

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

Study on "The Civil Dialogue Groups for the Common Agricultural Policy – Analysis of EU Policy Consultation"

DG/Unit: DG AGRI, Unit I.4

Official managing the study:

Julita Konieczka

Contractor:

Deloitte Consulting B.V.

Assessment carried out by:

Steering group

Date of the Quality Assessment:

January 2020

(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 complete information as requested in the terms of reference. The contractor has thoroughly followed the Study themes and respected the structure set up in the ToR. The Study includes ten case studies and describes in detail the functioning of Civil Dialogue Groups in DG AGRI, as well as similar groups in other Directorates-General.

(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:

The study methodology chosen is coherent with study needs and requests. The methodology is adequately described. The information sources and data-gathering tools chosen by the contractor are adequate for analysing the CDGs and their impact on the EU policy.

(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:

Given the time constraints the collected data is adequate for the intended use, even if parts of it are necessarily anecdotal. Some campaigning was reported due to the identical replies to some questions of the online questionnaire. The half-day workshop was attended by less than half of the CDG member organisations, so that the outcome of the discussions is less representative.

(4) SOUND ANALYSIS

Are data systematically analysed to answer study 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.

The report also reflects the information collected from the stakeholders interviewed and/or consulted during the Case studies and the half-day workshop.

A more critical approach of the extent to which the results from the online questionnaire have been affected by the campaign of some member organisations 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:

The findings are based on defined pre-established questions and supported by the evidence provided through the analysis. Stakeholders and EC officials' opinions were considered and reflected.

(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 based on the findings of the study. The general recommendations are based on the findings and the conclusions, are fair and balanced.

(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 areas needing improvements and proposes recommendations throughout the text/per Study theme. It also presents a set of overarching recommendations which focus on the five main areas identified by the contractor.

(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 includes all elements required by the tender specifications; the report is balanced and overall well-structured, but there are some repetitions and parts with lengthy writing.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL REPORT

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

- Does the report fulfil contractual conditions?

YES

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

YES, the findings and conclusions of the report are reliable but should be considered with caution due to the subjective nature of responses given by the consulted stakeholders.

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

YES, the report will help design the future framework of civil dialogue for the CAP. The case studies on groups in other DGs are particularly helpful.