

Evaluation of the European Commission's support to the Republic of Moldova

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

Overall, the evaluation meets very well the requirements of the ToRs and provides credible and well substantiated findings and conclusions. Recommendations follow the sector specific and overall conclusions. The structure of the report is clear and easy to follow.

1. Meeting needs: very good

The evaluation addresses well the information needs of the commissioning body and also responds to the ToRs and the evaluation questions to a reasonable degree. The evaluation goes even beyond the demands stated in the ToR and addresses the follow-up of the recommendations of the previous Moldova 2000 evaluation (annex 14).

2. Relevant scope: good

The period covers the whole EC intervention in its temporal, geographic and regulatory contexts. The main intended effects have been identified. EC -interventions are analysed in the light of "3Cs" (Coherence, Coordination and Complementarity) and evaluation took interest of partner government's policies as well.

3. Defensible design: good

The evaluation design is appropriate and adequate. The evaluation was carried out using the methodological approach of the EC : reconstruction of the intervention logic, evaluation questions, judgement criteria, indicators and standard phasing of desk, field and final synthesis phases. Methodological choices have been appropriate enough to meet the requirements of the ToR.

4. Reliable data: good

The report gives the picture that data and information have been collected from reliable sources : written documents received during the field phase from the Delegation, other development partners, statistical bodies, business organisations, academia and consultants. Additionally some 80 direct interviews in the field have been implemented with the parties involved in the strategy as actors or stakeholders.

5. Sound analysis: good

Information is well analysed for answering the EQs. The evaluators have proceeded systematically in demonstrating the relation with evidence found.

In the analysis cause-and-effect links between the interventions and their consequences are explained, comparisons (for example : before/after) have been used, at least to some extent, to give depth for the analysis as well.

Some sectors have been especially focused on and further analysed in Annex 3 (Trafficking, SME development, Exports, FSP targeted Budget Support, Environment).

Limitations applying to interpretations are explained and discussed (Transnistria issue).

6. Credible findings: very good

The evaluation findings derived from the analysis appear reliable and balanced. Findings acceptably reflect the reality described by the data and evidence recorded on the one hand, and the reality of the interventions as perceived by the actors and the beneficiaries on the other hand.

In addition to the information collected by the evaluators themselves, a large number of other useful information sources have been used, as Transparency International, Ministries of the Republic of Moldova, National Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Moldova, National Bank of Moldova, World Bank, UNDP, ECHR, OSCE. Large and well sourced empiric information adds the value and credibility of the findings.

7. Validity of the conclusions: good

Conclusions linked to findings are presented in a balanced way without systematically favouring negative or positive conclusions.

Sector conclusions stem well from EQs, JCs and Indicators and conclusions are consistent with them. The overall conclusions sum up sector conclusions and cluster them in five major conclusions, however without a systemic reference to the elements of analysis they are based on. Nevertheless, the overall conclusions summarise well the content of the sector conclusions.

8. Usefulness of the recommendations: good

Recommendations are impartial. Sector recommendations follow logically from sector conclusions and overall recommendations follow logically from overall conclusions. For overall recommendations first possible steps of action are identified. However, the formulation of the recommendation text is not best possible. The text is partly too long and concrete recommendations are not always easy to identify.

9. Clearly reported: good

The main report reveals the substance of the evaluation, it is easy to read and its structure is logical, the summary is brief and reflects the report. The main report is however too long (118 pages), the writing style could have been a bit shorter and more concise.

The 17 annexes (100 pages) provide useful supportive information if the reader wants to understand backgrounds of the evaluation more deeply.

Evaluation of the EC cooperation and partnership with Moldova Draft Final Report

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 examined 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 the primary and secondary data selected adequate. Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?			x		
5. Sound analysis: 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?			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		

