

European Commission, DG INTPA Evaluation Support Service

Quality Assurance for Final Evaluation 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

	Scale	Explanation
Legend: scores and their meaning	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, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers (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 Highlights the key messages	<i>Select from list</i>
1.3 The length of the various chapters and annexes of the Report are well balanced	<i>Select from list</i>
1.4 Contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding	<i>Select from list</i>
1.5 Contain a list of acronyms	<i>Select from list</i>
1.6 Avoid unnecessary duplications	<i>Select from list</i>
1.7 Have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors	<i>Select from list</i>
1.8 The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document	<i>Select from list</i>
1.9 Respects the compulsory format of the Report given in the ToR	<i>Select from list</i>
Section score	

2. RELIABILITY OF DATA AND ROBUSTNESS OF EVIDENCE	SCORE
2.1 Data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology (defined in the report and endorsed in the Inception Report - if not justifications are provided)	<i>Select from list</i>
2.2 The report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners' relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations	<i>Select from list</i>
2.3 The report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures	<i>Select from list</i>
Section score	

3. VALIDITY OF FINDINGS	SCORE
3.1 Findings (intended and unintended) derive from the evidence gathered	<i>Select from list</i>
3.2 Findings address all selected evaluation criteria	<i>Select from list</i>
3.3 Findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources	<i>Select from list</i>
3.4 When assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts	<i>Select from list</i>
3.5 The analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors	<i>Select from list</i>
3.6 Where appropriate the analysis and findings address the cross-cutting issues of gender, climate change, SDGs etc.	<i>Select from list</i>
Section score	

4. VALIDITY OF CONCLUSIONS	SCORE
4.1 Conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis	<i>Select from list</i>
4.2 Conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the evaluation questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions	<i>Select from list</i>
4.3 Conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation	<i>Select from list</i>
4.4 Conclusions are coherent and balanced (i.e. they present a credible picture of both strengths and weaknesses), and are free of personal or partisan considerations	<i>Select from list</i>
4.5 (If relevant) whether the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues	<i>Select from list</i>
Section score	

5. USEFULNESS OF RECOMMENDATIONS		SCORE
5.1	Are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions	<i>Select from list</i>
5.2	Are concrete, achievable and realistic	<i>Select from list</i>
5.3	Are targeted to specific addressees	<i>Select from list</i>
5.4	Are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound	<i>Select from list</i>
5.5	(If relevant) provide advice for the Intervention's exit strategy, post-Intervention sustainability or for adjusting Intervention's design or plans	<i>Select from list</i>
Section score		

6. APPROPRIATENESS OF LESSONS LEARNT ANALYSIS (IF REQUESTED BY THE TOR OR INCLUDED BY THE EVALUATORS)		SCORE
6.1	Lessons are identified	<i>Select from list</i>
6.2	When relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s)	<i>Select from list</i>
6.3	Lessons are well connected to the discussions in the body of the report and previous categories given in this QA checklist	<i>Select from list</i>
Section score		

OVERALL SCORE		
Category		Score
1	Clarity of the report	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>
2	Reliability of data and robustness of evidence	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>
3	Validity of Findings	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>
4	Validity of conclusions	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>
5	Usefulness of recommendations	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>
6	Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis (if requested)	<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.