

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM¹

Title of the evaluation

EVALUATION OF COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY MEASURES APPLIED TO THE WINE SECTOR

DG/Unit DG AGRI, Unit L4

Official managing the evaluation: Yves PLEES. The preparation of the terms of reference for the call for tenders was managed by Elvira BAKKER.

Evaluator/COGEA

Assessment carried out by:

Steering group with participants from units L-4, C-3, F-1, A-1, A-4,I-1, D-1 of DG AGRI, DG MARKT, DG TRADE, SG

Date of the Quality Assessment September 2012

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 the requirements expressed in the terms of reference.

(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 is based on a mix of quantitative analysis, combined with case studies in 12 regions and postal surveys to public authorities, wine sector and distilleries, as well as a number of interviews. It is complemented with an online store check in the EU and third countries. The research design is well-suited for this type of evaluation. Moreover, the limitations and difficulties encountered with the chosen approach were clearly identified.

(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 contractor ensured the use of the most recent and relevant information available. The contractor had access to data provided by Commission services, as well as secondary data such as from Eurostat. Also the own surveys, store checks and interviews provided useful data. However, the short time laps between the 2008 reform and the evaluation meant that for some measures the real effects can not yet be fully appreciated. Moreover, the response rate on the survey with the wine industry was very low.

(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 evaluation questions are answered using clear judgement criteria established in advance and using the available data in a methodologically sound way. Evidently, for some of the evaluation questions the analysis is limited by the (quality of) the data at hand.

(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 of the evaluation are supported by the evidence provided through the analysis and the case studies.

(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 reflect well the findings and are non-biased.

(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 recommendations are helpful and in coherence with the conclusions. However, some of them could be a bit more detailed as regarding the possibility of their practical implementation .

(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 well structured and balanced. The contractor succeeded to make the high volume of information digestible and to explain clearly the different steps leading to the evaluation conclusions and recommendations.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Overall, the quality of the report is assessed to be **very good**

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.

- 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 situation of the wine sector. Therefore, they are useful and relevant.