

Evaluation of the EC cooperation with the OCT's/PTOM Final Report

Concerning these criteria, the evaluation report is:	Unacceptable	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
1. Meeting needs: Does the evaluation adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and fit the terms of reference?			x		
2. Relevant scope: Is the rationale of the policy examined and its set of outputs, results and outcomes/impacts examined fully, including both intended and unexpected policy interactions and consequences?			x		
3. Defensible design: Is the evaluation design appropriate and adequate to ensure that the full set of findings, along with methodological limitations, is made accessible for answering the main evaluation questions?			x		
4. Reliable data: To what extent are the primary and secondary data selected adequate? Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?			x		
5. Sound analysis: Is the quantitative and qualitative information appropriately and systematically analysed according to the state of the art so that evaluation questions are answered in a valid way?			x		
6. Credible findings: Do findings follow logically from, and are they justified by, the data analysis and interpretations based on carefully described assumptions and rationale?			x		
7. Validity of the conclusions: Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are conclusions based on credible findings?			x		
8. Usefulness of the recommendations: Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personal or stakeholders' views, and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?			x		
9. Clearly reported: Does the report clearly describe the policy being evaluated, including its context and purpose, together with the procedures and findings of the evaluation, so that information provided can easily be understood?			x		
Taking into account the contextual constraints on the evaluation, the overall quality rating of the report is considered			x		

9. **Clearly reported – good:** In general, the report is easy to read and its structure is logical. An "overall assessment" is missing. The executive summary has to be redrafted (add a chapter on the methodology used and rewrite the conclusions and the recommendations). The report is adapted to its various audiences and is not more technical than necessary. There is also a list of acronyms.