



Brussels, 6 March 2017

STUDY ON "DISTRIBUTION OF THE ADDED VALUE OF THE ORGANIC FOOD CHAIN"
Evaluation Sheet

Concerning these criteria, the study report is:	Poor	Satisfac- tory	Good	Very Good	Excel- lent
1. Relevance: Does the study respond to information needs, in particular as expressed in the terms of references?			X		
2. Appropriate design: Is the design of the study adequate for obtaining the results needed to answer the study questions?			X		
3. Reliable data: Are data collected adequate for their intended use and have their reliability been ascertained?		X			
4. Sound analysis: Are data systematically analysed to answer study questions and cover other information needs in a valid manner?		X			
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?		X			
6. Valid conclusions: Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?		X			
7. Clarity: Is the report well structured, balanced and written in an understandable manner?			X		
Taking into account the contextual constraints of the study, the overall quality rating of the report is:		X			

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE EVALUATION

<p>1. Relevance: The study report, within its constraints, deals well with the analysis of the three study themes. A justification is provided about the depth to which particular themes are analysed. The scope covers the distribution of value addition along a number of organic food supply chains, with a focus on whether organic supply chains function effectively and efficiently. The case study countries have been selected seeking for representative and wide range of situations across countries and products. Limits of the subject scope of the requested analysis are mostly discussed and respected.</p>
<p>2. Appropriate design: Results are based on the observation of 18 case studies of typical organic supply chains of three different products. These case studies provide insights and are likely to reflect the different types of organic supply chains that can be found in the EU. The study method chosen is coherent with study needs and requests. The method is clearly and adequately described. Due to data unavailability and limited information sources the use of expert knowledge was necessary.</p>
<p>3. Reliable data: Available information and sources are identified. Relevant literature has been satisfactorily reviewed. Limited resources for primary data collection made the use of experts' judgement necessary for the purpose. Data collection rationale is explained. The level of gaps of information remains high. Therefore, the proportion of qualitative information and quantitative data is not always balanced and appropriate for a valid and reliable analysis in general terms.</p>
<p>4. Sound analysis: There is a clear and coherent analysis of the study themes. The analysis is focussed on the most relevant cause/effect relations and influences. The limitations of the analysis are presented as well as the difficulty to proceed to valid generalisations or extrapolations at EU level out of the case studies analysed.</p>
<p>5. Credible findings: Some conclusions are based on experts' opinions. Most findings are supported by evidence originating from qualitative data. Lack of public data on the organic market for specific products and in certain countries has been pointed out.</p>
<p>6. Valid conclusions: Conclusions are properly addressed to the study themes and other information needs. Conclusions are coherent and logically substantiated by study findings. They are orderly presented and related. Although valid, they are simplistic, self-evident and controversial issues are not brought up.</p>
<p>7. Clarity: The report is well structured. There is a sequence among data, interpretation and conclusions. Tables, graphs, and similar presentational tools are used to facilitate understanding. Written style and presentation is adequate.</p>

Varvara BEKTASIADOU
Technical Manager