



Brussels,
D(2011)

"STUDY ON ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN REDUCTION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY"

Quality grid

Concerning these criteria, the evaluation report is :	Unacceptable	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
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 ?				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

1. Meeting the needs:

The study addresses the information needs of the commissioning body and is in line with the requirements set out in the terms of reference.

2. Relevant scope:

The measures, geographical area as well as the timeframe covered by the study correspond to the ones set out in the terms of reference.

3. Defensible design:

The applied methodology corresponds to the methodology set out in the terms of reference. It is the default methodology for the assessment of administrative burden and is considered to provide adequate and useful results in relation to the matter.

4. Reliable data:

The study required extensive data collection; a task during which the contractor encountered practical difficulties. With a view to the calendar, an alternative data collection approach was found, at times different from the one originally envisaged but still within the boundaries of the approach generally followed for such a study.

The collected data is satisfactory for their intended use.

5. Sound analysis:

The data collected have been assessed according to requirements set out in the terms of reference and the elaboration of the recommendations was carried out in a valid manner, respecting the set methodology. The limitations of the methodological tools have been identified and taken into account in the interpretation of the results.

6. Validity of the conclusions:

Overall, the conclusions/recommendations are drawn in an understandable manner, based on the set methodological approach and substantiated by the findings.

7. Clearly reported:

Generally, the report is properly structured and clearly written. It provides a comprehensive inventory of the findings, an overview of good practices as well as an elaborate set of recommendations that may potentially be useful for future policy modifications.

Johan VAN GRUIJTHUIJSEN
Technical Manager