



Brussels, 9 December 2014

**STUDY "MANDATORY ORIGIN LABELLING FOR MILK, MILK USED AS AN INGREDIENT
AND OTHER TYPES OF UNPROCESSED MEATS"**

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

1. Meeting the needs: The contractor has met the information needs as identified in the Terms of References (ToR). The study provides for the first time a number of case studies (9) to assess different options on implementing origin labelling for milk and milk used as an ingredient and for main minor meats as horse, rabbit and game meats a desk research to analyse the feasibility of mandatory origin labelling at different stages of the animal's life (birth, rearing, slaughtering)

2. Relevant scope: The study meets the minimum requirements of the scope as identified in the ToR. The time span covered is in line with the requirements of the ToR.

3. Defensible design: The data collection strategy for the study was based on a combination of different methods and tools, aimed at collecting the necessary evidence base made up of both primary and secondary data. It consisted mainly of direct sourcing of primary data from international organisations and relevant stakeholders and collection of secondary data (where available) through desk research. However, the methodology proposed by the tender specifications has proven to be incomplete to fully analyse the different labelling options in some specific foods under the remit of the study.

4. Reliable data: Data on prices, costs and margins are difficult to collect in the milk and minor meat sectors. The consultants were not able to obtain reliable figures from relevant stakeholders in some cases (particularly in Germany and Romania) for specific dairy products. Also, data were not completed on the dairy products from other species than cattle and on game birds and hunted species. A quality control system was not clearly implemented to check the reliability of primary data on processing costs to implement mandatory labelling.

5. Sound analysis: The analysis was not completely sound to analyse the impact of voluntary labelling and reared/slaughter origins without birth indication. Impact costs and consumer/price increases were not clearly distinguished between mandatory labelling scenarios for EU/non EU, group and multi-country member state origins, and between place of milking and first processing. Aspects as consumer willingness to pay following increases of purchasing prices were not accurately accomplished for all origin scenarios and dairy products. Moreover, the impact of different compulsory origin labelling systems on the public administration burden and on trade for minor meats was quite limited.

6. Validity of the conclusions: The report provides an acceptable overview about the pros and cons of establishing mandatory origin labelling for drinking milk, some dairy products where the milk is used as an ingredient and horse and rabbit meats. However, results cannot be considered fully representative since the number of case studies carried out is limited. Hence, the conclusions and recommendations of the study for all the foods under the remit of the study have to be prudently evaluated

7. Clearly reported: The report is reasonable for reading and understand it and is presented with numerous graphs and tables. The executive summaries contain most of the fundamental elements of the study and are presented in a better even way than the study reports and the leaflets.

Manuel del Pozo Ramos
(Technical Manager)