

## QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

### EVALUATION OF EC AID DELIVERY THROUGH CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS

<b>Concerning these criteria, the evaluation report is:</b>	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 examined 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> To what extent 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 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 results?			<b>X</b>		
<b>8. Usefulness of the recommendations:</b> Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personnel or shareholders' 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>		

## QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

<b>1. Meeting needs:</b>	The report gives the information requested and answers adequately the EQs. The 'value-added of EC cooperation through CSOs' could be more clearly worked out. The report also covers sufficiently latest developments in the evaluated field (Accra Agenda), going beyond the temporal scope and makes the results more interesting to the informed reader.
<b>2. Relevant scope:</b>	The report covers the full theme in terms of aspects, time and effects.
<b>3. Defensible design:</b>	The Evaluation methods and their limits have been clearly explained and applied. Requirements have been fully met. The methodological annexes are very detailed and allow full information for specialists.
<b>4. Reliable data:</b>	Both quantitative and qualitative sources have been identified. The evaluation team has tested and discussed the reliability of data. The data collection tools have been clearly explained and adjusted to the data sought after. Limitations are explained. Cross-checking is systematic notably cross-checking quantitative with qualitative data. The mapping exercise provides an interesting picture but few references to it are found in the final report.
<b>5. Sound analysis:</b>	The quantitative and/or qualitative analysis is done rigorously, following the recognised and relevant steps depending on the type of analysed data. Cause-and-effect links between the intervention and its consequences are explained. Few Comparisons were made.
<b>6. Credible findings:</b>	The findings derived from the analysis seem largely both reliable and balanced. The findings reflect the reality described by the data and evidence recorded on the one hand, and the reality of the intervention as perceived by the actors and the beneficiaries on the other hand.
<b>7. Validity of the conclusions:</b>	The conclusions derive clearly and logically from the analysis and the findings. Limitations to the validity of the conclusions are only implicit; the context of the conclusions is well described. The conclusions do cover only briefly the 'value-added of the channel'. The evaluators have nuanced some conclusions in the light of new political commitments (Accra Agenda).
<b>8. Usefulness of the recommendations:</b>	The recommendations follow logically from the conclusions and are impartial. However, with one exception, are not immediately useful. They may be needed, but under present circumstances few of them can be applied. The evaluators have nuanced some recommendations in the light of new political commitments (Accra Agenda).
<b>9. Clearly reported:</b>	The structure is logical and the summary useful. However, the text is very dense and difficult to read. On the one hand this reflects the complexity of this very vast subject but, on the other hand room for improvement has not been used. Few graphs, no tables, few boxes or other elements to lighten editing.
<b>The overall quality rating</b>	The report is, with some shortcomings, definitively good. A very complex subject has been logically structured and carefully assessed. The report allows the reader to follow and judge the validity of the logical chain (data, analysis, conclusions, recommendations). The context of the interventions is extremely heterogeneous, entailing very different case studies. The evaluators have clearly identified common factors which allowed common lessons learnt with recommendations. The editing of the report is the weakest element.