

Evaluation of the Commission's country strategy for Ghana

Observations and Judgement on the final evaluation report

Taking into account the contextual constraints on the evaluation, the overall quality rating of the report is considered: Good

The report addresses well the demands expressed in the terms of reference. It provides credible findings and well substantiated conclusions. Nevertheless, methods used for the analysis should appear more clearly, and the usefulness of recommendations could have been increased by selecting a more limited number of targeted recommendations, accompanied by options of implementation and indications on their respective conditions of success.

- 1. Meeting needs:** demands expressed in the terms of reference and further specified in the evaluation questions are well addressed. In particular, shifts in the logic of intervention, such as the increased focus on the objective of equitable growth shared by all in the 9th EDF, are well described and analysed.
- 2. Relevant scope:** the report analyses well the rationale of the Commission's support to Ghana. The geographic, sectoral and geographic dimensions of the intervention are also well covered. Nevertheless, more attention could have been paid to the unintended effects of the intervention.
- 3. Defensible design:** the evaluation was carried out following the standard methodology in use for country level evaluations. In addition to their documentary analysis and their direct interviews in Brussels and in the field, the evaluators have selected and studied 10 projects covering the Commission's main sectors of intervention, which provided most of the information needed to answer the evaluation questions. The report also clearly mentions the limitations of the project study: despite the relevance of the selection made (confirmed by the Reference Group which validated it), the sample of projects could not pretend to be representative but only illustrative of the Commission's intervention logic.
- 4. Reliable data:** the data used in order to answer the evaluation questions seem reasonably reliable, although this is difficult to assess only from the sources mentioned in the annexes.
- 5. Sound analysis:** methods used to analyse the data collected are not indicated in the report. Therefore, it is difficult to assess whether the data were analysed according to the state of art or not. Nevertheless, the matrix of information presented in annex 6 shows that an important effort has been made to cross-check the data collected through various channels.

6. **Credible findings:** despite the absence of description of methods used for the data analysis, findings are generally well substantiated: for each evaluation question, an overall answer synthesises assessments made at the level of its corresponding judgement criteria, on the basis of the information retrieved from selected qualitative and quantitative indicators.
7. **Validity of the conclusions:** conclusions are logically derived from answers to the evaluation questions. Each conclusion is justified by a clear reference to its corresponding findings.
8. **Usefulness of the recommendations:** recommendations are well substantiated and each of them is clearly referred to its corresponding conclusions. Nevertheless, their usefulness is hindered by their high number (26 recommendations as a whole) which makes them difficult to take into account. It would be preferable to be presented with a limited number of targeted recommendations, each of them being accompanied with one or two options of implementation and an indication on their respective conditions of success.
9. **Clearly reported:** the report is well structured and clearly written.