



Study on

DEVELOPMENT AND MARKETING OF NON-MARKET FOREST PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

QUALITY GRID

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 for the impact assessment?					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 assess the effects of the expiry of the EU milk quota system and is the reporting comprehensible?				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 study adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and is in line with the criteria set out in the terms of reference.</p>
<p>2. Relevant scope: the instruments, product and geographical coverage as well as timeframe are in line with the criteria set out in the terms of reference.</p>
<p>3. Defensible design: the applied methodology is appropriate and adequate to provide useful results with relation to the objectives.</p>
<p>4. Reliable data: the qualitative and quantitative data used in the exercise are transparent and well documented. The fact that the data will not be available has been known even before start of the study. The contractor has sufficiently well addressed this issue in the methodological approach and data were gathered in the course of the study. The collected data were adequate for their intended use.</p>
<p>5. Sound analysis: the analysis has been performed according to requirements set out in the terms of reference. The data are systematically analysed to respond to the study objectives and to cover, to a reasonable extent, information needs. The limitations of the analysis and exceptions to general explanations or evidences were identified, discussed and transparently presented.</p>
<p>6. Validity of the conclusions: Findings and conclusions of the report are reliable. The complexity of the issue of valuation and marketing of non-market forest goods and services unavoidably imposes limitations to the validity and completeness of any attempt to address it. However, to the opinion of the Steering Group, the contractor managed to approach this issue in an effective way.</p>
<p>7. Clearly reported: the report provides a clear assessment of the situation and the information provided in the report may potentially be useful for designing interventions, in particular in the case of individual Member States.</p>

Marius Lazdinis
Technical Manager