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# Outline of an Evaluation Report

The quality criteria of an evaluation report have been defined by the OECD/DAC and the EU (see the Evaluation Manual 2018, chapter 4.1). The main components of an evaluation report are outlined below. The outline is not compulsory, but intended as a guideline in defining the appropriate table of contents for a specific evaluation. It is recommended that based on this general outline, the evaluators propose a detailed report outline e.g. in the Inception Report.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

* Providing an overview of the report, highlighting the main findings, conclusions, recommendations and any overall lessons.
* Includes a summary table presenting main findings, conclusions and recommendations and their logical links.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FINDINGS** | **CONCLUSIONS** | **RECOMMENDATIONS** |
| [Evaluation criteria / issue from ToR e.g. ***Relevance***] |
|  |  |  |
| [Evaluation criteria / issue from ToR e.g. ***Impact***] |
|  |  |  |
| [Evaluation criteria / issue from ToR e.g. ***Effectiveness***] |
|  |  |  |
| [Evaluation criteria / issue from ToR e.g. ***Efficiency***] |
|  |  |  |
| [Evaluation criteria / issue from ToR e.g. ***Sustainability***] |
|  |  |  |
| [Evaluation criteria / issue from ToR e.g. ***etc***] |
|  |  |  |

**INTRODUCTION**

* Evaluation’s rationale, purpose and objectives, scope and main evaluation questions
* Brief description on how the evaluation was conducted (methods, sampling, etc.)

**DESCRIPTION OF THE CONTEXT AND THE EVALUATED PROJECT/PROGRAMME**

* Description of the programme’s broader context and its influence on the performance of the project/programme.
* Introduction of the intervention being evaluated: objectives including the cross-cutting objectives, implementation strategies and approaches, and resources for implementation.
* Introduction of the stakeholders and their roles, including both final beneficiaries and involved institutions

**KEY FINDINGS**

* Empirical data, facts, evidence relevant to the evaluation questions and related indicators.
* Overall progress in the implementation.
* Findings by evaluation criteria / issue
	+ Relevance
	+ Impact
	+ Effectiveness
	+ Efficiency
	+ Sustainability
	+ etc.

**CONCLUSIONS**

* The evaluators’ assessment of the performance of the project/programme based on the findings in relation to the set evaluation criteria, performance standards or policy issues
	+ Relevance
	+ Impact
	+ Effectiveness
	+ Efficiency
	+ Sustainability
	+ etc.

NOTE: Often the distinction between findings and conclusions is artificial and they are presented together. Even when this is done, the conclusions must be substantiated by facts and evidence.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

* Proposed improvements, changes and actions to remedy problems in performance or to capitalise on strengths. Recommendations are based on the findings and conclusions. There should be a clear indication of
	+ to whom is the recommendation directed (MFA, partner institutions, consultant providing support services, etc.)
	+ who is responsible for implementing the recommendation, and
	+ when the recommendation should be implemented and what resources are needed.

NOTE: Findings, conclusions and recommendations are summarized in a table in the Executive Summary of the evaluation report.

**LESSONS LEARNED**

* Are there any general conclusions that are likely to have the potential for wider application and use?

**ANNEXES**

* ToR of the evaluation
* Description of the evaluation methodology used
* Limitations of the study
* Lists of information sources e.g. people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.
* Quality assurance statement produced by the quality assurance mechanism used
* 1-2 page evaluation brief for communicating the evaluation results, including
	+ the key message of the evaluation,
	+ who has benefitted and what are the most important positive results,
	+ any unexpected impacts,
	+ key recommendations and lessons learned.