

Quality Assessment for Final Report

DG AGRI/Unit B3

Assessment carried out by(*):

Steering group [x]

Evaluation Function []

Other (please specify) []

(*) Multiple crosses possible

Date of assessment 21/3/2023

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]	
	b. Has undertaken the tasks described in the work plan	[Y]	A series of additional tasks/activities - in addition to those specified in the Contract - were offered and implemented by the Contractor by regrouping of existing resources
	c. Has covered the requested scope for time period, geographical areas, target groups, aspects of the intervention, etc.	[Y]	The geographical coverage was the whole EU and the outcomes could be applicable in all Member States and even beyond. In particular, the ‘Come Along Smart Villages’ process, initiated as an additional task (following the high interest of participation during the selection of 21 pilot smart villages), allowed the participation of about 200 more communities from 23 EU and 2 non-EU countries in the Smart Rural 21 activities. The time period which was extended to additional five months largely contributed to the effective completion of many of the activities and a wider period of knowledge exchange among the participant villages.

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
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]	In two languages, EN & FR, as it was planned in the Terms of Reference and the contract
	b. Main report with required components <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Title and Content Page ▪ 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 	[Y]	The content of the final report is as planned in the Terms of Reference and the contract. The report is distinguished for its clarity, precision and consistency, of a high quality content with recommendations and lessons learnt for both rural stakeholders and policy makers for future policy purposes.
	c. All required annexes	[Y]	There are no Annexes with statistical information due to the nature of the project.
3. Data collection	Check that data is accurate and complete		
	a. Data is accurate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data is free from factual and logical errors ▪ The report is consistent, i.e. no contradictions ▪ Calculations are correct 	[Y]	No quantitative data
	b. Data is complete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relevant literature and previous studies have been sufficiently reviewed ▪ Existing monitoring data has been appropriately used ▪ Limitations to the data retrieved are pointed out and explained. ▪ Correcting measures have been taken to address any problems encountered in the process of data gathering 	[Y]	The project is based on previous studies dealing with Smart Villages, mainly the Pilot Project on Smart Eco-social Villages and the results of the Thematic Working Group of the European Network for Rural Development.
4. Analysis and judgments	Check that analysis is sound and relevant		
	a. Analytical framework is sound	[Y]	The methodology

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"> ▪ 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 ▪ Findings are reliable enough to be replicable 		<p>used for each of the Work Packages is sound and explained in the Final report. Qualitative data are based on information provided by national experts, interviews first-hand experience and rich input from participant villages and of Member States’ representatives, and on findings from the literature research and case studies.</p>
	<p>b. Conclusions are sound</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conclusions are properly addressing the evaluation questions and are coherently and logically substantiated ▪ There are no relevant conclusions missing according to the evidence presented ▪ Findings corroborate existing knowledge; differences or contradictions with existing knowledge are explained ▪ Critical issues are presented in a fair and balanced manner ▪ Limitations on validity of the conclusions are pointed out 	<p align="center">[Y]</p>	<p>The conclusions are of a high quality, with useful analysis about the policy framework and the success & failure factors, understandable and clear for all interested actors, with pedagogical aspects and realistic assessments.</p>
<p>5. Usefulness of recommendations</p>	<p>a. Recommendations are useful</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations flow logically from the conclusions, are practical, realistic, and addressed to the relevant Commission Service(s) or other stakeholders 	<p align="center">[Y]</p>	<p>The report includes a certain number of comprehensive and practical recommendations for policy makers and local stakeholders in terms of enabling factors for developing further the design of public support schemes and supporting Smart Villages initiatives across Europe. It takes into account the whole complexity at different levels and considers the target audience and the</p>

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
			overall scope of the project.
	b. Recommendations are complete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations cover all relevant main conclusions 	[Y]	The findings and recommendations are useful for future policy initiatives and will be complemented by the 2 ⁿ Preparatory Action on Smart Rural Areas in the 21st Century (Smart Rural 27) which aims to create a support policy environment for Smart Villages
6. Clarity of the report	a. Report is easy to read <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 	[Y]	The written style of the report is friendly and clear. Visual material and video, including sharing of smart solutions, tutorials for the roadmap tools, (available in the website https://www.smartrural21.eu/) are of high usefulness and reflect the richness of the project's outputs.
	b. Report is logical and focused <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ The report provides a proper focus on main issues and key messages are summarised and highlighted ▪ The length of the report (excluded appendices) is proportionate (good balance of descriptive and analytical information) ▪ Detailed information and technical analysis are left for the appendix; thus information overload is avoided in the main report 	[Y]	The report is well-structured and well-balanced according to the Working Packages, following a logical interest for the reader and containing the most important elements included in the submitted deliverables.
	Overall conclusion		
The report could be approved in its current state, as it overall complies with the contractual conditions and relevant professional evaluation standards		[Y]	