

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

Title of the evaluation

**Evaluation study of the Common Market measures for
dried fodder**

DG/Unit AGRI/G4

- Official(s) managing the evaluation: Andreas Kolodziejak and Nélide Ortega Barquero.

Evaluator/contractor

- **AND International** (Paris)
- in cooperation with COGEA (Roma), L'Université de Lleida (Lleida) and the Danish Agriculture Advisory Service (Aarhus)

Assessment carried out by^(*):

- Steering group with active participation of the units of DG AGRI G3, C1, F1 and DG ENV, ECFIN and BUDG.

Date of the Quality Assessment December 2007

(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:

Despite the challenges related to assessing two periods for each question and despite some data problems the evaluation questions have all been answered and the evaluation scope fully respected. Unintended effects were properly identified like the high administration cost of the system in relation to the amount of aid thanks to the appropriate design.

(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 takes into account very properly the need for a clear homogenous presentation of the very different national dried fodder sectors. Throughout the report judgement criteria and indicators are used systematically and adequately for the evaluation questions. The environmental challenge was also correctly taken into account.

(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 limitations of the data were properly tackled at an early stage, either by an increased effort to receive these data from governments, sector organisations and from the Commission or by covering the information needs by the surveys and interviews carried out. Confidential, delicate and sensitive information was treated in the right way which is an achievement in a highly concentrated sector.

(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:

There is a good equilibrium between the investigation of facts (before and after the reform of 2003) and their analysis using adequate overview tables and indicators. Cross checking of findings took place (e.g. from different stakeholders) where this was needed regarding the importance of a question. Furthermore the contractor takes into account the full vector of sustainability (economic, social, environmental) as determined by the Gothenburg Council (2001).

(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:

In the report findings are supported by evidence originating from sound analysis. Stakeholder opinions were considered and reflected when appropriate. Easy findings were avoided by using the appropriate steps before coming to findings.

(6) VALID CONCLUSIONS

Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			x		

Arguments for scoring:

Conclusions are well-ordered as well as coherently and logically substantiated by evaluation findings. Controversial issues e.g. the environmental effects of the aid are presented in a fair and balanced manner.

(7) HELPFUL RECOMENDATIONS

Do areas need 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 are brief, clear and certainly helpful as these are impartial and realistically linked to the policy context.

(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 very clearly structured and facilitates reading. Specialist concepts are well explained. The length of the report is adequate, the annex contains background data that are not needed to have clear understanding of the report. The schedules describing the dried fodder market and use in every MS considered are very helpful.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

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

- Does the evaluation fulfil contractual conditions?

Clearly and fully.

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

The findings and conclusions are reliable as these are based on sound analysis, the recommendations are useful.

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

The reports serves a ready to use rich material, including all the regional data, for the coming reform process of the intervention.

Given the contextual and contractual constraints encountered:

- What lessons can be learned from the evaluation process?

A contractor should be willing, as was shown in the case at hand, to invest enough to close information gaps by own targeted surveys and to ask assistance from regional partners when the regional pattern is more scattered than expected. Thus he can provide a very good evaluation report based on adequate data that are relevant for a sound analysis.