

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM¹

Title of the evaluation

EVALUATION OF MEASURES APPLIED UNDER THE COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY TO THE CEREALS SECTOR

DG/Unit DG AGRI, Unit L4

Officials managing the evaluation: Yves PLEES, replaced by Elvira BAKKER for a part of the study.

Evaluator/contractor LMC International

Assessment carried out by:

Steering group with participants from units C-1,C-5, D-1,H-4,I-1,L-1,L-3, L-4, of DG AGRI and DG ENER, ENV, ENTR, SG

Date of the Quality Assessment December 2012

¹ Refer to the [‘Guide on Scoring the Criteria’ for how to assess each criterion.](#)

(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 study covers the requirements expressed in the terms of reference. However, not all evaluation questions have been treated in the same level of detail.

(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 design is based on a mix of desk research combined with a survey questionnaire among farmers and interviews with stakeholders. Case studies carried out by experts from the relevant areas were responsible for analysing in depth specific topics (eg biogas in Germany).

(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 contractor had access to data provided by Commission services, as well as secondary data such as from Eurostat. The contractor also ensured the use of the most recent information available, also from sources outside the Commission services. Additional information was collected via questionnaires. Overall, the contractor used relevant and reliable information; however, cross-validation between different data sources (eg the information from the questionnaires) could have been done in a more systematic way.

(4) SOUND ANALYSIS

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

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
		X			

Arguments for scoring:

The descriptive part gives a good overview of the state of play regarding the EU cereals sector anno 2012. The answers to the evaluation questions were based on the information collected, however, for some evaluation questions the analysis could have been more in-depth, or at a lower geographical level of detail. Moreover, representativeness of the information used and limitations of analysis could have been given more clearly.

(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:

The findings of the evaluation are supported by the evidence provided through the analysis. However, given that not all aspects were analysed with the same level of rigour, some elements of the evaluation findings might have been overemphasised, while some other aspects might have been underestimated.

(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 reflect well the evaluation findings, however, given the issues highlighted in (4) and (5), it is necessary to consider them together with the analysis.

(7) HELPFUL RECOMMENDATIONS

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 recommendations, while in coherence with the conclusions, could have paid more attention as to their practical feasibility.

(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:

Most chapters also read fairly well, and efforts have been made to present the information in an attractive way. However, to a certain degree there is overlap between the information presented in the different chapters. Moreover, some parts of the document could have been drafted more clearly.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Overall, the quality of the report is assessed to be **satisfactory**

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

- Does the evaluation fulfil contractual conditions?

The evaluation fulfils the contractual conditions

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

The findings and conclusions of the report are reliable; however it is important to see them in the context of the analysis made.

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

The information in the evaluation is useful in presenting the state of play and main issues in the cereals sector anno 2012 and the main developments that have led to this; in this sense, it could be used for drawing lessons for the future.