

## Quality Assessment for Evaluation Final Report

**DG/Unit** AGRI C.4

Official(s) managing the evaluation: Ms Olivan

**Evaluator:** ARETE

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

Steering group X

Evaluation Function X

Other (please specify)

(\* Multiple crosses possible)

**Date of assessment** 7.11.2019

**CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for (Draft) 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>
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 evaluation questions were covered but not at the same level of detail (e.g. International standards, food waste)
	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	The evaluation covers the requested scope
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	Executive summary in EN and FR
	b. Main report with required components	Y	
	<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	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 data collected are fit for the purpose of this evaluation. Literature sources are there but they could have been even more detailed. In any case, there are more qualitative than quantitative sources
<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>			

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for (Draft) Final Evaluation Reports

4. Analysis and judgments	Check that analysis is sound and relevant	
	<p>a. Analytical framework is sound</p> <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>Y</p> <p>The <b>analytical framework</b> was sound. The methodological approach combines theoretical and empirical approaches and includes quantitative and qualitative approaches to address the different types of analysis that are required to respond to the evaluation questions.</p>
5. Usefulness of recommendations	<p>b. Conclusions are sound</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>	<p>Y</p> <p>Conclusions are sound. Final conclusions are based on evaluation questions' conclusions. Results are not surprising but balanced and addressing the evaluation questions.</p>
	<p>a. Recommendations are useful</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>	<p>Y</p> <p>The recommendations flow from the evaluation questions' conclusions and from the final conclusions.</p>
	<p>b. Recommendations are complete</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recommendations cover all relevant main conclusions</li> </ul>	<p>Y</p> <p>There are many sectors analysed in this evaluation, therefore it is extremely difficult to establish general conclusions and recommendations addressing them all.</p>

**CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for (Draft) Final Evaluation Reports**

<b>6. Clarity of the report</b>	<b>a. Report is easy to read</b>	<b>Y</b>	The report is written in a clear manner and easy to read. There is some repetition in some paragraphs. There are many sectors in scope and to present a better overview, the contractor made use of tables.
	<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>6. Clarity of the report</b>	<b>b. Report is logical and focused</b>	<b>Y</b>	The report is logical. However, readability could have been improved.
	<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	