



## EUROPEAN COMMISSION

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Directorate C. Economics of agricultural market and single CMO

**C.2. Olive oil, Horticultural products**

Brussels, 21.10.2009

MK - D(2009) 325498

### FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR A PLATFORM FOR MARKET DATA AND INFORMATION EXCHANGE OF THE EUROPEAN FRUIT AND VEGETABLE MARKET

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

## JUSTIFICATION FOR THE EVALUATION

<p><b>1. Meeting the needs:</b> The contractor has performed all the tasks required in the terms of reference. The study adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body</p>
<p><b>2. Relevant scope:</b> the scope of the study is in line with the criteria set out in the terms of reference, including the geographical scope and identification of data to be exchanged.</p>
<p><b>3. Defensible design:</b> the applied methodology is appropriate and adequate to provide useful results with relation to the objectives.</p>
<p><b>4. Reliable data:</b> The contractor conducted some valuable surveys with the interested operators. However, estimates on the cost for the platform development and operation require to be confirmed by more detailed analysis. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Hardware costs refer to an architecture that has been identified prior to the definition of non-functional requirements, and whose definition is therefore premature.</li><li>- Cost for the system development is not supported by quantitative indicators and seems to be underestimated.</li><li>- Labour costs are significant and should be better justified</li><li>- As an overall evaluation, the ratio between development and operation costs seems to be unbalanced.</li></ul>
<p><b>5. Sound analysis:</b> the analysis has been performed according to requirements set out in the terms of reference.</p>
<p><b>6. Validity of the conclusions:</b> Conclusions related to legal feasibility (in the light of the competition policy requirements) and involvement of the public actors should be clearer. The contractor has not tested in earnest the idea of setting up a platform as a transnational Association of Producer Organisations within the meaning of Article 37 of Commission Regulation 1580/2007. The study indicates that quality of the data submitted by the participants to the network is a pre-condition for the success of the platform, but do not clarify if this pre-condition can reasonably be assumed. This aspect should be assessed before drawing conclusions on the feasibility of the system. The report (to the extent that it is a feasibility study) should already anticipate at this stage certain suggestions as to how the platform should be structured in practice in order not to give rise to any anti-competitive concerns which may compromise its potential clearance from a competition perspective. Hence, it would be convenient to further develop the analysis of key competition aspects which may certainly impose limits and conditions as regards the scope and functioning of the platform such as, for instance, the particular level of data aggregation that may be carried out, the safeguarding mechanisms that should be implemented in order to prevent sensitive information from being disclosed or exchanged, or the autonomy features to be met by the body or institution in charge of managing the platform.</p>
<p><b>7. Clearly reported:</b> the clarity and style of the report are satisfactory.</p>

M. KWASOWSKI  
Technical manager