

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL TAXATION AND CUSTOMS UNION Direct taxation, Tax Coordination, Economic Analysis and Evaluation **Economic analysis**, evaluation & impact assessment support

ANNEX X

TAXUD/2012/AO-02

Provision of evaluation and impact assessment-related services

DG TAXUD'S QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM FOR FINAL EVALUATION REPORTS

All evaluations financed through the framework contract are subject to a quality assessment by DG TAXUD. The form below is used to perform this assessment. Contractors are made aware that this form may be published alongside the evaluation.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM¹

Title of the evaluation	
 Draft final report Final report Other, specify type 	
DG/Unit	TAXUD / D.4
• Official(s) managing the evaluation:	
Evaluator/contractor	

ssessment carried out by $^{(*)}$:
 Steering group Evaluation Function Other (please specify)
(*) Multiple ticks possible
ate of the Quality Assessment

	Unacceptable	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
1. Meeting needs: Does the evaluation adequately respond to the evaluation questions and? Does the evaluation meet the information needs of the commissioning body?					
2. Relevant scope: Does the scope of the study cover the foreseen time period, geographical area, target groups, etc.? Are limitations in the scope discussed and justified? Are effects on other policies, programs, groups, areas etc considered and are unintended consequences identified?					
3. Defensible design: Is the evaluation design appropriate and adequate to ensure that the rational of the program/policy as well as the related cause-effect relations, outcomes, policy context, and stakeholder interests are taken into account? Have the judgement criteria been sufficiently explained and linked to available indicators?					
Quality of the Analysis					
4a. Reliable data: To what extent are the primary and secondary data selected adequate? Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?					
4b. Sound analysis: Is the quantitative and qualitative information appropriately and systematically analysed so that evaluation questions are answered in a valid way?					
4c. Credible findings: Do findings follow logically from, and are they justified by, the data analysis and interpretations based on carefully described assumptions and rationale?					
4d. Validity of the conclusions: Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are					

conclusions based on credible findings?			
5. Usefulness of the recommendations: Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personal or stakeholders' views, and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?			
6. Clearly reported: Does the report clearly describe the policy being evaluated, including its context and purpose so that information provided can easily be understood? Are the judgement criteria of the evaluation sufficiently explained or visible in the report?			
Taking into account the contextual constraints on the evaluation, the overall quality rating of the report is considered			

Observations and Judgement

Taking into account the contextual constraints on the evaluation, the overall quality
rating of the report is considered (ranging from <u>unacceptable</u> to <u>excellent</u>):
•
1. Meeting needs: .
2. Relevant scope: .
2. Relevant scope.
3. Defensible design: .
4. Quality of the Analysis: .
5. Usefulness of the recommendations: .
6. Clearly reported: .