

## 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

**DG AGRI/Unit E.2** (Wine, Spirits and Horticultural Products)

**Assessment carried out by(\*):**

Steering group

Evaluation Function

Other (please specify)

(\*) Multiple crosses possible

**Date of assessment** **January 2023**

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 ]	Each of the 21 study questions was thoroughly examined and answered.
	b. Has undertaken the tasks described in the work plan	[Y ]	Yes, the tasks prescribed in the Terms of Reference were undertaken.
	c. Has covered the requested scope for time period, geographical areas, target groups, aspects of the intervention, etc.	[ Y ]	The study covered the requested scope for geographical areas, target groups and drinks category, with some limitation as to the time period during which data could be collected for the categories that were the main focus of the study (low/no alcohol spirit drinks and low/no alcohol aromatised wine products) which have only appeared on the market quite recently and for which no CN code has been established so far.
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 ]	The executive summary is available in EN and FR.
	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 ]	All required components were delivered, together with a chapter on <i>conclusion by main themes</i> and <i>general conclusions</i> , which includes general considerations and suggestions as appropriate.
	c. All required annexes	[ Y ]	Yes (10 national case studies and 2 thematic case

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
			studies).
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 ]	Since the Commission does not dispose of data on the internal market of alcoholic beverages (particularly for domestic production and consumption) and of data on trade of low/no alcohol beverages, we had to rely on the figures (sometimes estimated) provided by the contractor, which however seem consistent with the provided empirical information.
	b. Data is complete <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>	[ Y ]	The contractor collected an impressive list of literature on low/no alcohol beverages and used it to support the collection of data that was sometimes lacking. These limitations were pointed out by the contractor and discussed with the steering group. Correcting measures have been taken, particularly by using proprietary databases. Nonetheless, some of the presented figures had to be estimated.
4. Analysis and judgments	Check that analysis is sound and relevant		
	a. Analytical framework is sound	[ Y ]	The contractor

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
	<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>		<p>clearly explained the proposed methodology, which was used in a consistent and transparent way. The analysis relies on desk research (including a review of the relevant literature), the use of relevant datasets and databases (including two proprietary ones provided by Euromonitor International: <i>Passport</i> and <i>VIA</i>), interviews of stakeholders and competent authorities, surveys targeting business stakeholders, national competent authorities and individual consumers.</p>
	b. Conclusions are sound	[ Y ]	Conclusions are provided by main theme (grouping in a logical way the 21 study questions) and summarised in general conclusions.
	<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>		<p>The conclusions were thoroughly examined and discussed with the steering group. As a result, they appear to be exhaustive, consistent with the analysis of the different questions are presented in a fair and balanced way. Where there are limitations on the validity of the conclusions or of the consequent</p>

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
			recommendations, they are duly pointed out.
5. Usefulness of recommendations	a. Recommendations are useful	[ Y ]	The suggestions made by the contractor are the logic consequence of the conclusions drawn by the study. In some cases, the contractor recommends adaptations of various pieces of EU legislation, whose opportunity the Commission will examine at a later stage. Appropriate recommendations were also addressed to stakeholders.
	<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 ]	Yes they do.
6. Clarity of the report	a. Report is easy to read	[ Y ]	The report is of overall good quality.
	<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 ]	Considering the complexity of the subject of the study, the report is nonetheless of an appropriate length and clear structure. It provides all relevant information for each of the 21 study questions, which are summarised in a very well-structured conclusive chapter
<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>			

**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>
			that is well balanced and easy to read.

<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 ]	The report can be approved.	