

# QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM<sup>1</sup>

## **Title of the evaluation**

**Evaluation of Directive 1999/94/EC ("the car labelling Directive"): Final report**

## **DG CLIMA/Unit C4**

Official(s) managing the evaluation: Raphael Sauter, Willy Breda

**Evaluator/contractor:** Ricardo Energy & Environment

## **Assessment carried out by<sup>(\*)</sup>:**

- Steering group<sup>2</sup>: X
- Evaluation Function : X
- Other (please specify).....

(\*) Multiple crosses possible

**Date of the Quality Assessment** ...June 2016.....

---

<sup>1</sup> Refer to the ['Guide on Scoring the Criteria' for how to assess each criterion.](#)

<sup>2</sup> DG CLIMA, SG, DG MOVE, DG ENER, DG GROW, DG JUST, DG ENV

## **(1) RELEVANCE**

*Does the evaluation respond to information needs, in particular as expressed in the terms of references?*

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
				X	

Arguments for scoring:

The evaluation report covers the scope specified in the Terms of Reference (ToR), in terms of content, reference period and geographical scope. It responds to all 14 evaluation questions as requested in the ToR.

The evaluation adds value to existing policy knowledge by addressing the 5 evaluation dimensions as described in the ToR, even if it does not significantly broaden its understanding as most of the findings are based on existing studies and reports.

If relevant: **Contextual** (such as deficient terms of references) and **contractual constraints** (such as lack of time, insufficient resources)

## **(2) APPROPRIATE DESIGN**

*Is the design of the evaluation adequate for obtaining the results needed to answer the evaluation questions?*

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
				X	

Arguments for scoring:

The method followed is coherent with the evaluation needs and was discussed and agreed with the Commission project team and steering group.

The methodological framework and the research tools used were clearly and adequately described in the report. A well-developed intervention logic was presented and was appropriately referred throughout the various evaluation questions. Additionally, it was completed by an "actions and causal chains" diagram that was useful to structure the analysis. Judgement criteria to help answering the evaluation question were pre-defined in the inception report and are presented in Annex A of the final report.

The main limitations of the method used are acknowledged and clearly discussed in the report. The contractor has considered methodological alternatives, such as establishing a counterfactual scenario in order to assess the effectiveness and the efficiency of the Directive. However, due to several challenges, it was not possible to apply this method, and the analysis was mainly based on a qualitative assessment.

If relevant: **Contextual** (unexpected issues) and **contractual constraints** (such as lack of time and resources)

### **(3) RELIABLE DATA**

*Are data collected adequate for their intended use and have their reliability been ascertained?*

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The evaluation heavily relies on qualitative data gathered through desk research and through the consultation of stakeholders. Some quantitative data are missing to evaluate the effectiveness of the Directive, such as data concerning average CO2 emissions and vehicles sales per label category. This limitation is clearly described in the final report (page 33).

The desk research performed was based on a relevant list of literature such reports of implementation of Directive 1999/94/EC, EU barometer survey, infringement cases, various study reports, etc. In addition, the contractor has conducted an open public consultation, gathering the views of 179 citizens/stakeholders, has interviewed 26 persons and conducted 10 case studies.

The limitations of the inputs received from the open public consultation (open consultation without any sampling method used) are clearly presented (page 30) and has consequently been appropriately used as a complementary data source that may or may not corroborate the findings from other sources.

If relevant: **Contextual** (such as lack of data or access to data base) and **contractual constraints** (such as lack of time and resources)

### **(4) SOUND ANALYSIS**

*Are data systematically analysed to answer evaluation questions and cover other information needs in a valid manner?*

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
				X	

Arguments for scoring:

The report shows a clear, solid and coherent deductive analysis. Explanatory arguments are explicitly presented. The triangulation of information was used as much as possible, but still in some cases, the results of some evaluation questions heavily rely on the views of key stakeholders such as the EQ7 concerning the costs resulting from the implementation of the legislation and the EQ9 concerning the major sources of inefficiencies.

The report covers specific information needs related to the quantification of the costs and benefits of the implementation of the Directive (EQ7).

If relevant: **Contextual** and **contractual constraints** (such as lack of resources and time)

## **(5) CREDIBLE FINDINGS**

*Do findings follow logically from and are justified by, the data/information analysis and interpretations based on pre-established criteria and rational?*

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
				X	

Arguments for scoring:

**The findings are based on transparent judgment criteria and are supported by the evidence base. It adequately balances the evidence provided from different sources.**

**The robustness of the findings is adequately discussed under section 5.3. Limitations in the work, in the available data and subsequent analysis are clearly explained through the evaluation questions.**

**Stakeholder opinions were considered and reflected when appropriate.**

If relevant: Contextual and contractual constraints

## **(6) VALID CONCLUSIONS**

*Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?*

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
				X	

Arguments for scoring:

**The conclusions are well presented per evaluation criteria. The key messages clearly emerge from the report. They reflect well the findings discussed under the evaluation questions and are presented in a balanced manner.**

**In general terms, a clear distinction is made between findings that are based on clear evidence and those based on more mixed evidence. However, in some parts, the link between the collected / available evidence and the derived conclusions could have been better presented.**

If relevant: Contextual and contractual constraints

## **(7) HELPFUL RECOMENDATIONS**

*Are areas needing improvements identified in coherence with the conclusions? Are the suggested options realistic and impartial?*

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
---------	------	--------------	------	-----------	-----------

Arguments for scoring:

**N/A. The contractor was not requested to draft any recommendations in the final report.**

If relevant: **Contextual and contractual constraints**

## **(8) CLARITY**

*Is the report well structured, balanced and written in an understandable manner?*

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
---------	------	--------------	------	-----------	-----------

X

Arguments for scoring:

**The report is well structured and clearly presented. The written style and presentation is adapted for the target readers. Key messages are summarised in a relevant and concise executive summary. Detailed information and technical analysis are left for the appendix. However, a reduction of the report's length would have enhanced its readability.**

**However, the report has a number of "error messages" and problems with cross references to different sections of the report.**

If relevant: **Contextual and contractual constraints**