**STANDARD PROJECT ASSESSMENT ACCORDING TO OECD/DAC CRITERIA**



*(Manual “Evaluation Management”, Step 9: Write and approve final report)*



# Preliminary notes to the evaluator (please delete after reading):

Independent from the evaluation purpose and the evaluation questions laid down in the ToR, we would like you to “grade” the project according to the OECD/DAC and ALNAP criteria, i.e. with regard to the project’s relevance/appropriateness, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, coverage.We strongly recommend to do this during the phase of report-writing.

While being aware that this assessment cannot consistently be based on “hard facts” or evidence, and knowing that aggregation of different project assessments will only be possible with limitations, we still believe that the data compiled from a number of assessments will give us the opportunity to discuss trends with regard to our projects’ quality on an organisational level. We would also like to strongly emphasize that the evaluation questions as laid down in the ToR should by all means guide the evaluation, even if they do not refer to all / the OECD/DAC criteria. The assessment should be considered as an additional annex to the evaluation (report). If you find it difficult to grade a criterion, please check the cell provided for this case!

We would thus like to ask you whether you consider the project with reference to the respective criteria as “very good (1)”, “good/high (2)”, “satisfactory (3)” or as “not satisfactory (4)” or “no information / cannot say (9)” and to give a very short explanation. Ultimately, the assess- ment sheet should still fit on one page!

**Protection of your personal data:** Please be aware that we publish the evaluation report on our publicly available website [www.welthungerhilfe.org](http://www.welthungerhilfe.org/). You agree to the publication of the personal data you provide here.

**Project number:**

**Project title:**

**Type of intervention: Development cooperation:**  **Humanitarian assistance:**

**Name and contact details of the evaluator(s):**

**Type of evaluation: mid-term**  **final**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA** | **very good**  **(1)** | **good / high**  **(2)** | **satis- factory**  **(3)** | **not satis- factory**  **(4)** | **no information/ cannot say (0)** | **Justification / explanation** |
| **Relevance (DEV1)/ appropriateness (HA2)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Coherence (DEV and HA)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Efficiency (DEV and HA)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Effectiveness (DEV and HA)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Sustainability (DEV)/**  **connectedness (HA)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Impact/s (DEV and HA)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Coverage (HA)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1 Relevant for development projects

2 Relevant for humanitarian assistance projects