

## **QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Title of the evaluation:**

**SYNTHESIS OF SAPARD EX-POST EVALUATIONS**

**DG/Unit: DG AGRI, Unit L4**

- Official(s) managing the evaluation: Zélie Peppiette

**Evaluator/contractor: KPMG**

**Assessment carried out by:**

- Steering group with the active participation of units DG AGRI E3, G1, G4, H1, L2, L4, DG ENV B1 and DG REGIO C4.

**Date of the Quality Assessment: May 2011**

## **(1) RELEVANCE**

*Does the evaluation respond to information needs, in particular as expressed in the terms of references?*

**SCORING**

Poor

Satisfactory

Good

Very Good

Excellent

X

**Arguments for scoring:**

**The report adequately covers the themes defined in the terms of reference. It summarises the coverage of Evaluation Questions given in the individual programme ex-post reports, but due to time/resource constraints, and the significant gaps in the individual ex-post reports, full coverage of all Evaluation Questions was not possible. Analysis was therefore concentrated on six focus areas, and the set of Evaluation Questions identified as key to addressing them. Work on other Evaluation Questions was limited to synthesising information in the programme level ex-post reports.**

**The geographical scope and time scope for the evaluation related to the SAPARD ex post evaluation have been fully covered. The synthesis provides a reasonable overview of the extent to which SAPARD has been successful in preparing these countries to implement CAP after accession.**

## **(2) APPROPRIATE DESIGN**

*Is the design of the evaluation adequate for obtaining the results needed to answer the evaluation questions?*

<b>SCORING</b>	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
		X			

Arguments for scoring:

The approach of the evaluation was in line with the Terms of Reference.

The evaluation methodology developed for the SAPARD ex post evaluations combined different analyses:

1. An analysis of the national SAPARD Programmes and factual synthesis of the answers to the Common Evaluation Questions based on the individual programme level ex-post evaluations.
2. Additional data collection and fieldwork were carried out. The field work involved a stratified sample of 302 beneficiary interviews (stratified by country, measure, and project size/type), and 30+ interviews with institutional stakeholders. The field work concentrated on the six focus issues identified as fundamental to the evaluation. The desk research made use of official statistical databases, evaluation progress reports, programming documents and other available studies to provide further information.
3. The drawing of conclusions based on the findings and formulation of recommendations with the aim of improving the design of future pre-accession programmes.

The combination of these methodological approaches allowed the key Evaluation Questions to be addressed in a credible way, whilst others were addressed to the extent possible based on the information included in the individual ex-post reports. If the original methodological design had taken better account of the variable quality of the individual programme level ex-post reports, which was already indicated in the Terms of Reference, then more complete coverage of the Evaluation Questions might have been possible.

### **(3) RELIABLE DATA**

*Are data collected adequate for their intended use and have their reliability been ascertained?*

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
		X			

Arguments for scoring:

The evaluation relied on various existing data sources, principally the eight countries' ex-post evaluation reports, other central SAPARD documentation, country-level programming documentation, databases of beneficiaries, and EU & national statistical sources.

As expected, and highlighted in the Terms of Reference, the data available to the evaluators from these sources, particularly the ex-post evaluation reports, was not complete or sufficiently reliable to be adequate to address the requirements of the Terms of Reference.

There was thus a need for additional complementary primary research, as specified in the Terms of Reference. Additional primary data was gathered through a questionnaire-based survey of a stratified sample of 302 beneficiaries and interviews with 30 institutional representatives. The quality of the data obtained through the fieldwork was considered to be good.

### **(4) SOUND ANALYSIS**

*Are data systematically analysed to answer evaluation questions and cover other information needs in a valid manner?*

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
		X			

Arguments for scoring:

The analysis was generally carried out in line with the established methodology. The treatment of the individual country reports tends more towards summary than synthesis. The limitations of each of the analytical approaches and tools are presented and taken into account in the interpretation of the results.

### **(5) CREDIBLE FINDINGS**

*Do findings follow logically from and are justified by, the data/information analysis and interpretations based on pre-established criteria and rational?*

<b>SCORING</b>	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The findings of the evaluation are clearly formulated, and are supported by the evidence provided through the analysis. Although the sample used for the fieldwork was small in comparison to the overall number of beneficiaries, it was highly stratified and therefore was representative of the populations as a whole.

### **(6) VALID CONCLUSIONS**

*Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?*

<b>SCORING</b>	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The conclusions are substantiated by evidence-based evaluation findings, which were drawn from the analysis. Given the data constraints, they are balanced and prudent.

### **(7) HELPFUL RECOMENDATIONS**

*Are areas needing improvements identified in coherence with the conclusions? Are the suggested options realistic and impartial?*

<b>SCORING</b>	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The recommendations are impartial and based on the evaluation findings. They are specific and to the point. They identify policy issues, which can be taken into account when developing the legislative framework for the next programming period.

## **(8) CLARITY**

*Is the report well structured, balanced and written in an understandable manner?*

<b>SCORING</b>	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The evaluation report of SAPARD ex-post evaluations is logically structured. The text is streamlined and clear, and reasonably accessible to a readership without specific technical knowledge. The links between the analysis, conclusions and recommendations are shown clearly. The Executive Summary is well structured and clear.

## **OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

Overall, the quality of the report is assessed to be **good**.

**Is the overall quality of the report adequate, in particular:**

- Does the evaluation fulfil contractual conditions?  
**Yes. The value-added of this evaluation in comparison to the individual programme level ex-post evaluations is considerable.**
- Are the findings and conclusions of the report reliable, and are there any specific limitations to their validity and completeness?  
**The findings and conclusions of the report are generally reliable and clear, limitations are identified.**
- Is the information in the report potentially useful for designing intervention, setting priorities, allocating resources or improving interventions?  
**The findings support the current policy framework. The evaluation was completed at a time when preparations for pre-accession instruments for the post-2013 period were underway. The results of the evaluation can be taken into account in this work. In this context the evaluation is useful and relevant.**