Checklist on evaluation report quality

Independent Terminal Evaluation of the Project

Report title: GEF UNIDO Cleantech Programme for SMEs in Malaysia

UNIDO Project ID: 120096

GEF ID: 5146

Evaluation team leader: Mr. Marcel Crul;

National Evaluation Consultant: Prof. Dr. Raja Suzana Binti Raja Kasim

Quality review done by: Silvia Alamo

Date: 8/03/2018

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. Some improvements would facilitate the reading: • Organization of figures and tables, e.g. Figure 2 in annex 1 comes before Figure 1; Figures 4 and 5 do not exist; Table 4 does not exist; • Avoiding cutting and pasting texts from documents without adapting the text, e.g. bullet 8 of section 1.3, "Interviews addressed the main evaluation topics as described in 4.2" (4.2 referred to the TOR not to the evaluation report!); • Adding page numbering in the Table of Content.	3
B. Was the evaluation objective clearly stated and the methodology appropriately defined?	The purpose of the evaluation is stated appropriately. Key parameters and evaluation questions are provided. An evaluation matrix or framework was not provided. A theory of change is mentioned but it was not developed. The evaluation report states that "the model used for the theory of change is the Logframe approach".	4

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 is quite critical with the project design, and states that "the indicators set in the proposal to measure the expected outcomes are not specific enough, and do not indicate to what extent the outcomes are reached." The report does present an assessment of "outcome achievement" albeit referred mostly to outputs, e.g. no. of national GCIP competitions organized and applications received. The report includes confusing statements, e.g. "No systematic evaluation on the accelerator programme has been made in the project, so this assessment is solely based on the interviews during the mission of the evaluation team".	4
D. Was the report consistent with the ToR and was the evidence complete and convincing?	Except for the absence of a TOC analysis, the report was consistent with the TOR and evidence was convincing. 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, including assessment of risks. Assumptions are not directly assessed.	5
F. Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations? Are these directly based on findings?	Recommendations are supported by evidence and 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.