

## ANNEX 5 NARRATIVE QUALITATIVE EVALUATION OF REPORT

1. Documentation received by Meta-analysis Team and any supplementary information, such as interviews?
  - TOR:
  - Evaluation / appraisal report:
  - Project / programme document:
  - Other (specify):
2. Overview of Project (brief description)
3. Quality of the Evaluation Report, noting key strengths and weaknesses:
  - Did it respond to its TOR?
  - Quality of TOR? Did they include five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria (see # 4 below)? Two other Finnish criteria (see #5 below)?
  - Overall Quality of Evaluation Report?
4. Key OECD/DAC issues considered in evaluating /appraising the project:
  - Relevance:
  - Effectiveness:
  - Efficiency:
  - Impact:
  - Sustainability:
    - Three dimensions of sustainability (economic, social, ecological):
    - Factors contributing to good sustainability:
    - Obstacles to good sustainability:
    - Risks to good sustainability:
    - Major assumptions regarding sustainability:
5. Other Finnish criteria considered in evaluating /appraising the project:
  - Policy Coherence and Complementarity (including Paris Declaration, Millennium • Development Goals, poverty reduction, mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues):
  - Finnish added value (including how to implement, Finnish expertise, personnel):
6. Quality of the indicators, data and monitoring systems:
  - Baseline data
  - Indicators
  - Regular recording and monitoring of data
7. What is the overall quality of the aid /development intervention? In particular, is the planned / ongoing / completed intervention effective? Will it lead to sustainable development?

8. Is any information available (identify source) regarding what happened after the evaluation, i.e., was the project extended, funded, or a new phase formulated?
9. Is this programme likely to contribute to implementation of the 2007 Development Programme? If so, how?