

**Quality Grid**  
**Evaluation of the EC cooperation with SADC- Final Report**

<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?			X		
<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?			X		
<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?		X			
<b>4. Reliable data:</b> To what extent are the primary and secondary data selected adequate. Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?		X			
<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?		X			
<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?		X			
<b>7. Validity of the conclusions:</b> Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are conclusions based on credible results?			X		
<b>8. Usefulness of the recommendations:</b> Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personnel or shareholders' views, and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?			X		
<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?		X			
<b>Taking into account the contextual constraints on the evaluation, the overall quality rating of the report is considered.</b>		X			

## **Observations and Judgement**

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

Overall, the evaluation meets the requirements of the ToRs and provides good context information. However, the design of the evaluation has not been accurate enough to be able to deliver good responses to the evaluation questions, especially concerning to the results and impacts. The analysis suffers lack of primary data and a clear reference to quantitative evidences available. The main sources seem to be individual interviews which are not balanced enough to give credibility to this exercise. Conclusions are balanced but not directly derived from the findings and the recommendations are structured and prioritised but quite generally formulated.

### **1. Meeting needs: Good**

The evaluation meets needs of the commissioning body and responds to the requirement of the ToR. The structure of the report is logic and the content follows the headings. In many cases evaluation questions were presented for the regional programs which were at very early stages of the implementation. Hence, the focus was put on the relevance issues and to a less extent on the results and impact.

### **2. Relevant scope: Good**

The report deals with the whole intervention in its temporal, geographic and regulatory dimensions. The evaluation covers the main focal sectors and main issues of the cooperation with SADC. The evaluators have demonstrated to have a sufficient knowledge on evaluation methodology, on the specificity of the regional context, on sectors of intervention, although to a different degree.

### **3. Defensible design: Poor**

The basic method of logical diagram, evaluation questions, judgement criteria and indicators was applied following the standard phasing of desk, field and final synthesis stages. Information on the kind of the evaluation tools used and on the projects analysed is being presented. Nevertheless, the chapter that explains the evaluation methodology in the main report (2) is too general. The methodological choices seem to have been made without being sufficiently thought.

### **4. Reliable data: Poor**

Information sources have been used such as studies, interview, and focus group; however, there is no explicit indication that actors' perceptions have been systematically cross-checked. Quantitative and primary data supporting the evaluation findings are too often poor and samples are insufficient especially in relation to the answer to questions on effectiveness. Information has been presented more in a narrative than in a systematic way.

### **5. Sound analysis: Poor**

The hypothesis underling the intervention logic is explicit; however the cause-and-effect links between the EC interventions and their consequences are not always properly explained. The complexity of the regional situation of SADC has been properly taken into consideration for the interpretation of data. Quantitative analysis however suffers from the lack of the relevant information. There are also cases of generalisation which seem to be based too much on the subjective appreciation of actors than on sound objective data. For many judgement

criteria there were no sufficient data and corresponding analysis presented. Nevertheless limitation to the analysis has been presented.

**6. Credible findings: Poor**

The findings lack of reflecting in a complete way the reality described by the data and evidence recorded on the one hand, and the intervention as perceived by the actors and the beneficiaries on the other hand.

The findings focus more on relevance than on results and impacts. Especially evaluation findings in the specific sectors of support, EQ 4 (Trade), EQ5 ( Transport & Communication), EQ 6 (Food security, agriculture, natural resources ) and EQ7 (non-focal sectors) suffer from lack of quantitative and primary data.

**7. Validity of conclusions: Good**

Conclusions as such are presented in a balanced way without favouring negative or positive end they are logic and derives from findings. Conclusions are linked to findings through evaluation criteria and key issues such as relevance and coherence, ownership and alignment, complementarily and coordination, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Limitations to the validity of conclusions have been presented. The style for the conclusions should be more clear-cut; especially the part covering EC procedures is too repetitive.

**8. Usefulness of the recommendations: Good**

Recommendations are clustered and prioritised. They are also well presented and summarised in a table. They are linked to conclusions, however not in a direct way. They could be more detailed or targeted in some cases, notably for the specific sectors of intervention and on the SADC institutional weaknesses.

### **9. Clearly reported: Poor**

Efforts have been made to make the report not too long and easy to read, however it is very difficult to grasp the main messages of the evaluation. The links between the main report and the annexes are not clearly indicated which makes the reasoning difficult to follow.

Some graphs and tables have been included in the report but the writing style is not clear cut and does not help to the comprehension of the text.

The summary, while reflecting the report, is much too long, it does not cover the evaluation methodology and does not allow the reader to get the major key messages of the evaluation.