

Comprehensiveness Considers the extent of the problem space that has or will be explored for the system under study as an indicator of the breadth and depth of coverage and understanding attainable.	Relevance Considers the relevance of evidence (e.g. source studies, literature, data) and assumptions informing the findings for the problem currently being considered.	Objectivity Considers the extent to which sources of evidence have been peer-reviewed and independent challenge sought.	Quantity Considers the number and variety of sources as part of a balanced approach to the generation of evidence or the extent of the track record where variety is limited or unnecessary.	Consistency Considers the extent of agreement between multiple sources of evidence (trends/patterns) and how it supports the findings and/or the extent to which alternative accounts for the findings are explored.	Profile Level
<p>All key aspects of the problem and related uncertainties have been or will be explored.</p> <p>System outputs and all internal behaviour of the system can be described. All important processes in the system can be explained.</p> <p>Full or partial control can be exercised under normal circumstances and some system behaviour can be predicted or controlled under unusual conditions. This equates to a 'known knowns' perspective on the problem.</p>	<p>Evidence used to inform the findings draws from an extensive number of sources. These provide multiple relevant perspectives for understanding the wider context of the problem.</p> <p>Changes to relevant assumptions which could drive the findings have no impact.</p> <p>There is assessed to be a very small inferential gap between material and findings for the current problem.</p>	<p>Sources of evidence that inform the findings drawn have had extensive challenge.</p> <p>Review and scrutiny has been external to the study programme domain. For example, from across the wider Department or relevant national or international organisations.</p> <p>Relevant caveats and assumptions have been clearly stated. They do not limit the utility of the work for its stated purpose.</p>	<p>The problem is complicated or complex, evidence has or will be drawn from a multi-method approach. This is through the extensive use of combinations of 'hard' and 'soft' methods. These provide multiple lines of enquiry to elicit multiple perspectives.</p> <p>Alternatively, the problem is well understood. Evidence has or will be drawn from a single or limited method approach. This is considered best practice with an extensive track record for addressing problems of this type.</p>	<p>Sources of evidence that inform the findings drawn show strong agreement on trends or patterns across all or the majority of methods employed.</p> <p>There is strong direct support and indirect support for the findings. All relevant alternative accounts and views for the findings have been addressed and eliminated.</p> <p>In terms of cause and effect it is possible to say that A causes B.</p>	1
<p>The majority of the key aspects and related uncertainties have been or will be explored.</p> <p>System outputs and some internal behaviour of the system can be described. Some or all important processes in the system can be explained. Some changes in output or behaviour can be predicted for a limited time.</p> <p>Full or partial control can be exercised under normal circumstances. This equates to a 'known unknowns' perspective on the problem.</p>	<p>Evidence used to inform the findings draws from a good number of sources. These have some relevant perspectives for understanding the wider context of the problem.</p> <p>Changes to relevant assumptions which could drive the findings have some but no significant impact.</p> <p>There is assessed to be a small inferential gap between material and findings for the current problem.</p>	<p>Sources of evidence that inform the findings drawn have had a good level of challenge.</p> <p>Review and scrutiny has been external to the study programme domain. For example, from across other programme domains but not in the wider Department.</p> <p>Relevant caveats and assumptions have been clearly stated. To some extent they limit the utility of the work for its stated purpose.</p>	<p>The problem is complicated or complex, evidence has or will be drawn from a multi-method approach. This is through a good but limited use of combinations of 'hard' and 'soft' methods. These provide alternative lines of enquiry to elicit a variety of perspectives.</p> <p>Alternatively the problem is quite well understood. Evidence has or will be drawn from a single or limited method approach. This is considered good practice with a good track record for addressing problems of this type.</p>	<p>Sources of evidence that inform the findings drawn show moderate agreement on trends or patterns across all or the majority of methods employed.</p> <p>There is moderate direct support and indirect support for the findings. Salient alternative accounts and some non-salient accounts and views for the findings have been addressed and eliminated.</p> <p>In terms of cause and effect it is possible to say that A is very likely to cause B.</p>	2
<p>There are some key aspects and related uncertainties that have not or will not be explored.</p> <p>The nature of the problem space may be considered complex such that aspects are not easily explored. System outputs or some relationships, possibly correlations, between inputs and outputs can be described.</p> <p>Prediction is based on a continuing assumption of outputs being correlated to inputs. Reliable control is not possible. This equates to an 'unknown unknowns' perspective on the problem.</p>	<p>Evidence used to inform the findings draws from a limited number of sources. These provide a limited number of perspectives for exploring the wider context of the problem.</p> <p>Changes to some of the relevant assumptions that could drive the findings have a significant impact.</p> <p>There is assessed to be a large inferential gap between material and findings but it is asserted there is no doubt as to the value of their contribution for the current problem.</p>	<p>Sources of evidence that inform the findings drawn have had some but limited challenge.</p> <p>Review and scrutiny has been external to the study team but within the study programme domain.</p> <p>Relevant caveats and assumptions have been clearly stated. These largely limit the utility of the work for its stated purposes.</p>	<p>The problem is complicated or complex, evidence has or will be drawn from a single method approach. This is through a good but limited use of combinations of techniques within the set of 'hard' or 'soft' methods. This provides few alternative lines of enquiry reducing the variety of perspectives.</p> <p>Alternatively the problem is well or quite well understood. Evidence has or will be drawn from a single or limited method approach with a limited track record addressing problems of this type.</p>	<p>Sources of evidence that inform the findings drawn show some agreement in trends or patterns across all or the majority of methods employed.</p> <p>There is some direct support and indirect support for the findings. Most salient alternative accounts and some non-salient accounts and views for the findings have been addressed and eliminated. Some alternative accounts remain that could support the findings.</p> <p>The problem space is such that cause and effect is difficult to disentangle or multiple competing hypotheses may exist. It is possible to say that A may well cause B.</p>	3
<p>The majority of the key aspects and related uncertainties have not or will not be explored. The nature of the problem space may be chaotic meaning that aspects are difficult to explore.</p> <p>It is very difficult to explain or predict system behaviour and control is not possible.</p> <p>Understanding is absent or very limited and equates to an 'unknowable unknowns' perspective on the problem.</p>	<p>Evidence used to inform the findings draws from a very limited number of sources. These provide a very limited number of perspectives for exploring the wider problem context.</p> <p>Changes to most of the relevant assumptions that could drive the findings have a significant impact.</p> <p>There is assessed to be a very large inferential gap between material and findings and the current problem such that there is significant doubt as to the value of their contribution.</p>	<p>Sources of evidence that inform the findings drawn have had little and very limited challenge.</p> <p>Review and scrutiny has been within the study project team.</p> <p>Relevant caveats and assumptions have not all been clearly stated. This greatly limits the utility of the work for its stated purposes.</p>	<p>The problem is complicated or complex, evidence has or will be drawn from a very limited use of a technique within the set of 'hard' or 'soft' methods. This provides no alternative lines of enquiry and no variety of perspectives.</p> <p>Alternatively the problem is well or quite well understood. Evidence has or will be drawn from a single or limited method approach with no track record addressing problems of this type.</p>	<p>Sources of evidence that inform the findings drawn show little or no agreement in trends or patterns across all or the majority of methods employed.</p> <p>There is little or no direct support or indirect support for the findings. Only some alternative accounts and views have been eliminated. Differently founded accounts are also assessed to have particular merit.</p> <p>The problem space is such that discernible patterns or concepts of system behaviour are difficult to establish or do not exist. In terms of cause and effect it is possible to say that A might cause B.</p>	4

Face Validity Considers the extent of the alignment between the issues being examined and how they are characterised in the analysis with the understanding of the 'problem space'. Has the analysis approach engaged or will it engage with the aspects of the problem required by the customer?	Criterion Validity Considers the detailed engagement with the issues within the 'problem space' and the extent to which the analysis actually engages with the issues that it claims to. Is there or will there be good alignment between the things being measured and the things being studied?	Construct Validity Considers how adequate the representation of the issues are within the 'problem space' their structure, the key factors to which they respond and the mechanisms by which they do this. Has the analysis been structured or will it be structured around appropriate concepts relevant to the problem at hand?	Content Validity Considers the interpretative weight that the work undertaken or proposed can bear, as a result of its breadth, depth and granularity. Has the analysis considered or will it consider all relevant aspects for the intended purpose and measured or assessed what it purports to have measured or assessed?	Profile Level
The analysis is thoroughly aligned with the issues and is well structured for the purpose. Relationships to prior knowledge are easily recognised.	Actual variables associated with the issues under study have been directly used in the analysis.	The structure of the functional relationships between issues represented are well described and sufficient for the purpose.	The analysis delivers a thorough understanding of the relevant issues and drivers.	1
The analysis shows good alignment with the issues and is adequately structured for the purpose. Relationships to prior knowledge can be argued for.	Surrogate variables associated with the issues under study have been used and are assessed as being adequate for the purpose.	The structure of the functional relationships between issues represented is adequately described and assessed as being appropriate but not necessarily sufficient for the purpose.	The analysis delivers a good understanding of the relevant issues and drivers.	2
The analysis shows some, but limited alignment with the issues with some concerns about the suitability of the alignment. However, the analysis is largely adequate for the purpose. Relationships to prior knowledge that can be argued for.	Surrogate variables associated with the issues under study have been used extensively but there are concerns about their suitability for the purpose.	The structure of the functional relationships between the issues has been simplistically described but there are concerns about their sufficiency and suitability for the purpose.	The analysis delivers some, but limited, understanding of the relevant issues and drivers.	3
The analysis provides little or no alignment with the issues or prior knowledge and is not adequate for the purpose. Relationships to prior knowledge cannot be argued for.	The linkage between the issues under study and surrogate variables has not been demonstrated hence they are not currently recognised as being suitable for the purpose.	The structure of the functional relationships between the issues represented are inadequately described and are not seen as being suitable for the purpose.	The analysis delivers little or no understanding of the relevant issues and drivers.	4

				Confidence in Findings (Very Low to Very High) <i>Indicates the confidence band for the findings based on the extent of the Warranty and Agreement.</i>															
Validity of Findings <i>Considers the fitness-for-purpose of the findings through consideration of Face, Content, Construct and Criteria validity.</i>	The findings are accepted as valid and have significant benefit.	High	04																
	The findings are accepted as valid and have appreciable benefit.	Strong	05 06 07 08																
	The findings are accepted as valid and have some or limited benefit.	Moderate	09 10 11 12																
	The findings are not accepted as valid and have little or no recognised benefit.	Weak	13 14 15 16																
				20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	09	08	07	06	05
How to assess Warrant and Validity:			Weak				Moderate				Strong				Proof/BRD				
All criteria in the EPT and the VPT are equally weighted. Therefore take the sum of the Evidence Profile as an indication of Warrant and the sum of the Validity Profile as an indication of Validity.			Further analysis is likely to change the findings				Further analysis may change the findings				Further analysis is unlikely to change the findings				Further analysis will not change the findings				
			Warrant for Findings (BRD = Beyond Reasonable Doubt) <i>Considers the degree of inference for the findings as a result of the Evidence Profile generated</i>																

Very High

High

Medium

Low

Very Low

Confidence Scale

