

**QUALITY GRID**  
**Evaluation of the European Commission's Cooperation with Maldives**  
**Final Report (26<sup>th</sup> of November 2010)**

<b>Concerning these criteria, the evaluation report is:</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>1. Meeting needs:</b> Does the evaluation adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and fit the terms of reference?			<b>X</b>		
<b>2. Relevant scope:</b> Is the rationale of the policy and its set of outputs, results and outcomes/impacts examined fully, including both intended and unexpected policy interactions and consequences?			<b>X</b>		
<b>3. Defensible design:</b> 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?			<b>X</b>		
<b>4. Reliable data:</b> Are the primary and secondary data selected adequate? Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?			<b>X</b>		
<b>5. Sound analysis:</b> Is quantitative and qualitative information appropriately and systematically analysed according to the state of the art so that evaluation questions are answered in a valid way?		<b>X</b>			
<b>6. Credible findings:</b> Do findings follow logically from, and are they justified by, the data analysis and interpretations based on carefully described assumptions and rationale?			<b>X</b>		
<b>7. Validity of the conclusions:</b> Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are conclusions based on credible findings?			<b>X</b>		
<b>8. Usefulness of the recommendations:</b> Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personal or stakeholders' views, and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?			<b>X</b>		
<b>9. Clearly reported:</b> 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?				<b>X</b>	
<b>Taking into account the contextual constraints on the evaluation, the overall quality rating of the report is considered</b>			<b>X</b>		

## **Overall judgement criteria: good**

The report adequately responds to the requirements set out in the ToR. It deals with the whole intervention in its temporal and geographic dimensions. The methods used were appropriately chosen. The analysis is based on both qualitative and quantitative data, but the latter could've been used more systematically. The evidence supporting the findings is not always made explicit in the report. The findings are acceptable and take due account of the context in which the interventions were implemented. The conclusions are clearly linked to the findings. The recommendations derive from the conclusions. The report is short, clear and easy to read.

### **1. Meeting needs: good**

The report adequately responds to the requirements set out in the ToR. The different areas of cooperation have been assessed in a balanced way through the evaluation questions and judgement criteria selected. Evaluators have provided satisfactory answers to the evaluation questions.

### **2. Relevant scope: good**

The temporal and geographic dimensions of the EC support are well addressed in the evaluation. An important effort was made by the evaluation team in the field phase (14 islands were visited) and this allowed for an assessment of most types of activities financed by the EC. The intended effects are systematically assessed in the evaluation. The report deals with both strategic and implementation issues, although (given the nature of the EC cooperation with Maldives) the latter is emphasized more strongly. The interferences with other EC policies or other donor's interventions are addressed only to a limited extent.

### **3. Defensible design: good**

The evaluation methodology is well described in the report and has been appropriately chosen given the context of the evaluation and the questions that had to be answered. The challenges faced during the evaluation process are presented in a dedicated section of the report.

### **4. Reliable data: good**

The analysis is largely qualitative but contains to a certain extent also quantitative data. However in some specific cases it would have been useful to use more quantitative data in order to give a better picture of the effects of the EC support.

For example (bottom of page 22, main report):

*"After the tsunami, activities aimed at improving agricultural production and economic livelihoods were carried out by the Community Livelihoods Programme, which targeted approximately 2,000 beneficiaries on 10 to 20 islands – of which 60% were intended to be reached by, and benefit directly from, the various activities".*

It would have been useful to know also how many of those beneficiaries have actually been reached by the activities and in how many islands.

## **5. Sound data analysis: poor**

Very often the evidence supporting the findings is not explicitly mentioned in the main report. The annexes contain indeed more information on the evidence supporting the findings but this is not done in a systematic manner. For instance, in many cases it is difficult to understand how strong the evidence really is (not clear if findings are based on one or several interviews with internal/ external stakeholders and to what extent they are also backed up by independent assessments). Comparisons (for example before/ after) are not sufficiently addressed in the report.

## **6. Credible findings: good**

Findings are considered acceptable and cover the main issues in a balanced way. The context in which the interventions have taken place is made explicit in the report. Interpretations and extrapolations made are acceptable. The EC contribution to the described effects has not been isolated from the external factors, but the difficulties are explained.

## **7. Valid Conclusions: good**

Conclusions derive from findings and the use of hyperlinks makes it very easy to follow this connection in the main report. Overall the context in which the conclusions are drawn is well described and taken into account. The conclusions are well organised but they are not clearly prioritised.

## **8. Usefulness of recommendations: good**

Most of the recommendations clearly describe the action proposed to be taken. They are impartial but not clearly prioritised in the order of their importance. They are also clearly linked to the conclusions. Options for possible actions are usually specified. The actors that are supposed to implement the recommendations are clearly identified.

## **9. Clearly reported: very good**

The main report is short, clear and easy to read. Its different sections are well balanced and the structure is logical. For each evaluation question a short and clear answer is provided.