



Brussels, 17 January 2013
AGRI.H2/BT

**STUDY: "LABELLING OF AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD PRODUCTS
OF MOUNTAIN FARMING"**

CONTRACT No. AGRI-2011-0460 / JRC-IPTS No. 32349-2011-10

Evaluation Sheet

Concerning these criteria, the evaluation report 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 for the impact assessment?				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 report clearly describe the problem, the procedures and findings of the evaluation, 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	

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE EVALUATION

<p>1. Meeting the needs: The contractor has met the information needs identified in the Terms of Reference (ToR) as well as the requirements of the ToR.</p>
<p>2. Relevant scope: The study covers the geographical scope (EU-27) of the ToR. In accordance with the ToR, the study adapted the level of detail to the Member States' geography and attached more importance to Member States with a higher share of mountains. This is confirmed by the selection of the case studies: Austria, France and Spain. As required in the ToR, the definition of mountain areas corresponds to the definition set out in the Regulation (EC) No 1257/1999 on support for rural development from the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund. In terms of policy coverage, the study provides for a comprehensive overview of rules and tools that aim, through labelling, at protection of agricultural products and foodstuffs of mountain farming.</p>
<p>3. Defensible design: The methodology is based on both quantitative and qualitative data and other sources of information. The study presents the findings for EU-27 while at the same time allows for a comparison between the Member States. It works with various sources of data available in order to provide for an in-depth analysis of economic categories of mountain production and mountain products, like output, production costs, retail prices and gross margin. In-depth analysis is supported by three case studies. The study also provides for an inventory of the labelling schemes/practices across the EU and attempts at their classification. The methodology is appropriate and adequate.</p>
<p>4. Reliable data: Whenever available, the contractor used relevant data sources. EU-FADN data provided to DG AGRI by the Member States are key for the economic analysis.</p>
<p>5. Sound analysis: The analysis is sound and provides for numerous findings; both general at EU level as well as more detailed, showing the exceptions to the rule or particular cases in the Member States or for a specific category of products. With regard to the analysis of the food supply chain, the study offers a good combination of general analysis and more detailed, particular analysis as a result of the case studies. This is complemented by the results of previous studies (identified through an in-depth literature review) and as such offers a comprehensive understanding of findings.</p>
<p>6. Validity of the conclusions: The conclusions are based on large evidence gathered throughout the study. They are communicated in a clear form, both as partial conclusions at the end of the (sub)chapters as well as final conclusions of the study and in the executive summary.</p>
<p>7. Clearly reported: Overall the report is written clearly and can be considered good. It provides for numerous figures, tables and maps which allow for a more plastic presentation and offer to a reader a comprehensive grasp of the findings.</p>

Branka TOME

Contact:

Branka TOME, Telephone: +32 229-83155, branka.tome@ec.europa.eu