

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM¹

Title of the evaluation

EVALUATION OF EXCEPTIONAL MARKET SUPPORT MEASURES IN THE POULTRY AND EGG SECTOR

DG/Unit DG AGRI, Unit L4

Officials managing the evaluation: Andreas KOLODZIEJAK

Evaluator/contractor AgraCEAS

Assessment carried out by:

Steering group with participants from units C-4, D-2, D-3, I-1, L-3, L-4, M-1, M-3 and SJ, SG, DG TRADE, DG ENTR and DG SANCO.

Date of the Quality Assessment November 2011

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	

Arguments for scoring:

The evaluation study covers all the requirements expressed in the terms of reference. Moreover, the contractor extended the scope of the evaluation by analysing in depth the media coverage and communication process.

(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 design of the evaluation is based on a mix of quantitative and qualitative tools which are properly described. The analyses are built upon a large number of evaluation criteria and indicators. However, the quantitative tools could have been further developed to allow a better separation of the policy impacts from the effects of other factors.

(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:

The analyses were based on national and community agricultural statistics from EUROSTAT, FADN and the European Commission but also from European sector organisations such as Avec and from the World organisation for Animal Health. The quantitative data were complemented with qualitative data collected by an EU wide survey with the Competent Authorities and within country studies carried out in the 7 Member States that were the main recipients of the scheme: France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Poland and Spain and UK. Interviews were conducted with national authorities, professional organizations like Avec, EUWP and Copa Cogeca, retailers, producers, processors, packers and traders. It is appreciated that also an interview took place with the European Food Safety Authority. Data collection via interviews was limited by the fact that the measures took place five years ago. For data on income losses no harmonised data were available.

The limitations encountered in terms of data availability are properly explained and taken into account in the formulation of findings and conclusions.

(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 theoretical and empirical analyses are carried out in a systematic way, based on a mix of quantitative and qualitative tools. To the extent possible, the findings formulated based on quantitative tools were crosschecked with findings developed using qualitative tools. The constraints encountered and the limitations of the methods and tools used are pointed out in the presentation of the analysis results and taken into account in the formulation of the conclusions.

(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 well explained and justified based on the results of the analyses carried out. The findings on the impact of co-financing on the uptake of the measures could have been underpinned in a more robust 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 clearly formulated and reflect in a systematic way the judgements elaborated for each evaluation question. However, certain difficulties were sometimes encountered in clearly establishing causal relations between policy measures, other factors and impacts and reaching overall conclusions on the basis of analysis in the national case studies.

(7) HELPFUL RECOMMENDATIONS

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	

Arguments for scoring:

The contractor had the courage to formulate a rather long list of recommendations. The majority of the recommendations are logically derived from the evaluation results and conclusions. The recommendations are useful for the current debates on the future CAP after 2013 and on the review of the policies for crisis management, communication and promotion for agricultural products. In the CAP post 2013 policies the Commission foresees now a special budget dealing with crisis measures. The recommendations are also useful for other agricultural sectors dealing with crisis and perceived lack of consumer confidence. They also point clearly at aligning crisis policy with the new legal framework of the Lisbon Treaty.

(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 has a clear structure. Both the clear description of the national measures and the national implementation of the measures are appreciated. The report even repairs where clarity is lacking in the regulation such as the definition of market disturbance. The text contains some repetitions that are to a large extent necessary to cover adequately the answers to the evaluation questions.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

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; limitations have been clearly indicated and are mainly linked to the difficulty encountered in isolating the effects of the policy measures from other factors of influence and attributing causal relationships.

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

The findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation can be used in the current debates on the future CAP after 2013 and on the review of the policy for market stabilisation, crisis management, and adapting information, communication and promotion policies to the needs that occur in case of crisis for poultry and eggs but also for agricultural products including crops. Therefore, they are useful and relevant.