Checklist on evaluation report quality

Independent Terminal Evaluation of the Project

Report title: Environmentally Sustainable Management of Medical Wastes in China

UNIDO Project ID: 104036

GEF ID: 2927

Evaluation team leader: Mr. Carlo Lupi; National Consultant: Mr. Zhy Jiangxin

Quality review done by: Silvia Alamo

Date: 5/02/2018

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 clear. The report is structurally easy to follow.	4
B. Was the evaluation objective clearly stated and the methodology appropriately defined?[1]	Purpose stated appropriately. Key parameters and evaluation questions provided. No reference to a theory of change and no evaluation matrix provided.	3
C. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives?	Yes	6
D. Was the report consistent with the ToR and was the evidence complete and convincing? [2]	The report was consistent with the TOR except for the lack of theory of change or evaluation matrix. Evidence convincing. Main findings are categorized, but paragraphs are lengthy and issues. do not clearly stand out.	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 is discussed. Risks not analyzed as per GEF categories. Assumptions analyzed in depth.	4

[1] Awkwardly enough, TOR did not require a theory of change to be developed.
[2] It would have been useful to provide a stakeholder analysis.

Report quality criteria	UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV assessment notes	Rating
F. Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations? Are these directly based on findings?	Recommendations are unclear and are merged with lessons and conclusions.	3

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.