Quality Assessment for Final Report

DG/Unit A1 Policy perspectives

Assessment carried out by(*):

Steering group	[ ]
Evaluation Function	[ ]
Other (please specify)	technical manager of the study

(*)   Multiple crosses possible

Date of assessment   **19 September 2023**

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
1. Scope of evaluation	Confirm with the Terms of Reference and the work plan that the contractor :		
	a. Has addressed the evaluation issues and specific questions	[Y]	
	b. Has undertaken the tasks described in the work plan	[Y]	
	c. Has covered the requested scope for time period, geographical areas, target groups, aspects of the intervention, etc.	[Y]	Comprehensive overview of the micro and macro choices made in 28 CSPs, and also of other relevant data contextualising the findings, followed by building blocks of the analysis based on this data/information.
2. Overall contents of report	Check that the report includes:		
	a. Executive Summary according to an agreed format, in the three required languages (minimum EN and FR)	[Y]	Only in EN, further to specific rules for support by the Evaluation Helpdesk
	b. Main report with required components	[Y]	The report answers the research questions within the limitations of the study.
	▪ Title and Content Page ▪ A description of the policy being evaluated, its context, the purpose of the evaluation, contextual limitations, methodology, etc. ▪ Findings, conclusions, and judgments for all evaluation issues and specific questions ▪ The required outputs and deliverables ▪ Recommendations as appropriate		
	c. All required annexes	[Y]	
3. Data collection	Check that data is accurate and complete		
	a. Data is accurate	[Y]	CSP data and information comes from extraction as encoded in different parts of CSPs or screening/human interpretation of
	▪ Data is free from factual and logical errors ▪ The report is consistent, i.e. no contradictions ▪ Calculations are correct		

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
			non-numerical information based on machine translation. The form and the extent of data feeding the report does not rule out certain omissions / inaccuracies.
	b. Data is complete	[Y]	The main source of data and information are CSPs, with past period information used where available for contextualisation. Limitations are clearly explained.
	▪ Relevant literature and previous studies have been sufficiently reviewed ▪ Existing monitoring data has been appropriately used ▪ Limitations to the data retrieved are pointed out and explained. ▪ Correcting measures have been taken to address any problems encountered in the process of data gathering		
4. Analysis and judgments	Check that analysis is sound and relevant		
	a. Analytical framework is sound	[Y]	Methodological framework is explained. The process did not involve consultation with stakeholders.
	▪ The methodology used for each area of analysis is clearly explained, and has been applied consistently and as planned ▪ Judgements are based on transparent criteria ▪ The analysis relies on two or more independent lines of evidence ▪ Inputs from different stakeholders are used in a balanced way ▪ Findings are reliable enough to be replicable		
	b. Conclusions are sound	[Y]	Conclusions are based on qualitative assessment of the potential effects. Approach and limitations are explained.
	▪ Conclusions are properly addressing the evaluation questions and are coherently and logically substantiated ▪ There are no relevant conclusions missing according to the evidence presented ▪ Findings corroborate existing knowledge; differences or contradictions with existing knowledge are explained ▪ Critical issues are presented in a fair and balanced manner ▪ Limitations on validity of the conclusions are pointed out		
5.Usefulness of	a. Recommendations are useful	N/A	There are no

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
recommendations	▪ Recommendations flow logically from the conclusions, are practical, realistic, and addressed to the relevant Commission Service(s) or other stakeholders		recommendations. There are indications where further analysis would be needed to verify/validate the findings.
	b. Recommendations are complete	[N/A]	As above
	▪ Recommendations cover all relevant main conclusions		
6. Clarity of the report	a. Report is easy to read	[Y]	The language is quite technical reflecting the detailed scope of this study for an informed audience. Broad use of different visualisations.
	▪ Written style and presentation is adapted for the various relevant target readers ▪ The quality of language is sufficient for publishing ▪ Specific terminology is clearly defined ▪ Tables, graphs, and similar presentation tools are used to facilitate understanding; they are well commented with narrative text		
	b. Report is logical and focused	[Y]	The report is well structured, from detail to intermediate to overall findings following the building blocks of the analysis. Considering the scope of the study, the detail of CSP choices is covered in the body of the text.
	▪ The structure of the report is logical and consistent, information is not unjustifiably duplicated, and it is easy to get an overview of the report and its key results. ▪ The report provides a proper focus on main issues and key messages are summarised and highlighted ▪ The length of the report (excluded appendices) is proportionate (good balance of descriptive and analytical information) ▪ Detailed information and technical analysis are left for the appendix; thus information overload is avoided in the main report		

Overall conclusion			
The report could be approved in its current state, as it overall complies with the contractual conditions and relevant professional evaluation standards		[Y]	The report is well elaborated, providing in-depth information and analysis.