

Checklist on evaluation report quality

Independent Terminal Evaluation of the Project

Report title: Reducing greenhouse gas and ODS Emissions through technology transfer in industrial RAC (refrigeration and air conditioning) sector

UNIDO Project number: 120623

GEF ID: 5466

[Click here to enter text.:](#)

Evaluation team leader: Mr. José de Bettencourt; National evaluation consultant: Ndey Naffie Ceesay

Quality review done by: S. Alamo

Date: 08/09/2018

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)	This evaluation report is identical in structure and language to the evaluation report on a similar project in Vietnam by the same evaluation team leader Clear language and structure The executive summary lacks key features, such as a short description of the purpose of the evaluation and the methodology used	5
B. Was the evaluation objective clearly stated and the methodology appropriately defined?	Clear evaluation objectives and methodology No evaluation matrix, but evaluation questions mentioned and explicitly or implicitly answered Theory of change utilized: possible confusion with utilization of language or representation, for instance preconditions and changes, e.g. "Figure 2 illustrates how the three project outcomes, and some outputs in particular could contribute to the preconditions..." (on page 18)	5
C. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives?	Yes, the evaluation report presents an assessment of achievement of project outcomes	5
D. Was the report consistent with the ToR and was the evidence complete and convincing?	The evaluation report is compliant with the TOR Evidence presented is compelling	5

Report quality criteria	UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV assessment notes	Rating
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)	The report presents a reasonable assessment of sustainability of outcomes Assumptions and risks assessed at project design and implementation levels	5
F. Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations? Are these directly based on findings?	Lessons and recommendations are adequately 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.