

European Commission, DG INTPA Evaluation Support Service

Quality Assurance for Inception Report

Evaluation Title	Type here
Review Date	Type here
Review Version of document (V1, V2,...)	Type here
Eval Module reference (if known)	Type here
Reviewed by (ESS staff/consultant name)	Type here

Legend: scores and their meaning	Scale	Explanation
	Very Satisfactory	The criterion was fully met (or exceeded)
	Satisfactory	The criterion was met with only minor shortcomings.
	Unsatisfactory	The criterion was partially met with some shortcomings.
	Very Unsatisfactory	There were major shortcomings
	<i>Non-relevant</i>	<i>Criteria is ignored in scoring grid and related averages</i>

1. CLARITY OF THE REPORT	SCORE
1.1 Is easily readable, and understandable (it is free of jargon, written in plain English or French, has logical use of chapters, appropriate use of tables, graphs and diagrams).	<i>Select from list</i>
1.2 Appropriate page length (20 to 30 pages in total)	<i>Select from list</i>
1.3 The annexes contain – at the least – the original TORs, the evaluation matrix, a bibliography and a list of consultees.	<i>Select from list</i>
Section score	

2. INTRODUCTION	SCORE
2.1 The report provides appropriate description to the context of the evaluation, its objectives and focus	<i>Select from list</i>
2.2 It explains the timing of the evaluation and its expected outputs and use.	<i>Select from list</i>
2.3 Any departures from the original TOR are adequately explained and justified.	<i>Select from list</i>
Section score	

3. FINALISED EVALUATION QUESTIONS WITH JUDGEMENT CRITERIA AND INDICATORS	SCORE
3.1 The total number of Evaluation Questions are equal to or lower than 10	<i>Select from list</i>
3.2 Questions are detailed, open ended and focused on 'why' and 'how'	<i>Select from list</i>
3.3 Questions are sensitive to to the context, including gender, age, and disabilities issues (as relevant)	<i>Select from list</i>
3.4 The judgement criteria and indicators are well defined and are relevant to the EQs and coherent to the objectives of evaluation (2.1), its scope (2.2.1) and the Evaluation Questions (2.2.2)	<i>Select from list</i>
3.5 The evaluation matrix is clearly articulated indicating the evaluation criteria, data sources and methods for gathering and analysis.	<i>Select from list</i>
Section score	

4. METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION	SCORE
4.1 The IR provides a detailed overview of the evaluation process, its design and the choice of evaluation criteria	<i>Select from list</i>
4.2 The proposed design, tools and methods are appropriate for addressing the evaluation mandate and their relative strenghts are explained	<i>Select from list</i>
4.3 The consultation strategy is clear and appropriate [as needed]	<i>Select from list</i>
4.4 The structuring and organisation of the different phases of the evaluation, including planning of the missions is clear	<i>Select from list</i>
4.5 Methodological limitations are acknowledged, their impact on evaluation design is discussed and appropriate mitigation measures envisaged.	<i>Select from list</i>
Section score	

5. RISKS AND ETHICS	SCORE
5.1 The IR explains how the evaluation avoids harm; attains informed consent; ensures confidentiality and demonstrates contextual sensitivity	<i>Select from list</i>
5.2 The IR contains a section describing actual or potential conflict of interest affecting the evaluation team and an appropriate mitigation strategy is explained.	<i>Select from list</i>
Section score	

6. WORKPLAN		SCORE
6.1	A sufficiently detailed free text description of the work plan is provided in the IR	<i>Select from list</i>
6.2	The workplan is provided in Gantt format	<i>Select from list</i>
		Section score

OVERALL SCORE		
Category		Score
1	Clarity of the report	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>
2	Introduction	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>
3	Finalised Evaluation Questions with judgement criteria and indicators	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>
4	Methodology of the evaluation	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>
5	Risk and Ethics	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>
6	Workplan	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>

Passing Criteria: for a document to pass the QA check, the average of the section scores must be Very satisfactory or Satisfactory AND no section score should be scored Very Unsatisfactory.