

TEMPLATE 2: UN-HABITAT EVALUATION REPORT QUALITY REVIEW TEMPLATE

| |
|--|
| Title of the evaluation report: |
| Month and year of the evaluation report: |
| Responsible Regional Office or Branch: |
| Type of report: Centralized evaluation report, decentralized evaluation report, joint evaluation report, or evaluation by with other entity. |
| Date of the quality review: |
| Name of reviewer: |
| Level of independence: Extent to which independence of implementation and control of the evaluation activities were ensured in the evaluation process. |
| Evaluation approach: Types include: mid-term, interim, end-of-project, impact, global programme, country programme |
| Executive feedback on overall quality score: Feedback to be provided after completing sections I-VI and with both positive and negative feedback on the quality of the report. |

| Section I: Report is Well Structured, Logic and Clear | | |
|--|----------|---------------|
| Question | Comments | Quality Score |
| 1. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements? Title of project evaluated, timeframe of the evaluation, UN-Habitat logo, disclaimer, table of contents, list of figures and tables, list of acronyms and abbreviations. | | |
| 2. Is the report logically structured and UN-Habitat's format for evaluation reports? | | |
| 3. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? | | |
| 4. Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements? Elements include: Overview of the evaluated project; evaluation objectives and intended users; evaluation methodology; most important findings and conclusions; main recommendations | | |
| 5. Do the annexes contain appropriate elements, including Terms of Reference, project budget overview, list of interviewees, bibliography and questionnaire templates (if used) | | |

| Section II: Object of the Evaluation | | |
|--|----------|---------------|
| Question | Comments | Quality Score |
| 1. Is the project of the evaluation described well? | | |
| 2. Is the context explained and related to the project that is to be evaluated? | | |
| 3. Is the results chain/ logic model/ project theory of change well-articulated? | | |
| 4. Are stakeholders clearly identified? | | |
| 5. Are key stakeholders' contribution described? | | |
| 6. Are UN-Habitat's contributions described? | | |
| 7. Are the implementation status and expenditure % of the project described? | | |

| Section III: Evaluation Mandate, Purpose, Objectives and Scope | | |
|--|----------|---------------|
| Question | Comments | Quality Score |
| 8. Are the mandate and purpose of the evaluation clear? | | |
| 9. Are the evaluation's objectives and scope clear and realistic? | | |
| 10. Do the evaluation's objectives and scope relate the purpose of the evaluation? | | |
| 11. Does the evaluation provide a list of evaluation criteria that are appropriate for the purpose? | | |
| 12. Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria where chosen and/or any standard evaluation criteria rejected? | | |
| 13. Are the interlinkages of the project to UN-Habitat's strategic plan, regional strategic plans and Habitat Country Programme Document and/or UNDAF described? | | |

| Section IV: Evaluation Methodology | | |
|---|----------|---------------|
| Question | Comments | Quality Score |
| 14. Does the report specify methods, data collection and analysis methods, sampling methods and limitations? | | |
| 15. Does the report specify data sources and data limitations? | | |
| 16. Does the evaluation make use of the project's log frame or other results framework to capture the theory of change and guide the assessment? | | |
| 17. Do the evaluation design, methodology and analytical framework consider and include information on gender equity, youth, human rights and climate change issues? Consider also application of environmental and social safeguards. The inclusion of any of the cross-cutting issues should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations. | | |
| 18. Are the levels of stakeholder consultation described? | | |
| 19. Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual or address issues of contribution / attribution? | | |
| 20. Does the methodology facilitate answers to the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation? | | |
| 21. Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task at hand? | | |

| Section V: Findings and Conclusions | | |
|---|----------|---------------|
| Question | Comments | Quality Score |
| 23. Are findings of results clearly presented by outputs and outcomes (and impacts where appropriate) and extent to which each expected accomplishment is achieved. Findings should tell the whole story of the evidence and avoid bias. Expected accomplishment are rated in terms of achievement (not achieved, partially achieved, achieved). | | |
| 24. Are delivery gaps and limitations discussed? | | |
| 25. Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated evaluation criteria and provide rating of level of satisfaction? Key evaluation criteria include relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact outlook | | |
| 26. Do the findings address all of the stated evaluation questions? | | |
| 27. Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated project was monitored in terms of gender, youth, human rights or climate change issues? | | |
| 28. Are unexpected findings discussed? | | |
| 29. Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders? | | |
| 30. Are casual reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible? Causal reasons should be based on the theory of change, which outlines causal pathways. | | |
| 31. Do conclusions summarize level of achievement of expected accomplishment and rating of performance based on evaluation criteria? | | |
| 32. Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated project? | | |
| 33. Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings? | | |
| 34. Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders, including gender-based and youth and are views of the evaluator clearly indicated?. | | |

Section VI: Lessons Learned and Recommendations

| Question | Comments | Quality Score |
|---|----------|---------------|
| 35. Are lessons learned correctly identified and based on project experience? Findings and conclusions to the evaluated project are not lessons learned. | | |
| 36. Are lessons learned generalized to indicate what wider relevance they may have? Lessons are contributions to general knowledge. | | |
| 37. Are the recommendations supported by the evidence, findings and conclusions reported? | | |
| 38. Are recommendations relevant to the project subject and the purpose of the evaluation? | | |
| 39. Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritized? | | |
| 40. Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group and action? | | |
| 41. Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation? | | |