

Annex 4

Quality standards for evaluation¹

Quality of the evaluation process	Quality of the evaluation report
Coherent objectives: The objectives of the NSRF and the operational programmes shall be coherent enough to facilitate evaluation.	Meeting needs: The evaluation report adequately and accurately addresses information needs and corresponds to the terms of reference (TOR).
Adequate terms of reference: The terms of reference shall be drawn up in a form that does not require revision.	Relevant scope: The rationale, outputs, results, impacts, interactions with other policies and unexpected effects have been carefully studied (depending on the evaluation scope and evaluation questions)
Tender selection of evaluator: The selection process shall be conducted in accordance with the law and the chosen tenderer shall be able to perform the evaluation to a professional standard.	Open process: The interested parties shall be involved in the design of the evaluation and in the discussion of the results in order to take into account their arguments and explain their point of view.
Effective dialogue and feedback: Evaluation shall be carried out in a spirit of partnership; the evaluator shall enter into dialogue with decision-makers and managers; feedback shall be provided to partners which improves the quality of evaluation.	Defensible design – the design of evaluation shall be adequate for obtaining the results needed to answer all the evaluation questions.
Adequate information: A functioning monitoring system shall be created to provide data for the evaluation; administrators and partners shall have access.	Reliable data: The primary and secondary data collected or selected shall be suitable and reliable in terms of their expected use.
Professional evaluation management: The evaluation team shall be professionally managed with adequate support for the performance of evaluation.	Sound analysis: Quantitative and qualitative data shall be analysed in accordance with well-established conventions and in ways appropriate to answer the evaluation questions correctly.
Effective dissemination to decision-makers: The evaluation reports/evaluation results were disseminated to relevant decision makers, who responded appropriately with timely feedback.	Reliable results: The results are logical and justified by the analysis of data and suitable interpretation and hypotheses.

¹ Quality standards were elaborated on the basis of the Communication for the Commission from the President and Mrs Schreyer, C (2002) 5267/1 of 23 December 2002, Evaluation Standards and Good Practice and the Communication to the Commission from Ms Grybauskaitė in Agreement with the President, SEC (2007) 213 of 21 February 2007, Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation.

<p>Effective dissemination to stakeholders: The evaluation reports/evaluation results shall be suitably disseminated to all stakeholders and targeted in ways that support the learning of lessons.</p>	<p>Impartial conclusions: The conclusions shall be justified and unbiased.</p>
	<p>Clear report: The report shall describe the context and goal as well as the organisation and results of the operational programme in such a way that the information provided is easily understood. The report shall include a coherent executive summary; the results of evaluation shall be disseminated to other member states for exchange of experience and good practice.</p>
	<p>Useful recommendations: The report shall provide recommendations that are useful to decision-makers and stakeholders and are detailed enough to be implemented.</p>