as-judge paradigms. The **Eval Factsheet** environment provides a standardized format that accommodates paradigm-specific requirements while maintaining consistent structure for comparability.

Key contributions include: (1) a systematic taxonomy of evaluation characteristics organized across five orthogonal dimensions—Context, Scope, Structure, Method, and Alignment, (2) a practical questionnaire operationalizing this taxonomy through structured sections that map directly to these dimensions, balancing comprehensiveness and usability, and (3) validated examples in the **evaluationcard** format demonstrating applicability across diverse evaluation types.

We encourage the community to create **Eval Factsheets** for their methodologies, contribute domain-specific extensions, and provide feedback to inform framework evolution. By establishing documentation standards for evaluation, we can improve transparency, reproducibility, and informed decision-making.

## References

- Matthew Arnold, Rachel KE Bellamy, Michael Hind, Stephanie Houde, Sameep Mehta, Aleksandra Mojsilović, Ravi Nair, K Natesan Ramamurthy, Alexandra Olteanu, David Piorkowski, et al. Factsheets: Increasing trust in ai services through supplier’s declarations of conformity. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 63(4/5):6–1, 2019.
- Andrew M. Bean, Ryan Othniel Kearns, Angelika Romanou, Franziska Sofia Hafner, Harry Mayne, Jan Batzner, Negar Foroutan, Chris Schmitz, Karolina Korgul, Hunar Batra, Oishi Deb, Emma Beharry, Cornelius Emde, Thomas Foster, Anna Gausen, María Grandury, Simeng Han, Valentin Hofmann, Lujain Ibrahim, Hazel Kim, Hannah Rose Kirk, Fangru Lin, Gabrielle Kaili-May Liu, Lennart Luettgau, Jabez Magomere, Jonathan Rystrøm, Anna Sotnikova, Yushi Yang, Yilun Zhao, Adel Bibi, Antoine Bosselut, Ronald Clark, Arman Cohan, Jakob Foerster, Yarin Gal, Scott A. Hale, Inioluwa Deborah Raji, Christopher Summerfield, Philip H. S. Torr, Cozmin Ududec, Luc Rocher, and Adam Mahdi. Measuring what matters: Construct validity in large language model benchmarks, 2025. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.04703>.
- Emily M Bender and Batya Friedman. Data statements for natural language processing: Toward mitigating system bias and enabling better science. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 6:587–604, 2018.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. Evaluating large language models trained on code. 2021.
- Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2009. CVPR 2009. IEEE Conference on*, pages 248–255. IEEE, 2009. <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/5206848/>.
- Jesse Dodge, Suchin Gururangan, Dallas Card, Roy Schwartz, and Noah A Smith. Show your work: Improved reporting of experimental results. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.03004*, 2019.
- Timnit Gebru, Jamie Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hanna Wallach, Hal Daumé III, and Kate Crawford. Datasheets for datasets. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(12):86–92, 2021.
- Sebastian Gehrmann, Tosin Adewumi, Karmanya Aggarwal, Pawan Sasanka Ammanamanchi, Aremu Anuoluwapo, Antoine Bosselut, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, Miruna-Adriana Clinciu, Dipanjan Das, Kaustubh Dhole, et al. The gem benchmark: Natural language generation, its evaluation and metrics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.01672*, 2021.
- Furkan Gursoy and Ioannis A Kakadiaris. System cards for ai-based decision-making for public policy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.04754*, 2022.
- Sarah Holland, Ahmed Hosny, Sarah Newman, Joshua Joseph, and Kasia Chmielinski. The dataset nutrition label: A framework to drive higher data quality standards. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.03677*, 2020.

Tony Lee, Haoqin Tu, Chi H Wong, Wenhao Zheng, Yiyang Zhou, Yifan Mai, Josselin S Roberts, Michihiro Yasunaga, Huaxiu Yao, Cihang Xie, et al. Vhelm: A holistic evaluation of vision language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:140632–140666, 2024.

Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, et al. Holistic evaluation of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09110*, 2022.

Margaret Mitchell, Simone Wu, Andrew Zaldivar, Parker Barnes, Lucy Vasserman, Ben Hutchinson, Elena Spitzer, Inioluwa Deborah Raji, and Timnit Gebru. Model cards for model reporting. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 220–229, 2019.

Shira Mitchell, Eric Potash, Solon Barocas, Alexander D’Amour, and Kristian Lum. Algorithmic fairness: Choices, assumptions, and definitions. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 8:141–163, 2021.

Joelle Pineau, Philippe Vincent-Lamarre, Koustuv Sinha, Vincent Larivière, Alina Beygelzimer, Florence d’Alché Buc, Emily Fox, and Hugo Larochelle. Improving reproducibility in machine learning research (a report from the neurips 2019 reproducibility program). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(164):1–20, 2021.

Mahima Pushkarna, Andrew Zaldivar, and Oddur Kjartansson. Data cards: Purposeful and transparent dataset documentation for responsible ai. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 1776–1826, 2022.

Inioluwa Deborah Raji, Emily M Bender, Amandalynne Paullada, Emily Denton, and Alex Hanna. Ai and the everything in the whole wide world benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.15366*, 2021.

Oscar Sainz, Jon Ander Campos, Iker García-Ferrero, Julen Etxaniz, Oier Beltrán, and Eneko Agirre. Nlp evaluation in trouble: On the need to measure llm data contamination for each benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18018*, 2023.

Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, et al. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04615*, 2022.

Jenna Wiens, Suchi Saria, Mark Sendak, Marzyeh Ghassemi, Vincent X Liu, Finale Doshi-Velez, Kenneth Jung, Katherine Heller, David Kale, Mohammed Saeed, et al. Do no harm: a roadmap for responsible machine learning for health care. *Nature medicine*, 25(9):1337–1340, 2019.

Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric. P King, Hao Zhang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena, 2023.