

# **QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Title of the evaluation:**

**EVALUATION OF CAP MEASURES APPLIED TO THE SUGAR SECTOR**

**DG/Unit: DG AGRI, Unit L4**

- Official(s) managing the evaluation: Martin Szentivany

**Evaluator/contractor:** Agrosynergie, Groupement Européen d'Intérêt Economique

**Assessment carried out by:**

- Steering group with the active participation of units C5, C1, D1, I1, J2, G1, A1, A3, L3, L4, L5 of DG AGRI and DG ENTR

**Date of the Quality Assessment: December 2011**

## **(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:

The evaluation adequately responds to the information needs of the commissioning body and fully meets the requirements of the terms of reference. The themes and evaluation questions are fully addressed and the geographical and time scopes of the evaluation are covered.

## **(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 methodology design is appropriate for addressing the evaluation objectives. As requested by the terms of reference, the evaluation started with the theoretical analysis of measures applied to the sugar sector. In answering the evaluation questions, the results of the theoretical analysis were confronted with the results of the empirical analysis. The methodology developed for the empirical analysis and answering evaluation questions combined several approaches:

- a) theoretical analysis to formulate assumptions on impact of policy measures and analysis of bibliography,
- b) quantitative statistical analysis,
- c) qualitative analysis based on the information collected within the 6 national/regional case studies.

The combination of these approaches allowed answering all evaluation questions in a credible way.

### **(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:

Multiple data sources were exploited in the analysis. The contractor had access to the data provided by the Commission services, which were treated in an appropriate way and were correctly presented.

The quantitative data included statistics from Eurostat, FADN, DG AGRI. The contractor also exploited data from national and regional statistics and the data from private sources, such as data from the Comité européen des fabricants de sucre (CEFS) or Confédération Internationale de betteraviers européenne (CIBE). The quantitative data were completed by qualitative information collected during national/regional case studies during which sugar operators and MS authorities were interviewed. The MS covered by case studies were selected with a view to cover different situations in terms of sugar production/refining and competitiveness level (France, Germany, Italy, UK, Poland, Finland).

Some data deemed too sensitive by sugar operators were not (or only partially) provided to the evaluators, including data on costs of production, sugar companies' restructuring plans, refiners' business plans, which somewhat limited subsequent examination of certain aspects (such as the analysis of social impacts and partly the analysis of competitiveness).

### **(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:

The analysis was carried out in a rigorous way following established evaluation criteria and indicators, relying on multiple data sources. The examination was well developed both in quantitative and qualitative terms, while the limitations of each of the analytical approaches and tools were clearly presented and taken into account in the interpretation of the results.

The analysis was complicated by a particular market context characterised by unprecedented high sugar prices, which made it challenging to isolate the impacts of the reformed sugar measures from those of non-policy factors. Yet, the evaluators made an effort to clearly distinguish the impact of the sugar reform and from the effects of other factors.

### **(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:

The findings are based on clearly defined evaluation criteria and supported by the evidence provided through the analysis. Opinions from the stakeholders were considered in an unbiased way.

### **(6) VALID CONCLUSIONS**

*Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?*

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The conclusions are substantiated by evaluation findings, which in turn were drawn from the sound analysis.

### **(7) HELPFUL RECOMENDATIONS**

*Are areas needing improvements identified in coherence with the conclusions? Are the suggested options realistic and impartial?*

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Arguments for scoring:

The contractor did not make recommendations.

### **(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 well structured and balanced. Yet, it could have been more concise.

## OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Overall, the quality of the report is assessed to be **good**.

**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 of the report are reliable and clear.**

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

**The report provides a sound evaluation of the impacts of the 2006 sugar reform on the sugar sector. Its conclusions are relevant for the post-2013 policy proposal, which is currently underway. In this respect, the evaluation can be used as a useful reference.**