

Quality Assessment for the Final Report of the Support Study to the Ex-post Evaluation of Regulation (EC) No 392/2009

DG/Unit	[MOVE/D2]
Official(s) managing the evaluation:	[Ms Leмония Tsaroucha]
External Contractor:	[Ecorys NL (consortium)]
Assessment carried out by^(*):	
Steering group	[+]
Evaluation Function	[]
Other (please specify)	[]
(*) Multiple crosses possible	
Date of assessment	[20/01/2017]

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for the Support Study to the Ex-post Evaluation of REG
(EC) No 392/2009

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]	The contractor responded positively to all our comments to the inception and the intermediate report as regards completing the scope of the study in accordance with the scope of the ex-post evaluation. More to the point, they have kept a log of all adjustments made in response to our requests from the start until the final report.
2. Overall contents of report	Check that the report includes:		
	a. Executive Summary according to an agreed format, in the three languages	[Y]	The ToRs approved by SG for this specific contract, in the context of Framework Contract MOVE/A3/119-2013 Lot 4, required the Executive Summary in two working languages (EN and FR)
	b. Main report with required components	[Y]	

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for the Support Study to the Ex-post Evaluation of REG
(EC) No 392/2009

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
	<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 		
	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"> ▪ Data is free from factual and logical errors ▪ The report is consistent, i.e. no contradictions ▪ Calculations are correct 		
	b. Data is complete	[Y]	<p>Bearing in mind the limited availability of data pertaining to the application of this Regulation, we note that the contractor has undertaken a systematic effort to gather all data available within the timeframe of this study. Wherever difficulties were encountered, in particular low response rate to questionnaires and unavailability of public information, the contractor has undertaken mitigating measures, i.e. carried out a series of additional interviews with stakeholders,</p>
<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 			

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for the Support Study to the Ex-post Evaluation of REG
(EC) No 392/2009

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
			which proved to be the most appropriate means of gathering information in this case.
4. Analysis and judgments	Check that analysis is sound and relevant		
	a. Analytical framework is sound	[Y]	Triangulation of evidence was pursued by the contractor throughout the study – and we insisted upon it. Presenting clearly the different stakeholders' input was a point we specifically emphasised for the draft final report, and was addressed in the final report.
	<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]	The limited time during which the Regulation has been in force, and the existing opt-outs that applied during the evaluation period are pointed out clearly in the final report and in the conclusions.
<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 			
5. Usefulness of recommendations	a. Recommendations are useful	[Y]	
	<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	a. Report is easy to read	[Y]	

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for the Support Study to the Ex-post Evaluation of REG
(EC) No 392/2009

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

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]	