

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM¹

Title of the evaluation

EVALUATION OF MEASURES FOR THE APICULTURE SECTOR

DG/Unit DG AGRI, Unit L4

Officials managing the evaluation: Andreas KOLODZIEJAK

Evaluator/contractor Deloitte Consulting

Assessment carried out by:

Steering group with participants from units C-4, D-3, H-1, L-4 and SG, DG RTD, DG ENV, DG SANCO.

Date of the Quality Assessment July 2013

¹ Refer to the ['Guide on Scoring the Criteria'](#) for how to assess each criterion.

(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 study covers in a precise way all the numerous requirements expressed in the terms of reference.

(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 design of the evaluation is based on a mix of quantitative and qualitative tools which are properly described. The analyses are built upon a large number of evaluation criteria and indicators. The design regarding the case studies and two surveys proved to be adequate. A large ad hoc data set was generated specifically for this evaluation in view of the limited information available in the national programme reports.

(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 analyses were based on a precise collection of data mainly through fieldwork, interviews with experts and stakeholders as well as through two large surveys carried out, one with national or regional authorities and one with beekeepers and their organisations. In addition a large amount of desk research was done to obtain useful data on production, marketing, trade, costs, income, prices, the downstream sector and the administrative burden from FAO, EUROSTAT, EFSA, Apimondia, FEEDM, ANSES, Commission Services, etc. As the apiculture sector shows a great variation among EU countries and the degree of organisation of beekeepers is low in most EU countries this was a challenging task that has been carried out very well.

The limitations encountered in terms of data availability are properly and precisely explained. These were taken into account in the formulation of findings and conclusions. In particular the challenging effort made in the evaluation study to collect data on other bees products than honey e.g. national prices per portion with the member States is appreciated.

(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 theoretical and empirical analyses are carried out in a systematic way, based on a mix of qualitative and quantitative tools. In some cases the statistical analysis remains descriptive where it could have been more sophisticated e.g. in order to check for trends, correlation and causality.

The constraints encountered and the limitations of the methods and tools used are pointed out in the presentation of the analysis results and taken into account in the formulation of the conclusions.

(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 are well explained and justified by the results of the analyses carried out. Important findings are mostly based on careful analysis of policy impacts in various Member States which makes these findings more robust and reliable.

(6) VALID CONCLUSIONS

Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect in a systematic way the judgement For each evaluation question. If overall conclusions are missing, e.g. on the impact of the apiculture measures on honey prices and trade, because valid conclusions could not be supplied it is well explained why. The conclusions reflect well the multidisciplinary framework of these CAP measures e.g. policies and research related to bee health, environment, regional development.

(7) HELPFUL RECOMMENDATIONS

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

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The recommendations are logically derived from the evaluation results and conclusions. The recommendations are useful for preparing the report on the apiculture measures from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council in 2013 and for reflecting on possible adaptations of the apiculture measures and their implementation after 2013.

(8) CLARITY

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

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The report has a clear structure. Both the clear description of the national measures and their implementation of the measures are much appreciated. The small boxes after every evaluation question provide very clear summaries of the main findings regarding the evaluation questions. The text contains some repetitions that are to a large extent necessary to cover adequately the answers to the evaluation questions; Some formulations in English are too literally translated from other languages, but the overall clarity of the text is good, and the report can be well understood by the reader due to the clear structure and adequate descriptions and explanations.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT **OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

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; limitations have been clearly indicated and are mainly linked to the large variety of production structures in the Member States, limited availability of sector data and in isolating the effects of the policy measures from other factors of influence and attributing causal relationships.

- Is the information in the report potentially useful for designing intervention, setting priorities, allocating resources or improving interventions?

The findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation can be used for discussing adaptations of the apiculture measures after 2013 and in particular in the report on the apiculture programmes from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council of August 2013. Therefore, they are very useful and relevant.