

QUALITY GRID

EVALUATION OF THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN UNION'S COOPERATION WITH NEPAL

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 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: Are the primary and secondary data selected adequate? Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?			X		
5. Sound analysis: 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?			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 findings?				X	
8. Usefulness of the recommendations: Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personal or stakeholders' 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		

Observations and Judgement

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

Overall, the evaluation meets the requirements of the ToR and covers the prescribed scope. The evaluation design is appropriate and adequate methodology have been explained and applied throughout the evaluation. The report and its annexes show that a quite extensive amount of information has been collected. However, because of the amount of information for each indicator, it is often difficult to follow the analysis. In addition the analysis is based on qualitative information without enough quantitative data.

Despite those shortcomings the evaluation team managed to formulate conclusions and recommendations satisfactorily.

The report is written in a comprehensive manner and its structure is logical but the readability of some sections could have been improved. The executive summary captures the essence of the report.

1. Meeting needs: Good

The evaluation responds to the ToRs and provides satisfactory answers to the evaluation questions (EQ). The evaluation report and the annexes provide a balanced overview of the main areas of cooperation taking into account Nepal specificities (e.g. internal political situation and EU institutional constraints).

2. Relevant scope: Good

The report deals with the whole intervention in its temporal, geographic and regulatory dimension. The evaluation has taken into account other donors' interventions and the partner government's policies. Main intended effects have been identified although no unintended effect has been mentioned.

3. Defensible design: Very Good

The evaluation design is appropriate. The methodological tools have been chosen adequately to provide answers to the EQs. The evaluation method is clearly explained and has been actually applied. Challenges faced during the evaluation process and solutions chosen to tackle them in order to have reliable findings are clearly explained.

4. Reliable data: Good

The amount of information presented in the "Evaluation matrix" is very impressive and seemed to be fairly extensive. However, most of them are qualitative with very few figures hard to find out in the text.

5. Sound data analysis: Good

Information has been analysed rigorously in order to derive findings. However, the way all the information has been cross-checked and processed is not clear enough. No reflection on the limitation of the validity of the analysis has been made.

6. Credible findings: Good

The findings have a logical connection to the data analysis. Interpretations and extrapolations made are acceptable.

7. Validity of the conclusions: Very Good

The conclusions logically stem from the provided findings and are well organised and clustered. Direct references to the EQs (and, when relevant to specific judgement criteria) are made which makes the supporting information conveniently identifiable through the document.

8. Usefulness of the recommendations: Good

The recommendations are linked to the conclusions and presented in clusters. However there is no indication on services (SEAE, Commission HQ, EUD) to implement them and very rare orientations (except for recom 2 on productive sector) to implement them.

9. Clearly reported: Good

The report is short with a clear structure while containing all relevant information. An effort is made to have the most relevant links to the Information matrix in annex at indicators level. However, the section 3 of the main report and the Information matrix is quasi exclusively narrative with no table and graph and very rare figures on results hidden in the text. The executive summary captures the essence of the report. However the writing is very dense with no visual attractiveness.