



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Directorate G. Economic analyses and evaluation

G.4. Evaluation of measures applicable to agriculture; studies

Brussels,

CC D(06) **40042**

G/A30/DT5/Quality grid/ quality grid food
security - final

STUDY ON THE IMPACT OF EXPORT SUPPORT MEASURES AND FOOD AID ON FOOD SECURITY

Subject: Quality grid based on the Final Report submitted by GRET

PRELIMINARY REMARK

The following text and grid provides a global assessment of the above-mentioned evaluation study. The Commission steering group in charge prepared it at the end of the evaluation process.

The judgement is made on the methodological approach followed to answer the evaluation questions, not on the results, conclusions or recommendations reached by the contractor. It has to be pointed out that it is neither the opinion of the evaluators nor the content of their conclusions that are judged here, but only the methods used for obtaining them.

1. Meeting the needs: Does the evaluation adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and fit the terms of reference?

The evaluation study fully fits the Terms of Reference and meets the information needs of the Commission. The question on the impact of different export support measures and different food aid schemes on food security in destination countries has been well addressed. The main difficulty in this respect was to highlight the impact of certain measures and to distinguish the effects according to the different measures. This information was in some cases not fully delivered due to the complexity of the subject to be analysed. However, the evaluator delivered well what was envisaged in the Terms of Reference.

Global assessment: good

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 evaluation study has fully examined the rationale and the results and likely impacts of the different export support measures and food aid schemes. The possible impact of the measures on the markets and the related consequences are well explained (methodology) and analysed (world markets, importing countries). The different intended and unexpected interactions and consequences of these policies have been examined by looking at experiences in case study countries.

Global assessment: good

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 methodological design is carefully reasoned and clearly presented. The approach to split the analysis of the vast overall question of the evaluation study into different parts was adequate. The splitting of the work in three steps, first theoretical analysis based on literature, second a trade analysis and third field work in case study countries, was very appropriate for answering the difficult question on the impact of export support measures and food aid schemes on food security in destination countries.

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?

Multiple ways of data collection were effectively targeted. The data sources used were adequate; the data collection ensures a sufficiently reliable primary data while also secondary data was well exploited. The data sources are clearly identifiable in the report.

However, in some cases, especially in the case study countries, data availability was restricted or insufficient due to the political and economic circumstances in these countries. In these cases the evaluator tried to get evidence via expert interviews or literature which was appropriate and adequate but which limited in the end the reliability of this data to a certain extent.

Global assessment: satisfactory

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?

The analysis of the information presented was well structured and appropriate. Based on the methodology presented the evaluator analysed the different information sources and tried to establish the causal links to the extent possible. However, due to the complexity of the subject the well established analysis was not always able to deliver clear answers to the questions.

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 data sources form the basis for the findings which are generally well justified. The evaluator was very conscientious of those instances where the information basis was not robust enough, and tried to avoid any judgements which were not sufficiently founded by the sources exploited.

Global assessment: good

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

Conclusions are laid out in a clearly understandable and detailed manner (at the end of each chapter). The conclusions are based on credible results, highlighting the contradictory findings of the study and the related difficulties of drawing general conclusions. However, it was difficult to draw conclusions on the specific impact of the different measures on food security, as other intervening factors play a key role.

Global assessment: good

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

Recommendations point towards directions to follow, but are rather general in character. Detailed advice which could immediately be put in practice is not given due to the complexity of the study's subject. The recommendations are fair and unbiased.

Global assessment: satisfactory

9. Clear report: 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 report is well-structured, written in a very clear language and therefore easily understandable.

Overall judgement: good

The overall quality rating of the report is considered

good

Quality assessment grid

Concerning these criteria, the evaluation report is:	Unaccept- table	Formally correct but weak	Satisfac- tory	Good	Excel- lent
1. Meeting the needs: Does the evaluation adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and fit the terms of reference?				X	
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?				X	
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?				X	
4. Reliable data: To what extent are the primary and secondary data selected adequate? Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?			X		
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?				X	
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?				X	
7. Validity of the conclusions: Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are conclusions based on credible results? Are they unbiased?				X	
8. Usefulness of the recommendations: Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personal or stakeholders' views, and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?			X		
9. Clear report: 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?				X	
Taking into account the contextual constraints on the evaluation, the overall quality rating of the report is considered				X	