**PARAMETER 6.1** Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions. They flow from findings and conclusions. Recommendations are clearly articulated, prioritized and directed to specific agencies or sections of stakeholders.

**PARAMETER 6.2** Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g. reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.

**PARAMETER 6.3** Justification of what the evaluation covers and did not cover (thematically, geographically etc) as well as the reasons for approach taken.

**PARAMETER 6.4** Recommendations are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings. They are well formulated and are directly connected to the findings, providing clear responses to the evaluation questions.

**PARAMETER 6.5** Findings are clearly supported by and respond to the evidence presented and are free from subjective judgements. They are representative of the universe of project stakeholders. More details about the geographical distribution of these stakeholders and their roles are described.

**PARAMETER 6.6** The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of the evaluation's objectives are described. The analysis and interpretation of the data; they are free from subjective judgements.

**PARAMETER 6.7** Relevant ethical standards including but not limited to, informed consent of participants, confidentiality and avoidance of conflicts of interest, roles, attitudes and relations.

**SECTION 3: METHODOLOGY (15%)

**PARAMETER 3.1** The report contains a good overview of the methodology regarding data analysis and triangulation and identification of a few key stakeholders. The report includes detailed information on the methods and techniques used for data collection, analysis and interpretation. The report presents a clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation.

**PARAMETER 3.2** The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings. They are well substantiated by the evidence presented.

**PARAMETER 3.3** The purposes, objectives and use of evaluation are clearly outlined along with good overview of the evaluation scope, including thematic and geographic coverage.

**SECTION 4: FOCUS AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION (15%)

**PARAMETER 4.1** The evaluation report provides a clear description of the intervention and the objectives of the evaluation, including the intended use and uses of the evaluation and the information the report will be used for.

**PARAMETER 4.2** Findings are clearly supported by and respond to the evidence presented, reflecting systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data; they are free from subjective judgements.

**PARAMETER 4.3** The report specifies and provides a complete description of the relevant design and criteria of the evaluation.

**SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (20%)

**PARAMETER 5.1** Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings. They are well formulated and are directly connected to the findings, providing clear responses to the evaluation questions.

**PARAMETER 5.2** The conclusions provide good insights and there is a good balance between strengths and weaknesses but it is important to show what needs to be done but also on how it should be done. A description of the process undertaken and/or consultations held for implementation is provided.

**PARAMETER 5.3** ToC and/or goals and objectives described). The role of the key stakeholders/partners could also be expanded in addition to only listing them.

**SECTION 6: ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS (15%)

**PARAMETER 6.1** Lessons are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are reflective of the evaluation findings. The report presents a clear description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation.

**PARAMETER 6.2** The evaluation report provides sufficient levels of high-quality evidence to optimally address all of the evaluation questions and criteria.

**PARAMETER 6.3** Findings are clearly supported by and responsive to the evidence presented, reflecting systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data, they are free from subjective judgment.

**PARAMETER 6.4** Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g. causal attributions).

**PARAMETER 6.5** Findings are clearly supported by and responsive to the evidence presented, reflecting systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data. They are free from subjective judgments.

**PARAMETER 6.6** Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g. causal attributions).

**PARAMETER 6.7** The report contains a good overview of the methodology regarding data analysis and triangulation and identification of a few key stakeholders. The report includes detailed information on the methods and techniques used for data collection, analysis and interpretation. The report presents a clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation.
### PART 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (20%)

**Guiding Questions:**
- **Is the report well written and presented, with appropriate structure?**
- **Is the content well organized and logically presented?**
- **Are all required details and references included?**
- **Is the report organized and logical, with clarity and coherence (e.g. the structure and language of the report)?**
- **Is the report credible?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the report well written and presented, with appropriate structure?</strong></td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>The report is well written and presented, with appropriate structure. It is logically organized and well-structured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the content well organized and logically presented?</strong></td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>The content is well organized and logically presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are all required details and references included?</strong></td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>All required details and references are included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the report organized and logical, with clarity and coherence (e.g. the structure and language of the report)?</strong></td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>The report is well organized and logically presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the report credible?</strong></td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>The report is credible and well-structured.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Section 8**

- **The report is well written and presented, with appropriate structure.**
- **Ideally, the report length should be shortened to about 50 pages.**
- **Note:**
  - The report does not adequately address the evaluation questions and the methodology is not clearly described. It would have been helpful to have a clear statement of the evaluation questions and a clear methodology section.
  - The evaluation criteria and questions are not clearly stated.
  - The evaluation methodology is not clearly described.
  - The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis. The gender analysis is satisfactorily integrated.
  - The evaluation methodology was fully gender-responsive. The methodology is fully gender-responsive.
  - The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis. The gender analysis is satisfactorily integrated.
  - The evaluation methodology was fully gender-responsive. The methodology is fully gender-responsive.
  - The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis. The gender analysis is satisfactorily integrated.

**Additional Information:**

- This is a very good evaluation report, providing in-depth assessments in response to the evaluation questions. The findings and conclusions are well-supported by evidence, and recommendations are clearly stated. The report is well-written and logically structured.