



Brussels,  
DG AGRI/G-4/JK D(2006)  
A25\_4\DT\5\Quality assessment\_PNP

## **EVALUATION OF MEASURES REGARDING FRESH AND PROCESSED PEACHES, NECTARINES AND PEARS**

### **Quality judgement of the final report submitted by AGROSYNERGIE**

#### **PRELIMINARY REMARKS**

This quality judgement provides a global assessment on the above-mentioned evaluation study. The Commission steering group in charge prepared it at the end of the evaluation processed.

If the report is to be published on the Internet, the quality grid together with the comments of the steering group, will complement the final report.

It has to be pointed out that the judgement is not made on the contents of the results, conclusions or recommendations reached by the contractor, but on the methodology used for obtaining them.

It has to be recognised, that the contractor was confronted with a difficult task since a wide range of impacts of the CMO had to be evaluated in a very short time period (8 months for the draft final report). In addition, the contractor had to overcome the lack of statistical data, in particular as concerns the price at different levels of the chain. The limited statistical data were completed by using the interviews and questionnaires. Despite the fact that the evaluation was ex-post, it contained one ex-ante evaluation question. The effort of the contractor to answer this question must be appreciated in particular.

#### **1. MEETING THE NEEDS: Does the evaluation adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and fit the terms of reference?**

All evaluation questions have been addressed and all themes have been covered.

The evaluation contains a good overview of the impacts of the CMO, including the unintended effects. This information base was used for drawing the conclusions on effectiveness and efficiency of the CMO and it helped also to answer the ex-ante

evaluation question on decoupling. The evaluation study meets the information needs of the Commission and it will form a good information source for the discussion on the reform of the CMO.

Global assessment: **excellent**

**2. RELEVANT SCOPE: Is the rationale of the policy examined and its set of outputs, results and outcomes/impacts examined fully, including both intended and unexpected policy interactions and consequences?**

The report covers the period since the substantial reform of the CMO in 1996, distinguishing the periods before and after the 2000 reform. The descriptive part and, where appropriate the analysis, cover also the period before 1996. The contractor examined also the coherence of the current CMO with the 2003 reform of CAP.

The description and analysis of the production and processing chain is well developed, including the special characteristics of the chains in main EU producing regions and in the major world producing countries.

By identifying the effects of the current CMO, including the regional and environmental impacts and unintended effects, the evaluation provides an interesting set of information useful for the assessment of the current CMO and for the discussion on the reform of the CMO.

Global assessment: **good**

**3. DEFENSIBLE DESIGN: Is the evaluation design appropriate and adequate to ensure that the full set of findings, along with methodological limitations, is made accessible for answering the main evaluation questions?**

The methodology design is clearly presented and reasoned. The methodology was adapted to the different issues covered by the evaluation and it took into account the data constraints (see below). The Contractor was flexible enough to adapt the methodology according to requests made by the steering group.

Global assessment: **good**

**4. RELIABLE DATA: To what extent are the primary and secondary data selected adequate? Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?**

The contractor had access to data provided by the Commission services which were treated correctly and well presented. These data had to be completed by data from different sources at national and regional level. If these sources were not available, the contractor used the interviews and questionnaires in order to get the missing data. Despite the effort to get all necessary data, some data were collected only partially. All data constraints are sufficiently explained in the report, including the effects on the analysis.

Global assessment: **satisfactory**

**5. SOUND ANALYSIS: Is quantitative and qualitative information appropriately and systematically analysed according to the state of the art so that evaluation questions are answered in a valid way?**

Taking into account the data constraints, the analysis is well developed in quantitative and qualitative terms. The limitations of the analysis are presented in a transparent way, including the effects on its conclusions.

The analysis was affected by a lack of data in particular in the following areas:

- analysis of the income of farmers - FADN database at Commission level does not have a separate category of peaches and a separate category of pears. Therefore, the contractor used for different producing Member States and regions the data sources that were available and were the most appropriate in order to provide the data for these two categories of fruits. This approach did not allow a comparative analysis among Member States. In addition, in case of Spain, no analysis was conducted due to missing data.
- analysis of the transmission of price – full series of weighted prices at all levels of the chain were not available.
- analysis of the efficiency and sustainability – due to the lack of data on costs linked with the management and control of the scheme, the analysis is only partial.

Global assessment: **good**

**6. CREDIBLE FINDINGS: Do findings follow logically from, and are they justified by, the data analysis and interpretations based on carefully described assumptions and rationale?**

In general, the evaluation findings are credible, clearly reported and justified. In those cases where they are based on the analysis affected by lack of data (see above), the contractor presents the limitations in a transparent way, and recommends to consider the findings with caution.

Global assessment: **good**

**7. VALIDITY OF THE CONCLUSIONS: Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are conclusions based on credible results?**

Taking into account the data constrains that affected the analysis and the findings drawn from it, the conclusions are well developed. Despite the fact that this evaluation was an ex-post evaluation, the contractor was able to provide credible conclusions also on the ex-ante question concerning possible consequences of decoupling.

Global assessment: **good**

**8. USEFULNESS OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS: Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personal or stakeholders' views, and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?**

The recommendations proposed in the report are derived from the conclusions of the analysis, they are fair and unbiased. They are developed for two scenarios: 1) status quo, 2) possible reform of the CMO by introducing the decoupled aid.

Global assessment: **satisfactory**

**9. CLEAR REPORT: Does the report clearly describe the policy evaluated, including its context and purpose, together with the procedures and findings of the evaluation, so that information provided can easily be understood?**

The structure and the presentation of the report and the language are clear enough. The unnecessary repetitions have been avoided. The length of the report, including the annexes, is adequate.

Global assessment: **good**

**10. ASSESSMENT OF THE REPORT AS A WHOLE**

Taking into account the aspects mentioned above, the report can be considered **good**.

## Quality assessment grid for the evaluation of measures regarding fresh and processed peaches, nectarines and pears

<b>Concerning these criteria, the evaluation report is:</b>	Unaccep- table	Formally correct but weak	Satisfac- tory	Good	Excel- lent
<b>1. Meeting the needs:</b> Does the evaluation adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and fit the terms of reference?					<b>X</b>
<b>2. Relevant scope:</b> Is the rationale of the policy examined and its set of outputs, results and outcomes/impacts examined fully, including both intended and unexpected policy interactions and consequences?				<b>X</b>	
<b>3. Defensible design:</b> Is the evaluation design appropriate and adequate to ensure that the full set of findings, along with methodological limitations, is made accessible for answering the main evaluation questions?				<b>X</b>	
<b>4. Reliable data:</b> To what extent are the primary and secondary data selected adequate? Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?			<b>X</b>		
<b>5. Sound analysis:</b> Is quantitative and qualitative information appropriately and systematically analysed according to the state of the art so that evaluation questions are answered in a valid way?				<b>X</b>	
<b>6. Credible findings:</b> Do findings follow logically from, and are they justified by, the data analysis and interpretations based on carefully described assumptions and rationale?				<b>X</b>	
<b>7. Validity of the conclusions:</b> Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are conclusions based on credible results? Are they unbiased ?				<b>X</b>	
<b>8. Usefulness of the recommendations:</b> Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personal or stakeholders' views, and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?			<b>X</b>		
<b>9. Clear report:</b> Does the report clearly describe the policy evaluated, including its context and purpose, together with the procedures and findings of the evaluation, so that information provided can easily be understood?				<b>X</b>	
<b>Taking into account the contextual constraints on the evaluation, the overall quality rating of the report is considered</b>				<b>X</b>	