

## QUALITY GRID

### EVALUATION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION'S CO-OPERATION WITH THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Concerning these criteria, the evaluation report is:	Unacceptable	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
<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>		

## ***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 and cross checking process and to have a clear idea of the robustness of all the findings.

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

The recommendations are connected to the conclusions and are presented in clusters with very detailed information.

The report is written in a comprehensive manner and its structure is logical but the readability of some section 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.

### **2. Relevant scope: Good**

The EC support have been analysed in the light of other donors' interventions and the partner government's policies. The geographical Dominican Republic specificity, an island shared with Haiti has been taken into consideration. However, the emphasis on the mining sector was not useful and has weakened the first purpose of the EQ which was an analysis of environmental issues.

### **3. Defensible design: Good**

The evaluation design is appropriate. The methodological tools have been chosen adequately to provide answers to the EQs. Although the methodology described in the main report is very general, more relevant details can be found in Annex 5.

### **4. Reliable data: Good**

The amount of information presented in the annexes, mainly in the "Evaluation matrix" is very impressive and seemed to be fairly extensive. However, in the seminar some weaknesses have been highlighted mainly on the lack of information as regards institutional changes thanks to the interventions of the EC during the evaluation period.

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

Qualitative and quantitative information has been analysed 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 and provide a link to relevant conclusions and recommendations.

### **7. Validity of the conclusions: Good**

The conclusions logically stem from the provided findings and are well organised and clustered. Direct references to the EQs are made which makes the supporting information conveniently identifiable through the document.

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

The recommendations are linked to the conclusions and very well presented in clusters with their basis, different levels of priority, and a proposal of short terms actions to be taken. Nevertheless, the usefulness of the information on the "EC structures to which the recommendations is addressed" can still be put in question.

### **9. Clearly reported: Poor**

The structure of the report is clear. However, although there is a summary and a graph at the beginning of every answer to the EQ, the section 3 is very difficult to read.

One of the difficulties of the exercise is too be concise without losing the most import issues. In this case, the report is too long (the ToR mentioned that the main report should not exceed 70 pages and the current report has 87-88 pages) and sometimes it is difficult to catch the most important points.

In addition, the link between the main body of the report and the Annexes (esp. the Information Matrix) is rather difficult to follow. The effort made to structuring the conclusions are not very convincing: all strategic-level conclusions are highlighted with a different presentation (not consistent) for the specific conclusions. The recommendations are better presented but still with some font inconsistencies.

The executive summary captures the essence of the report but the writing is very dense with very few data and no visual attractiveness.