

**Quality Assessment for Final Report of Evaluation study on the application of Directive 2011/82/EU facilitating the cross-border exchange of information on road safety related traffic offences (Service Contract MOVE/C4/SER/2014-255/SI2.706133)**

**DG/Unit** DG MOVE C.4  
**Official(s) managing the evaluation:** Rudolf KORONTHÁLY

**Evaluators:**  
 SG/ Annette SCHAEFER  
 DG JUST/Eniko FELFOLDI  
 DG HOME/Barry MCGREAL  
 DG DIGIT/Konstantinos BOVALIS  
 DG DIGIT/Peter BURIAN  
 DG MOVE/Sandrine FAORO  
 DG MOVE/Rudolf KORONTHÁLY  
 DG MOVE/Emese VIDA  
 DG MOVE/Espen RINDEDAL

**Assessment carried out by<sup>(\*)</sup>:**

Steering group X  
 Evaluation Function ---  
 Other (please specify) ---

(\*) Multiple crosses possible

**Date of assessment** 31/05/2016

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for (Draft) 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	
	c. Has covered the requested scope for time period, geographical areas, target groups, aspects of the intervention, etc.	Y	
2. Overall contents of report	Check that the report includes:		
	a. Executive Summary according to an agreed format, in the three languages	Y	
	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	Nevertheless, there are some minor mistakes and inconsistencies in calculations.
	<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	
<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 methodology is

**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>		
	<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>		not always clearly explained.		
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;"><b>b. Conclusions are sound</b></td> <td align="center"><b>Y</b></td> </tr> </table> <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>	<b>b. Conclusions are sound</b>	<b>Y</b>		
<b>b. Conclusions are sound</b>	<b>Y</b>				
5. Usefulness of recommendations	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;"><b>a. Recommendations are useful</b></td> <td align="center"><b>N</b></td> </tr> </table> <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>	<b>a. Recommendations are useful</b>	<b>N</b>		Recommendations are mainly focused on what Member States should do, while recommendations for the Commission's possible actions are insufficient and vague.
	<b>a. Recommendations are useful</b>	<b>N</b>			
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;"><b>b. Recommendations are complete</b></td> <td align="center"><b>Y</b></td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recommendations cover all relevant main conclusions</li> </ul>	<b>b. Recommendations are complete</b>	<b>Y</b>			
<b>b. Recommendations are complete</b>	<b>Y</b>				
6. Clarity of the report	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;"><b>a. Report is easy to read</b></td> <td align="center"><b>N</b></td> </tr> </table> <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>a. Report is easy to read</b>	<b>N</b>		The quality of the language is insufficient, as well as the style.
	<b>a. Report is easy to read</b>	<b>N</b>			
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;"><b>b. Report is logical and focused</b></td> <td align="center"><b>Y</b></td> </tr> </table>	<b>b. Report is logical and focused</b>	<b>Y</b>		However, there are	
<b>b. Report is logical and focused</b>	<b>Y</b>				

**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>
	<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>		<p>some duplications, the report is lengthy and it is not easy to get an overview, including key results (it is a report for experts rather than general public).</p>

<b>Overall conclusion</b>		
<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 align="center">Y</p>	