

Checklist on evaluation report quality

Independent Terminal Evaluation of the Project

Report title: Promoting Renewable Energy Based Mini Grids for Productive Uses in Rural Areas in the
Gambia

UNIDO Project ID: 103023

GEF ID: 3922

Evaluation team leader: Mr. Tequam TEFAMARIAM;

National Evaluation Consultant: Mr. Sewareh JABBAI

Quality review done by: Silvia Alamo

Date: 26/07/2018

| 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) | The executive summary lacks key features, e.g. a brief description of the evaluation methodology and a brief project background / summary. Language is generally clear. However, confusing or contradictory language is used in some instances, e.g. "The budget allocated to evaluate project progress at the end of each of the project milestones was not enough to carry out periodical monitoring on critical project milestones and is therefore rated as Satisfactory(S)" (page 10). Another example of confusing or contradictory language can be found on page 23, e.g. "...are not currently providing the required service to the community due to forced majeure. The pilot project is therefore rated as Satisfactory (S)." Frequent grammar mistakes in parts of the report. 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 not referred to in the report. An evaluation matrix or framework was not provided. A theory of change was not developed. | 3 |
| C. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives? | The report presents an assessment of achievement of outputs, i.e. the status of completion or operation of the units and legislative developments, albeit no reference is made of the productive uses or societal benefits of the facilities. Some comments are made on section A on the contradictory language utilized when rating achievements, e.g. on page 23 "...are not currently providing the required service to the community due to forced majeure. The pilot project is therefore rated as Satisfactory (S)". | 4 |

| Report quality criteria | UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV assessment notes | Rating |
|--|---|--------|
| 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. | 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 was assessed in a reasonably sound manner. Assumptions were referred to in the analysis of project design, e.g. "... Verification and Assumptions were adequate and important external factors and risks were identified..." (see page 20). However, assumptions were not analyzed in the context of sustainability or risk. | 4 |
| F. Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations? Are these directly based on findings? | Despite the confusing language used in some instances, 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.