



# EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATING MATRIX

## A Guiding Matrix on Project Performance Rating for Evaluations

### **Environomica Consulting**

*Unlocking sustainable change*

---

**Tel.** +49 176 367 178 71

Karl-Marx-Str. 100, D-12045, Berlin

[environomica.com](http://environomica.com)

**Fax.** +39 341 285 245

Via Aspromonte 13, I-23900, Lecco

[m.galli@environomica.com](mailto:m.galli@environomica.com)

---

# EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATING MATRIX

## A Guiding Matrix on Project Performance Rating for Evaluations

This document is a product of ENV Consulting co-authored by Mr. Marco De Milato and Mr. Michele Galli. The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The designations “client” and “organisation” are intended in general and do not necessarily express a judgement about the stage reached by a particular client and/or organisation. Any use, reproduction and distribution of this document without written permission of ENV Consulting is prohibited.

All rights reserved ©2020 by the Environomica Consulting (ENV).

## OECD/DAC DEFINITIONS

- ✓ **Relevance:** ‘the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor’.
- ✓ **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
- ✓ **Efficiency:** A measure of how economically resources/ inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.
- ✓ **Outputs:** ‘The products, capital goods and services that result from a development intervention; they may also include changes resulting from the intervention, which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes’.
- ✓ **Outcomes:** ‘The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs.’
- ✓ **Impact:** Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended”.
- ✓ **Sustainability:** The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.

# Contents

A guiding matrix on project performance rating for evaluations.....	2
Relevance .....	2
Effectiveness.....	3
Efficiency .....	5
Sustainability.....	6
Weighted ratings table.....	9

# A guiding matrix on project performance rating for evaluations

Our evaluations assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project through performance indicators. What follow is a tool to understand how indicators and principles guide the evaluation of projects and programs.

## Relevance

The evaluation will assess, in line with the OECD/DAC definition of relevance, ‘the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor’. The evaluation will include an assessment of the program’s relevance in relation to the clients’ mission and its alignment with international and local priorities. Furthermore, the evaluation will assess the complementarity of the program with other similar projects in the same locations and/or addressing the needs of the same target groups.

Rating	Rationale	Indicators
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory</b>	The project implementation strategies and delivered contributions (results) show: - lack of alignment with a), b) & c) - very limited consideration of d)	a) Mandate of the organization, Strategy / Thematic Priorities. b) International, Regional, National, County, sub-county priorities c) Target group and beneficiary needs and priorities d) Donor/funding agency priorities e) The intervention was NOT complementary to (or duplicates) other recent or ongoing interventions of the client or other organisations working in the project area or on the same problem/issue.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	The project’s implementation strategies and delivered contributions (results) show: - weak alignment with a) - limited alignment with b), c) & d) - very limited consideration of e) & f)	a) Mandate of the organization, Strategy / Thematic Priorities. b) International, Regional, National, County, sub-county priorities c) Target group and beneficiary needs and priorities d) Donor/funding agency priorities e) The intervention was complementary to other recent, ongoing or planned interventions by the client or other organisations working in the project area or on the same problem/issue.
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>	The project’s implementation strategies and delivered contributions (results) show: - partial alignment with a), b), c) & d) - limited consideration of e)	a) Mandate of the organization, Strategy / Thematic Priorities. b) International, Regional, National, County, sub-county priorities c) Target group and beneficiary needs and priorities d) Donor/funding agency priorities e) The intervention was complementary to other recent, ongoing or planned interventions by the client or other organisations working in the project area or on the same problem/issue.
<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>	The project’s implementation strategies and delivered contributions (results) show: - explicit and full alignment with a) & b) - partial alignment with c) & d) - partial consideration of e)	a) Mandate of the organization, Strategy / Thematic Priorities. b) International, Regional, National, County, sub-county priorities c) Target group and beneficiary needs and priorities d) Donor/funding agency priorities e) The intervention was complementary to other recent, ongoing or planned interventions by the client or other organisations working in the project area or on the same problem/issue.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	The project’s implementation strategies and delivered contributions (results) show: -explicit and full alignment with a), b), c), & d) -partial consideration of e) & f)	a) Mandate of the organization, Strategy / Thematic Priorities. b) International, Regional, National, County, sub-county priorities (e.g. SDGs, Vision 2030, Big 4 agenda etc) c) Target group and beneficiary needs and priorities d) Donor/funding agency priorities e) The intervention was complementary to other recent, ongoing or planned interventions by the client or other organisations working in the project area or on the same problem/issue.
<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	The project’s implementation strategies and delivered contributions (results) show: - explicit and full alignment with all indicators	a) Mandate of the organization, Strategy / Thematic Priorities. b) International, Regional, National, County, sub-county priorities c) Target group and beneficiary needs and priorities d) Donor/funding agency priorities e) The intervention was complementary to other recent, ongoing or planned interventions by the client or other organisations working in the project area or on the same problem/issue.



## Effectiveness

The evaluation will assess the project's success in producing the programmed outputs (products, goods and services resulting from the intervention) and achieving milestones as per the project design document. The delivery of outputs will be assessed in terms of both quantity and quality, and the assessment will consider their ownership by, and usefulness to, intended beneficiaries and the timeliness of their delivery. The evaluation will briefly explain the reasons behind the success or shortcomings of the project in delivering its programmed outputs and meeting expected quality standards. The achievement of direct outcomes (short and medium-term effects of the intervention's outputs; a change of behaviour resulting from the use/application of outputs, which is not under the direct control of the intervention's direct actors) is assessed as performance against the direct outcomes as defined in the reconstructed Theory of Change. These are the first-level outcomes expected to be achieved as an immediate result of project outputs. Based on the articulation of longer term effects in the reconstructed Theory of Change (TOC) - i.e. from direct outcomes, via intermediate states, to impact - the evaluation will assess the likelihood of the intended, positive impacts becoming a reality. Project objectives or goals should be incorporated in the TOC, possibly as intermediate states or long-term impacts. 'Likelihood of Impact Assessment Decision Tree': essentially the approach follows a 'likelihood tree' from direct outcomes to impacts, taking account of whether the assumptions and drivers identified in the reconstructed TOC held. Any unintended positive effects should also be identified and their causal linkages to the intended impact described. The evaluation will also consider the likelihood that the intervention may lead, or contribute to, unintended negative effects. The evaluation will consider the extent to which the project has played a catalytic role or has promoted scaling up and/or replication as part of its Theory of Change and as factors that are likely to contribute to longer term impact.

Rating	Rationale	Indicators
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory</b>	<p>Less than 20% of the planned/approved outputs were delivered fully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All delivered outputs were delivered too late for their intended use.</li> <li>• All delivered outputs were deemed to be of poor quality / utility by users and reviewers.</li> <li>• Very little or no user ownership - intended users of key outputs not involved in / party to their preparation.</li> </ul>	<p>No direct outcomes achieved (not even partial achievement).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumptions for the change process from project outputs to direct outcome(s) do not hold.</li> <li>• Drivers to support transition from outputs to direct outcome(s) not in place.</li> </ul> <p>No direct outcomes achieved (not even partial achievement).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumptions for the change process from direct outcomes to intermediate states do not hold.</li> <li>• Drivers to support transition from direct outcome(s) to intermediate states not in place.</li> </ul>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<p>21 - 40% of the planned/approved outputs were delivered fully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The most important outputs to achieve outcomes were delivered too late for their intended use.</li> <li>• Among the delivered outputs, the most important to achieve outcomes were deemed to be of poor quality / utility by users and reviewers.</li> <li>• Very low user ownership - intended users of key outputs only peripherally involved in / party to their preparation.</li> <li>• Where additional relevant outputs were delivered or output level targets were exceeded: this work was somewhat late for its intended use and was below average quality.</li> </ul>	<p>Some direct outcomes partially achieved but do not include those most important to attain intermediate states/impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumptions for the change process from project outputs to direct outcome(s) do not hold. • Drivers to support transition from outputs to direct outcome(s) are not in place.</li> </ul> <p>Some direct outcomes partially achieved but do not include those most important to achieve intermediate states/impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumptions for the change process from direct outcomes to intermediate states do not hold.</li> <li>• Drivers to support transition from direct outcome(s) to intermediate states not in place.</li> </ul>
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>	<p>41 - 60% of the planned/approved outputs were delivered fully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The delivery of the most important outputs to achieve outcomes was delayed but they still fulfilled their intended use.</li> <li>• Among the delivered outputs, the most important to achieve outcomes were deemed to be of good quality / utility by users and reviewers.</li> <li>• Low user ownership - intended users of key outputs were partially and unevenly involved in / party to their preparation.</li> <li>• Where additional relevant outputs were delivered or output level targets were exceeded: this work was available somewhat late for its intended use and was of average quality.</li> </ul>	<p>Some direct outcomes fully achieved, but do not include those most important to attain intermediate states/impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumptions for progress from project outputs to direct outcome(s) do not hold. • Drivers to support transition from outputs to direct outcome(s) are not in place.</li> </ul> <p>Some direct outcomes fully achieved, but do not include those most important to attain intermediate states/impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumptions for the change process from direct outcomes to intermediate states do not hold.</li> <li>• Drivers to support transition from direct outcome(s) to intermediate states not in place.</li> </ul> <p>AND, in addition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No intermediate state(s) achieved.</li> <li>• Assumptions for the change process from intermediate state(s) to impact do not hold.</li> <li>• Drivers to support transition from intermediate state(s) to impact not in place.</li> </ul>



<p><b>Moderately Satisfactory</b></p>	<p>61 - 80% of the planned/approved outputs were delivered fully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The delivery of the most important outputs to achieve outcomes was on time and they fulfilled their intended use.</li> <li>• Among the delivered outputs, the most important to achieve outcomes were deemed to be of good quality / utility by users and reviewers.</li> <li>• Acceptable levels of user ownership - intended users of key outputs somewhat involved in / party to their preparation.</li> <li>• Where additional relevant outputs were delivered or output level targets were exceeded: this work was available on time for its intended use and was of average quality.</li> </ul>	<p>Those direct outcomes that are the most important to attain intermediate states, partially achieved.</p> <p>Other direct outcomes are not/only partially achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumptions for progress from project outputs to direct outcome(s) hold partially.</li> <li>• Drivers to support transition from outputs to direct outcome(s) are only partially in place.</li> </ul> <p>Those direct outcomes that are the most important to attain intermediate states, partially achieved. Other direct outcomes are not/only partially achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumptions for the change process from direct outcomes to intermediate states do not hold.</li> <li>• Drivers to support transition from direct outcome(s) to intermediate states not in place.</li> </ul> <p>AND, in addition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No intermediate state(s) achieved.</li> <li>• Assumptions for the change process from intermediate state(s) to impact do hold.</li> <li>• Drivers to support transition from intermediate state(s) to impact are not in place.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Satisfactory</b></p>	<p>81-99% of the planned/approved outputs were delivered fully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The most important outputs to achieve outcomes were delivered in time to allow high levels of use.</li> <li>• Nearly all the delivered outputs, including the most important to achieve outcomes were deemed to be of very good quality / utility by users and reviewers.</li> <li>• Good levels of user ownership - intended users of key outputs meaningfully involved in / party to their preparation.</li> <li>• Where additional relevant outputs were delivered or output level targets were exceeded: this work was available on time for its intended use and was of good quality.</li> </ul>	<p>Those direct outcomes that are the most important to attain intermediate states, fully achieved. Other direct outcomes are not/only partially achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumptions for progress from project outputs to direct outcome(s) hold.</li> <li>• Drivers to support transition from outputs to direct outcome(s) are in place</li> </ul> <p>Those direct outcomes that are the most important to attain intermediate states, fully achieved. Other direct outcomes are not/only partially achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumptions for progress direct outcomes to intermediate states hold.</li> <li>• Drivers to support transition direct outcomes to intermediate states are in place.</li> </ul> <p>AND, in addition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some intermediate state(s) partially achieved.</li> <li>• Assumptions for the change process from intermediate state(s) to impact do hold.</li> <li>• Drivers to support transition from intermediate state(s) to impact are partially in place.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Highly Satisfactory</b></p>	<p>All (100%) of planned/approved outputs delivered fully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All outputs delivered at the time required to maximise their intended use.</li> <li>• All outputs deemed to be of excellent quality / utility by users and reviewers.</li> <li>• High levels of user ownership - intended users of key outputs closely involved in / party to their preparation</li> <li>• Where additional relevant outputs were delivered or output level targets were exceeded: this work was available on time for its intended use and was of excellent quality</li> </ul>	<p>All direct outcomes fully achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumptions for progress from project outputs to direct outcome(s) hold fully.</li> <li>• Drivers to support transition from outputs to direct outcome(s) are fully in place.</li> </ul> <p>All direct outcomes fully achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumptions for progress direct outcomes to intermediate states hold fully.</li> <li>• Drivers to support transition direct outcomes to intermediate states are fully in place.</li> </ul> <p>AND, in addition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All intermediate states fully achieved.</li> <li>• Assumptions for the change process from intermediate state(s) to impact do hold.</li> <li>• Drivers to support transition from intermediate state(s) to impact are fully in place.</li> </ul>



## Efficiency

In keeping with the OECD/DAC definition of efficiency, the evaluation will assess the extent to which the project delivered maximum results from the given resources. This will include an assessment of the cost-effectiveness and timeliness of project execution. Focussing on the translation of inputs into outputs, cost-effectiveness is the extent to which an intervention has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its results at the lowest possible cost. Timeliness refers to whether planned activities were delivered according to expected timeframes as well as whether events were sequenced efficiently. The evaluation will also assess to what extent any project extension could have been avoided through stronger project management and identify any negative impacts caused by project delays or extensions. The evaluation will describe any cost or time-saving measures put in place to maximise results within the secured budget and agreed project timeframe and consider whether the project was implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative interventions or approaches. The evaluation will give special attention to efforts by the project teams to make use of/build upon pre-existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities with other initiatives, programmes and projects, etc. to increase project efficiency. The evaluation will also consider the extent to which the management of the project minimised UN Environment's environmental footprint. The factors underpinning the need for any project extensions will also be explored and discussed. As management or project support costs cannot be increased in cases of 'no cost extensions', such extensions represent an increase in unstated costs to implementing parties

Rating	Rationale / Indicators
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory</b>	<p>The project has had three or more 'no-cost extensions' against the formally approved results framework.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The delays in project implementation (timeliness) had negative impacts on at least one group of stakeholders.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Evidence suggests that a lack of cost effective approaches undermined the achievement of project targets.</p>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<p>The project has had two 'no cost extensions' of one year or more against the formally approved results framework.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The delays in project implementation (timeliness) had negative impacts on at least one group of stakeholders.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Project activities/events were occasionally sequenced efficiently.</p>
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>	<p>The project has had two 'no cost extensions' of one year or more against the formally approved results framework.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Project activities/events were occasionally sequenced efficiently.</p>
<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>	<p>The project has had one 'no cost extension' of one year or less and with justified amendments to the formally approved results framework.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Project activities/events were frequently sequenced efficiently.</p>
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<p>The project has had one 'no cost extension' of one year or less and with justified amendments to the formally approved results framework.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Evidence suggests that the application of cost effective approaches strongly supported the achievement of project targets.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Project activities/events were frequently sequenced efficiently.</p>
<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<p>The project was implemented within the originally intended (first approval) timeframe (i.e. duration) or was implemented within the timeframe and against an appropriately revised results framework specified by a formal revision that secured additional resources.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The project had a 'costed' extension (ie. additional funds were awarded to either continue or extend the agreed scope of work)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Evidence suggests that cost-effective approaches supported project targets being exceeded.</p>

## Sustainability

Sustainability is understood as the probability of direct outcomes being maintained and developed after the close of the intervention. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to undermine or contribute to the persistence of achieved direct outcomes (i.e. ‘assumptions’ and ‘drivers’). Some factors of sustainability may be embedded in the project design and implementation approaches while others may be contextual circumstances or conditions that evolve over the life of the intervention. Where applicable an assessment of bio-physical factors that may affect the sustainability of direct outcomes may also be included. Sustainability is assessed against three sub-criteria: a) socio-political sustainability, b) financial sustainability and c) institutional sustainability.

Rating	Rationale / Indicators
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Highly Unsatisfactory</b></p>	<p>At evaluation, evidence suggests that:</p> <p><b>High/moderate dependency No (0-5%) mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sustainability of project outcomes has a high/moderate degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders to sustain the project outcomes.</li> <li>• No mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context. (e.g. relevant social norms and/or political priorities have not been identified during the project).</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>High dependency 5-25% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sustainability of project outcomes has a high degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is little or no ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders to sustain the project outcomes.</li> <li>• No mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. relevant social norms and/or political priorities have not been identified during the project).</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Unsatisfactory</b></p>	<p>At evaluation, evidence suggests that:</p> <p><b>High dependency 25-50% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sustainability of project outcomes has a high degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is moderate ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders to sustain the project outcomes.</li> <li>• A partial mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. some relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project).</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Moderate dependency 5-25% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sustainability of project outcomes has a moderate degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is weak ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders to sustain the project outcomes.</li> <li>• A partial mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. some relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project).</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Low dependency No (0-5%) mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sustainability of project outcomes has a low degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders to sustain the project outcomes.</li> <li>• A partial mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. some relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project).</li> </ul>

### Moderately Unsatisfactory

At evaluation, evidence suggests that:

#### High dependency 50-75% mitigation

- The sustainability of project outcomes has a high degree of dependency on social/political factors

AND

- There is fairly strong ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders but it does not reach the levels which have the power to sustain the project outcomes.

- A weak mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project, but none have been discussed with stakeholders).

OR

#### Moderate dependency 25-50% mitigation

- The sustainability of project outcomes has a moderate degree of dependency on social/political factors

AND

- There is weak ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders to sustain the project outcomes.

- A weak mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project, but none have been discussed with stakeholders).

OR

#### Low dependency 5-25% mitigation

- The sustainability of project outcomes has a low degree of dependency on social/political factors

AND

- There is no ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders to sustain the project outcomes.

- A weak mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project, but none have been discussed with stakeholders).

### Moderately Satisfactory

At evaluation, evidence suggests that:

#### High dependency 75-99% mitigation

- The sustainability of project outcomes has a high degree of dependency on social/political factors

AND

- There is strong ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders which to some extent extends to the critical levels of government which have the power to sustain project outcomes. The ownership might be subject to government changes.

- A moderate mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project, and some have been discussed with stakeholders)

OR

#### Moderate dependency 50-75% mitigation

- The sustainability of project outcomes has a moderate degree of dependency on social/political factors

AND

- There is fairly strong ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders but it does not reach the levels which have the power to sustain the project outcomes.

- A moderate mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project, and some have been discussed with stakeholders)

OR

#### Low dependency 25-50% mitigation

- The sustainability of project outcomes has a low degree of dependency on social/political factors

AND

- There is weak ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders to sustain the project outcomes.

- A moderate mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project, and some have been discussed with stakeholders).



<p><b>Satisfactory</b></p>	<p>At evaluation, evidence suggests that:</p> <p><b>High dependency 100% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sustainability of project outcomes has a high degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a high level of ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders. Concrete action has been taken to sustain outcomes. Only a small possibility of this ownership to vanish with future government changes.</li> <li>• A strong mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project and all have been discussed with stakeholders)</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Moderate dependency 75-99% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sustainability of project outcomes has a moderate degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is strong ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders which to some extent extends to the critical levels of government which have the power to sustain project outcomes. The ownership might be subject to government changes.</li> <li>• A strong mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project and all have been discussed with stakeholders)</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Low dependency 50-75% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sustainability of project outcomes has a low degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is fairly strong ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders but it does not reach the levels which have the power to sustain the project outcomes.</li> <li>• A strong mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project and all have been discussed with stakeholders).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Highly Satisfactory</b></p>	<p>At evaluation, evidence suggests that:</p> <p><b>Moderate dependency 100% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sustainability of project outcomes has a moderate degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a high level of ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders. Full action has been taken to sustain outcomes. There is strong evidence the outcome(s) are long-term.</li> <li>• An adaptive mechanism is in place to respond to changes in the social/political context, should it become necessary (e.g. all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project, all have been discussed with stakeholders and some action has been taken to ensure consistency between the project's direct outcomes and these social norms and/or political priorities)</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Low dependency 75-100% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sustainability of project outcomes has a low degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is strong ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders which to some extent extends to the critical levels of government which have the power to sustain project outcomes. The ownership might be subject to government changes.</li> <li>• An adaptive mechanism is in place to respond to changes in the social/political context, should it become necessary (see example above)</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>No dependency</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project outcomes have no dependency on/are not sensitive to, social/political factors. An adaptive mechanism is in place to respond to changes in the social/political context, should it become necessary (see example above).</li> </ul>

## Weighted ratings table

We use scores across all the evaluation criteria to calculate the overall project performance instead of a mathematical average. The criteria that hold the greatest ‘weights’ in this scoring system include: ‘Effectiveness’ (which factors in the following sub-criteria: ‘delivery of outputs’, ‘achievement of direct outcomes’ and ‘likelihood of impact’); ‘Sustainability’ (which includes socio-political, financial and institutional dimensions of sustainability); and ‘Efficiency’. In other words, not all criteria are considered equal, there is a strong focus on the achievement of sustainable results and value for money.

Evaluation criteria	Rating	Score	Weight	Weighted score
<b>Strategic Relevance (select the ratings for sub-categories)</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0,6</b>
<i>Alignment to mandate</i>	Highly Satisfactory	6	2	0,1
<i>Alignment to international and donor strategic priorities</i>	Highly Satisfactory	6	2	0,1
<i>Relevance to regional and national issues and needs</i>	Highly Satisfactory	6	3	0,2
<i>Complementarity with existing interventions</i>	Highly Satisfactory	6	3	0,2
<b>Effectiveness (select the ratings for sub-categories)</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>2,7</b>
<i>Delivery of outputs</i>	Highly Satisfactory	6	5	0,3
<i>Achievement of direct outcomes</i>	Highly Satisfactory	6	30	1,8
<i>Likelihood of impact</i>	Highly Likely	6	10	0,6
<b>Efficiency</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0,9</b>
<b>Sustainability (select the ratings for sub-categories)</b>	<b>Highly Likely</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>1,8</b>
<i>Socio-political sustainability</i>	Highly Likely	6	10	0,6
<i>Financial sustainability</i>	Highly Likely	6	10	0,6
<i>Institutional sustainability</i>	Highly Likely	6	10	0,6
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>100</b>	<b>6</b>

