

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

Study on improving crisis prevention and management criteria and strategies in the agricultural sector

DG AGRI, Unit G1

Officials managing the evaluation:

Sergiusz Waplak

Contractor:

Wageningen University, Ecorys

Assessment carried out by:

Steering group

Date of the Quality Assessment:

October 2019

(1) RELEVANCE

Does the study 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 study provides an analysis and a critical review of all aspects related to crisis situations, its impact and practices, in order to better focus and improve the effectiveness of CAP policy and better contribute to the European Union's priorities. Furthermore, the study distinguishes two aspects: crisis prevention and crisis management. It provides an overview of feasible ways of anticipating, preparing for and responding to crises in agriculture.

(2) APPROPRIATE DESIGN

Is the design of the study adequate for obtaining the results needed to answer the evaluation questions?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
		x			

Arguments for scoring:

Given the budgetary and time constraints the study's design is satisfactory for obtaining helpful results.

(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:

With regards to the case study on market disturbance in the dairy sector, the sample chosen for one of the two Member States surveyed is not representative of the sector in that country, affecting the reliability of the findings of the case study.

(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 collected data is compiled and reported in the text as well as in figures, tables, and annexes. A more extensive and transparent use of data collected in the frame of the case studies could have improved the analysis.

(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:

Findings are based on the collected information and corresponding analysis. They aim at responding to the pre-established questions.

(6) VALID CONCLUSIONS

Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
		X			

Arguments for scoring:

Statements and conclusions in the text are based on information compiled for the study. The validation of the findings in the course of a workshop with stakeholders enhanced the validity of the findings and deriving conclusions.

(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 study identifies some areas for improvement. Recommendations are general.

(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 is balanced and overall well-structured, but there are sections where writing could be better.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Is the overall quality of the report adequate, in particular:

- Does the study fulfil contractual conditions?

Yes

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

Given the budgetary and time constraints, the findings and conclusions of the report are acceptable. Findings from case studies should be handled with care as they are based on limited data. Nevertheless, conclusions are overall reliable. They were validated with stakeholders.

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

Yes, to a limited extent. In particular work done on the definition of crisis is appreciated.