

Quality Assessment for (Draft)¹ 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.

¹ If the QA is carried out on the draft final report (as opposed to the final report), it will need to be updated once the final report is being reviewed.

Quality Assessment for Final Report	
DG/Unit	DG AGRI B.3
Evaluator: Ecorys	
Assessment carried out by^(*):	
Steering group	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation Function	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Official managing the evaluation
(*) Multiple crosses possible	
Date of assessment	05/01/2022

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	The synthesis study examines the effectiveness, and efficiency of POSEI and SAI schemes with respect to achieving the objectives laid down in their respective regulations
	b. Has undertaken the tasks described in the work plan	Y	The synthesis study adequately responds to the information needs 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 requested scope (geographical scope and time scope), target groups and aspects of the intervention have been fully covered
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	
	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	

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
	c. All required annexes	Y	
3. Data collection	Check that data is accurate and complete		
	a. Data is accurate	Y	The synthesis study uses a variety of quantitative and qualitative data, but limited to those made available by the Commission (documentation provided: implementation reports, programmes)
	<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 		
	b. Data is complete	Y	The evaluators have exploited the available data sources, but data availability was limited (beyond the control of the contractor). The limitations of analysis related to the availability of accurate data is clearly stated
<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 			
4. Analysis and judgments	Check that analysis is sound and relevant		
	a. Analytical framework is sound	Y	<p>The design of the synthesis study is appropriate for addressing the objectives set.</p> <p>The study consisted in deskwork and was carried out in four phases: structuring, observing, analysis and judgement. The methodology for answering evaluation questions (analysis and judgement) were based on transparent criteria and the limitations of approaches were clearly presented and taken into account in the interpretation of the results.</p>
	<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 		
b. Conclusions are sound	Y		

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"> ▪ 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>The findings are based on clearly defined evaluation criteria and supported by the evidence provided through the analysis. The conclusions are substantiated by findings, which in turn were drawn from the sound analysis. Given the data constraints, they are balanced and prudent.</p>
5. Usefulness of recommendations	a. Recommendations are useful	Y	<p>The recommendations are based on the evaluation conclusions.</p> <p>They can realistically be considered for improving the programmes' management by requiring a clearer strategy of the programmes, reinforcement of coherence with other programmes or more focused reporting in order to better assess compliance with the objectives.</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 		
	b. Recommendations are complete	Y	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations cover all relevant main conclusions 			
6. Clarity of the report	a. Report is easy to read	Y	<p>The synthesis study is structured and balanced, following the elements required by the terms of reference. The overall clarity of the report is good.</p>
	<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 		

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
	b. Report is logical and focused	Y	
	<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 		

Overall conclusion		
<p>The report could be approved in its current state, as it overall complies with the contractual conditions and relevant professional evaluation standards</p>		<p><u>The overall quality of the report is adequate, fulfils the contractual conditions and can be scored as satisfactory.</u> It could serve as a useful reference material supporting the Commission to respond to its obligation of submitting two general reports to the European Parliament and to the Council showing the impact of the action taken under the Regulations n° 228/2013 (POSEI) and n° 229/2013 (SAI), in accordance respectively with their articles 32(3)² and 20(3)³.</p>

² REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL on the implementation of the scheme of specific measures for agriculture in favour of the outermost regions of the Union (POSEI) - COM(2021) 765 final

³ REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL on the implementation of the scheme of specific measures for agriculture in favour of the smaller Aegean islands (SAI) - COM/2021/763 final