

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

## **Title of the evaluation**

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF CAP MEASURES RELATED TO COTTON**

## **DG/Unit AGRI/G4**

Official(s) managing the evaluation:

*Elsa Laval* (replaced by *Dorota Nadolna*) and *Nelida Ortega Barquero*

## **Evaluator/contractor**

Alliance Environnement GEIE with collaboration of Oréade Brèche Sarl

## **Assessment carried out by:**

Steering group involved active participation from DG AGRI (C-1, D-1, F-1, G-1, G-3, G-4), DEV, ENV, ECFIN, SG, and TRADE

**Date of the Quality Assessment 19 July 2007**

---

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

## (1) RELEVANCE

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

	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
SCORING				X	

Arguments for scoring:

**Despite the short delay foreseen for the work, the intensive collaboration needed with the team in charge of the socio-economic study on the same sector and substantial data collection needed the evaluation questions have all been answered in time and the evaluation scope set out in the Terms of Reference has been fully respected.**

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?*

	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
SCORING				X	

Arguments for scoring:

**An adequate theoretical approach to the cut between environmental impact of the cotton growing itself and the environmental impacts of the measures has been applied allowing separating both concepts. Problems on the data availability and the need to analyse the information related to local situation and context was foreseen from the beginning. Both resulted in a correct use of the tools for answering the evaluation questions.**

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:

**An extended bibliographical review allowed having the state of the art at world level on the practices and effects of intensive cotton growing. But for the regional and local level situation, difficulties in obtaining the environmental indicators and cross cutting of the information available are on the base of limitations of the data. The contractor did big efforts on collecting information by the case studies carried out. In particular, for the reform period only one year of results were available, too short term figures for analysing environmental effects.**

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:

**There is a good equilibrium between the investigation of facts (before and after the reform of 2006). The analysis is well focussed on the most relevant cause/effect relations and presented using adequate overview tables, indicators and maps. Qualitative inputs from stakeholders are used in a balance way.**

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:

**In the report findings are supported by a sound analysis, but as data availability and the only one year implementation of the reform, limit the solidity of findings on the last period considered. This situation has been well presented in the report.**

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:

**Conclusions are coherently and logically substantiated by evaluation findings. They are free of personal or partisan considerations and the different regional situations are presented in a balanced way.**

If relevant: Contextual and contractual constraints

## **(7) HELPFUL RECOMENDATIONS**

*Do areas need 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 brief and limited but certainly helpful as these are impartial and realistically linked to the policy context.**

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 clearly structured. The length of the report is adequate, the annex contains background data with comprehensive technical details on practices and effects of inputs used for this crop well summarised and explained.**

If relevant: Contextual and contractual constraints

## OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

### 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 are reliable as these are based on sound analysis, the recommendations are limited but useful.
  
- Is the information in the report potentially useful for designing intervention, setting priorities, allocating resources or improving interventions?  
Yes, impact assessment foreseen for reform of the regime can make use of the evaluation and the rich material, including all the regional data, that comes with it.

### SCORING

Poor

Satisfactory

X      **Good**

Very Good

Excellent

### Given the contextual and contractual constraints encountered:

- What lessons can be learned from the evaluation process?  
The time constrain has been a factor limiting possible improvements in a more in depth use of data collected for the analysis and on final presentation.