

# 17. Final Reports and Other Evaluation Products

## Principles and Norms

### COVERAGE OF QUALITY EVALUATION REPORTS

17.1 GRPP evaluation reports must include a profile of the GRPP and the key issues or questions addressed, and explain the methodology followed and criteria used (including any limitations or exceptions). They must present in a clear, complete, and balanced way the evidence-based findings; dissident views; and consequent conclusions, recommendations, and lessons. They must have an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report and facilitates dissemination and distillation of lessons.

Applies DAC Principle X, para. 39, and UNEG Norm 8, para. 8.2, to GRPPs

### PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

17.2 Evaluation reports must distinguish between findings and recommendations. Relevant information to support findings should be included in a way that does not compromise sources. To have an effect on decision making, evaluation findings must be presented in a clear and concise way. They should fully reflect the different views and interests of the many parties involved in development cooperation. Easy accessibility is crucial for usefulness.

Based on DAC Principle IV, paras. 18, 20, and 21

### OTHER EVALUATION PRODUCTS

17.3 Evaluation results may be disseminated in several ways apart from the evaluation report itself: annual reports providing a synthesis of findings; abstracts/summaries providing a synopsis of findings; electronic extracts posted on Web sites; and workshops. Ways should be found to present findings in an accessible form as needed for some stakeholder groups, including evaluation products in local languages.

Elaborates on DAC Principle X, para. 41, and GEF Policy, section 5.2, para. 83

## Standards and Guidelines

### SUMMARY STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION REPORTS

17.4 A reader of an evaluation report must be able to understand:

- The purpose of the evaluation
- Exactly what was evaluated
- How the evaluation was designed, conducted, and reviewed, including the degree of stakeholder participation
- Methodology, evaluation questions, evidence found, and conclusions drawn

Based on UNEG Standard 3.16, para. 37

- Recommendations
- Distillation of lessons.

DAC Standards  
10.1–10.3

17.5 “The evaluation report answers all the questions and information needs detailed in the scope of the evaluation. Where this is not possible, reasons and explanations are provided. The analysis is structured with a logical flow. Data and information are presented, analyzed and interpreted systematically. Findings and conclusions are clearly identified and flow logically from the analysis of the data and information. Underlying assumptions are made explicit. Conclusions are substantiated by findings and analysis. Recommendations and lessons learned follow logically from the conclusions.”

#### OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDED CONTENTS

Based on UNEG  
Standards 4.1–  
4.11

17.6 The evaluation report should provide a clear and complete description of the following:

- Reference information on opening pages
- The evaluation process and the TOR (in a preface or annex)
- The purpose and context of the evaluation
- The evaluation objectives and the scope of the evaluation
- The subject being evaluated, namely the GRPP or the relevant subset of its activities, and the context in which it operates
- The logframe, the expected results chain, and the intended impacts of the program, its implementation strategy, and key assumptions
- The role and contributions of the partner organizations, governing bodies, and other stakeholders in GRPP governance and management
- The evaluation methodology applied, including any limitations to the methodology
- The data collection instruments (usually in the annexes)
- The evaluation criteria the evaluators used
- The performance standards or benchmarks used in the evaluation, if any
- The level of stakeholder participation in the evaluation and the rationale for selecting that particular level
- The extent to which the evaluation design included ethical safeguards, where appropriate.

The following paragraphs provide more details on each of these.

#### REFERENCE INFORMATION ON OPENING PAGES

Based on UNEG  
Standard 4.1,  
para. 1

17.7 The title page and opening pages should provide key basic information, such as the name of the GRPP evaluated; the date; the table of contents, including annexes; the name(s) and organization(s) of the

evaluators; and the name and address of the organization(s) that commissioned the evaluation.<sup>90</sup>

## PREFACE

17.8 A preface (or annex) should provide key information on the process of the evaluation, the coverage of which should be in accordance with the policy on evaluation and disclosure approved by the governing body. The preface would cover selected topics from the following:

Draws on IEG's experience with reviewing GRPPs

- Who commissioned the evaluation (essential)
- Funding source for the evaluation (essential)
- Who approved the TOR and any peer reviewers, if applicable (recommended)
- Rationale for the level of participation chosen for the evaluation (can be helpful for transparency)
- How the evaluation team was selected (whether competitive or not) and the criteria applied (recommended)
- Who managed the evaluation and to whom the team reported (essential)
- Any conflicts of interest and how they were dealt with (essential)
- Any other organizational information relevant to the evaluation and the degree of independence of the process (recommended)
- The budget (or staff weeks estimated to be required) for the evaluation (recommended, with the agreement of the governing body and any donors involved)
- Actual resources expended for the evaluation (recommended for accountability and transparency, if feasible, and if remuneration information can be kept confidential)
- A description of any changes in the TOR during the evaluation process and the reasons (can be helpful for transparency)
- Information on the process of reviewing the findings, conclusions, and/or final report (can be helpful for transparency)
- Information on planned dissemination of the final report and any other related evaluation products or workshops (recommended).

17.9 The final TOR should always be included in the final report, either in a preface or annex.

17.10 The responses of the commissioners of the evaluation, the governing body, and program management should be proactively

---

90. DAC also emphasizes in Principle III that giving the actual names of the authors increases transparency.

disseminated to the key stakeholders and disclosed to the public. These may be in either a preface or annex of the final evaluation report if they emerge in a timely fashion, but may also be disclosed later through a means other than the final evaluation report, if necessary.

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Elaborates on  
UNEG Standard  
4.2, paras. 2  
and 3

17.11 The executive summary should provide a synopsis of the substantive elements of the evaluation report. To facilitate higher readership, the Executive Summary should be brief and should “stand alone.” The level of information should provide the uninitiated reader with a clear understanding of what was found and recommended and what has been learned from the evaluation. The executive summary should include:

- The commissioner of the evaluation and the members of evaluation team
- A brief description of the program being evaluated, including financial parameters and main activities
- The origin, context, and present situation of the program
- The purpose of the evaluation, the intended audience of the evaluation report, and the expected use of the evaluation report
- The objectives of the evaluation and key evaluation questions
- A short description of the methodology, including the rationale for the choice of methodology, data sources used, data collection and analysis methods used, and major limitations
- The most important findings and conclusions
- Main recommendations and lessons learned.

#### DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM AND CONTEXT

Based on DAC  
Standards 3.1,  
3.2 and 3.3

17.12 The evaluation report provides a description of the context relevant to the GRPP, the development interventions it supports, and their influence on the outcomes and impacts, for example:

- The circumstances surrounding the origin of the program and its maturity <sup>91</sup>
- The objectives of the GRPP, its coverage and scale (in financial terms), its stakeholders, and the range of activities supported
- References to the relevant program policy documents, objectives, and strategies
- Description of the institutional environment and stakeholder participation relevant to the GRPP and its activities

---

91. This treatment should include the *raison d'être* of the program, namely, why global or regional collective action was deemed necessary or useful, and what additional features the partnership brings to the program.

- Description of the socio-political context within which the GRPP operates and the evaluated activities take place
- Description of the organizational arrangements established for implementation of the development intervention, including the roles of donors and partners
- Expected outcomes and impacts affecting specific target groups.

#### EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

17.13 The criteria used, such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability, are mentioned, as are any other pertinent benchmarks. The questions asked, as well as any revision to the original questions, are documented in the report so that readers can assess whether the evaluation team has sufficiently assessed them.

Elaborates on  
DAC Standard  
2.4

#### EXPLANATION OF METHODOLOGY USED

17.14 “The evaluation report describes and explains the evaluation method and process and discusses validity and reliability. It acknowledges any constraints encountered and their effect on the evaluation, including their effect on the independence of the evaluation. It details the methods and techniques used for data and information collection and processing. The choices are justified and limitations and shortcomings are explained.”

DAC Standard  
4.1

17.15 The description of the methodology should include:

- Data sources
- Description of data collection methods and analysis (including level of precision required for quantitative methods, value scales, or coding used for qualitative analysis)
- Description of sampling (area and population represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, limitations to sample)
- Reference indicators and benchmarks, where applicable
- Any deviations from the evaluation plan
- Key limitations.

Based on DAC  
Standard 4.4  
and UNEG  
Standard 4.9

#### INFORMATION SOURCES AND GATHERING PROCEDURES

17.16 “The evaluation report describes the sources of information used (documentation, respondents, literature, etc.) in sufficient detail, so that the adequacy of the information can be assessed. Complete lists of interviewees and documents consulted are included, to the extent that this does not conflict with the privacy and confidentiality of participants.”

DAC Standards  
5.1 and 5.2

UNEG Standard 4.12, para. 22 17.17 “Data [do] not need to be presented in full; only data that support a finding needs to be given, and full data can be put in an annex.”

#### DESCRIPTION OF PARTICIPATION AND CONSULTATION OF STAKEHOLDERS

DAC Standard 4.3 and UNEG Standard 4.10, para. 17 17.18 “The evaluation report indicates the stakeholders consulted and the criteria for their selection and describes stakeholders’ participation. If less than the full range of stakeholders was consulted or invited to participate, the methods and reasons for selection of particular stakeholders are described.”

#### INTERVENTION LOGIC AS RELATED TO FINDINGS

Based on DAC Standard 2.2 and UNEG Standard 4.6, para. 10 17.19 The evaluation report should briefly describe and assess the intervention logic and distinguish between findings at the different stages of the results chain: inputs, activities, outputs, reach, outcomes, and impacts. The report should also provide a brief overall assessment of the intervention logic. Any value judgments should be presented transparently.

#### FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Based on DAC Standard 9.1 and UNEG Standards 4.6, 4.12, and 4.14 17.20 The evaluation findings should be relevant to the GRPP and to the purpose of the evaluation. They should cover all the evaluation objectives, showing a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions. The evaluators should explain the evaluation criteria that were used. Measurement of inputs, the progress of activities, outputs, and outcomes, and impacts should be presented to the extent possible, with reference to appropriate benchmarks (or an appropriate rationale given as to why these were not measured). Findings regarding inputs and activities should be distinguished clearly from outputs, outcomes, and impacts. Outcomes and impacts should include any unintended effects, whether beneficial or harmful. Additionally, any multiplier or downstream effects of GRPP activities should be included. Any discrepancies between the planned and actual implementation of the GRPP activities should be explained with reference to factors, including external factors, which were especially constraining or enabling.

UNEG Standard 4.15, para. 29 17.21 “Conclusions must focus on issues of significance to the program as determined by the evaluation objectives and the key evaluation questions. Simple conclusions that are already well known and obvious are not useful, and should be avoided.”

#### RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Based on DAC Standard 9.3 and UNEG Standard 4.16 17.22 Recommendations and lessons learned should be relevant and targeted to the intended users. Recommendations should be the logical implications of the findings and conclusions and be firmly based

on evidence and analysis. They should be realistic: the priorities, responsibilities for action, and provisional time-frame for action should be clear to the extent possible.

17.23 A good evaluation report should correctly identify lessons that stem logically from the findings, present an analysis of how these can be applied to different contexts and/or different sectors, and take into account evidential limitations such as generalizing from single point observations. But not all evaluations generate lessons. Lessons should only be drawn if they represent a contribution to general knowledge.

Based on UNEG  
Standard 4.17,  
paras. 33 and 34

#### ANNEXES

17.24 Additional supplementary information to the evaluation that should be included in annexes includes:

Based on UNEG  
Standard 4.18

- A list of abbreviations, if not included in the early pages
- The final TOR for the evaluation (and earlier versions if appropriate, if not in the preface)
- Program logical framework
- List of persons interviewed (if confidentiality allows) and sites visited
- Data collection instruments (copies of questionnaires, surveys, etc.)
- Documents consulted and references.