



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
EuropeAid Co-operation Office

Evaluation

Quality Grid

Evaluation of the EC cooperation and partnership with China - Final Report

Observations and Judgement

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

Overall, the evaluation meets the requirements of the ToRs and provides credible findings, substantives conclusions and prioritized and operational recommendations, optimising the capitalisation on the considerable work undertaken. Well balanced and clear report.

- 1. Meeting needs:** The evaluation adequately addresses the information needs of the commissioning body and also responds to the ToRs and in particularly to the evaluation questions to a reasonable degree. Moreover the evaluation report goes beyond the demands stated in the terms of reference and addresses other topics of interest, such as: the exit strategy form development cooperation on a moving approach.
- 2. Relevant scope:** The period covered as requested in the ToRs was respected. The evaluation covers the current focal sectors and their coherence and complementarity with the political dialogues. Within the sample the number of projects analysed could have been bigger.
- 3. Defensible design:** The evaluation design is appropriate and adequate; the evaluation method is clearly explained and has been actually applied throughout the process. The evaluation was carried out using the standard methodology of reconstructing the intervention logic and from its analysis developed evaluation questions, judgement criteria and indicators and following the standard phasing of desk, field and final synthesis phases.
- 4. Reliable data:** The report gives the impression that data and information has been collected from reliable sources, as: legal documents, EC Policy & Strategy documents, relevant international documentation, project documents, monitoring and evaluation reports, statistics and interviews both to headquarters' staff and delegation's staff as well as to Chinese partners (however on a limited number; no interviews with Chinese partners on Governance issues).

The various actors' perceptions have been systematically cross-checked through out several techniques: focus group discussion (one), civil society organisation round table event, interviews (120) covering all relevant actors except for Governance issues in what regards government officials and documents (about 250) analysis.

Commission européenne, B-1049 Bruxelles/Europese Commissie, B-1049 Brussel - Belgium - Office: L-41 03/158.
Telephone: direct line (+32-2)29 67403, switchboard 299.11.11. Fax: 29 92912.
Telex: COMEU B 21877. Telegraphic address: COMEUR Brussels.

Internet: Alexandra.Chambel-Figueiredo@cec.eu.int

- 5. Sound analysis:** The evaluators have demonstrated to have a good knowledge on evaluation methodology, on the country context, on the specific sectors of intervention and on the instruments used by the EC.

Quantitative and qualitative information has been systematically analysed for each EQ. Evaluators made a systematic demonstration of their logic reasoning illustrating the relation between evidence found, analysis, judgement and conclusions. Responses to the EQs are formulated in a concise and logical manner, confirmed by the data as well as the graphic illustration. For example, regarding the EQ on the international economic integration (T) – a general assessment made by the consultants (main report pp.25-26) has been validated by the comprehensive presentation of the issue (annex 3 to the main report) resulting from a thorough analysis with the application of various evaluation tools (presented in the volume 2 of the report). Limitations applying to interpretations and extrapolations are explained and discussed.

- 6. Credible findings:** Overall results reflect a reasonable compromise between realities described by data and stated facts. Detail findings are presented on the annexes on a compact and complex way; respective summaries on all EQ would have been useful for readers.

On the final report, consultants made an effort to demonstrate their findings and conclusions through schemes, graphs showing the links between responses to the evaluation questions, judgement criteria and indicators. Moreover the core text systematically refers to the annexes which further develop the basis for the analysis and shows that the report is well-supported.

- 7. Validity of the conclusions:** Conclusions are presented on a balanced way without systematically favouring the negative or positive conclusions. Conclusions are clustered and linked to findings in the annexes. The report makes a clear and logic distinction between sector related conclusions and synthesis evaluation questions.

The overall assessment is straightforward nevertheless the team could have pick up 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive. The identification and validation of transferable lessons was clearly done.

- 8. Usefulness of the recommendations:** Recommendations are well structured and directly result from the analysis and conclusions. They are fair and unbiased. Furthermore they are impartial and linked to the conclusions and presented in a hierarchical order (indicating the priorities) within each level of assessment and forward looking. They are detailed and operationally applicable and presented in the form for possible actions.

On the final version of the report the team made an attempt to summarise the main recommendations, while avoiding being repetitive. This practice allows better communicating the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission services and to the Commissioners.

Particularly valuable is the attempt of the consultants to select a set of recommendations that may contain transferable lessons for other countries.

- 9. Clearly reported:** The draft final report is presented on a reader-friendly way; the structure and presentation of the report is easy to read. It uses plenty of schemes and graphs to present the information; overall comprehensible answers were provided to each of the questions.

References to the annexes are explicitly indicated. Finally it is a well balanced report in what concerns the main report and the annexes.