



Brussels, January, 12th 2010
AGRI L.2/SL (2010)

NOTE TO THE FILE

**Subject: Quality assessment of the study
"The update of analysis of prospects in the Scenar 2020 study"**

The following text and grid provide an assessment of the above-mentioned study.

It must be recalled that that this is an update of the previous study "Scenar 2020 – Scenario study on agriculture and the rural world"¹, with a limited budget and time available.

The assessment is primarily made on the methodological approach followed to answer the study questions, and also to some extent on the databases created, results, conclusions or recommendations drawn by the contractor.

The overall quality rating of the report has been judged: Good.

1. MEETING THE NEEDS: DOES THE STUDY ADEQUATELY ADDRESS THE INFORMATION NEEDS OF THE COMMISSIONING BODY AND FIT THE TERMS OF REFERENCE?

The study fully addresses the information needs of the commissioning body as expressed in the terms of reference. The three parts of the study (refined scenarios, economic analysis and territorial analysis) were developed in close cooperation with the Commission services.

The study provides a relevant literature review, which sets up the context and state of the art. It used up-to-date economic models and went as far as possible in modelling rural development measures, building on the models developed in the context of a study previously implemented.² The study provides prospective results on the likely effects of

¹ http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/publi/reports/scenar2020/index_en.htm

²"Study on the economic, social and environmental impact of the modulation provided for in Article 10 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003"
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/analysis/external/index_en.htm

new policies, such as the Renewable Energy Directive and other possible trends of the CAP.

Final assessment: Good

2. RELEVANT SCOPE: ARE THE NECESSARY POLICY INSTRUMENTS REPRESENTED AND IS THE PRODUCT AND GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE AS WELL AS TIME SCOPE SUFFICIENT?

Future trends and driving forces of rural areas were very well identified and presented. Agricultural products and geographical coverage were sufficient to carry out the analysis, taking duly into account the combination of social, economic and environmental subject-matters. The study fully covers the relevant scope in what was possible from the data and methodological points of view.

Final assessment: Excellent

3. DEFENSIBLE DESIGN: IS THE APPLIED METHODOLOGY APPROPRIATE AND ADEQUATE TO ENSURE A CLEAR AND CREDIBLE RESULT?

Given the difficulties in the accessibility to reliable data at NUTS 2 or 3 levels, especially for the territorial analysis, the assumptions made were sound, well explained and discussed with the Steering Group. Limitations still present are duly acknowledged in the study. In this context, the methodology was the best possible considering also the budget and time available.

Final assessment: Good

4. RELIABLE DATA: TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY DATA SELECTED ADEQUATE? ARE THEY SUFFICIENTLY RELIABLE FOR THEIR INTENDED USE?

For the economic analysis and the analysis of agri-structural conditions a lot of data is available, which is duly used in the study. The economic crisis created more uncertainty, but the qualitative analysis took this issue into account. However, as regards the reliability of statistical data at low level of spatial aggregation for several themes, such as quality of life and environmental conditions, limitations were noted.

Final assessment: Good

5. SOUND ANALYSIS: IS THE QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE INFORMATION APPROPRIATELY AND SYSTEMATICALLY ANALYSED AND HAVE THE RESPECTIVE TASKS BEEN CORRECTLY FULFILLED?

Long-term trends of demographic development in rural areas, dynamics of rural areas and the future of the agricultural economy are analysed, based on time series of regional data. The LEITAP, ESIM and CAPRI models provide interesting projections in numerous sectors.

Some difficulties in the modelling tasks were discussed, highlighted and remain in the study. Therefore model results have to be interpreted in a careful manner (especially on

livestock under the reference scenario and the results for processed products, both under the reference and the liberalisation scenarios).

Compared to the first Scenar 2020 study, the territorial analysis has been further developed. In this part an attempt has been made to analyse a range of environmental indicators. However it has proved to be difficult to provide, in the frame of the project, a thorough analysis of regional aspects related to soil, water and biodiversity.

Final assessment: Satisfactory

6. VALIDITY OF THE CONCLUSIONS: DOES THE REPORT PROVIDE CLEAR CONCLUSIONS? ARE THE CONCLUSIONS BASED ON CREDIBLE INFORMATION?

Conclusions were drawn in several steps from individual fields and then combined. The multidisciplinary approach and the complexity of the study questions have to be considered when judging the validity of the conclusions, which are unbiased and factual.

Concerning the environmental issues, where the analysis was developed going beyond the core focus of the study, the report is prudent in drawing conclusions, given the difficulties and limits encountered concerning methodologies and data.

The study avoids policy recommendations and leaves them to the reader.

Final assessment: Good

7. CLEARLY REPORTED: DOES THE DELIVERABLE CLEARLY DESCRIBE THE INDICATOR FRAMEWORK, INCLUDING ITS CONTEXT AND PURPOSE, TOGETHER WITH THE PROCEDURES AND FINDINGS OF THE STUDY, SO THAT INFORMATION PROVIDED CAN EASILY BE UNDERSTOOD?

The deliverable is very well structured and easy to read. The final report duly summarises the results of the different tasks.

Final assessment: Excellent

Sylvain Lhermitte
Technical Manager

QUALITY GRID

Concerning these criteria, the study is:	Unaccep- table	Poor	Satisfac- -tory	Good	Excel- -lent
1. Meeting the needs: Does the study adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and fit the terms of reference?				X	
2. Relevant scope: Are the necessary policy instruments represented and is the product and geographical coverage as well as time scope sufficient?					X
3. Defensible design: Is the applied methodology appropriate and adequate to ensure a clear and credible result?				X	
4. Reliable data: To what extent is the selected quantitative and qualitative information adequate?				X	
5. Sound analysis: Is the quantitative and qualitative information appropriately and systematically analysed and have the respective tasks been correctly fulfilled?			X		
6. Validity of the conclusions: Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are the conclusions based on credible information?				X	
7. Clearly reported: Does the deliverable clearly describe the indicator framework, including its context and purpose, together with the procedures and findings of the study, so that information provided can easily be understood?					X
Taking into account the contextual constraints of the study, the overall quality rating of the report is:				X	