

Checklist on evaluation report quality

Independent Terminal Evaluation of the Project

Report title: Improve the Health and Environment of Artisanal Gold Mining Communities by Reducing Mercury Emissions and Promoting Sound Chemical Management

UNIDO Project ID: 100336

GEF ID: 4569

Evaluation team leader: Mr. Nee Sun CHOONG KWET YIVE;

National Evaluation Consultant: Ms. Marie Clémence NDOUR

Quality review done by: Silvia Alamo

Date: 21/07/2018

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)	Language in various parts of the report is unclear / difficult to understand, contradictory or confusing, e.g., "the project have made recommendations to the countries for the development of a national action plan for the sound management of mercury in the artisanal gold mining sector. However, the plan has not yet been developed, but the countries have already secured international financial assistance to develop those plan, which are currently being developed." (see recommendation 3, page viii). Some unknown and unexplained references are made to "cf. paragraphs xx". Frequent grammar mistakes in parts of the report, particularly in recommendations (see above). The report is structurally easy to follow.	3
B. Was the evaluation objective clearly stated and the methodology appropriately defined?	The purpose of the evaluation is stated appropriately. Evaluation questions are referred to in section I only, Evaluation objectives, methodology and process, but not listed nor responded. An evaluation matrix or framework was not provided. A theory of change was not developed.	3

Report quality criteria	UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV assessment notes	Rating
C. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives?	The report presents an assessment of achievement of outcomes and outputs. The report is quite critical regarding the achievement of outcomes (page vi), albeit rates the achievement as "Satisfactory" (page viii), presumably based on the achievement of outputs.	4
D. Was the report consistent with the ToR and was the evidence complete and convincing?	Except for the issues mentioned in B above, the report was reasonably consistent with the TOR. Evidence was convincing, particularly regarding the assessment of outcomes. Main findings are presented clearly.	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)	Sustainability of outcomes is assessed in a comprehensive manner. Assumptions are referred to in a couple of instances, but not addressed in-depth.	4
F. Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations? Are these directly based on findings?	Lessons and recommendations are reasonably supported by evidence and based on findings.	4

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.