

January 1994

PROJECT EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Annex 4

FOR COMPLETION BY ALL EVALUATION MISSIONS

The questionnaire has been designed to summarise the basic findings of each project evaluation. It covers all the key aspects to be reviewed by the evaluation mission and may be used by the mission as a checklist while evaluating the project. The completed questionnaire serves to build up the data bank on evaluation reports which is used for providing feedback from evaluation in improving project selection design and management, i.e. internal reports, sector and sub-sector reviews of field projects, reports to Governing Bodies and other ad hoc searches on the characteristics of the Field Programme. The glossary of terms in the annex is intended to help clarifying terminology used.

Each evaluation mission is requested to respond to all points of the questionnaire. The questionnaire should be completed in the field (simultaneously with drafting of the report) and returned to the Project Operations Officer for forwarding to the Evaluation Service (PBEE) together with the mission's draft report.

I BACKGROUND INFORMATION						
Project Title:			Indicate the Phase of the project (I, II etc.):		Symbol:	
Project start date:			Project completion date (planned/actual):			
Total Donor Budget (US\$):			Budget FAO Component (US\$):			
Type of execution		National	FAO	Other Agency (specify).....		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
If UNDP project was project formulated as a programme component?			<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	No	
Mission Dates in the country (s)			From:		To:	
Type of evaluation			Mid-term	Final/terminal	Ex-post	
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Mission Composition (Name/Title/Discipline)				Experience in Evaluation	Mission Leader in Current Mission	
Donor Representative				Yes/No	Yes/No	
Host Government Representative				Yes/No	Yes/No	
FAO Representative				Yes/No	Yes/No	
Other Participants				Yes/No	Yes/No	

Mission Arrangements



one box for each aspect of the mission arrangements

1. Briefing	Poor	Satisfactory	Very Comprehensive
2. Debriefing	Poor	Satisfactory	Very Comprehensive
3. Clarity of mission terms or reference (mandate)	Unclear	Reasonably clear	Very Clear
4. Duration of mission in relation to terms of reference	Too short	Adequate	Too long

S:\GUIDE\ENG\QUES-ENG

II PROJECT RELEVANCE (Appropriateness - At the time the project was initiated) * Use a value scale of 1 to 5		* Score (1-5)
1. Did the project address a genuine development problem? (1=not at all 2=hardly 3=yes 4=yes to an important problem 5= yes to a very major problem)		
2. How well did the project provide a cost effective response to that development problem? (1=not at all 2=barely appropriate 3=satisfactory 4=highly appropriate 5=the most appropriate possible)		
3. Did the project form part of a coherent national programme? (1=not at all 2=only slightly 3=linked in 4=well integrated 5=totally integrated)		
4. Were there reasonable expectations that adequate national resources could be committed to the project? (1=not at all 2=only slight 3=reasonable 4=very little doubt 5=absolutely certain)		
5. Was it realistic to expect project outputs to continue to be used once the project was completed and adequate resources to be committed for meaningful follow-up? (1=no or very little expectation 2= slight expectation 3=some expectations 4=very reasonable expectations 5=very strong expectations)		
6. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT RELEVANCE (Appropriateness) (1=very poor 2= rather unsatisfactory 3=satisfactory 4=good 5=excellent/highly relevant)		

III PROJECT DESIGN (The assessment should be based on the latest official PRODOC or its substantive revision) *Assess the key elements of the project using the following (0-5) value scale: 0 = Not mentioned in the project document (PRODOC) 1 = Poor 2 = Weak/Less than Satisfactory 3 = Average/Satisfactory/Adequate 4 = Good/More than Satisfactory 5 = Excellent.		* Score (0-5)			
1. Immediate Objectives including specification of targets:	Clarity of definition		Relevance**		
2. Specification of Beneficiaries:					
3. Specification of Outputs and Output Targets:					
4. Specification of inputs: - donor					
- national					
5. Validity of means->ends relationship between inputs, outputs and objectives:					
6. Implementation arrangements and managerial structure	Clarity of definition		Appropriateness		
7. Work-plan including timing of inputs, activities and outputs	Clarity		Realism		

8. Identification of prerequisites and risks for project success	Clarity of definition		Realism			
9. Linkages with other related institutions and organizations	Clarity of definition		Adequacy			
10. For achievement of Project objectives the realism of:						
- Project duration (time horizon) FF	Too short	About Right	Unnecessarily Long			
- Project size FF	Too small	About Right	Unnecessarily Large			
11. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN (score 1-5)						
** Relevance to development problem						
IV PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION						
* Assess project implementation on the following (1-5) value scale: 1 = very poor 2 = Less than Satisfactory 3 = Average/Satisfactory 4 = above average/good 5 = Excellent.		Not included in the Prodoc or not due to be provided by time of evaluation	Quantity *(1-5)	Quality *(1-5)	Time-liness *(1-5)	Overall Assessment *(1-5)
Donor Inputs:						
1. Budgetary disbursements						
2. Project personnel including consultants						
3. Equipment and construction						
4. Fellowships/study tours and other formal training						
5. Other (specify)						
National Inputs						
6. Budgetary disbursements						
7. Personnel						
8. Equipment and physical infrastructure						
9. Other (specify)						
Internal Management						
10. Project implementation reporting						
11. Work-planning and monitoring						
12. Coordination and relation with other organizations/departments						
13. Flexible management response to problems/and or changed circumstances						
14. National project director	Was the national project director (FF one box)	Part Time	Full Time			
	Did the national project director have in practise the main responsibility for project management (FF one box)	Yes	No			
	Assessment of the effectiveness of the national project director (score 1-5)					
15. Overall assessment of internal project management (score 1-5)						
External Support/Inputs to Management and Implementation						

16. Technical support by FAO and or/other agencies (specify)				
- in-country visits				
- written comments on reports etc.				
17. Administrative support by FAO and/or other agencies (specify)				
18. Management support/Decision making by: - donor(s)				
- government(s)				
19. External management committee and Tri-partite (donor-recipient) meetings				
20. Assessment of evaluation and review processes				
21. Overall assessment of input to project management/implementation by:				
- FAO				
- Other supporting agencies (specify)				
- Government(s)				
- Donor(s)				
22. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION (Score 1-5)				

<u>V PROJECT OUTPUTS</u>	Not Included in the Project or not yet due to be produced at time of evaluation	Was this a major or minor project output? (mark no more than 2 as major)	Quantity	Quality	Use expected to be made of Outputs
The assessment of the outputs produced should be made with respect to the planned targets and reasonable expectations of productivity . *Assess the outputs of the project using the following (1 -5) value scale 1 = very poor (less than 30% of target) 2 = Less than Satisfactory (31-59% of target) 3 = Average/Satisfactory (60-80% of target) 4 = Good (81-100% of target) 5 = Excellent (100%+ of target).			* (1-5)	* (1-5)	* (1-5)
1. Survey findings/baseline study results					
2. Results of research/pilot activities					
3. Extension trials and demonstrations					
4. Farm inputs and services (e.g. seeds, tools, credit)					
5. Physical facilities (i.e. constructed/rehabilitated)					
6. Technical recommendations					
7. Policy formulation/planning advice					
8. Organisation/management advice					
9. Investment potential (i.e. projects identified/prepared)					
10. Staff trained on the job					

11. Staff trained on fellowships/study tours					
12. Farmers/producers trained					
13. Other (specify):					

14. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF OUTPUTS ACHIEVED

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

VI COST EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROJECT

1. Given your knowledge of similar projects, was this project the most cost effective (least cost) way to achieve:	Planned Outputs	Yes	No	Planned Sustainable Effects	Yes	No
FF						

2. Were there substantial cost over-runs (extension of budget) to complete the project ? FF	Yes	No

3. Could the project have been more cost effective if there had been more or less of the following or was it well balanced as implemented? (tick one box for each):	More	Just Right as Implemented	Less
	FF	FF	FF

- Use of National experts			
- Reliance on existing Government capacities			
- National training			
- Use of Short-term staff			
- Use of NGOs			
- Use of the private sector			
- Concentration on key/central objectives/outputs (focus)			
- Delegation of authority (if more or less specify by whom)..			
- Quantity of resources			
- Other (specify).....			

4. Tick FF any of the following which had a particularly negative effect on cost effectiveness	Scheduling of inputs and activities	Implementing agency procedures (specify agency)	Government procedures
---	-------------------------------------	---	-----------------------

--	--	--	--

VII SUSTAINABLE EFFECTS AND IMPACT (in relation to project objectives)	Planned as objective in the project document. Tick at least one box	Sustainable Effects and Impact (Expected at time of Evaluation - Use scale of 1-5 where 1 = none or negligible 2 = slight 3 = some 4 = considerable 5 = very substantial)
In this context sustainable effects means the extent to which the project outputs/results continue to be applied and used effectively (whether these are trained staff, institutional structures, technical or policy recommendations etc.). Sustainable impact means whether these effects can be expected to make a continued contribution to the welfare of ultimate end beneficiaries (normally the rural populations) and/or the maintenance/ preservation of the physical natural environment)	FF	

1. Sustainable effects and impact for project objectives	Effects	Impact
-Policy/planning/legislative improvements		

-National Institutional capacity (including staff skills)			
-Uptake/use of technical improvements			
-Replication/expansion of pilot activities			
-Follow-up Investment			
-Other (specify)			
2. Can the project be expected to have a sustainable impact on the following categories of ultimate end-beneficiaries (<u>categories are not mutually exclusive</u>):	Planned in the project document. Tick at least one box.	Enter score as per above (1-5 scale)	
	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Negative Impact	Positive Impact
		Negative or positive not <u>both</u>	
-Farmers/fisherfolk/pastoralists/livestock-keepers			
-The rural poor			
-The urban poor			
-Women			
-Private sector (other than farmers/fisherfolk etc.)			
-Other specify			
-The natural environment			
3. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT EFFECTS AND IMPACT (value 1-5)			

VIII PROJECT FEATURES WHERE THERE IS GREATEST NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT			
These questions are intended to help identify those aspects of projects where there is most room for improvement			
1. What do you consider to have been the aspect of this project where there was greatest room for improvement if sustainable effects and impact were to be <u>more</u> cost effectively achieved? (tick one box only)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Project Selection (i.e. the concept and immediate objectives of the project)			
- Project Design			
- Project Implementation and Management			
- Project Supervision and Adjustment (revision)			
2. Which of the following factors are <u>most</u> likely to limit the sustainability of the project effects and impact? Tick a maximum of two as this question is intended to identify the areas which need most attention in future projects	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-Weaknesses in national institutions			
-Non-economic attractiveness/viability of the outputs developed by the project			
-Technical weaknesses in project outputs/recommendations			

-Lack of attention to natural resource sustainability	
-Lack of social/political realism in project outputs/recommendations	
-Insufficient involvement/participation by beneficiaries	
-Insufficient national financial resources to follow-up on the project	
-Insufficient national manpower resources to follow-up on the project	
-Lack of national priority/commitment to this type of development	
-Other (specify).....	

VIII Comments: (to be provided at your discretion to complement the evaluation presented in the report and clarify any points which are unclear above):