

**Quality Grid**  
**Evaluation of the EC cooperation with Mozambique - 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?			<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. Validity of the conclusions:</b> Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are conclusions based on credible findings?			<b>X</b>		
<b>8. Usefulness of the recommendations:</b> Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personal or stakeholders' 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>		

## **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 ToR and provides credible findings, substantives conclusions and prioritized and operational recommendations. The evaluation design is appropriate and adequate; methods are explained and have been actually applied throughout the process. Limitations have been indicated. The report shows that data and information have been collected from reliable sources. The various actors' perceptions have systematically been cross-checked through techniques such as focus group discussions and triangulation. The report is presented in a structured way, gives an overall assessment and also details information on the different sectors analysed. An improved use of visual presentation tools such as graphs and tables would have improved the effective communication of the results.

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

The evaluation adequately addresses the information needs of the commissioning body and responds to the ToR and in particularly to the evaluation questions. The evaluation report and the annex provide a good overview of how the stated objectives have been achieved.

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

The report deals with the whole intervention in its temporal, geographic and regulatory dimension as requested in the ToR by the commissioning body. The evaluation covers the current focal and non focal sectors of EC cooperation with the country, the different aid delivery methods and their coherence and complementarities with the political and sector dialogues. The evaluators have demonstrated to have a good knowledge on evaluation methodology, on the country context, on the specific sectors of intervention, although to a different degree. The evaluation took an interest in making explicit the interrelations between the EC and other donors' interventions and shows clearly the extent, to which GBS and SBS are in line with the government's poverty reduction policies.

### **3. Appropriate design: Good**

The evaluation design is appropriate and adequate; the evaluation method is explained and has been actually applied throughout the process. The evaluation was carried out using the standard methodology of reconstructing the intervention logic, evaluation questions, judgement criteria and indicators and following the standard phasing of desk, field and final synthesis phases. 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 (2.4.) is too short. It only outlines the focus of the evaluation and the criteria it assesses. The methodological tools used have only been presented in the executive summary. However, the annex is to some extent self-explanatory.

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

The report shows that data and information have been collected from reliable sources such as: legal documents, strategy documents, relevant international documentation, national statistics databases, and relevant number of project documents, evaluation reports, statistics and interviews of both, headquarters' and delegation's staff as well as of national stakeholders. The various actors' perceptions have been systematically cross-checked through techniques such as focus group discussions and triangulation. Limitations of the data collection process and of the quality of the information have been indicated, and wherever possible a proxy was used.

## **5. Sound analysis: Good**

Quantitative and qualitative information have systematically been compared and consistency of data checked. The specific context of the country has been taken into consideration for the interpretation of the data collected. The annex puts a reasonable amount of data in relation to each other, mainly in form of useful tables. The overview of the evaluation, which is presented in form of logical diagrams, helps the reader to understand the relation of the data to the areas under evaluation. The report also shows interrelations such as e.g. between investment in the transport sector and HIV/AIDS. Limitations applying to interpretations are sufficiently spelled out. The relevant cause-effect linkages between the intervention and their consequences have been explained, nevertheless to varied degrees in the focal and non focal sectors of this evaluation. Hence, the resulting quality of the answers provided to each of the EQs is not homogeneous.

## **6. Credible findings: Good**

The overall results reflect a reasonable compromise between realities described by data and stated facts. Detailed findings are presented in the annexes and well organised in judgment criteria fiches. Findings are presented in a logical, very detailed and comprehensive way and make clear references to supporting documents and analysis. The reference to the elements of analysis upon which they are based is indicated. The evaluation team has thoroughly isolated the findings from external factors. Multiple aspects that have an influence on macroeconomic development indicators are discussed one by one and thoroughly taken into account.

## **7. Validity of the conclusions: Good**

Conclusions are structured, clustered and linked to findings and illustrative examples in the annexes. General conclusions are drawn from realistic findings using judgment criteria validation. The final report is well-supported due to consultants making an effort in demonstrating their findings and conclusions as well as showing the links between responses to the evaluation questions, judgement criteria and indicators. The overall assessment is straightforward and useful to the reader. The focus on the implementation of the strategies and on the link between different aid delivering methods is important to the use of the evaluation by the Commission services. Conclusions are explicit and presented in a balanced way also in relation to controversial issues. The reader understands clearly where conclusions logically derive from. The limitations to conclusions' validity are made explicit.

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

Recommendations are structured, logically derive and directly result from the conclusions. Furthermore they are presented in a hierarchical order (clearly indicating priorities) within each level of assessment and they are forward looking. Recommendations are detailed and operationally applicable for commission services. Nevertheless the number of recommendations presented is too large (60). This does not facilitate the task of effective communication of the evaluation messages to different target audiences.

## **9. Clearly reported: Good**

The report is presented in a structured way, gives an overall assessment and also details information. It presents evidence through a good number of tables and illustrative examples; e.g. including a summary table that breaks down the EDF sector budget distribution to Mozambique. The team has made the right choices, tables and analysis presented in the main report are detailed enough, but do not overload the reader. However, the main report is not always easy to read. References to the annexes are explicitly indicated. Finally it is a well balanced report in what concerns the main report and the annexes. An improved use of visual

presentation tools such as better designed graphs and tables in the main report would have improved the effective communication of the results.