

RAG Evaluation Report

Generated on: 2026-02-23 17:22

Executive Summary

This report compares 1 RAG techniques. The top performing technique based on overall metrics is **Microsoft Rag**.

Technique	Correctness	Faithfulness	Relevancy	Completeness	Time (s)
Microsoft Rag	0.05	0.80	0.40	0.03	108.53

Winning Technique Analysis: Microsoft Rag

Case #1

Question:

What is the definition of a "child" in these rules?

Model Answer:

I'm sorry, but the data provided does not contain information regarding the definition of a "child" in any specific rules or context. Therefore, I cannot provide an answer.

Correctness: 0.0 (FAIL) | **Faithfulness:** 1.0 (PASS) | **Relevancy:** 0.0 (FAIL) | **Completeness:** 0.0 (FAIL)

Case #2

Question:

What does "online real money game" mean?

Model Answer:

I do not know the answer.

Correctness: 0.0 (FAIL) | **Faithfulness:** 1.0 (PASS) | **Relevancy:** 0.0 (FAIL) | **Completeness:** 0.0 (FAIL)

Case #3

Question:

Within what time must an intermediary remove/disable unlawful information after "actual knowledge"?

Model Answer:

I don't have the information to answer that question.

Correctness: 0.0 (FAIL) | **Faithfulness:** 1.0 (PASS) | **Relevancy:** 0.0 (FAIL) | **Completeness:** 0.0 (FAIL)

Case #4

Question:

What are the two ways "actual knowledge" can arise (as per Rule 3(1)(d))?

Model Answer:

The concept of "actual knowledge," as per Rule 3(1)(d), can arise in two primary ways: 1. **Directly Acquired Knowledge**: This refers to situations where an individual has personally witnessed or been involved in a particular event or situation, leading to an understanding or awareness of its details. For instance, if someone is present during a transaction or happens to witness a relevant action, they directly acquire knowledge of that event. 2. **Knowledge from Reliable Sources**: Actual knowledge can also arise when information is obtained from credible and reliable sources. This could include documented evidence, official reports, or communications from trustworthy parties. Such resources can provide an individual with necessary and accurate details regarding a situation or event, contributing to their actual knowledge. These two ways ensure that an entity or individual has a genuine understanding of the facts at hand, formed either through personal experience or by relying on trustworthy information. This delineation of knowledge is crucial in various legal contexts, emphasizing the importance of being informed and aware based on direct or credible information. Unfortunately, I do not have specific datasets or references regarding this rule to support these points directly.

Correctness: 0.0 (FAIL) | **Faithfulness:** 0.0 (FAIL) | **Relevancy:** 1.0 (PASS) | **Completeness:** 0.0 (FAIL)

Case #5

Question:

What are the content rating categories for online curated content in the Appendix?

Model Answer:

I'm sorry, but I don't have information regarding the content rating categories for online curated content in the Appendix.

Correctness: 0.0 (FAIL) | **Faithfulness:** 1.0 (PASS) | **Relevancy:** 0.0 (FAIL) | **Completeness:** 0.0 (FAIL)

Case #6

Question:

By when must an intermediary acknowledge and resolve a complaint handled by its Grievance Officer (Rule 3(2)(a)(i))?

Model Answer:

I don't have information regarding the specific timeframe for an intermediary to acknowledge and resolve a complaint as outlined in Rule 3(2)(a)(i). It seems to be a specialized topic not covered in the provided data tables. For accurate information on this rule, please refer to the relevant legal documents or regulatory guidelines.

Correctness: 0.0 (FAIL) | **Faithfulness:** 1.0 (PASS) | **Relevancy:** 0.0 (FAIL) | **Completeness:** 0.0 (FAIL)

Case #7

Question:

What is the timeline to appeal to the Grievance Appellate Committee, and how quickly should it be resolved?

Model Answer:

I don't have information regarding the timeline to appeal to the Grievance Appellate Committee or the expected resolution times for such appeals. For accurate and updated details on this process, it is recommended to refer directly to the relevant authority's official guidelines or resources.

Correctness: 0.0 (FAIL) | **Faithfulness:** 1.0 (PASS) | **Relevancy:** 0.0 (FAIL) | **Completeness:** 0.0 (FAIL)

Case #8

Question:

List the minimum criteria for an entity to apply to be designated as an “online gaming self-regulatory body” (Rule 4A(2)).

Model Answer:

I'm sorry, but I do not have the information regarding the minimum criteria for an entity to apply for designation as an “online gaming self-regulatory body” (Rule 4A(2)). This specific information is not included in the data provided.

Correctness: 0.0 (FAIL) | **Faithfulness:** 1.0 (PASS) | **Relevancy:** 1.0 (PASS) | **Completeness:** 0.0 (FAIL)

Case #9

Question:

Before accepting any deposit for a permissible online real money game, what must the online gaming intermediary do?

Model Answer:

I'm unable to provide specific information about regulations or requirements for online gaming intermediaries. If you need assistance with guidelines or legal obligations related to online real money gaming, I recommend consulting relevant legal resources or authorities in the gaming sector.

Correctness: 0.0 (FAIL) | **Faithfulness:** 1.0 (PASS) | **Relevancy:** 0.0 (FAIL) | **Completeness:** 0.0 (FAIL)

Case #10

Question:

What is the three-tier structure for ensuring adherence to the Code of Ethics for publishers (Part III)?

Model Answer:

I'm sorry, but the information regarding the three-tier structure for ensuring adherence to the Code of Ethics for publishers (Part III) is not provided in the data tables. Therefore, I am unable to answer your question at this time.

Correctness: 0.0 (FAIL) | **Faithfulness:** 1.0 (PASS) | **Relevancy:** 1.0 (PASS) | **Completeness:** 0.0 (FAIL)

Case #11

Question:

Scenario: A user's grievance against an intermediary is not resolved in time. What appeal route exists and what are the key timing + process requirements?

Model Answer:

I'm sorry, but I don't have information on the specific appeal routes, timing, and process requirements related to grievances against intermediaries. The data provided does not address this scenario or any related procedures. Please consult relevant regulations, legal guidelines, or specific organizational protocols to get the accurate information you need.

Correctness: 0.0 (FAIL) | **Faithfulness:** 1.0 (PASS) | **Relevancy:** 0.0 (FAIL) | **Completeness:** 0.0 (FAIL)

Case #12

Question:

Under Rule 3(1)(d), if the government wants an intermediary to remove unlawful information without a court order, what must the written intimation include and who can issue it?

Model Answer:

Under Rule 3(1)(d), when the government seeks the removal of unlawful information from an intermediary without a court order, it must provide a written intimation. This written intimation must include specific details outlined in the rule.

Required Contents of the Written Intimation

The written intimation must contain:

- **The reason for the removal**: Clearly stating why the information is considered unlawful.
- **Contact information**: Providing contact details for follow-up if necessary.
- **Any identification of the content**: Specific references to the information requiring removal, so the intermediary can identify it effectively.

Issuer of the Written Intimation

The written intimation must be issued by a designated official from the government. This typically means that it should come from an authorized officer or agency responsible for enforcing laws concerning online content. This framework is intended to streamline the process of content removal while ensuring that there is a legitimate governmental basis for such requests, balancing the need for enforcement with the rights of intermediaries and content creators. In summary, the government must issue a clearly articulated and specific intimation detailing unlawful content and its rationale for removal, ensuring compliance with the proper channels and oversight.

Correctness: 0.4 (FAIL) | Faithfulness: 0.0 (FAIL) | Relevancy: 1.0 (PASS) | Completeness: 0.25 (FAIL)

Case #13

Question:

What actions can a self-regulating body (Level II) issue after disposing a grievance/appeal, and when can it refer content to the Ministry?

Model Answer:

The actions that a self-regulating body (Level II) can issue after disposing of a grievance or appeal generally include:

- 1. **Issuing a Resolution**: The body can formally conclude the grievance with a resolution that outlines the steps taken and the findings. This resolution may include any recommendations or actions to be taken by the parties involved.
- 2. **Providing Recommendations**: Based on the findings of the grievance, the self-regulating body can provide recommendations for changes in practice or policy to prevent similar grievances in the future.
- 3. **Imposing Disciplinary Measures**: If applicable, the body may impose disciplinary actions on individuals or entities found to be in violation of established standards or regulations.
- 4. **Conducting Follow-up Actions**: The body may establish follow-up mechanisms or review processes to ensure compliance with the resolution and assess the effectiveness of any recommendations made.
- 5. **Reporting Outcomes**: The self-regulating body may prepare a report that summarizes the grievance and the outcome, which could be shared with relevant stakeholders or the public for transparency purposes.

Referral to the Ministry: A self-regulating body may refer content to the Ministry under certain conditions, such as:

- **Severe Violations**: If the grievance involves significant misconduct or violations of laws or regulations that require intervention from a higher authority.
- **Systemic Issues**: When the grievance highlights systemic issues that need attention from governmental regulations or frameworks.
- **Lack of Authority**: If the self-regulating body determines that it does not have the authority to take appropriate action to resolve the grievance adequately.
- **Public Interest Concerns**: When the findings of the grievance have implications for public health, safety, or welfare, prompting a need for governmental oversight or action.

By having a structured approach to handling grievances and appeals, self-regulating bodies can maintain accountability while promoting a fair process in their respective industries. However, ensuring transparency in their actions and referrals also enhances public trust in such bodies. If you need specifics about regulations or framework formats concerning a particular context, please provide additional details!

Correctness: 0.3 (FAIL) | Faithfulness: 0.0 (FAIL) | Relevancy: 1.0 (PASS) | Completeness: 0.25 (FAIL)

Case #14

Question:

Explain the verification lifecycle of a permissible online real money game under Rule 4A: conditions, temporary period, and publication requirements.

Model Answer:

I'm sorry, but I don't have information on the verification lifecycle of a permissible online real money game under Rule 4A, as it is not covered in the data provided. If you have specific details or context about Rule 4A, I could potentially assist further.

Correctness: 0.0 (FAIL) | Faithfulness: 1.0 (PASS) | Relevancy: 0.0 (FAIL) | Completeness: 0.0 (FAIL)

Case #15

Question:

For "A" rated online curated content, what access restrictions and verification mechanisms are required in the Appendix?

Model Answer:

I'm sorry, but I do not have the information regarding the access restrictions and verification mechanisms required for "A" rated online curated content in the provided data tables.

Correctness: 0.0 (FAIL) | Faithfulness: 1.0 (PASS) | Relevancy: 1.0 (PASS) | Completeness: 0.0 (FAIL)
