



Brussels,

Study on
MODELLING OF FEED CONSUMPTION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION
QUALITY GRID

| Concerning these criteria, the evaluation report is: | Unacceptable | Poor | Satisfactory | Good | Excellent |
|---|--------------|------|--------------|------|-----------|
| 1. Meeting the needs: Does the study adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and fit the terms of reference? | | | | X | |
| 2. Relevant scope: Is the product, price and geographical coverage as well as time scope sufficient for the terms of reference? | | | | X | |
| 3. Defensible design: Is the applied methodology appropriate and adequate to ensure a clear and credible result? | | | X | | |
| 4. Reliable data: To what extent is the selected quantitative and qualitative information adequate? | | | X | | |
| 5. Sound analysis: Is the quantitative and qualitative information appropriately and systematically analysed and have the respective tasks been correctly fulfilled? | | | X | | |
| 6. Validity of the conclusions: Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are the conclusions based on credible information? | | | | X | |
| 7. Clearly reported Is the work clearly set-out in the study report, understandable for those not specialised in the subject matter? | | | | 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. Meeting the needs: the study provided a comprehensive overview of feed consumption in the EU and a revised model – that takes into account better the on-farm component – allowing a very useful assessment of feed consumption and the feed stuffs market, in line with the criteria set out in the terms of reference.</p> |
| <p>2. Relevant scope: the scope of the model (in terms of coverage of geography, animal sectors, feed concentrates, time frame) follows the conditions set out in the terms of references. Certain modifications were discussed and agreed with the Steering Group and implemented adequately.</p> |
| <p>3. Defensible design: the model allows a good estimate of industrial feed compound but, although substantial improvements in the concept itself, the on-farm component of the model would need further development.</p> |
| <p>4. Reliable data: The contractors used a wide variety of source considered as reliable to obtain nutritional and technical coefficients. Data come from national institutes (nutritional tables), ESTAT (animal and crop production), FEFAC (animal production, compound feed data), JRC (remote sensing data), Tallage (the contractor, for different balance sheets) and a certain number of private providers as regards price of raw materials and other commodities.</p> |
| <p>5. Sound analysis: The models calibration's exercises as well as the sensitivity analysis were conducted in a very sound manner. The proposal to change the modeling concept as regards 'on-farm' component was based on factual evidences and accepted. Although, the descriptive part (e.g; behavior of farmers across Europe against in terms of farm management) was rather limited but considered as satisfactory in the frame of the current study. Globally a 'satisfactory' score can be given.</p> |
| <p>6. Validity of the conclusions: The simulated results in terms of final volumes (total) for the animal feed at the EU level are acceptable (comparison with both Tallage and AFGRI balance sheets). After the improvement of the on-farm component, more is asked from the user to interpret appropriately the model results. The results should be compared with external sources and against several scenario (e.g. price evolution in the future, milk quotas...), these aspects have not been part of the Terms of Reference. Training for further users has to be foreseen.</p> |
| <p>7. Clearly reported: The report provides a brief and good description of all the aspects related to modeling. The manual and user guide for the model are clear and comprehensible.</p> |

(signed)

Mohamed EL AYDAM
Technical manager