



Brussels, 15 January 2018

**STUDY ON "STORAGE CAPACITIES AND LOGISTICAL INFRASTRUCTURE FOR EU
AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TRADE"**

Evaluation Sheet

Concerning these criteria, the study report is:	Poor	Satisfac- tory	Good	Very Good	Excel- lent
1. Relevance: Does the study respond to information needs, in particular as expressed in the terms of references?				X	
2. Appropriate design: Is the design of the study adequate for obtaining the results needed to answer the study questions?			X		
3. Reliable data: Are data collected adequate for their intended use and have their reliability been ascertained?			X		
4. Sound analysis: Are data systematically analysed to answer study questions and cover other information needs in a valid manner?				X	
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?			X		
6. Valid conclusions: Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?			X		
7. Clarity: Is the report well structured, balanced and written in an understandable manner?		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. Relevance: The study report deals well, within its constraints, with the analysis of the three study themes and case studies. The contractor has met the information needs identified in the tender specifications. The report addresses the information needs of DG AGRI by providing for the first time a comprehensive, systematic overview, mapping and analysis of the storage capacity and the logistical infrastructure for cereals, the oilseed complex and protein crops in the EU. The scope covers the requested periods, products and geographical areas.</p>
<p>2. Appropriate design: The study method chosen is coherent with study needs and requests. The method is adequately described. The information sources and analysis tools chosen by the contractor are adequate for analysing, within available limits, the study themes. Due to some data unavailability or data constraints (e.g. for the mapping of logistical infrastructure) and limited information sources, the use of expert knowledge was necessary.</p>
<p>3. Reliable data: Available information and sources are well identified. However, the situation was challenging for some storage and logistical data. Literature on storage capacities for COP crops covering the entire geographical scope of the study, or at least a significant part of it, emerged as being extremely limited. The mapping of storage capacity was carried out through a combination of desk research, interviews with business associations and independent experts and direct enquiries to individual operators. Reported data on storage capacity had to be supplemented by estimates (especially for on-farm storage). The mapping of the logistical infrastructure was mainly carried on through extractions from relevant databases, supplemented by additional material from desk research and interviews. Some data gaps were filled through interpolation. The data gathered seem sufficient for the purpose. Data collection rationale is explained, and it is coherent with the design of the study. The quality of existing or collected data was assessed as robust, although a level of uncertainty and gaps of information remain. The amount of qualitative information and quantitative data is balanced and appropriate for a valid and reliable analysis in general terms.</p>
<p>4. Sound analysis: There is a clear, solid and coherent deductive analysis of the study themes. The analysis was partly challenging given the difficult data and literature situation. The analysis uses appropriate quantitative or qualitative techniques, suitable to the study context. The context is well taken into account in the analysis. The report reflects a range of stakeholders consulted. The limitations of the analysis are presented.</p>
<p>5. Credible findings: The findings are based on clearly defined evaluation criteria and supported by the evidence provided through the analysis. Stakeholder opinions were considered and reflected.</p>
<p>6. Valid conclusions: The conclusions properly addressed the study themes. They are based on the evaluation findings, drawn from the analysis. The recommendations are based on the findings and the conclusions, are fair and balanced, but also quite general and could have been more concise. They are orderly presented and related.</p>
<p>7. Clarity: The report includes all elements required by the tender specifications. The overall structure of the report is clear. However, some parts contain redundant information and could have been better structured and more concise to facilitate the clarity and readability of the report. The text needed editorial improvement. To facilitate the readability of the maps, the labelling could have been more accurate and organised and the colour ramp classification could have been improved.</p>

Vera FAIRBROTHER
Technical Manager