

Quality Assessment for 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 package¹ 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.

Quality Assessment for Evaluation of Directive 2009/21/EC on compliance with Flag State Requirements and Directive 2009/18/EC establishing the fundamental principles governing the investigation of accidents in the maritime transport sector - Final Report

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| DG/Unit | DG MOVE / D.2 (Maritime Safety) |
| Official(s) managing the evaluation: | Jacob Terling & John Burke |
| Evaluator: | ECORYS |
| Assessment carried out by^(*): | |
| Steering group | Y |

¹ The package is composed of the draft final SWD; the draft final report produced by the consultants; roadmap and minutes of the last SG meeting.

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for (Draft) Final Evaluation Reports

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Evaluation Function | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (*) Multiple crosses possible | |
| Date of assessment | 29/08/2017 |

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 | <i>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.</i> |
| 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 <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 | |
| | c. All required annexes | Y | |
| 3. Data collection | Check that data is accurate and complete | | |
| | a. Data is accurate <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 | Y | <i>It is generally accepted that reliable maritime statistics are difficult to obtain and verify. The contractor has nonetheless made a genuine effort to find and use to the</i> |

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for (Draft) Final Evaluation Reports

| Objective of the assessment | Aspects to be assessed | Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A | Comments |
|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|
| | | | <i>extent possible what is available, including data from EMSA.</i> |
| | b. Data is complete <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 | Y | <i>Bearing in mind the limited availability of data, the contractor has undertaken a systematic effort to gather all data available.</i> |
| 4. Analysis and judgments | Check that analysis is sound and relevant | | |
| | a. Analytical framework is sound <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 | Y | <i>The analysis has been refined following the discussions both in the ISG and with MOVE unit D.2 and EMSA. The understanding of AI as part of FS obligations but, in the context of EU law, an autonomous body has been taken into account.</i> |
| | b. Conclusions are sound <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 | Y | <i>Findings corroborate existing knowledge and respect the internationally agreed set up for States as flag States.</i> |
| | a. Recommendations are useful <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 | Y | |
| 5. Usefulness of recommendations | a. Recommendations are useful <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 | Y | |

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for (Draft) Final Evaluation Reports

| Objective of the assessment | Aspects to be assessed | Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A | Comments |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | b. Recommendations are complete | Y | <i>But given the very broad remit of FS obligations and the fact that the Directive is a framework Directive, not more could have been expected. On the other hand for the AI Directive the Recs are more detailed.</i> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations cover all relevant main conclusions | | |
| 6. Clarity of the report | a. Report is easy to read | Y | <i>But respecting the established vocabulary used in the International Conventions and for which there is a specific meaning.</i> |
| | <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 | | |
| | b. Report is logical and focused | Y | <i>Report on the long side, but given the need to cover the two Directives also in context, acceptable.</i> |
| | <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 | | |
|--|---|--|
| The report could be approved in its current state, as it overall complies with the contractual conditions and relevant professional evaluation standards | Y | <i>Good cooperation with the contractor leading to a better understanding of involved issues in a complex setting.</i> |