

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

Title of the evaluation:

EVALUATION OF EU BEEF LABELLING RULES

DG/Unit: DG AGRI, Unit E4

- Official(s) managing the evaluation: Martin Szentivany

Evaluator/contractor: And International

Assessment carried out by:

- Steering group with the active participation of units C.3, E.2, E.4, B.3 of DG AGRI and SG, DG SANTE-FVO, DG GROW

Date of the Quality Assessment: September 2015

(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 examines the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the EU legislation regarding the labelling of beef and beef products¹ with respect to achieving the objectives laid down in this legislation, as well as its coherence with other relevant measures applied under the CAP.

The evaluation adequately responds to the information needs of the commissioning body and fully meets the requirements of the terms of reference. The geographical scope and time scope for the evaluation have been fully covered.

(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 methodology design is appropriate for addressing the evaluation objectives. The methodology for answering evaluation questions combined several approaches:

- a) quantitative analysis using data from Eurostat, DG AGRI, DG SANTE, national statistics and reports and professional statistics;
- b) analysis of information gathered through a field survey (consisting of more than eighty interviews in seven case study Member States covering national authorities, slaughterhouses, processors, food service suppliers and retailers);
- c) analysis of opinions collected through fourteen consumer focus groups organised in seven case study Member States.

The combination of these approaches allowed addressing all evaluation questions in a credible way.

¹ Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 of 17 July 2000 establishing a system for the identification and registration of animals and regarding the labelling of beef and beef products and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 820/97

(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 uses a variety of quantitative and qualitative data:

- a) **statistical data from Eurostat, DG AGRI, DG SANTE, national statistics and reports and professional statistics.**
- b) **information from semi-structured interviews with the representatives of national authorities, slaughterhouses, processors, food service suppliers and retailers in the seven selected Member States²;**
- c) **opinions collected through fourteen consumer focus groups organised in the seven case study Member States.**

The evaluators have made an effort to exploit all available data sources. In the event that the data were not available on the EU-wide scale (e.g. data on additional costs due to labelling, costs of controls), the evaluators used estimations based on national data. The limitations of those estimations are clearly explained.

(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 analysis was carried out in a systematic way following established evaluation criteria and indicators, relying on multiple quantitative and qualitative data sources.

The examination was well developed both in quantitative and qualitative terms, while the limitations of each of the analytical approaches were clearly presented and taken into account in the interpretation of the results.

The analysis was complicated by a long period under examination (1995-present) characterised by many market and policy changes, making it difficult to ascertain the causal relationships between beef labelling rules and their impacts. Another challenge was related to the lack of certain data (see above). Yet, the evaluators made an effort to clearly distinguish the impact of the beef labelling rules from the effects of other factors.

² France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Poland, Spain and United Kingdom altogether covering more than 75% of EU beef production

(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 clearly defined evaluation criteria and supported by the evidence provided through the analysis. Opinions from the stakeholders were considered in an unbiased way.

(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 substantiated by evaluation findings, which in turn were drawn from the sound analysis. Given the data constraints, they are balanced and prudent.

(7) HELPFUL RECOMMENDATIONS

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

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The recommendations are based on the evaluation conclusions.

They are impartial and can realistically be considered for simplifying the rules on beef labelling and improving the control system.

(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 evaluation report is well structured and balanced, following the elements required by the terms of reference. Some formulations in English are too complicated but the overall clarity of the report is good.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Overall, the quality of the report is assessed to be **good**.

Is the overall quality of the report adequate, in particular:

- Does the evaluation fulfil contractual conditions?

Clearly and fully.

- Are the findings and conclusions of the report reliable, and are there any specific limitations to their validity and completeness?

The findings and conclusions of the report are reliable and clear.

- Is the information in the report potentially useful for designing intervention, setting priorities, allocating resources or improving interventions?

The evaluation provides a useful reference for any potential revision of beef labelling rules.