## ANNEX 1: EVALUATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>EVALUATION QUESTION</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>DATA SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RELEVANCE | EQ1: To what extent is the project design culturally, medically and contextually relevant in each site? | Stakeholder perceptions of alignment of project objectives and site specific contextual, cultural and medical needs.  
Documentary evidence of alignment of project objectives and site specific contextual, cultural and medical needs. | Document review  
Key informant interviews |
|           | EQ2: To what extent is the project implementation (initial and ongoing) culturally, medically and contextually relevant in each site? | Stakeholder perceptions of alignment of project implementation (initial and ongoing) and site specific contextual, cultural and medical needs.  
Documentary evidence of alignment of project implementation (initial and ongoing) and site specific contextual, cultural and medical needs. | Document review  
Key informant interviews |
| COHERENCE | EQ3: How compatible are the project activities with other similar activities in the organization? | Documentary evidence of the fit/linkage of project activities with ongoing MSF activities/projects.  
Stakeholder perceptions of the fit/linkage of project activities with ongoing MSF activities/projects. | Document review  
Key informant interviews |
|           | EQ4: How compatible are the project activities with other similar activities in the region? | Documentary evidence of the fit/linkage of project activities with ongoing non-MSF activities/projects.  
Stakeholder perceptions of the fit/linkage of project activities with ongoing non-MSF activities/projects. | Document review  
Key informant interviews |
| EFFECTIVENESS | EQ5: To what extent have the projects achieved their expected results? | • Documentary evidence of project results and comparison with expected outcomes in log frame.  
• Stakeholder perceptions of the project outcomes. | • Document review  
• Key informant interviews  
• Field visits |
| EFFICIENCY | EQ6: To what extent did the projects utilize resources satisfactorily? | • Documentary evidence of resource (human, financial, time, etc.) allocation and use over time.  
• Stakeholder perceptions of adequacy of resources (human, financial, time, etc.) and their allocation and use over time. | • Document review  
• Key informant interviews  
• Field visits |
| IMPACT | EQ7: What has been the impact of the project on stakeholders (patients, staff, community)?  
EQ8: To what extent will the impact of the project likely to continue in the future? | • Documentary evidence of project results.  
• Stakeholder perceptions of intended and unintended impacts of project.  
• Stakeholder perceptions of continued impacts of the project. | • Document review  
• Key informant interviews  
• Field visits |
| LESSONS LEARNT | EQ9: What lessons can be learned for similar projects in the future? | • Stakeholder perceptions of lessons learned and what can be replicated in other contexts. | • Document review  
• Key informant interviews  
• Field visits |