

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM¹

Title of the evaluation

EVALUATION OF COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY MEASURES APPLIED TO THE SHEEP AND GOAT SECTOR

DG/Unit DG AGRI, Unit L4

Officials managing the evaluation: Elvira BAKKER

Evaluator/contractor AND International

Assessment carried out by:

Steering group with participants from units C-4, D-1, F-1, I-1, L-1, L-3, L-4 of DG AGRI and DG SANCO

Date of the Quality Assessment October 2011

¹ Refer to the ['Guide on Scoring the Criteria'](#) for how to assess each criterion.

(1) RELEVANCE

Does the evaluation 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 evaluation study covers all the requirements expressed in the terms of reference.. Moreover, the contractor extended the scope of the evaluation by including the milk processing industry in the framework of evaluation questions 4 and 10, dealing respectively with the supply to the processing industries and the relevance of the measures.

(2) APPROPRIATE DESIGN

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

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The design of the evaluation is based on a mix of quantitative and qualitative tools which are properly described. The analyses are built upon a large number of evaluation criteria and indicators. However, the quantitative tools could have been further developed to allow a better separation of the policy impacts from the effects of other factors. The analysis of areas where the sheep and goat production is a traditional activity or contributes significantly to the rural economy is limited to less favoured areas and the case study areas.

(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:

The analyses were based on national and regional agricultural statistics from EUROSTAT, DG AGRI and FADN but also from organisations from different Member States such as France AgriMer, Quality Meat Scotland, Eblex. The quantitative data was complemented with qualitative data collected within case studies carried out in regions in 7 Member States: France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Romania, Spain and UK. A big number of interviews were conducted with national and regional authorities, professional organizations, growers, processors, traders.

Despite the fact that the evaluation covered the period since 1 January 2005, data from 2001 onwards was used in order to capture the impact of the 2003 CAP reform. Despite that some data already available for 2010 was used, the impacts of the Health Check reform were not within the scope of this evaluation. The limitations encountered in terms of data availability are properly explained and taken into account in the formulation of findings and conclusions.

(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 theoretical and empirical analyses are carried out in a systematic way, based on a mix of quantitative and qualitative tools. To the extent possible, the findings formulated based on quantitative tools were crosschecked with findings developed using qualitative tools. However, the quantitative tools could have been extended beyond the mere analysis of statistical trends in order to allow a better separation of the impacts of the reform from the effects of other factors.

The constraints encountered and the limitations of the methods and tools used are pointed out in the presentation of the analysis results and taken into account in the formulation of the conclusions.

(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 well explained and justified based on the results of the analyses carried out. However, the findings related to the drivers behind the dynamics are sometimes ambiguous. This reflects the difficulty encountered sometimes in isolating the effects of the policy measures from other factors of influence.

(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 clearly formulated and reflect in a systematic way the judgements elaborated for each evaluation question. However, certain difficulties were sometimes encountered in clearly establishing causal relations between policy measures, other factors and impacts.

(7) HELPFUL RECOMENDATIONS

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 recommendations are logically derived from the evaluation results and conclusions. They are useful for the current debates on the future CAP after 2013 and on the review of the policy for information and promotion for agricultural products.

(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 has a clear structure. Both the large number of evaluation criteria and indicators used and the balance found in describing and summarising the results and finding are appreciated. However, certain formulations remain ambiguous.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

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

- Does the evaluation fulfil contractual conditions?

Clearly and fully.

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

The findings and conclusions of the report are reliable, limitations have been clearly indicated and are mainly linked to the difficulty encountered sometimes in isolating the effects of the policy measures from other factors of influence and attributing causal relationships.

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

The findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation can be used in the current debates on the future CAP after 2013 and on the review of the policy for information and promotion for agricultural products. Therefore, they are useful and relevant.