



EVALUATION OF THE INFORMATION POLICY ON THE CAP

Subject: Quality assessment of the Final Report submitted by Deloitte

PRELIMINARY REMARK

This quality grid provides a global assessment on the above-mentioned evaluation study, and has been agreed by the steering group in charge of the following up of the contract.

The judgement is made on the methodological approach followed to answer the evaluation questions, not on the conclusions and recommendations reached by the contractor. It has to be pointed out that it is neither the opinion of the evaluators nor the content of their conclusions that are judged here, but only the methods used for obtaining them.

1. MEETING THE NEEDS: Does the evaluation adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and fit the terms of reference?

The main task of providing answers to all the evaluation questions set out under the contract's terms of reference has been fulfilled. The structure of the report is sufficiently balanced among the different themes and sections which have been developed and it has been delivered in time. A clear justification of the difficulties in answering the part of efficiency of the measures is presented.

In addition, the consultant did a serious effort in adapting his methodology and redirected the work in accordance to the needs identified and concerns expressed by the steering group.

Global assessment: **good**

2. RELEVANT SCOPE: Is the rationale of the policy examined and its set of outputs, results and outcomes/impacts examined fully, including both intended and unexpected environmental impacts?

The rationale of the whole policy and every one of the different components has not been well investigated in order to explain and analyse every step of the action logic in terms of expected impacts. This would have helped the identification and a better understanding of the key connections in this logic. The evaluation results would have been improved with a targeted work to a better ranking of the key connections. The unexpected effects are not always included.

Global assessment: **poor**

3. DEFENSIBLE DESIGN: Is the evaluation design appropriate and adequate to ensure that the full set of findings, along with methodological limitations, is made accessible for answering the main evaluation questions?

The limitations due to data availability as well as diverse quality of available data were well-known. Substantial efforts have been made by the contractor to overcome those limitations, even during the last phases of the evaluation.

Ethical issues have been properly addressed (as confidentiality in the interviews, bias prevention, etc).

Global assessment: **good**

4. RELIABLE DATA: To what extent are the primary and secondary data selected adequate? Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?

The evaluator used the available material, including the surveys already produced by the Commission Services (e.g. Euro barometer) or by the beneficiaries (e.g. self evaluations mentioned in the Regulation) before the evaluation at hand, in a manner which took account of severe methodological limits and lack of these data, in particular on the impact of the measures.

It is acknowledged that certain data are intrinsically difficult to get at local level or after a significant delay. Most of this information collection had never been conducted before at national/regional level.

Therefore, the need to complete the information available from statistics has been an important issue under this contract. This was mainly addressed through comprehensive series of interviews with important qualitative content, the results of which were not always available in time to have all the necessary impact in terms of added value to the analysis, but the report present the data available in a structured way and clear explanation of the limits of validity.

Global assessment: **satisfactory**

5. SOUND ANALYSIS: Is quantitative and qualitative information appropriately and systematically analysed according to the state of the art so that evaluation questions are answered in a valid way?

The evaluation study implied a two-step approach to be carried out to answer the evaluation questions: the synthesis of available information on one side (together with gathering additional data to fill information gaps through the interviews), and, on the other side, the analysis of that information together with the presentation of relevant findings.

As regards the analysis, the difficulties in the data collection have limited a wide ranging use of the material obtained. More specific tools to make the most of the interviews were not applied.

From the interviews the information was derived in such a way that the systematic analysis according to the themes of the study could be performed. However, the generated information remained very limited in terms of comparing results over time, and over regions/Member States. A more clustered origin of perceptions would also have been appreciated.

Global assessment: **poor**

6. CREDIBLE FINDINGS: Do findings follow logically from, and are they justified by, the data analysis and interpretations based on carefully described assumptions and rationale?

All in all, taking into account the difficulties that prevented them to be comprehensive the findings presented are based on the data obtained and on explicit assumptions, they are justified and the evidence presented in a clear and transparent way. The limitations of the analysis and the data are also clearly explained.

The findings presented are relevant for all the questions considered.

Global assessment: **satisfactory**

7. VALIDITY OF THE CONCLUSIONS: Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are conclusions based on credible results?

The conclusions are based on the main findings presented, and they are well organised: for each targeted group and kind of activity. It is acknowledged that it is far from easy to provide clear conclusions on 7 themes for several kinds of activities, managed in 2 schemes (direct and indirect actions) in 15 Member States. The conclusions are normally based on the content of the chapter summaries and linked to the evaluation question at hand.

The synthesis of the information gathered at national level is converted into a limited number of relevant statements for the European level. Valuable observations and conclusions deal with the implementation of the information measures.

Global assessment: **satisfactory**

8. USEFULNESS OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS: Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personal or stakeholders' views, and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?

The recommendations are linked to the conclusions and evidences presented in the report, they are unbiased by personal or stakeholders' views. Recommendations issued by the consultant are sufficiently detailed. They are linked to every activity and cover both operational and overall objectives, responding in that sense to the needs of the commissioning body.

The number of the recommendations issued is large and for this reason some priorities would be necessary to better match the needs.

In spite of that some of them are not realistic, in general the feasibility has been considered, and even some elements of costing is taking into account.

Global assessment: **satisfactory**

9. CLEAR REPORT: Does the report clearly describe the policies evaluated, including their context and purpose, together with the procedures and findings of the evaluation, so that information provided can easily be understood?

The consultant has presented a readable overview of the impacts of the information policy measures, their effectiveness and relevance. The basic Regulation 814/2000, its implementation rules and procedures as well as the methodological aspects of the evaluation are clearly explained.

The report is written in a sufficiently clear language considering the variety of measures, stakeholders, sectors, impacts and regions. The summaries for the evaluation questions are sufficiently clear, repetitions has been avoided.

The length of the report is adequate considering the needs.

Global assessment: **good**

10. ASSESSMENT OF THE REPORT AS A WHOLE

Taking into consideration all the aspects discussed above, the overall judgement of this evaluation report is: **SATISFACTORY**

Concerning these criteria, the report is :	Unaccep- -table	Poor	Satisfac- -tory	Good	Excel- -lent
1. Meeting the needs: Does the evaluation adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and fit the terms of reference?				X	
2. Relevant scope: Is the rationale of the policy examined and its set of outputs, results and outcomes/impacts examined fully, including both intended and unexpected policy interactions and consequences?		X			
3. Defensible design: Is the evaluation design appropriate and adequate to ensure that the full set of findings, along with methodological limitations, is made accessible for answering the main evaluation questions?				X	
4. Reliable data: To what extent are the primary and secondary data selected adequate? Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?			X		
5. Sound analysis: Is quantitative and qualitative information appropriately and systematically analysed according to the state of the art so that evaluation questions are answered in a valid way?		X			
6. Credible findings: Do findings follow logically from, and are they justified by, the data analysis and interpretations based on carefully described assumptions and rationale?			X		
7. Validity of the conclusions: Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are conclusions based on credible results?			X		
8. Usefulness of the recommendations: Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personal or stakeholders' views, and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?			X		
9. Clearly reported: Does the report clearly describe the policy evaluated, including its context and purpose, together with the procedures and findings of the evaluation, so that information provided can easily be understood?				X	
Taking into account the contextual constraints on the evaluation, the overall quality rating of the report is considered :			X		