

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM¹

Title of the evaluation:

EVALUATION OF MARKET EFFECTS OF PARTIAL DECOUPLING

DG/Unit: DG AGRI, Unit L.4

- Official(s) managing the evaluation: Jana KLIMOVA

Evaluator/contractor: AGROSYNERGIE G.E.I.E.

Assessment carried out by:

Steering group with the active participations of Units C-2, C-3, C-4, D-1, L-1, L-3, L-4 of DG AGRI and DG ECFIN

Date of the Quality Assessment: October 2010

¹ Refer to the ['Guide on Scoring the Criteria'](#) for how to assess each criterion.

(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

The evaluation replies to all evaluation questions laid down in the Terms of Reference.

As the first horizontal evaluation of direct payments conducted for DG AGRI, it is focused on assessing effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and coherence of partially coupled aid maintained after the 2003 CAP reform. It covers a wide scope of sectors, for which relevant drivers and particularities were examined to isolate the effects of partially coupled aid. The evaluation delivers both the conclusions per each sector and the general policy conclusions.

(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		

The methodology of this evaluation was based on several pillars:

The starting point of the evaluation was, in line with the Terms of Reference, a theoretical analysis of market effects of the coupled / partially coupled / decoupled aid.

For carrying out an empirical analysis and for replying to the evaluation questions, a combination of the following tools was applied:

- statistical analysis,
- qualitative analysis,
- modelling of the effects of full decoupling.

The simulation of the effects of full decoupling was carried out via Positive Mathematic Programming (PMP) models. PMP is a microeconomic model simulating the effects in short-term. The major limitation of this model for the purpose of this evaluation (for simulating market effects) is that this model only gives the results for represented holdings. Consequently, the results cannot be extrapolated to the whole EU agricultural sector. This limitation was partly overcome by a selection of the most relevant farm typologies and macro-regions, for which the simulations were run. Another important limitation, linked to the previous one, is that the model gives results only for the supply side and only for the supply by the groups of holdings represented in the model. In order to overcome this limitation, the evaluator used the results of the external study², in which the impact of full decoupling on prices on the EU market was estimated. The above-mentioned two major limitations as well as the other limitations of the model are clearly explained in the evaluation report.

Furthermore, for the judgement phase a panel of experts was consulted.

² Assessment of the impact of partial decoupling on prices, production and farm revenues within the EU, Scottish Agricultural College, Macaulay Institute and LEI – Wageningen University, 2008

(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	

The evaluator used available secondary data from different sources (such as Eurostat, COMEXT, ministries and statistical offices of Member States, data of DG AGRI and of European federations of processing industries, etc.). A significant part of the analysis, including the simulations via PMP model, was based on FADN data. The available quantitative data were supplemented by qualitative information collected through interviews with relevant stakeholders.

The data were treated in an appropriate way and are well presented.

(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	

The analysis was carried out in a rigorous way, in line with the established methodology. The limitations of each of the analytical approaches and tools are clearly presented and fully taken into account in the interpretation of the results.

The evaluator made an effort to distinguish the impact of the policy measures from the effects of other factors, and paid due attention to the assessment of deadweight effects.

(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	

The findings of the evaluation are clearly formulated and are supported by the evidence provided through the sound analysis.

(6) VALID CONCLUSIONS

Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
				X	

The conclusions are based on an impartial judgement and are substantiated by evaluation findings. They are established in a detailed manner, distinguishing the effects of the policy measures on different sectors covered by this evaluation.

(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
			X		

The recommendations are clear and unbiased. They are helpful as they are impartial and supported by the evaluation results and conclusions. However, they stay rather general.

(8) CLARITY

Is the report well structured, balanced and written in an understandable manner?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

The report is well-structured and balanced, although it could have been shortened. The executive summary represents a very well drafted synthesis of the evaluation conclusions, both at a general policy level and at a level of sectors covered by this evaluation.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Overall, the quality of the report is assessed to be **very 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, limitations have been clearly indicated.

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

The evaluation is completed at a time when the work on the Impact Assessment for the future legislative proposal for the post-2013 CAP is underway. The results of the evaluation can be taken into account in this work. In this context the evaluation is very useful and relevant.