



Brussels, 2.10.2013  
COM(2013) 686 final

**ANNEX**

*to the*

**COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN  
PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL  
COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS**

**Strengthening the foundation of Smart Regulation - improving evaluation**

## ANNEX - WHAT THIS WOULD MEAN FOR EVALUATION

**To build on existing good practices and satisfy the "evaluate first" principle, it would be required that the following steps are met to qualify as a Commission evaluation.**

**A.** The evaluation is followed by a **Steering Group** with a minimum of three members, including at least one from the Directorate General's evaluation function. Where the intervention clearly overlaps with the responsibilities of other Directorates General, they must be invited to participate in the steering group. The steering group will be consulted on the mandate, terms of reference (where applicable) and all draft reports. It will contribute to the quality of all deliverables and provide input to the quality assessment of the final report, based on a minimum set of pre-determined criteria.

**B.** All evaluations **assess the evaluation criteria of: effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, relevance and EU added value of the intervention**, or provide due justification why this is not the case. Other evaluation criteria may be added, as appropriate. The exact level of analysis provided for each criterion will differ according to the intervention being evaluated and the point reached in the intervention's lifecycle.

**C.** An **evaluation mandate** is published centrally, early in the process, indicating:

- i. The purpose and scope of the evaluation;
- ii. The background and objectives of the intervention being evaluated (including a short description of how these were expected to be achieved);
- iii. The expected start and publication date of the final report;
- iv. Contact details, allowing stakeholders to provide feedback.

**D.** Where external contractors are involved, the **Terms of Reference** for their work are published centrally on the same website as the evaluation mandate.

**E.** The evaluation follows a clearly defined **methodology** which addresses the evaluation criteria which have been selected. Where a prior (Commission) impact assessment exists, the same broad categories of impacts must be analysed. Credible efforts must be made to obtain data from a wide range of qualitative and quantitative sources. Any consultation undertaken must comply with the Commission's minimum standards for consultation.

**F.** The **final report** contains:

- i. An executive summary of no more than (6) pages;
- ii. Critical judgement, based on a range of data, of the evaluation criteria which the evaluation intended to address;
- iii. A clear summary of the methodology followed and a final assessment of the limitations of both the approach taken and the data used;
- iv. A clear chain of logic between the analysis and findings presented, the answers to the evaluation questions and the conclusions drawn.

**G.** As a minimum, the evaluation findings are **disseminated** via the central publication of the final report, alongside the evaluation mandate and Quality Assessment.

**H.** The Commission Services in charge of the evaluation draw up a short document outlining their responses to the conclusions and recommendations made in the final evaluation report. They also identify appropriate **follow-up** actions within six months of the completion of the final evaluation report. As useful, regular progress updates must be provided to senior management.