

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

Title of the evaluation:

**SYNTHESIS OF SAPARD EX-POST EVALUATIONS – UPDATE: BULGARIA, CROATIA,
ROMANIA**

DG/Unit: DG AGRI, Unit L4

- Official managing the evaluation: Andreas Lillig

Evaluator/contractor: Metis GmbH, Vienna

Assessment carried out by:

- Steering group with the active participation of unit G4

Date of the Quality Assessment: October 2013

(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 adequately responds to the information needs of the commissioning body and fully meets the requirements of the terms of reference.

The evaluation examined the effects of support schemes laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 1268/1999 (the “SAPARD-Regulation”) in the three countries analysed, in particular the contribution to the preparation for the CAP with a view to lessons learnt and good practice-examples. It assessed the development of the farming sector on labour force, environment, social impacts, and administrative capacities. Further aspects regarded subsidiarity, additionality and proportionality.

(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. As requested by the terms of reference, the evaluation started with the description of the programmes. Subsequently, the findings of the evaluation reports were synthesized.

In answering the evaluation questions, this synthesis was confronted with the results of an empirical analysis of further data collected in the countries concerned and discussed in country-specific “focus groups”.

On this basis, findings on the evaluation themes were formulated.

This approach allowed addressing all evaluation questions 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 X Very Good Excellent

Arguments for scoring:

Basic data sources were the final evaluation reports.

These were supplemented through interviews with experts and questionnaires for stakeholders and discussed in the focus groups.

The data limitations were presented for each of the tools used.

(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 X Excellent

Arguments for scoring:

The analysis was carried out in a rigorous way following established evaluation criteria and indicators, relying basically on the evaluation reports and in particular on the analysis by the focus groups.

The analysis distinguished between the three countries.

The evaluator made an effort to distinguish the impact of policy measures from the effects of other factors, which is challenging, as there are clearly other impacting developments over the pre-accession period.

(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 X Excellent

Arguments for scoring:

The findings are based on defined evaluation criteria and predominantly supported by the evidence provided by the focus groups.

(6) VALID CONCLUSIONS

Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?

SCORING Poor Satisfactory Good Very Good
X

Arguments for scoring:

The conclusions are based on evaluation findings from the reports and the focus groups, which in turn were drawn from the sound analysis. They substantiate the statements made.

(7) CLARITY

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

SCORING Poor Satisfactory Good Very Good
X

Arguments for scoring:

The report is well structured, relatively easy to read, and balanced. The evaluator made an effort for a presentation in an understandable manner. The executive summary synthesises in a transparent way numerous analyses and findings and presents the conclusions to the reader in a way that are easy to follow.

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?
- Yes

Clearly and fully:

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

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?
- See general conclusion below.

Together with the previous SAPRD evaluations, this evaluation regarding BG, HR and RO provides a useful tool for assessing the effect of such programmes and

lessons learnt for the future implementation of similar programmes.

