

QUALITY GRID
Evaluation of "EC support to decentralisation processes"
Final report March 2012

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: To what extent are primary and secondary data selected adequately? Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?			X		
5. Sound data 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		

Overall judgement criteria: good

The report provides the information required in the ToR and answers to the evaluation questions. The exercise was very complex: the team applied the methodology well, coupled with sound knowledge of the topic. Findings are supported by evidence and conclusion by coherent analysis. Recommendations could have been more detailed. Clarity of the text could have been further improved.

1. Meeting needs: good

The report provides the information required in the ToR and answers to the evaluation questions.

2. Relevant scope: good

The evaluation analyses the entire temporal, geographic and regulatory dimensions of the EC intervention.

3. Defensible design: good

The evaluation methodology, tools and process, are well described and applied.

4. Reliable data: good

Data sources are good, though there is some difference among quality of the ten country notes.

5. Sound data analysis: good

The analysis is carried in a coherent systematic way.

6. Credible findings: good

Findings are well linked to analysis of data.

7. Valid Conclusions: good

The Evaluation is well structured but the information gathered could have led to elaborate more on EC strategic approaches.

8. Usefulness of recommendations: good

Recommendations are well structured but the amount of information gathered could have provided with more operational recommendations.

9. Clearly reported: good

Clarity of the text could have been further improved.