

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM¹

Title of the evaluation Evaluation of Income Effects of Direct Support

DG/Unit DG AGRI, Unit L4

Officials managing the evaluation: Elvira BAKKER, Jana KLIMOVA

Evaluator/contractor AGROSYNERGIE G.E.I.E.

Assessment carried out by:

Steering group with the active participations of Units D-1, I-1, L-1, L-2, L-3, L-4, L-5 of DG AGRI and DG ECFIN

Date of the Quality Assessment April 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 scope formulated in the Terms of Reference was fully covered.

The evaluation examined the effects of the direct support schemes laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 on the income of farmers and answered on how effective and efficient these schemes have been in ensuring a fair standard of living for the agricultural community. The evaluation also examined the coherence of direct payments with measures under the Single CMO and rural development measures with respect to the income objectives. An in-depth analysis was carried out: thus the evaluation distinguished between seven agricultural sectors, choices of implementation of the direct payment schemes in different Member States/regions, farm size, type of organisation and geographical location.

(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:

In the structuring phase, based on literature review, AGROSYNERGIE undertook a comprehensive empirical analysis of the role of direct payments in supporting and enhancing farmers' income. This research enabled the consultant to propose adequate criteria and indicators for answering each evaluation question, and to put forward a methodology comprising a wide range of tools. Thus, the evaluation is based on an adequate mixture of quantitative (statistical analysis, modelling of the effects of direct payments on farm income, farm household income and resource allocation, calculation of Gini coefficient, etc.) and qualitative tools (in the judgement phase an expert survey was carried out).

The methodology, the sources and the reliability of the data as well as the limitations are properly described and well taken into account in the answers to each evaluation question.

(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 analysis was based on agricultural statistics from EUROSTAT at regional level (NUTS II) and on farm data from the FADN database. The difficulties encountered and the data limitations are well explained for each of the tools used.

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 reform. The consultant applied adequate solutions for dealing with the difficulties encountered, and the limitations are properly taken into account in the formulation of findings and conclusions. The data were treated in an appropriate way and are well presented.

(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 adequate quantitative and qualitative tools.

A particularly strong point is represented by the fact that most conclusions are supported by the results of two or more analyses carried out through different methods.

The outcomes of the statistical and quantitative analyses are also cross checked with the opinions of a panel of experts.

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, and they reflect the results of the sound analysis carried out.

(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.

(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.

(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. A good balance was found in the presentation between the huge amount of detailed results of the analyses carried out and the need to summarise the findings in a concise and easily understandable manner. In the executive summary, the analyses carried out, the related findings and the conclusions are synthesised in a straight forward manner, facilitating the reading and the understanding.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

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

- 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 and clear, limitations have been clearly indicated.

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

The results and conclusions of the evaluation can be used as elements for the impact assessment for the future legislative proposals for the post-2013 CAP which is currently carried out. In this context the evaluation is very useful and relevant.