

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

Title of the preparatory action: “EU plant and animal genetic resources in agriculture – No 2”

DG/Unit: DG AGRI, Unit B2

- Official(s) managing the evaluation: Aniko SEREGELYI, Fabio COSSU

Contractor: Arcadia International (Belgium) and Areté srl (Italy)

Assessment carried out by the technical manager

Date of the Quality Assessment: 16/01/2020

(1) RELEVANCE

Does the study 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 relevance of the pilot project is considered very good. The preparatory action addresses the needs identified by European Parliament (who initiated the project) and elaborated by the Commission in the tender specifications. In particular, it provided an array of operational tools to inspire and stimulate interested actors across the EU to initiate projects for the valorisation of neglected/endangered breeds and varieties in an economically viable way.

(2) APPROPRIATE DESIGN

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

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring: The design of the preparatory action was regarded as good. The methodology chosen is coherent with the needs of the preparatory action. The methodological approach for each step was duly described and agreed with the Steering Group. The four valorisation projects and the further examples collated in the compendium of valorisation projects provided a good basis for the development of the user guide and to support the overall preparatory actions' findings. The communication and dissemination activities supported effectively the implementation of the projects and contributed to awareness raising activities and dissemination of results.

(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 preparatory action made use of the extensive database of contacts and projects/initiatives established under the first preparatory action on EU plant and animal genetic resources in agriculture. It complemented such information by gathering first-hand data from existing projects and initiatives across the 28 EU member states. Relevant stakeholders were engaged and consulted along the preparatory actions and in the validation of the results.

(4) SOUND ANALYSIS

Are data systematically analysed and cover other information needs in a valid manner?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring: The analysis performed was in line with the requirements set out in the terms of reference. It was based on the methods and tools agreed within the Steering Group. Four valorisation projects in four EU member states were carried out. Specific strategies based on a SWOT analysis and an implementation plans were developed for each of the four projects in close collaboration with local actors. Findings from the four projects and other 56 valorisation initiatives form across Europe were analysed as a basis to develop the operational user guide.

(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: Credibility of findings was evaluated as good. The findings are based on the analysis of a wide set of projects and initiatives and supported by the evidence provided through the analysis. The opinions of local actors were considered and reflected. The final conference provided the occasion to discuss the findings with a range of relevant stakeholders whose opinion and recommendations have been further integrated in the main operational output of the preparatory action (user guide).

(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 properly addressed the preparatory action themes. They are largely based on the analysis of the projects' findings and the compendium of valorisation initiatives. The user guide developed as main advisory tool, provides the project's target group (actors involved in the developments, management and support of valorisation projects) with a practical advisory tool to support the valorisation of neglected breeds and varieties in agriculture.

(7) 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 clarity of the report was considered good. The report includes all elements required by the tender specifications. It is well structured and provides a clear description of the rationale and the findings of the preparatory action.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL REPORT

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

- Does the report fulfil contractual conditions?

YES

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

Findings and conclusions of the report are considered reliable. The user guide aims to support valorisation projects of agriculture genetic resources. It draws on the experience of a large number of initiatives across Europe, therefore the general recommendations therein provided should be adapted to the specificity of the local contexts and the genetic resource concerned. Its translation in more languages would enhance its value and practical use by local actors.

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

YES