UNDP evaluation report template and quality standards

This **evaluation report template** is intended to serve as a guide for preparing meaningful, useful and credible evaluation reports that meet quality standards. It does not prescribe a definitive section-by-section format that all evaluation reports should follow. Rather, it suggests the areas of content that should be included in a quality evaluation report.

The evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and be understandable to the intended audience. In a country context, the report should be translated into local languages whenever possible. The report should include the following:

1. **Title and opening pages** should provide the following basic information:
* Name of the evaluation intervention.
* Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report.
* Countries of the evaluation intervention.
* Names and organizations of evaluators.
* Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation.
* Acknowledgements.
1. **Project and evaluation information details** to be included in all final versions of evaluation reports (non-GEF)[[1]](#footnote-1) on second page (as one page):

|  |
| --- |
| **Project/outcome Information** |
| **Project/outcome title** |  |
| **Project Number** |  |
| **Corporate outcome and output** |  |
| **Country** |  |
| **Region** |  |
| **Date project document signed** |  |
| **Project dates** | **Start** | **Planned end** |
|  |  |
| **Total committed budget** |  |
| **Project expenditure at the time of evaluation** |  |
| **Funding source** |  |
| **Implementing party[[2]](#footnote-2)** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation information** |
| **Evaluation type (project/ outcome/thematic/country programme, etc.)** |  |
| **Final/midterm review/ other** |  |
| **Period under evaluation** | **Start** | **End** |
|  |  |
| **Evaluators** |  |
| **Evaluator email address** |  |  |
| **Evaluation dates** | **Start** | **Completion** |
|  |  |  |

1. **Table of contents,** including boxes, figures, tables, and annexes with page references.
2. **List of acronyms and abbreviations.**
3. **Executive summary (four/ five page maximum).** A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:
* Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s), programme(s), policies, or other intervention) that was evaluated.
* Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
* Describe key aspects of the evaluation approach and methods.
* Summarize principle findings, conclusions and recommendations.
1. **Introduction**
* Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
* Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
* Identify the intervention being evaluated (the project(s) programme(s) policies or other intervention).
* Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the intended users.
1. **Description of the intervention** provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. It should:
* Describe **what is being evaluated**, **who seeks to benefit** and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.
* Explain the **expected results model or results framework**, **implementation strategies** and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy / theory of change.
* Link the intervention to **national priorities**, UNSDCF priorities, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or Strategic Plan goals, or other **programme or country-specific plans and goals.**
* Identify the **phase** in the implementation of the intervention and any **significant changes** (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks, theory of change) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
* Identify and describe the **key partners** involved in the implementation and their roles.
* Include data and an analysis of **specific social groups** affected. Identify **relevant cross-cutting issues** addressed through the intervention, i.e., gender equality, human rights, vulnerable/ marginalized groups, leaving no one behind.
* Describe the **scale of the intervention**, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population (men and women) for each component.
* Indicate the **total resources**, including human resources and budgets.
* Describe the context of the **social, political, economic, and institutional factors**, and the **geographical landscape** within which the intervention operates, and explain the challenges and opportunities those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
* Point out **design weaknesses** (e.g., intervention logic, theory of change) or other **implementation constraints** (e.g., resource limitations).
1. **Evaluation scope and objectives.** The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation’s scope, primary objectives and main questions.
* **Evaluation scope.** The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population and geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were or were not assessed.
* **Evaluation objectives.** The report should spell out the types of decisions the evaluation will feed into, the issues to be considered in making those decisions and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
* **Evaluation criteria.** The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used[[3]](#footnote-3) and explain the rationale for selecting those particular criteria.
* **Evaluation questions.** The report shoulddetail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to those questions address the information needs of users.
1. **Evaluation approach and methods.**[[4]](#footnote-4) The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the time and money constraints, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped to answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. **The report should specify how gender equality, disability, vulnerability and social inclusion were addressed in the methodology, including how data collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations, use of disaggregated data and outreach to diverse stakeholder groups.** The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description of methodology should include discussion of each of the following:
* **Evaluation approach.**
* **Data sources:** the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders met) as well as the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
* **Sample and sampling frame.** If a sample was used, describe the sample size and characteristics, the sample selection criteria; the process for selecting the sample (e.g. random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of sample for generalizing results.
* **Data collection procedures and instruments:** methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data-collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source, and evidence of their reliability and validity, as well as gender-responsiveness.
* **Performance standards:**[[5]](#footnote-5) the standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g. national or regional indicators, rating scales).
* **Stakeholder participation:** who participated and how the level of involvement of men and women contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
* **Ethical considerations:** including the measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators’ for more information).[[6]](#footnote-6)
* **Background information on evaluators:** the composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members, and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
* **Major limitations of the methodology** should be identified and openly discussed, as well as any steps taken to mitigate them.
1. **Data analysis.** The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results for different stakeholder groups (men and women, different social groups, etc.). The report should also discuss the appropriateness of the analyses to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.
2. **Findings** should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed. Findings should reflect gender equality and women’s empowerment, disability and other cross-cutting issues, as well as possible unanticipated effects.
3. **Conclusions** should be comprehensive and balanced and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision-making of intended users, including issues in relation to gender equality and women’s empowerment as well as to disability and other cross-cutting issues.
4. **Recommendations.** The report should provide a reasonable number of practical, actionable and feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable. Recommendations should also provide specific advice for future or similar projects or programming. Recommendations should address any gender equality and women’s empowerment issues and priorities for action to improve these aspects. Recommendations regarding disability and other cross-cutting issues also need to be addressed.
5. **Lessons** **learned.** As appropriate and/or if requested in the TOR, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context, outcomes, even evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report. Gender equality and women’s empowerment, disability and other cross-cutting issues should also be considered.
6. **Report annexes.** Suggested annexesshould include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:
* TOR for the evaluation.
* Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data-collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate.
* List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited. This can be omitted in the interest of confidentiality if agreed by the evaluation team and UNDP.
* List of supporting documents reviewed.
* Project or programme results model or results framework.
* Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators.
* Pledge of ethical conduct in evaluationsigned by evaluators.
1. GEF evaluations have their own project information template requirements. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. This is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The evaluation criteria most commonly applied to UNDP evaluations are the OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. All aspects of the described methodology need to receive full treatment in the report. Some of the more detailed technical information may be contained in annexes to the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. A summary matrix displaying, for each of the evaluation questions, the data sources, data collection tools or methods and the standard or measure by which each question was evaluated. This is a good illustrative tool to simplify the logic of the methodology for thereport reader. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNEG, 2020, Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)