

QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

EVALUATION OF EC SUPPORT FOR STATISTICS IN THIRD COUNTRIES

Concerning these criteria, the evaluation report is:	Unacceptable	Poor	Good	Very good	Excellent
1. Meeting needs: Does the evaluation adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and fit the terms of reference?			X		
2. Relevant scope: Is the rationale of the policy examined and its set of outputs, results and outcomes/impacts examined fully, including both intended and unexpected policy interactions and consequences?			X		
3. Defensible design: Is the evaluation design appropriate and adequate to ensure that the full set of findings, along with methodological limitations, is made accessible for answering the main evaluation questions?			X		
4. Reliable data: To what extent are the primary and secondary data selected adequate. Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?			X		
5. Sound analysis: Is quantitative information appropriately and systematically analysed according to the state of the art so that evaluation questions are answered in a valid way?			X		
6. Credible findings: Do findings follow logically from, and are they justified by, the data analysis and interpretations based on carefully described assumptions and rationale?			X		
7. Validity of the conclusions: Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are conclusions based on credible results?			X		
8. Usefulness of the recommendations: Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personnel or shareholders' views, and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?			X		
9. Clearly reported: Does the report clearly describe the policy being evaluated, including its context and purpose, together with the procedures and findings of the evaluation, so that information provided can easily be understood?				X	
Taking into account the contextual constraints on the evaluation, the overall quality rating of the report is considered.			X		

Evaluation of EC Support for Statistics in Third Countries Final Report – Observations and Judgement

Global Appraisal:

Taking into account the difficulties to encircle this sector considered sometimes as a cross cutting issue and taking into account the lack of clear EC strategy in this thematic, the overall quality rating of this report can be considered as good .

1. Meeting needs:

The evaluation adequately addresses the information needs and also responds to the ToRs and in particular to the evaluation questions (EQs).

2. Relevant scope:

The period covered as requested in the ToRs was respected. Despite the difficulties to collect all the information, the consultants covered correctly all the financed activities with the support of the Reference Group members and particularly the Estat (ex- Eurostat) member. They have chosen a significant sample of projects (29) selected in the different regions.

3. Defensible design:

The design is appropriate and adequate. The evaluation was carried out using the standard methodology of reconstructing the intervention logic and from its analysis developed evaluation questions, judgement criteria and indicators and following the standard phasing of desk, field and final synthesis phase. The encountered difficulty was to reconstruct the intervention logic without official strategies in this sector. The EQs are 9 including appraisal of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coordination/complementarities and, finally, the Cross Cutting Issues.

4. Reliable data:

Data and information have been collected from reliable sources (legal documents, EC Policy documents, projects documents, monitoring and evaluation reports, questionnaires and interviews both to headquarters' staff and delegation's staff of the visited countries ,etc.)

A complete questionnaire finalised with the support of Estat (ex- Eurostat) has been sent everywhere in all the covered regions to the EC Delegations, to the partners organisations as also to the supported trainings schools. Answers have been received from a total of 25 countries.

The Consultants have organised 5 different field missions covering 7 countries in 3 different regions (ACP, MEDA and Tacis)

5. Sound analysis:

The evaluators have a good knowledge on evaluation methodology, on the different existing contexts, on the different specific sub sectors of intervention and on the instruments used by the EC. The various actors' perceptions have been systematically cross-checked through questionnaires and interviews.

They have presented in the annexes a complete "sheet" per analysed project. These "sheets" comprise a description of the project and answers to the 9 different EQs.

6. Credible findings:

The findings presented are realistic. Nevertheless, sometimes, they have tendencies to extrapolate the findings. It is often difficult in sectors or thematic evaluations to express findings useful in the different contexts prevailing in the world.

7. Validity of the conclusions:

The conclusions are clearly justified. They are presented on a balanced way without favouring the negative or positive conclusions but in some cases there are weak links between conclusion and factual information's. Conclusions are linked to finding and clustered following the different stages of a project.

8. Usefulness of the recommendations:

The recommendations are impartial and clearly linked to the conclusions. They are clustered like the conclusions. They would have been more detailed and operationally applicable – under a form of practical possible actions and targeted in order to be more useful for EC services.

9. Clearly reported:

The report is easy to read and, despite the hardness of this sector, is presented on a very reader-friendly way. Overall comprehensible answers were provided to each questions and a clear summary is incorporated for each EQ. The executive summary is complete and clear.

References to the annexes are explicitly indicated.

It is a well balanced report in what concerns the main report and the annexes.