

# **QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Title of the evaluation:**

**EVALUATION OF THE CAP POLICY ON PROTECTED DESIGNATIONS OF ORIGIN (PDO)  
AND PROTECTED GEOGRAPHICAL INDICATIONS (PGI)**

**DG/Unit:** DG AGRI, unit L-4

- Official managing the evaluation: Dorota Nadolna

**Evaluator/contractor:** London Economics

**Assessment carried out by:**

- Steering group with the active participation of DG AGRI (units B-1, B-3, C-2, C-4, G-1, H-1, H-2, H-3, K-1, L-4, M-1), ENTR, RTD, and TRADE.

**Date of the Quality Assessment:** November 2008

### **(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 covers the intervention scheme in question on Protected Designation of Origin and Protected Geographical Indication in the requested period of time and geographical coverage. However, not all aspects of the policy specified in the terms of reference are sufficiently examined, e.g. legal aspects concerning the balance of rights between PDO/PGI producers and other potential users or the coexistence with trademarks, and economic impacts of the scheme.

### **(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 methodology design is very general and reflects a superficial understanding of the rationale of the intervention. It is based almost exclusively on qualitative analyses based on opinions of the stakeholders collected during interviews. The limitations of data had not been adequately addressed which resulted in the necessity to reorient parts of the evaluation work and prolong the respective stages of the evaluation process.

### **(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:

In the absence of adequate EU-wide quantitative data, the contractor used available secondary data, including subject literature and research projects, which have been sufficiently reviewed. The primary data is only of qualitative nature as indicated above. Moreover, the limited number of interviewed stakeholders limits the possibility of sound analysis and credible conclusions. The formal verification of the collected interview data has been insufficient due to their limited validation by the country experts. The limitations of data are explained only in a general manner.

#### **(4) SOUND ANALYSIS**

*Are data systematically analysed to answer evaluation questions and cover other information needs in a valid manner?*

	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
<b>SCORING</b>	X				

Arguments for scoring:

The evaluation study implied a two-step approach: 1) a description of the intervention, including EU-wide implementation and usage of the scheme and 2) analysing data collected in case studies (interviews) to answer the evaluation questions. From the interviews the information was derived in such a way that an analysis according to the themes of the study could be performed. However, this analysis remains only superficial. The limitations of the analysis are identified and explained in the report in a general manner.

#### **(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?*

	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
<b>SCORING</b>	X				

Arguments for scoring:

The findings presented are based on the analysis of obtained qualitative data and on assumptions. The limitations of the analysis and the data are generally explained. Cross-checking of findings was carried out only to a limited extent. Extrapolations made on the basis of the analysis are not always justified and explained, e.g. potential impacts of the non-existence of list of generics. The credibility of the findings is limited due to the weaknesses of data collection and analysis.

#### **(6) VALID CONCLUSIONS**

*Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?*

	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
<b>SCORING</b>	X				

Arguments for scoring:

The conclusions are established in a general manner and are not always sufficiently substantiated by evaluation findings or linked thereto. Due to the methodological design, which was not fully adapted to all issues of the evaluation, such as economic impacts of the scheme, and consequently affected the analysis and its results, the validity and usefulness of conclusions is limited.

## **(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 rather small number of recommendations in the report, is of general nature and not always clearly linked to the conclusions and evidence presented in the report.**

## **(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. However, its length in comparison with the content is disproportionate, with unnecessary repetitions. Detailed information collected in the course of the case studies are left for the annex, so that information overload in the report is avoided. The written style and presentation are clear and adapted to different target readers; though, the use of specific terminology is not always accurate.**

## **OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

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

- Does the evaluation 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 do not provide sufficient answers to all evaluation questions. They are general and based mainly on qualitative analysis. The validity and completeness of the findings and conclusions are, therefore, limited.**

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

**Some information in the report can serve as an input for an impact assessment in view of reviewing the intervention.**