

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

Title of the evaluation:

**EVALUATION OF MEASURES APPLIED UNDER THE COMMON AGRICULTURAL
POLICY TO THE RAW TOBACCO SECTOR**

DG/Unit: DG AGRI, Unit L4

- Official(s) managing the evaluation: Jana Klimova

Evaluator/contractor: COGEA S.r.l.

Assessment carried out by:

- Steering group with the active participation of units C3, D1, E4, F1, L1 and L4 of DG AGRI

Date of the Quality Assessment: September 2009

(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 fully covers the scope defined in the Terms of Reference, including prospective analysis of the introduction of full decoupling and the transfer of 50% of financial resource from the 1st pillar to the rural development programmes.

(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 fits the objectives of the evaluation. The starting point of the evaluation was, in line with the Terms of Reference, the theoretical analysis of decoupling in the sector of raw tobacco. In answering the evaluation questions, the results of this theoretical analysis were confronted with the results of the empirical analysis.

The methodology developed for the empirical analysis combined three different analyses:

- quantitative statistical analysis,
- simulations via Positive Mathematical Programming (PMP) models which were used for analysing behaviour of farmers in the situation of full decoupling (prospective),
- qualitative analysis which was fed by the information collected within case studies and surveys.

This methodology allowed answering all evaluation questions, including prospective ones, in a credible way.

(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 contractor had access to the data provided by the Commission services, which were treated in an appropriate way and are well presented.

The biggest data source was FADN (Farm Accountancy Data Network), which was used for the analysis of economic results of the farms specialised in the raw tobacco production and for the simulations via PMP models.

As concerns the implementation of the Single Payment Scheme and Single Area Payment Scheme, the contractor completed the data available by the Commission by the data collected at Member States level.

The quantitative data were completed by qualitative information collected during case studies, which were carried out in major producing Member States (Italy, Spain, Greece and Poland), and during surveys addressed to first processors and manufacturers.

The contractor also exploited secondary data from other sources, such as Eurostat.

(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 rigorous way, and it is well developed both in quantitative and in qualitative terms. The limitations of each of the analytical approaches and tools are clearly presented and fully taken into account in the interpretation of the results.

(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 of the evaluation are supported by the evidence provided through the sound analysis. Stakeholders' opinions were considered, where appropriate, and in an unbiased way.

(6) VALID CONCLUSIONS

Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?

	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
SCORING				X	

Arguments for scoring:

The conclusions are established in a clearly understandable and detailed manner. They are substantiated by the evaluation findings, which are drawn from the sound analysis.

(7) HELPFUL RECOMENDATIONS

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

	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
SCORING			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The recommendations are clear and unbiased, although they stay rather general. Nevertheless, they are helpful as they are impartial and realistically linked to the policy context.

(8) CLARITY

Is the report well structured, balanced and written in an understandable manner?

	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
SCORING			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The report is well-structured and balanced. The unnecessary repetitions have been avoided and the written style and the presentation are clear and adapted to different target readers. However, the report is too long that makes it not enough reader-friendly.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Overall, the quality of the report is assessed to be **very 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 study is ready before the reform of the measures for the raw tobacco sector enters its final phase. Therefore, the findings of the evaluation are relevant and should be exploited further with respect to the possibilities offered by the policy.