

**Quality Assessment for FINAL EVALUATION REPORT OF MEASURES FOR AGRICULTURE CARRIED OUT FOR THE OUTERMOST REGIONS (POSEI) AND SMALLER AEGEAN ISLANDS (SAI)**

<b>DG/Unit</b>	AGRI/E4
Official(s) managing the evaluation:	Yves Plees
<b>Evaluator:</b>	ADE
<b>Assessment carried out by<sup>(*)</sup>:</b>	
Steering group	X
Evaluation Function	X
Other (please specify)	
(*) Multiple crosses possible	
<b>Date of assessment</b>	10/11/2016

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
1. Scope of evaluation	Confirm with the Terms of Reference and the work plan that the contractor :		
	a. Has addressed the evaluation issues and specific questions	Y	The evaluation examines the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of POSEI and SAI schemes with respect to achieving the objectives laid down in their legislation, as well as their coherence with other relevant measures applied under the CAP and EU added value.
	b. Has undertaken the tasks described in the work plan	Y	The evaluation adequately responds to the information needs of the commissioning body and meets the requirements of the terms of reference.
	c. Has covered the requested scope for time period, geographical areas, target groups, aspects of the intervention, etc.	Y	The requested scope (geographical scope and time scope), target groups and aspects of the intervention have been fully covered in this evaluation.
	Overall assessment of the scope of the evaluation by the steering group: good <sup>1</sup>		
2. Overall contents of report	Check that the report includes:		
	a. Executive Summary according to an agreed format, in the three required languages (minimum EN and FR)	Y	
	b. Main report with required components	Y	

<sup>1</sup> scale of scoring: poor, satisfactory, good, very good, excellent

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Title and Content Page</li> <li>▪ A description of the policy being evaluated, its context, the purpose of the evaluation, contextual limitations, methodology, etc.</li> <li>▪ Findings, conclusions, and judgments for all evaluation issues and specific questions</li> <li>▪ The required outputs and deliverables</li> <li>▪ Recommendations as appropriate</li> </ul>		
	c. All required annexes	Y	
Overall assessment of the contents of the report by the steering group: very good			
3. Data collection	Check that data is accurate and complete		
	a. Data is accurate	Y	The evaluation uses a variety of quantitative and qualitative data: a) statistical data DG AGRI, Eurostat, FADN, national and regional statistics and reports (including implementation reports), Producers' Organisations micro-data from farms and accountancy data and operators' b) information from individual and collective interviews with local, regional and national managing authorities, representatives of Producers' Organisations (PO) and Inter-branch Organisations (IBO), farmers and representatives of processing industry including SSA operators, transport operators, slaughterhouses, food service suppliers and retailers;
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data is free from factual and logical errors</li> <li>▪ The report is consistent, i.e. no contradictions</li> <li>▪ Calculations are correct</li> </ul>		
b. Data is complete	Y	The evaluators have exploited the available data sources,	

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Relevant literature and previous studies have been sufficiently reviewed</li> <li>▪ Existing monitoring data has been appropriately used</li> <li>▪ Limitations to the data retrieved are pointed out and explained.</li> <li>▪ Correcting measures have been taken to address any problems encountered in the process of data gathering</li> </ul>		<p>yet data availability for some analysis was limited. This however is beyond the control of the contractor. The limitations of analysis related to the availability of accurate, detailed and homogenous data and the particularities of the FADN system are clearly explained and where possible addressed.</p>
	<p>Overall assessment of data collection: satisfactory</p>		
<p>4. Analysis and judgments</p>	<p>Check that analysis is sound and relevant</p>		
	<p>a. Analytical framework is sound</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The design of the evaluation is appropriate for addressing the evaluation objectives. The evaluation included both desk and field work and was carried out in four phases: structuring, observing, analysis and judgement. The methodology for answering evaluation questions (analysis and judgement) combined several approaches:</p> <p>a) analysis of regulatory framework, socio-economic situation of each region and national support programmes for the implementation of the programmes, implementation reports, Court of Auditor reports, other relevant studies and evaluations in the descriptive part and specific case studies;</p> <p>b) quantitative analysis using data of DG AGRI,</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The methodology used for each area of analysis is clearly explained, and has been applied consistently and as planned</li> <li>▪ Judgements are based on transparent criteria</li> <li>▪ The analysis relies on two or more independent lines of evidence</li> <li>▪ Inputs from different stakeholders are used in a balanced way</li> <li>▪ Findings are reliable enough to be replicable</li> </ul>		

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
			<p>Eurostat, FADN, national and regional statistics and reports, Producers' Organisations micro-data from farms and accountancy data and operators' trade activities;</p> <p>c) qualitative analysis of data gathered thorough individual and collective interviews with local, regional and national managing authorities, representatives of Producers' Organisations (PO) and Inter-branch Organisations (IBO), farmers and representatives of processing industry including SSA operators, slaughterhouses, processors, food service suppliers and retailers;</p> <p>The combination of these approaches allowed addressing all evaluation questions in a credible way.</p> <p>The examination was well developed both in quantitative and qualitative terms, while the limitations of approaches were clearly presented and taken into account in the interpretation of the results.</p> <p>The analysis was complex given the range of covered fields and the diversity of the Outermost regions (OR) and smaller Aegean islands (SAI). Another challenge was related to the lack of certain homogenous data relating to the period under examination (2006-2014). The steering group noted that the analysis regarding the SAI programme was less elaborated than the one regarding the POSEI programme.</p> <p>The period was characterised by changes introduced by Council Regulation (EC) No 247/2006 and Council Regulation (EC) No 1405/2006, which modified the scheme in order to optimize the food supply and the local</p>

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
			agricultural support by a programming approach. These Regulations were further repealed and aligned with the Lisbon Treaty by Regulations (EU) 228/2013 and 229/2013 respectively.
	<p>b. Conclusions are sound</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Conclusions are properly addressing the evaluation questions and are coherently and logically substantiated</li> <li>▪ There are no relevant conclusions missing according to the evidence presented</li> <li>▪ Findings corroborate existing knowledge; differences or contradictions with existing knowledge are explained</li> <li>▪ Critical issues are presented in a fair and balanced manner</li> <li>▪ Limitations on validity of the conclusions are pointed out</li> </ul>	Y	The findings are based on clearly defined evaluation criteria and supported by the evidence provided through the analysis. Opinions from the stakeholders were considered in a balanced way. The conclusions are substantiated by evaluation findings, which in turn were drawn from the sound analysis. Given the data constraints, they are balanced and prudent.
	Overall assessment by the steering group of analysis and judgements - good		
5.Usefulness of recommendations	a. Recommendations are useful	Y	The recommendations are based on the evaluation conclusions. They can realistically be considered for improving the

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recommendations flow logically from the conclusions, are practical, realistic, and addressed to the relevant Commission Service(s) or other stakeholders</li> </ul>		programmes' management by requiring a clearer strategy of the programmes, reinforcement of coherence with other programmes or more focused reporting in order to better assess compliance with the objectives.
	b. Recommendations are complete	Y	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recommendations cover all relevant main conclusions</li> </ul>		
	The overall usefulness of recommendations scoring - good.		
6. Clarity of the report	a. Report is easy to read	Y	The evaluation report is structured and balanced, following the elements required by the terms of reference. Some formulations in English however are rather complicated but <u>the overall clarity of the report is good.</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Written style and presentation is adapted for the various relevant target readers</li> <li>▪ The quality of language is sufficient for publishing</li> <li>▪ Specific terminology is clearly defined</li> <li>▪ Tables, graphs, and similar presentation tools are used to facilitate understanding; they are well commented with narrative text</li> </ul>		
	b. Report is logical and focused	Y	Even though the structure of the report is logical and consistent, key messages are highlighted and summarised, detailed information is left for the appendix, the main

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The structure of the report is logical and consistent, information is not unjustifiably duplicated, and it is easy to get an overview of the report and its key results.</li> <li>▪ The report provides a proper focus on main issues and key messages are summarised and highlighted</li> <li>▪ The length of the report (excluded appendices) is proportionate (good balance of descriptive and analytical information)</li> <li>▪ Detailed information and technical analysis are left for the appendix; thus information overload is avoided in the main report</li> </ul>		report text could be shortened.
	The overall scoring on clarity of the report - good.		

Overall conclusion			
The report could be approved in its current state, as it overall complies with the contractual conditions and relevant professional evaluation standards	Y	<u>The overall quality of the report is adequate and fulfils clearly the contractual conditions and can be scored as good.</u> It can serve as a useful reference material on the performance of POSEI and SAI schemes to feed into the evaluation SWD that will complete this evaluation.	