

## Checklist on evaluation report quality

### *Independent Terminal Evaluation of the Project*

**Report title:** Market Transformation Programme on Energy Efficiency in Greenhouse Gas Intensive Industries in the Russian Federation

**UNIDO Project ID:** 103056

**GEF ID:** 3593

Evaluation team leader: Mr. Marjan MIHAJLOV, MSc;

National Evaluation Consultant: Mr. Vitaly BEKKER

Quality review done by: Silvia Alamo

Date: 29/07/2018

Report quality criteria	UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV assessment notes	Rating
A. Was the report well-structured and properly written? (Clear language, correct grammar, clear and logical structure )	<p>Language is clear.</p> <p>The subheadings in the various sections of the report are unclear and it is not always structurally easy to follow, e.g. III Project assessment&gt; B. Implementation performance&gt; <b>Project results</b> (considered a subchapter, not visible in the TOC) encompassing &gt; Effectiveness. It is unclear whether Efficiency or Progress to impact are under the section on Project results. Some terminology confusion, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• On page 11, outcomes are listed as a criterion encompassing relevance, effectiveness and efficiency;</li><li>• The term “implementation” is used 134 times, not defined but rated (quality of implementation and execution) as an independent evaluation criterion, albeit not listed in table 22.</li><li>• On page 34, Efficiency is defined as “the extent to which the Project has produced the results (outputs and outcomes) within the expected time frame”, which appears contradictory with the definition given in the Glossary, i.e. a measure of how economically inputs (through activities) are converted into outputs;</li><li>• These confusions have a repercussion on the evaluation findings for efficiency and effectiveness, which are slightly toggled. For instance, on page 26, the following is stated: “Project’s results</li></ul>	3

Report quality criteria	UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV assessment notes	Rating
	framework is shown as matrix and it gives a detailed and clear description of the project showing how the activities will lead to outputs, i.e to outcomes.”	
B. Was the evaluation objective clearly stated and the methodology appropriately defined?	<p>The purpose of the evaluation is stated appropriately.</p> <p>Evaluation questions are listed in the methodology section and mostly addressed by the report.</p> <p>An evaluation matrix or framework was referred to in methodology but not provided.</p> <p>A theory of change was not provided.</p>	4
C. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives?	<p>With the caveats indicated in A above, the report presents an assessment of project results (encompassing the section of effectiveness) and of the achievement of outcomes, outputs and activities.</p> <p>An analysis of the measurability of the indicators is provided.</p>	5
D. Was the report consistent with the ToR and was the evidence complete and convincing?	<p>Except for the issues mentioned in B above, the report was reasonably consistent with the TOR.</p> <p>Evidence provided reasonably convincing.</p>	4
E. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes or did it explain why this is not (yet) possible? (Including assessment of assumptions, risks and impact drivers)	<p>Sustainability of outcomes was assessed in a reasonably sound manner.</p> <p>Risk management is comprehensively developed.</p> <p>Assessment of assumptions not provided.</p>	4
F. Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations? Are these directly based on findings?	Lessons and recommendations are supported by evidence and reasonably based on findings.	5

#### Rating system for quality of evaluation reports

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.