



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

EuropeAid Co-operation Office

Evaluation

## **Evaluation of the European Commission's support to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan**

### **Observations and Judgement on the final evaluation report**

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

The report meets well the requirements expressed in the ToR. It provides credible findings, leading to valid conclusions and a prioritised and clustered set of recommendations. It is clear and easy to read.

#### **1. Meeting needs: very good**

The report answers well all the information demands expressed in the ToR. Beside a satisfactory answer to all evaluation questions, the report provides an overall assessment which cuts across several issues and themes which emerged during the evaluation process.

#### **2. Relevant scope: good**

The report covers the whole EC intervention in its temporal, geographic and regulatory dimensions. An attempt has been made to identify unintended effects of EC interventions, although not systematically (e.g. unintended effects of EC support to water resource management as regards the situation of the poor and the near poor; unintended centralisation effects of the EC's cooperation mechanisms).

#### **3. Defensible design: very good**

The evaluation was carried out following the standard methodological approach in use for country level evaluations. The overall approach, the tools used as well as the methodological limitations are well described (cf. volume 3). In particular, for each evaluation question, the report compares the planned approach to the approach actually implemented and, when needed, gives the information accounting for possible changes in the indicators used.

#### **4. Reliable data: good**

The data collected and analysed seems reasonably reliable (given the sources indicated in the annexes). Quantitative data are nevertheless often too scarce, which leads to rather imprecise and/or too theoretical considerations (e.g. general lack of financial information on the EC interventions; absence of figures regarding the target groups defined as "poor" and "near poor"). In the case of the question on free trade and exports, the wide discrepancy between trade statistics provided by Eurostat and the Central Bank of Jordan account for the cautiousness with which figures are quoted and commented upon.

The evaluation team has tried to mitigate the scarcity of quantitative data through the use of such tools as focus groups and/or interviews of experts.

#### **5. Sound analysis: good**

The analysis is mainly qualitative. It has been rigorously conducted through the systematic use of a contribution analysis approach. Thanks to this approach, for each evaluation question cause-and-effect assumptions were first developed and then convincingly tested. Although a cost-contribution analysis is mentioned in the approach to question I (Instruments supporting SMEs), this analysis was actually not conducted because of the absence of financial data. More generally, the scarcity of available quantitative data has resulted in the absence of proper quantitative analysis.

#### **6. Credible findings: good**

The findings are logically derived from the analysis. When extrapolations and interpretations are made, underlying assumptions are clearly presented and justified. Nevertheless, findings are mostly based on the perception of actors and beneficiaries of EC interventions rather than on direct data and/or evidence, which makes them often difficult to verify.

#### **7. Valid conclusions: very good**

The progressive elaboration of the conclusions of the report is clearly displayed in the report. In section 4 of the report (Answers to questions), partial conclusions which derive directly from the analysis can be found at the end of each answer to an evaluation question. Section 5 (Conclusion) then sums up these partial conclusions and clusters them in four major conclusions with a systematic reference to the elements of analysis upon which they are based. Each conclusion is presented with a detailed evaluation team's self-assessment of its strengths and limitations.

#### **8. Useful recommendations: very good**

The recommendations are impartial. They logically follow the conclusions and are clustered in three main areas (joint policy development, cross-cutting issues and learning). For each recommendation, a level of priority is set and addressees are identified.

## **9. Clear report: good**

The report is easy to read and is logically structured. The summary is brief and clearly reflects the content of the report. However, the quality of the summary could have been easily improved by recalling a few general financial information regarding the EC cooperation during the period considered (at least the volume of commitments for the main sectors of cooperation should have been indicated).

**Quality assessment grid**

<b>Concerning these criteria, the evaluation report is:</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<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 the 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. Valid conclusions:</b> Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are conclusions based on credible findings?				<b>x</b>	
<b>8. Useful recommendations:</b> Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personal or stakeholders' views, and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?				<b>x</b>	
<b>9. Clear report:</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>		