

## Quality Assessment for (Draft)<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup> 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 Second Intermediate Evaluation of the Functioning of the SANTE non-food Scientific Committees (SCs) Final Report

DG/Unit	DG SANTE C2
Mailbox managing the evaluation:	SANTE-C2-SCIENTIFIC-COMMITTEES@ec.europa.eu
Evaluator:	Economisti Associati
Assessment carried out by <sup>(*)</sup> :	
Steering group	X

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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 Final Evaluation Reports

Evaluation Function	[ ]
Other (please specify)	[ ]
(*) Multiple crosses possible	
<b>Date of assessment</b>	[03/05/2016]

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	
	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	DE translation was requested and provided at final stage (in addition to the original contract )
	b. Main report with required components <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>	Y	
	c. All required annexes	Y	PPT presentation was also delivered for presentation to the new SCs (29/04/2016)
3. Data collection	Check that data is accurate and complete		
	a. Data is accurate <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>	Y	
	b. Data is complete <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>	Y	Correcting measure has been taken at the end of the work: see last survey process among all members of the SCs to check their

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
			reply or agree/not with statements made.
4. Analysis and judgments	Check that analysis is sound and relevant		
	a. Analytical framework is sound <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>	Y	Last comments from the Steering group were taken into account to clarify and complete the methodology part
	b. Conclusions are sound <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>	Y	
	a. Recommendations are useful <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>	Y	Some changes to the structure of the Scientific Committees that are part of the recommendations had already been implemented before the end of the evaluation process. The evaluation thus confirmed the need for those actions.
5. Usefulness of recommendations	b. Recommendations are complete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recommendations cover all relevant main conclusions</li> </ul>	Y	

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
6. Clarity of the report	a. Report is easy to read	Y	The Steering group requested an easier language and shorter sentences. It has been widely applied in the main report but annexes could have been improved in that sense.
	<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. Report is logical and focused	Y	The contractor addressed the steering group's request to revise totally the structure of the final report according to the Better Regulation guidelines. This revision added better clarity for the non-expert reader.
	<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>		

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	The final report was sent to the members of the Steering group on 3 May 2016. General and more specific comments made by the Steering Group were taken into account in the final report. As no further issues were noted, it was acknowledged and agreed by the Steering Group.

## CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports