



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
Directorate G. Economic analyses and evaluation
G.1. Analysis and overall approach

Brussels,
VJ D(2007)

STUDY ON AGRICULTURAL INSURANCE SCHEMES

Quality judgement of the final report submitted by JRC ISPRA, November 2006

PRELIMINARY REMARK

This quality grid provides a global assessment of the above mentioned report.

It has to be pointed out that it is only the methods and the reasoning used for obtaining the conclusions that are judged here.

1. **Meeting the needs:** does the report adequately address the information need of the commissioning body and fit the terms of reference?

The questions and tasks of the terms of reference have been addressed. Valuable information has been collected on the different schemes and insurance products available in the Member States. The report gives a good picture of the diversity of risk and crisis management tools that exist in the EU and provides very useful and interesting maps.

Global assessment : **excellent**

2. **Relevant Scope:** Is the rationale of the policy examined and its set of outputs, results and outcomes/impacts examined fully, including both intended and unexpected policy interactions and consequences?

The study was not required to examine any existing policies at EU level.

3. **Defensible design:** Is the evaluation design appropriate and adequate to ensure that the full set of findings, along with methodological limitations, is made accessible for answering the main evaluation questions?

The methodology followed to realise the study was well adapted to the situation. Even if the methodological limitations are numerous they are well explained and taken into account.

Global assessment : **good**

4. **Reliable data:** To what extent are the primary and secondary data selected adequate? Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?

The data used for mapping were provided by JRC and are of excellent quality.

The data concerning insurance schemes now in place in the Member States were provided by the Member States themselves, on the basis of a questionnaire. This resulted in major difficulties, as the data and other information supplied were not homogeneous and in some cases arrived very late. Thanks to its commitment, the working team was able to overcome these obstacles. The expert group also acknowledged these difficulties, for which the contractor cannot be held responsible.

Global assessment : **good**

5. **Sound analysis:** Is quantitative and qualitative information appropriately and systematically analysed according to the state of the art so that evaluation questions are answered in a valid way?

Quantitative and qualitative information are appropriately analysed.

Global assessment : **good**

6. **Credible findings:** Do findings follow logically from, and are they justified by, the data analysis and interpretations based on carefully described assumptions and rationale?

The study usefully highlights areas for further work, in particular climatic risk analysis.

Global assessment : **good**

7. **Validity of the conclusions:** Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are conclusions based on credible results?

As the work carried out was largely investigative, the conclusions provide a clear summary of the results of those investigations.

8. **Usefulness of the recommendations:** Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personal or stakeholders' views, and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?

The study was not required to make recommendations. Some hypothetical scenarios for EU-wide insurance schemes were quantified but, in view of the high level of uncertainty, further input will be needed on the policy side in order to fine-tune the analysis.

9. **Clearly reported:** Does the report clearly describe the policy evaluated, including its context and purpose, together with the procedures and findings of the evaluation, so that information provided can easily be understood?

The structure and the presentation of the report are clear enough. The style and the level of language are satisfactory.

Global assessment : **good**

10. **Assessment of the report as a whole**

Taking into account the aspects mentioned above, the report can be considered **good**.