UNIDO

UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

OFFICE OF EVALUATION AND INTERNAL OVERSIGHT

INDEPENDENT EVALUATION DIVISION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Independent thematic evaluation

UNIDO's programme and project formulation, appraisal and approval function

MARCH 2020

Content

I.   INTRODUCTION

This independent thematic evaluation of UNIDO's programme and project formulation, appraisal and approval function has been approved within the Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight (EIO) evaluation work plan for 2020-2021, and will be conducted in line with the Charter of EIO[1] and the UNIDO Evaluation policy[2],

UNIDO's main delivery mechanism is its technical cooperation (TC) programme, which involves many different functional units inside UNIDO. Implementation of the TC programme is based on the standard project management cycle, which includes several interlinked functions such as needs assessment, project/programme identification, resource mobilization, **formulation, appraisal and approval**, implementation, monitoring and reporting, evaluation and operational closure.

A key decision function in this process is a consistent and systematic quality assurance mechanism to ensure that approved projects/programmes are strategically aligned and meet UNIDO quality requirements, and therefore to ensure that programmes and projects contribute to UNIDO's mandate of inclusive and sustainable industrial development (ISID) and to the 2030 Agenda.

Background

The UNIDO programme and project formulation, appraisal and approval function/process is currently governed by Director General Bulletin DGB/2016/6 – "The programme and project formulation and approval function", issued on 30 May 2016, the Executive Board Terms of Reference, and other related policy documents (see annex 1 – List of relevant UNIDO documents).

The declared main purposes and expectations of the process/function, as established in DGB/2016/6 are:
*   To raise the efficiency and effectiveness of Technical Cooperation (TC) delivery by making the formulation process faster, more transparent and more collaborative.;
*   To strengthen quality, and to ensure compliance with donor standards.
*   To ensure that the formulation of programmes and projects is embedded in national development strategies. It is shaped by the need for consistency with United Nations programming principles and UNIDO's goal of Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (ISID).
*   The Logical Framework and Result-Based Management (RBM) principles form the guiding tools for programme and project development. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), an integral part of this approach, adjusted to facilitate result-based reporting along the three dimensions of ISID. Relevance, sustainability and cost-effectiveness remain at the core of the appraisal and approval process.
*   Additional criteria are introduced to comply with the increasingly stringent standards of UNIDO's donors.
*   The system continues to build quality at every step of the formulation process, rather than controlling quality at the end of it.
*   It segregates the roles of design and execution on one hand, and approval and monitoring on the other.

---

[1] UNIDO. (2019). Director General's Bulletin. Charter of the Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight (DGB/2019/07, 26 March 2019)
[2] UNIDO. (2018). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (DGB/2018/08, dated 1 June 2018)

- The formal approval authority lies with the UNIDO Executive Board (EB). The Executive Board takes an informed decision based on the project document, and based upon the clearance by hierarchical supervisors.

In addition, in recent years, several related policies, guidelines and provisions (in the form of DG bulletins, information circulars and/or administrative instructions) have been issued to supplement and provide further enhancements and clarification. These include the recently- issued administrative instruction on results management[3], Programmes for Country Partnership (PCPs)[4], UNIDO's Country Programme[5]; DG bulletins on the quality assurance framework[6], TC programme/project revisions, budget revisions and extensions[7].

Historically, since 2006, Director Generals Administrative Instruction UNIDO/DGAI.17.Rev.1 - Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programme and Project Cycle has been governing the whole programme and project management cycle, which was partially superseded by recent related policies and guidelines.

II.   Objectives and scope of the evaluation

The overall objective of this evaluation is to assess the value and effectiveness of UNIDO's programme and project formulation, appraisal and approval function/process, as a core organizational function, and to inform UNIDO senior management and stakeholders on what works and what would need to be revisited and/or improved.

The scope of evaluation will encompass:
- The formulation, appraisal and approval (FAA) function/process of projects and programmes of technical cooperation and how the FAA function affects UNIDO's TC performance.
- The assessment of the UNIDO portfolio of technical cooperation against the UNIDO mandate and strategic goals (Mandate, ISID, Lima declaration, Abu Dhabi declaration, MTPF, etc.) in order to demonstrate effectiveness of the FAA function.
- The process framework (e.g. policies, strategies, governance, roles and responsibilities, and processes related to its operation);
- Compliance with established requirements (e.g. quality, timeliness, roles);
- In terms of time, the evaluation will cover the process operation over the period 2012 to 2019. To the extent possible, the different FAA systems in place during this time will be compared and the effectiveness of process reforms assessed.

During the inception phase, the assessment of the limitations, data availability, and/or re-scoping of the evaluation will be conducted by the evaluation team accordingly, taking into consideration a deeper analysis of data and documents available. Any adjustment of the scope of the evaluation will be cleared by the Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight.

---

[3] AI/2020/01 - Managing for Results: A Guide to UNIDO's Integrated Results and Performance Framework (IRPF) Approaches and Tools (January 2020)
[4] DGB/2018/04 - UNIDO Policy on the Programme for Country Partnership" (23 February 2018)
[5] AI/2019/01 - UNIDO's Country Programme (4 June 2019)
[6] DGB/2019/11 - UNIDO Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) (14 May 2019)
[7] AI/2016/03 - Technical Cooperation (TC) programme/project revisions, budget revisions and extensions including funds availability controls (30 May 2016)

III.   Evaluation approach and methodology

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation[8] and will be guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Manual[9].

The evaluation will be carried out as an independent evaluation using a participatory approach whereby all key stakeholders associated with the process will be informed and consulted regularly and throughout the evaluation.

A participatory approach will both allow the wide capture of views and perspectives of all parties, and enable strong ownership of the recommendations of the evaluation, thus supporting the possible implementation of such recommendations. In this way, the evaluation ensures a learning process for UNIDO senior management, staff at large, and Member States

The evaluation team (ET) will liaise with the UNIDO Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight (EIO) and its Independent Evaluation Division (EIO/IED) on the conduct of the evaluation and on methodological issues.

The evaluation will use a **theory of change** and/or **SWOT analysis** (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) approach and mixed methods to collect data and information from a range of sources and informants. It will pay attention to triangulating the data and information collected before forming its assessment. This is essential to ensure an evidence-based and credible evaluation, with robust analytical underpinning.

Data collection methods

The ET will be required to use different methods to ensure that data gathering and analysis deliver evidence-based qualitative and quantitative information, based on diverse sources, as necessary: desk study and literature review, statistical analysis, individual interviews, focus group meetings/discussions, surveys and direct observation. This approach will not only enable the evaluation to assess causality through quantitative means but also to provide reasons why certain results were achieved or not and to triangulate information for higher reliability of findings. The specific mixed methodological approach will be described in the inception report.

Following are the main instruments for data collection:

(a)   **Desk and literature review** of documents related to the process, including but not limited to:
   - The current and previous policies, guidelines, manuals that govern and provide operational information to the process.
   - Past evaluation and audit reports related to the process and relevant to the evaluation subject.
   - Review of formulation, appraisal and approval function in other multilateral organizations, including the identification of best practices, e.g. from evaluations of such systems.

(b)   **Stakeholder consultations** will be conducted through structured and semi-structured interviews and focus group discussion. Key stakeholders to be interviewed include:

---

[8] UNEG. (2016). Norms and Standards for Evaluation (June 2016)
[9] UNIDO. (2018). Evaluation Manual (ODG/EIO/IED/16/R.27, March 2018)

- UNIDO Senior management (process owners, monitoring and controlling it)
- UNIDO Management and staff, in their role as users/clients of the process
- UNIDO Management and staff, in their role as supporting the process (e.g., Finance, Quality, Donor relations)

(c) **IT data collection.** Current and historical data from the ERP system to assess e.g., process parameters and adequacy of data flow, controls, segregation of duties, timeliness, roles and responsibilities.

(d) **A quantitative analysis of the UNIDO portfolio of technical cooperation against the UNIDO mandate and strategic goals (Imandate, ISID Lima and Abu Dhabi declarations, MTPF, etc.)** in order to demonstrate effectiveness of the FAA function in aligning the organization's TC activities with established strategic priorities.

(d) **SWOT analysis**: A SWOT analysis will be considered as a key analytical tool to frame and scope the evaluation and its findings.

(e) **Other** interviews, surveys or document reviews as deemed necessary for triangulation purposes.

Key evaluation questions

The overall guiding key evaluation questions will be:

- To what extent is the FAA function/process effective in meeting the stated objectives and ensuring optimal performance and strategic alignment of UNIDO's TC.
- To what extent are the criteria, roles and responsibilities related to the function/process clear and adequate for their stated purpose?
- Is the process governance coherent with other relevant processes, rules and regulations?
- How is the FAA process monitored and quality assured? How is the segregation of duties considered by the function/process?
- To what extent are the mechanisms that provide adequate quality control and quality assurance in place and effective?
- How does the process consider different categories of agreements, projects/programmes, CPs, PCPs, others? Which are the specific requirements in each case?
- To what extent is the UNIDO FAA system in line with international good practices and modern systems, including IT solutions?

During the inception phase, the evaluation questions will be revised and further detailed as needed and in line with any scope adjustment.

The preliminary list of key documents relevant to this evaluation is presented in Annex 1. Additional documents will be included as needed during the conduct of the evaluation.

IV.   Evaluation process

The evaluation will be implemented in phases, which are not strictly sequential, but in many cases iterative, conducted in parallel and partly overlapping:

- UNIDO Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight (EIO) and its Independent Evaluation Division (EIO/IED) identify and select the ET members.
- Inception phase
  - ✓ Desk review and data analysis: The ET will review related documentation and literature and carry out a preliminary data analysis
  - ✓ Briefing of consultant(s) at UNIDO Headquarters (HQ)
  - ✓ Preparation of inception report: The ET will prepare the inception report providing details on the methodology for the evaluation and include an evaluation matrix with specific issues for the evaluation
  - ✓ Conduct of initial Interviews and survey
- Data collection and analysis
  - ✓ Collect further documentation and data form ERP or any other IT system
  - ✓ Review of documentation, and carry out further data analysis
  - ✓ Prepare preliminary findings, trends, information based on the evidence collected
- Reporting phase
  - ✓ HQ debriefing by the ET with preliminary findings, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned
  - ✓ Further data analysis and writing of draft evaluation report
  - ✓ Submission of draft evaluation report to EIO
  - ✓ Sharing draft report for factual validation with stakeholders
  - ✓ Finalization of the evaluation report
  - ✓ Submission of final evaluation report and QA for clearance by EIO
  - ✓ Snapshot information (max. 2 pages) summarizing key messages for the preparation of an evaluation brief; and preparation of an evaluation infographic
- Issuance and distribution by EIO of the final evaluation report with the respective management response sheet and further follow-up, publication of evaluation report in UNIDO intra/internet sites

V.   Evaluation team composition

A staff from the UNIDO Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight (EIO) will be assigned as Evaluation Manager. He/she will coordinate and provide evaluation backstopping to the evaluation team and will also be part of the evaluation team and, hence, participate in the whole conduct of the evaluation as such. The Evaluation Manager will also ensure the quality of the evaluation throughout its process.

The **evaluation team (ET)** will be composed of one international evaluation consultant, the Evaluation Manager, and one more EIO evaluation staff (who will be the evaluation team leader). The evaluation team members will possess relevant strong experience and skills on evaluation and evaluation management. The ET will be assisted by EIO/IED staff as needed.

The tasks of ET member are specified in individual terms of reference (job descriptions) in annex 2 to these terms of reference.

According to UNIDO Evaluation policy, members of the evaluation team must not have been directly involved in the design and/or implementation of the subject under evaluation.

VI. Time schedule

The evaluation is scheduled to take place from March to June/July 2020.

The final evaluation report will be submitted two weeks after the factual validation and of receipt of comments.

VII. Evaluation deliverables

Inception report

This evaluation terms of reference (TOR) provides some information on the evaluation methodology, but this should not be regarded as exhaustive. After reviewing the evaluation-related documentation, including a review of FAA-related findings from independent evaluations, and having conducted initial interviews with the concerned stakeholders, the evaluation team will prepare a short inception report that will operationalize the TOR relating to the evaluation questions and provide information on what type of and how the evidence will be collected (methodology). It will be discussed with and approved by the responsible UNIDO Evaluation Manager.

The evaluation inception report will focus on the following elements: preliminary theory model(s); elaboration of evaluation methodology including quantitative and qualitative approaches through an evaluation framework ("evaluation matrix"); data collection process, division of work between the international evaluation consultant and the evaluation team member(s); people to be interviewed, and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable[10].

Evaluation report and review procedures

The draft evaluation report will be delivered to the Evaluation Manager (the suggested report outline is contained in annex 3) and circulated to stakeholders associated with the evaluation for factual validation and comments. Any comments or responses, or feedback on any errors of fact to the draft evaluation report provided by the stakeholders will be sent to the Evaluation Manager for collation and onward transmission to the evaluation team leader and the evaluation team members who will be advised of any necessary revisions. On the basis of this feedback, and taking into consideration the comments received, the evaluation team will prepare the final version of the evaluation report.

A presentation of preliminary findings will take place at UNIDO HQ.

The evaluation report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated, and the methods used. The evaluation report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. The report should provide information on when the evaluation took place, who was involved and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the main report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of recommendations and lessons learned.

---

[10] The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report and a Guide on how to formulate lessons learned (including quality checklist) prepared by the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

Findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete, logical and balanced manner. The evaluation report shall be written in English and follow the outline given in annex 3 unless otherwise specified in the inception report. The ET should submit the final version of the evaluation report in accordance with UNIDO Evaluation standards.

VIII.   Quality assurance

All UNIDO evaluations are subject to quality assessments by the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division. Quality assurance and control is exercised in different ways throughout the evaluation process (briefing of consultant(s) on methodology and process), providing inputs regarding findings, recommendations and lessons learned from other UNIDO evaluations, review of inception report, and ensuring that the draft evaluation report is factually validated by stakeholders.

The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality (annex 4). The draft and final evaluation reports are reviewed by the UNIDO Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight (EIO). The final evaluation report will be disseminated by this office within UNIDO together with a management response sheet, to Member States and relevant stakeholders, and made publicly available from the UNIDO evaluation website.

Annex 1: Preliminary list of relevant UNIDO documents

Current related policies, guidelines and/or manuals:
- 2020-02-11 AI/2020/01 - Managing for Results: A Guide to UNIDO's Integrated Results and Performance Framework (IRPF) Approaches and Tools
- 2019-05-14 DGB/2019/11: UNIDO Quality Assurance Framework (QAF)
- 2017-07-18 AI/2017/04: UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP)
- 2016-05-30 DGB/2016/6 - The programme and project formulation and approval function.
- Terms of Reference of the UNIDO Executive Board
- 2016-05-30 AI/2016/3: Technical Cooperation (TC) programme/project revisions, budget revisions and extensions including funds availability controls
- 2006-08-24 UNIDO/DGAI.17.Rev.1 : Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programme and Project Cycle-partially superseded by UNIDO/DGB/(P).130 and UNIDO/DGAI.21
- 2018-02-23 DGB/2018/04: UNIDO Policy on the Programme for Country Partnership
- 2018-02-23 AI/2018/01 - UNIDO Guidelines on the Programme for Country Partnership
- 2019-06-04 AI/2019/01 - UNIDO's Country Programme

Other/previous references:
- 2014-07-04 :UNIDO/DGB/(P).130: The programme and project formulation and approval function SUPERSEDED BY UNIDO/DGB_2016_6 The programme and project formulation and approval function
- 2013-04-30 :DGB/(P).120/Rev.1: Principles and Process for Screening, Appraisal, Approval and Monitoring of Technical Cooperation Programmes and Projects SUPERSEDED BY UNIDO/DGB/(P).130: The programme and project formulation and approval function
- 2010-05-31 :DGB(P).120: Revised System for the Screening, Appraisal and Approval of Technical Cooperation Programmes and Projects SUPERSEDED BY DGB/(P).120/Rev.1: Principles and Process for Screening, Appraisal, Approval and Monitoring of Technical Cooperation Programmes and Projects
- 2006-03-03 DGB(P).96: Programme Approval Committee and the Quality Advisory Group
- 2015-01-30 UNIDO/DGAI.24:Country Programme Framework (Word Version) SUPERSEDED BY AI/2019/01 - UNIDO Country Programme
- EB decision of 25 March 2019 on the Revision of DGB/2016/6

Annex 2: Job description

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PERSONNEL UNDER INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AGREEMENT (ISA)

Title:	Senior international evaluation consultant
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Missions:	UNIDO Headquarters (Vienna, Austria)
Start of Contract (EOD):	[15 March 2020] WAE
End of Contract (COB):	[15 July 2020]
Number of Working Days:	30 working days spread over 4 months

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The UNIDO Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight (EIO) is responsible for the independent evaluation function in UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes. Evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of a programme, a project or a theme. Independent evaluations provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the decision-making processes at organization-wide, programme and project level. UNIDO Evaluation function is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

PROJECT CONTEXT

Detailed background information of the evaluation subject can be found in the terms of reference (TOR) for the evaluation.

Under the guidance and overall coordination of the Evaluation team leader, the Senior international evaluation consultant will be part of an evaluation team for the conduct of the independent evaluation of UNIDO's programme and project formulation, appraisal and approval process. More specifically the senior evaluation consultant is responsible for the duties and deliverables detailed in the table below:

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Excepted duration (in work days)	Location
Desk review of relevant documents related to o UNIDO's programme and project formulation, appraisal and approval process. o Assignment of tasks and guidance of team members	• Division of evaluation tasks among evaluation team members • An adjusted table of evaluation questions for the assessment • A draft list of stakeholders to be interviewed during the evaluation	5 days	Home-based

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Excepted duration (in work days)	Location
Together with the ET prepare an inception report which streamlines the specific questions to address the key issues in the TOR, specific methods that will be used and data to be collected during the briefing at UNIDO HQ, detailed evaluation methodology confirmed, draft theory of change, and agenda for data collection	Inception report submitted to the evaluation manager	3	Home-based
Briefing with the UNIDO Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ	• Detailed evaluation schedule (incl. list of stakeholders to be interviewed) submitted to evaluation manager	4 days	Vienna, Austria
Undertake data collection and analysis of information. Verify and complete preliminary evaluation findings from desk review and data analyzed	• Evaluation/debriefings presentations of preliminary findings prepared, draft conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt	7 days	Home-based
Debriefing at HQ: Present preliminary findings, recommendations and lessons learned to stakeholders at UNIDO HQ for factual validation and comments. Hold additional meetings with and obtain additional data from other stakeholders as required	• Power point presentation • Feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed • Additional meetings held as required	3 days	Vienna, Austria
Prepare the draft evaluation report with inputs from the other evaluation team member(s), and in accordance with the evaluation TOR. Submit draft evaluation report to the evaluation manager for feedback and comments	• Draft evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager for review and comments	5 days	Home-based
Revise the draft evaluation report based on comments and suggestions received through the evaluation manager and edit the language and finalize the evaluation report according to UNIDO Evaluation standards	Final evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager	2 days	Home-based
Prepare an evaluation infographic and inputs for an evaluation brief (max. 2 pages)	Evaluation infographic and evaluation brief (2 pages input) submitted to evaluation manager	1	Home-based
	TOTAL	**30 days**	

<u>MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS</u>

Education: Advanced university degree in a field related to development studies, economics, public administration, business administration, or related areas

Technical and functional experience:
- Minimum of 15 years' experience in evaluation of development projects/programmes
- Proven practical experience in evaluating high-level and strategic issues with a UN and international development agency
- Knowledge of multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks
- Working experience in developing countries
- Good knowledge of UNIDO activities and working experience within the UN system
- Experience/knowledge in managing evaluations and evaluation teams
- Excellent analytical and drafting skills

Languages: Fluency in written and spoken English is required.

Reporting and deliverables
1) At the beginning of the assignment the Consultant will submit a concise Inception Report that will outline the general methodology and present a concept Table of Contents
2)
   Debriefing at UNIDO HQ:
   - Presentation and discussion of findings
   - Concise summary and comparative analysis of the main results of the evaluation report
3) Final evaluation report, comprising of executive summary, findings regarding design, implementation and results, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
4) Evaluation infographic; and 2-pages input for Evaluation brief

All reports and related documents must be in English and presented in electronic format.

Absence of conflict of interest:

According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

Annex 3: Outline of the evaluation report
(To be reviewed / updated in the inception phase)

Acknowledgement (incl. list of evaluation team members)
Abbreviations and acronyms
Glossary of evaluation-related terms

Executive summary
- Must provide a synopsis of the storyline which includes the main evaluation findings and key recommendations and lessons learned
- Must present strengths and weaknesses of the process (evaluation subject)
- Must be self-explanatory and should be maximum 3 to 4 pages in length

I. Evaluation objectives, methodology and process
- Information on the evaluation: why, when, by whom, etc.
- Scope and objectives of the evaluation, main questions to be addressed
- Information sources and availability of information
- Methodological remarks, limitations encountered and validity of the findings

II. Evaluation findings

Overall Assessment of the FAA Process

- Relevance, coherence, effectiveness, TOC/SWOT analysis, compliance (to be revised at inception phase))

III. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
   A. Conclusions
   B. Recommendations[11]
   C. Lessons learned[12]

Annexes should include the evaluation TOR, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, case studies, and any other detailed quantitative information. Dissident views or management responses to the evaluation findings may later be appended in an annex.

---

[11] Please refer to the UNIDO Evaluation Manual for guidance on the formulation of recommendations.

[12] Please refer to the UNIDO Evaluation Manual for guidance on the formulation of lessons learned.

Annex 4: Checklist on evaluation report quality

Evaluation title:

Evaluation team
Evaluation team leader:
Evaluation team members:

Quality review done by: Date:

Report quality criteria	UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division assessment notes	Rating
A. Was the report well-structured and properly written? (Clear language, correct grammar, clear and logical structure)		
B. Was the evaluation objective clearly stated and the methodology appropriately defined?		
C. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives?		
D. Was the report consistent with the ToR and was the evidence complete and convincing?		
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)		
F. Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations? Are these directly based on findings?		
G. Did the report include the actual project costs (total, per activity, per source)?		
H. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of both the M&E plan at entry and the system used during the implementation? Was the M&E sufficiently budgeted for during preparation and properly funded during implementation?		
I. Quality of the lessons: were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
J. Quality of the recommendations: did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can these be immediately implemented with current resources?		
K. Are the main cross-cutting issues, such as gender, human rights and environment, appropriately covered?		
L. Was the report delivered in a timely manner? (Observance of deadlines)		

Rating system for quality of evaluation reports
A rating scale of 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.