

Checklist on evaluation report quality

Independent Terminal Evaluation of the Project

Report title: Industrial Energy Efficiency for Malaysian Manufacturing Sector (IEEMMS)

UNIDO Project ID: 103042

GEF ID: 3908

International Evaluation Consultant and Team Leader: Mr. Brahmanand Mohanty;

National Evaluation Consultant: Ali Askar Sher Mohamad

Quality review done by: Silvia Alamo

Date: 8/09/2018

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 is clear. The report is structurally easy to follow.	5
B. Was the evaluation objective clearly stated and the methodology appropriately defined?	The purpose of the evaluation is stated appropriately. Evaluation questions and evaluation matrix not referred to. A reconstructed theory of change is provided (some terminology used indistinctly, e.g. impact drivers and assumptions) and to some extent utilized in the evaluation.	5
C. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives?	The report presents an assessment of outcome achievement. The report appears to toggle outputs and outcomes and to be somewhat contradictory regarding the assessment, i.e. "outcomes have been largely achieved" (page 13 and 28) and "...the project was not quite successful in achieving outcomes 1 and 5" (page 18). This mix of achievements is not reflected in the summary assessment table 10.	5
D. Was the report consistent with the ToR and was the evidence complete and convincing?	Except as indicated in section B above, the report was consistent with the TOR and evidence was convincing. Main findings are presented clearly.	5
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, including assessment of risks. Unclear use of impact drivers and assumptions in reconstructed TOC to assess achievement of outcomes and intermediate changes.	5

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 not always clearly based on findings, e.g. recommendation 1, suggesting the allocation of project responsibility to a different Government Agency, does not appear to clearly emanate from previous findings. In fact, "the following can be read on page 52 "As the main focus of the Project was the industrial sector, MITI was rightly chosen as the executive agency for the Project."	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.