



Brussels,
MD D(2011)

**STUDY ON ASSESSING AGRICULTURE VULNERABILITIES
FOR THE DESIGN OF EFFECTIVE MEASURES
FOR ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE IN THE EU
AVEMAC**

Concerning these criteria, the evaluation report is :	Unaccep- table	Poor	Satisfac- tory	Good	Excel- lent
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 for the impact assessment?				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 of the evaluation, 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

<p>1. Meeting the needs: The contractor has performed all the tasks specified in the administrative arrangement specifications. The study adequately addresses the information needs of the commissioning body.</p>
<p>2. Relevant scope: The study fully covers the scope defined in the administrative arrangement specifications.</p>
<p>3. Defensible design: the applied methodology is appropriate and adequate to provide useful results in relation to the objectives. The new methodology developed for projecting a climate change scenario into a daily set of weather criteria on the whole EU territory and in a very small spatial cell grid is a great step forward in downscaling climate change impacts, assessing crops responses and regional vulnerabilities.</p>
<p>4. Reliable data: The contractor used well acknowledged climate and reported weather data set as well as EUROSTAT and internal data based on a long standing monitoring of harvesting forecasts (historical yields, areas, cropping systems, LFA characteristics...). The different impacts of the two realizations of the IPCC 1AB scenario linked with different precipitation projected patterns are clearly stated together with the limits of the data and assumptions.</p>
<p>5. Sound analysis: the analysis has been performed according to the requirements set out in the administrative agreement specifications.</p> <p>The different analytical tools used were appropriate, analysing the qualitative and quantitative data in a valid manner. The limitations of each of the analytical approaches and tools are clearly presented and fully taken into account in the interpretation of the results.</p> <p>On top of the downscaling, another valuable and innovative element brought by this study, when compared to same type of those currently available/ongoing is the effort done in the assessment of "shorter" term impacts (2020-2030), more relevant for their use in current policy making cycle.</p>
<p>6. Validity of the conclusions: In spite of the great technicalities of this new modelling exercise, the conclusions are established in an understandable and sufficiently detailed manner. They are substantiated by the findings, which are drawn from the sound analysis.</p> <p>The conclusions are not isolated but are put in the wider context of the study, including the detailed analysis of the needs and ways to strengthen the modelling platform currently available to continue assessing climate change impacts on other crops/production systems and regions vulnerabilities with even more downscaling (up to farm level system) and more complex assumptions in order to select the more efficient adaptation measures to be developed in priority in the different regions according to their specific situation.</p>
<p>7. Clearly reported: the clarity and style of the report are satisfactory.</p> <p>The report is well structured, written in a clear language and therefore easily understandable. Unnecessary repetitions have been avoided and the written style and the presentation are clear and adapted to different readers.</p> <p>Even if some parts of the report may be seen as complex for non experts in modelling climate change and crop responses, an extensive set of maps and tables provide clear information on the possible effects of climate change at local level on the yields of the major arable crops produced in the EU, on the production capacity of the regions and on the possible evolution of their LFA status. This will provide valuable baseline for MS when assessing their risks and needs and will allow them making the best use as possible of the tools provided by current and coming CAP.</p>

Myriam DRIESSEN
Technical manager