Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

According to the Commission **Better Regulation Guidelines and toolbox** the Quality Assessment (QA) by the Inter Service Group judges the external contractor's report and its overall process. It is the final "sign off" by the ISG of the contractor's work and includes a judgement on whether key aspects of the work conducted meet the required standards and provides any related comments.

If the evaluation is selected for review by the Regulatory Scrutiny Board, this QA and minutes of the last ISG meeting will form part of the package submitted to the RSB.

In compliance with the above, this documents provides a Quality Assessment checklist to be completed for all interim and ex-post evaluations, in order to:

- give a structured feedback to the Evaluator on the draft report, and
- support and justify the approval of the final version of the report.
- Provide stakeholders and citizens with an overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation.

The assessment criteria included should be applied also with reference to the specific Terms of Reference for the evaluation to be assessed and specific agreements made between the evaluation Steering Group and the Evaluator during the execution of the contract.

The checklist can be quickly filled out by ticking boxes, but becomes most useful when also including comments in the open fields.

Quality Assessment for Final Report: "Study on EU agri-food via ecommerce to China" DG/Unit DG AGRI/G.3 Evaluator: Agra CEAS Consulting S.A. (IHS Markit), Areté and SPI Assessment carried out by(*): Steering group [X] Evaluation Function [] Other (please specify) [] (*) Multiple crosses possible Date of assessment

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]	Study covers the requested areas, with China main focus and three other countries studied in less details	
2. Overall contents	Check that the report includes:			
of report	a. Executive Summary according to an agreed format, in the three required languages (minimum EN and FR)	[Y]		
	 b. Main report with required components Title and Content Page 	[Y]	Study does not focus on the evaluation of a	
	 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	e		
	 a. Data is accurate Data is free from factual and logical error The report is consistent, i.e. no contradict 			
	 Calculations are correct 			
	b. Data is complete	[Y]	The contractor has	
	 Relevant literature and previous studie sufficiently reviewed 	s have been	exploited	
	 Existing monitoring data has been appropriately used Limitations to the data retrieved are pointed out and explained. 		adequately the available data sources.	
	 Correcting measures have been taken to problems encountered in the process of da 			
4. Analysis and	Check that analysis is sound and relevant			
judgments	a. Analytical framework is sound	[Y]		

Quality Assessment for the study on "EU agri-food via e-commerce to China"

Objective of the	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled?	Comments
assessment	P	Y, N, N/A	
	 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 		Part of the methodology is further developed in the annex
	 Findings are reliable enough to be replicated. Conclusions are sound Conclusions are properly addressing the questions and are coherently and substantiated 		
	 There are no relevant conclusions missing to the evidence presented Findings corroborate existing knowledge or contradictions with existing knowledge explained Critical issues are presented in a fair a manner Limitations on validity of the conclusion out 	e; differences owledge are and balanced	
 5.Usefulness of recommendations a. Recommendations are useful Recommendations flow logically conclusions, are practical, realistic, and the relevant Commission Service(s) stakeholders 			
	 Recommendations are complete Recommendations cover all relevant mair 		
6. Clarity of the report	 a. Report is easy to read [Y] 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 The structure of the report is logical an information is not unjustifiably duplicate easy to get an overview of the report results. The report provides a proper focus on makey messages are summarised and highlig The length of the report (excluded approportionate (good balance of descanalytical information) Detailed information and technical analyst the appendix; thus information overload the main report 	ed, and it is and its key in issues and thted opendices) is criptive and is are left for	Technical Unit has agreed that report could be a bit longer compared to what was specified in the ToR.

Quality Assessment for the study on "EU agri-food via e-commerce to China"

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