

## Quality Assessment for Evaluation Study “Synthesis of Rural Development Programmes (RDP) ex-post evaluations of period 2007-2013” - Final Report

<b>DG/Unit</b>	DG AGRI C4
Official(s) managing the evaluation:	Agnieszka GOGOLEWSKA
<b>Evaluator:</b>	Ecorys
<b>Assessment carried out by(*):</b>	
Steering group	X
Evaluation Function	X
Other (please specify)	
(*) Multiple crosses possible	
<b>Date of assessment</b>	02/05/2018

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	All questions specified in the ToRs have been addressed by the evaluator.
	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	The report has covered all Member States which had a Rural Development Programme in the 2007-2013 period, except Bulgaria. As Bulgaria did not provide an ex-post evaluation of its RDP for the 2007-2013 period, it could not be included for the purpose of this assignment.
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 has been submitted in EN and FR
	b. Main report with required components	Y	The report in its final version

**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>		contains all the needed elements.
	c. All required annexes	Y	
3. Data collection	Check that data is accurate and complete		
	a. Data is accurate	Y	
	<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 quality of the evaluation was hindered by the varied quality of the ex-post evaluations and in particular by the limited availability and inaccuracies of relevant indicators. The evaluators have exploited the available data sources to the extent possible. The limitations of analysis related to the availability of data, and in particular, the indicators and targeting are clearly explained in the report.
<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>			
4. Analysis and judgments	Check that analysis is sound and relevant		
	a. Analytical framework is sound	Y	The

**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>		methodological approach combines both quantitative and qualitative methods to address the different types of analysis required to respond to the relevant sets of ESQs.
	<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 findings are based on clearly defined evaluation criteria and supported by the evidence provided through the analysis. The conclusions are substantiated by evaluation findings, which in turn were drawn from the sound analysis.
<b>5. Usefulness of recommendations</b>	<p><b>a. Recommendations are useful</b></p> <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>	Y	Recommendations are based on the evaluation conclusions. They can realistically be considered for improving the evaluation process of the policy.
	<p><b>b. Recommendations are complete</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recommendations cover all relevant main conclusions</li> </ul>	Y	
<b>6. Clarity of the report</b>	<p><b>a. Report is easy to read</b></p> <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>	Y	
	<p><b>b. Report is logical and focused</b></p>	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>▪ 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	