

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

<b>Quality Assessment for Final Report</b>	
<b>DG/Unit</b>	DG AGRI Unit A.1 Global issues and relations with ACP
Official(s) managing the evaluation:	Paolo BOLSI
<b>Evaluator:</b>	Ecorys and Wageningen University and Research
<b>Assessment carried out by(*):</b>	
Steering group	[X]
Evaluation Function	[X]
Other (please specify)	[ ]
(*) Multiple crosses possible	
<b>Date of assessment</b>	<b>27/09/2021</b>

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 ]	The contractor provided answers to the 13 study questions foreseen by the Terms of Reference.
	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 ]	Covered study period: 2005-2018, using EU-28 aggregate, since the United Kingdom was still a Member State.
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]	
	b. Main report with required components	[Y]	

**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>▪ 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>		
	c. All required annexes	[ Y ]	
3. Data collection	<b>Check that data is accurate and complete</b>		
	a. Data is accurate	[ Y ]	The data used in the report is generally accurate but due to the horizontal nature of the study the same statistical source and calendar year statistics are used for different Agri-food sectors with different marketing years and correction coefficients. As such, the statistics on imports and production can differ from the statistics published in DG AGRI market balances.
	<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>		
	b. Data is complete	[ Y ]	The contractor made its best efforts to review existing academic literature and statistical data to reply to the 13 study questions, but due to the wide scope of the study and need to maintain the main report concise, the study mainly exploited qualitative information.
4. Analysis and judgments	<b>Check that analysis is sound and relevant</b>		
	a. Analytical framework is sound	[ Y ]	The methodology has been discussed and fine-tuned with the Commission services, however data limitations and limited timespan for analysis made it difficult to perform statistical

**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>▪ 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>		analysis. For some questions, the contractor resorted to qualitative analysis, based on literature review, interviews and case studies.
	<p><b>b. Conclusions are sound</b></p> <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>	[ Y ]	The results of the quantitative analysis built upon regressions are often not significant and potentially affected by biases due to data limitations. The study provides sufficient warnings on such limitations. The reply to certain sub-questions presents some limitations due to lack of data or literature on the subject, and further research is needed. As the analysis is based on 2005-2018, some of the results and conclusions may have to be interpreted with care as consumer trends are changing and the Green Deal objectives may change the policy framework.
5. Usefulness of recommendations	<p><b>a. Recommendations are useful</b></p>	[ Y ]	The study recommendations are quite general. On some study questions, recommendations are limited given the difficulties encountered to produce a more comprehensive analysis.
	<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>		
6. Clarity of the	<p><b>b. Recommendations are complete</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recommendations cover all relevant main conclusions</li> </ul>	[ Y ]	
	<p><b>a. Report is easy to read</b></p>	[ Y ]	After various rounds of

**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>
report	<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>		improvements, the report includes a methodological part with technical explanations to allow replicability, and the replies to the study questions that use quantitative and qualitative evidence with a narrative to present results to the relevant target readers.
	<p><b>b. Report is logical and focused</b></p> <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>	[ Y ]	After several revision rounds, the structure, logic and length of the study have significantly improved. The report foresees an overview of the main take-aways per chapter, allowing the reader to easily skim through the report.

<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 ]	