



Brussels, 14 January 2016

STUDY ON "COST OF AND GOOD PRACTICES FOR FADN DATA COLLECTION"

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

1. Relevance: The study report deals very well, within its constraints, with the analysis of the study themes. A justification is provided about the depth to which particular themes are analysed. The scope covers the requested periods and geographical areas. The case study countries are suitably selected. Limits of the subject scope of the requested analysis are mostly discussed and respected. The study broadens the geographical scope of analysis in search for more evidence. The study adds to existing knowledge by providing a comprehensive, systematic overview as well as offering a full set of specific value estimates.

2. Appropriate design: The rationale of FADN data collection, the concept of the FADN network, the type of data collected, policy context, stakeholder interests, etc. have been taken into account in design the study. The study method chosen is coherent with study needs and requests. The method is clearly and adequately described. Information sources and analysis tools are adequate for analysing, within available limits, the study themes.

3. Reliable data: Available information and sources are well identified. Relevant literature has been satisfactorily reviewed, although non English or French language items are only very few. 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.

4. Sound analysis: There is a clear, solid and coherent deductive analysis of the study themes. The analysis is well focussed on the most relevant cause/effect relations and influences underlying the FADN data collection and use, and alternative explanations have been considered. The analysis uses appropriate quantitative or qualitative techniques, suitable to the study context. Nevertheless, there are also statements supported by very little evidence. The context is well taken into account in the analysis. The report reflects a range of stakeholders consulted. While stakeholders in the data supply chain are well represented, those using the data are less so. The limitations of the analysis are presented.

5. Credible findings: Many judgements are based on stated criteria. Most findings are supported by evidence originating from sound analysis. Generalisations or extrapolations, when made, seem justified. Findings corroborate existing knowledge, although there is not much reference information available and uncertainties related to underlying data remain. Stakeholder opinions were often considered and reflected. Limitations on validity are pointed out; trade-offs between internal and external validity are identified and discussed.

6. Valid conclusions: Conclusions are properly addressed to the study themes and other information needs. Conclusions are coherently and logically substantiated by study findings. However, the ones on the best practices in use are relatively scant, which might be a reflection of the representation of the data users in the analysis. Conclusions are interpreted in relation to the policy context. They are orderly presented and related, although with recommendations mixed in. Controversial issues are not brought up.

7. Clarity: The report is well structured. However, key messages are summarised and highlighted only in the concluding section. There is a sequence among data, interpretation and conclusions, although the width of the subject, variety of situation and number of evoked examples overwhelm the reader with enumeration and detail. Tables, graphs, and similar presentational tools are used to facilitate understanding and they are very useful, also in terms of increasing clarity of presentation. Written style and presentation is adapted for the various relevant target readers.

Piotr BAJEK
Technical Manager