

## Quality Assessment for the Evaluation Support Study on the CAP's impact on knowledge exchange and advisory activities

<b>DG/Unit</b>	DG AGRI C4
Official(s) managing the evaluation:	Andre KOLODZIEJAK
<b>Evaluator:</b>	ADE in cooperation with CCRI and ÖIR
<b>Assessment carried out by(*):</b>	
Steering group	X
Evaluation Function	X
Other (please specify)	
(*) Multiple crosses possible	

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

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	The evaluation adequately responds to the information needs of the commissioning body and meets the requirements of the terms of reference.
	c. Has covered the requested scope for time period, geographical areas, target groups, aspects of the intervention, etc.	Y	
2. Overall contents of report	Check that the report includes:		
	a. Executive Summary according to an agreed format, in the required languages (minimum EN and FR)	Y	
	b. Main report with required components <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Title and Content Page</li> <li>▪ A description of the policy being evaluated, its context, the purpose of the evaluation, contextual limitations, methodology, etc.</li> <li>▪ Findings, conclusions, and judgments for all evaluation issues and specific questions</li> <li>▪ The required outputs and deliverables</li> <li>▪ Recommendations as appropriate</li> </ul>	Y	
	c. All required annexes	Y	
3. Data collection	Check that data is accurate and complete		
	a. Data is accurate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data is free from factual and logical errors</li> <li>▪ The report is consistent, i.e. no contradictions</li> <li>▪ Calculations are correct</li> </ul>	Y	
	b. Data is complete	Y	The evaluators

**CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports**

<b>Objective of the assessment</b>	<b>Aspects to be assessed</b>	<b>Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Relevant literature and previous studies have been sufficiently reviewed</li> <li>▪ Existing monitoring data has been appropriately used</li> <li>▪ Limitations to the data retrieved are pointed out and explained.</li> <li>▪ Correcting measures have been taken to address any problems encountered in the process of data gathering</li> </ul>		have exploited the available data sources.
4. Analysis and judgments	<b>Check that analysis is sound and relevant</b>		
	<b>a. Analytical framework is sound</b>	Y	The analytical frame is sound. The methodological approach combines theoretical and empirical approaches and includes a variety of methods, both quantitative and qualitative, to address the different types of analysis that are required to respond to the ESQs.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The methodology used for each area of analysis is clearly explained, and has been applied consistently and as planned</li> <li>▪ Judgements are based on transparent criteria</li> <li>▪ The analysis relies on two or more independent lines of evidence</li> <li>▪ Inputs from different stakeholders are used in a balanced way</li> <li>▪ Findings are reliable enough to be replicable</li> </ul>		
	<b>b. Conclusions are sound</b>	Y	The findings are based on clearly defined evaluation criteria and supported by the evidence provided through the analysis. Opinions from the stakeholders were considered in a balanced way and presented in a transparent way. The conclusions are substantiated by evaluation findings, which in turn were drawn
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Conclusions are properly addressing the evaluation questions and are coherently and logically substantiated</li> <li>▪ There are no relevant conclusions missing according to the evidence presented</li> <li>▪ Findings corroborate existing knowledge; differences or contradictions with existing knowledge are explained</li> <li>▪ Critical issues are presented in a fair and balanced manner</li> <li>▪ Limitations on validity of the conclusions are pointed out</li> </ul>			

**CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports**

<b>Objective of the assessment</b>	<b>Aspects to be assessed</b>	<b>Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A</b>	<b>Comments</b>
			from the sound analysis. Given the data constraints, they are balanced and prudent.
5. Usefulness of recommendations	a. Recommendations are useful	Y	Recommendations are based on the evaluation conclusions. They represent the views of the contractor and are not bound for the Commission services.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recommendations flow logically from the conclusions, are practical, realistic, and addressed to the relevant Commission Service(s) or other stakeholders</li> </ul>		
	b. Recommendations are complete	Y	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recommendations cover all relevant main conclusions</li> </ul>		
6. Clarity of the report	a. Report is easy to read	Y	There is some overlap regarding measures and instruments of the CAP providing advice to farmers.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Written style and presentation is adapted for the various relevant target readers</li> <li>▪ The quality of language is sufficient for publishing</li> <li>▪ Specific terminology is clearly defined</li> <li>▪ Tables, graphs, and similar presentation tools are used to facilitate understanding; they are well commented with narrative text</li> </ul>		
	b. Report is logical and focused	Y	The structure of the report is logical and consistent, key messages are highlighted and summarised, detailed information is left for the appendix.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ The report provides a proper focus on main issues and key messages are summarised and highlighted</li> <li>▪ The length of the report (excluded appendices) is proportionate (good balance of descriptive and analytical information)</li> <li>▪ Detailed information and technical analysis are left for the appendix; thus information overload is avoided in the main report</li> </ul>			

<b>Overall conclusion</b>		
The report could be approved in its current state, as it overall complies with the contractual conditions and relevant professional evaluation standards	Y	