

QUALITY GRID
Evaluation of the European Union's regional Cooperation with Pacific Region
Final Report (September 2014)

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

Overall judgement: good

Overall, the evaluation meets the requirements of the ToR and covers the prescribed scope. The report and its annexes show that quite an extensive amount of information has been collected. The analysis is based on qualitative information and quantitative data. The report is written in a comprehensive manner and its structure is logical but the readability of some sections could have been improved. The recommendations follow logically from the conclusions and they are both strategic and operational. The executive summary captures the essence of the report.

1. Meeting needs: very good

The report adequately responds to the ToRs and it addresses the whole intervention of the EU's strategy for the cooperation with the Pacific region. It analyses the interference with other EU policies (in particular with the fisheries and trade policies). It examined other donors' intervention in the framework of question 10) and the partner government policy (Pacific Plan which is addressed in question 1). The evaluation also looked into both intended and unintended effects of the EU cooperation with the Pacific Region.

2. Relevant scope: good

The temporal and regional dimensions of the EU support are well addressed through the analysis of the regional organisations. The evaluation also takes into account the regulatory dimension of the EU cooperation with Pacific Region and the interferences with EU major EU policies present in the field.

3. Defensible design: good

The evaluation uses the standard methodology for regional level evaluations. The tools have been appropriately chosen to answer the evaluation questions. The methodological choices are not always defended against other options.

4. Reliable data: good

Throughout the evaluation the data used is primarily based on evaluations carried out for programmes and projects financed by the EU in regional Pacific in specific sectors. Additional data was collected through interviews. There have been some challenges regarding the collection of documents and interviews with relevant stakeholders given the wide area covered. The data has been identified explicitly (see annex 8).

5. Sound data analysis: good

Cause-and-effect links between the intervention and its consequences are well explained and comparisons (such as for example before/after in the case of Education sector) are made explicit as well. Data on external factors are well-analysed (such as for example the political context for Fiji and the relationship between POCT and PACP).

6. Credible findings: good

Findings derive from the analysis and are reliable and balanced in the Pacific context. The findings cover both the reality described by the data and evidence gathered and the perception of the main stakeholders on the intervention (this is clearly covered by interviews especially regarding the fisheries sector).

7. Valid Conclusions: good

Conclusions derive logically from findings and they are organised along clusters. They are debated upon in connection with the context in which the analysis was done (for example Conclusion 2: choice of RAO). There are direct references to the EQs which makes the supporting information conveniently identifiable through the document

8. Usefulness of recommendations: very good

The recommendations follow logically from the conclusions and they are impartial. They are prioritised and clustered (page 100 and p 87 of the Main report). They are presented in the form of options for possible actions (for example Recommendation IR6: on approach towards POCT and PACP with 3 possible actions).

9. Clearly reported: very good

The main report is short, clear and easy to read. Its different sections are well balanced and the structure is logical. The summary is clear and presents the main conclusions and recommendations in a balanced and unbiased way.