



Brussels,

STUDY ON THE "VALUE OF PRODUCTION OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND FOODSTUFFS, WINES, AROMATISED WINES AND SPIRITS PROTECTED BY A GEOGRAPHICAL INDICATION (GI)"

Evaluation Sheet

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: Are the necessary policy instruments represented and is the product and geographical coverage as well as time scope sufficient?				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: Does the report clearly describe the problem, the procedures and findings, so that information provided can easily be understood?				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 contractor has met the information needs identified in the Terms of References (ToR). It addresses the information needs of DG AGRI by providing for the first time a clear picture of the economic importance of the EU GI sector.</p>
<p>2. Relevant scope: The study covers all the EU-27 geographical indications registered through the 4 EU schemes as requested in the ToR. The time span covered is the one indicated in the ToR.</p>
<p>3. Defensible design: The contractor found a good balance between collecting existing data from national public authorities (in particular in IT, ES, PT and FR), conducting a survey of producers' groups, and doing estimates based on reference prices and comparison with similar GIs.</p>
<p>4. Reliable data: The data collected were cross checked and are reliable. The contractor corrected the minor errors identified in the numerous data provided (for each of the 2768 GIs considered, the database provide the sales volume and value for each year from 2005 to 2010, and by destination: national market, EU market, export).</p>
<p>5. Sound analysis: The analysis is sound but rather descriptive. Further explanations on the reasons behind the sales evolution and the dynamics of the sector were expected.</p>
<p>6. Validity of the conclusions: the report clearly provides an overview of the EU GI sector, and the similarities and differences between the 4 existing EU schemes.</p>
<p>7. Clearly reported: the report is clear, well presented with numerous graphs and tables and easy to read and understand.</p>

Vincent CORDONNIER
Technical Manager