EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Directorate H - Sustainability and Quality of Agriculture and Rural Development
H.4. Bioenergy, biomass, forestry and climate change

Brussels, 10.07.2012
AP D(2012)

"IMPACTS OF RENEWABLE ENERGY ON EUROPEAN FARMERS"

CONTRACT NO. 30-CE-0367588/00-58

Evaluation Sheet

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**		

Commission européenne/Europese Commissie, 1049 Bruxelles/Brussel, BELGIQUE/BELGIË - Tel. +32 22991111
Office: L130 3/154 - Tel. direct line +32 229-56682 - Fax +32 229-21133

andreas.pilzecker@ec.europa.eu

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE EVALUATION

1. Meeting the needs: The contractor has met the information needs identified in the Terms of References (ToR).
2. Relevant scope: The study covers the geographical scope (EU27) of the ToR and focuses for details on carefully chosen case study regions. As requested all relevant types of Renewable Energy (RE) are covered. The time span covered is the one indicated in the ToR. In terms of policy coverage, the study covers national RE support policies. However, Rural Development policy is not covered analytically.
3. Defensible design: Given the lack of (coherent) data, the approach to make a judged extrapolation based on the National Renewable Energy Actions Plans (NREAPs) for the calculation of the on-farm RE balances is adequate. The methodology for calculating the GHG emission savings is sound and reflects the current state of the art. The questionnaire for collecting primary information is adequate for getting insight at farm level (drivers and barriers). The FFSIM model does not entirely clarify the questions of theme 3 of the ToR, which are not covered by the questionnaire or any other analytical tools.
4. Reliable data: Whenever available, the contractor used relevant data sources. The ToR required primary data collection in the case study regions. The quality of these data was to a certain extent restricted by limited time and financial resources. However, it is difficult to trace back how the data available relate to the RE balance projections and FFSIM model calculations. Data shortcomings are spelled out in the study.
5. Sound analysis: Regarding themes 1 & 2 the analysis is sound, but difficult to follow in case of theme 1. The FFSIM counterfactual simulations for theme 3 are based on rather theoretical assumptions making the modelling an exercise of reduced added value. Moreover, they cover not enough parameters to deliver meaningful insights into farm-level impacts. The analysis of drivers and barriers based on the questionnaire is satisfactory given the limitations faced. The study, however, does not provide a comprehensive analysis of the RD policy.
6. Validity of the conclusions: The RE balance projections are presented with adequate caution. However, it is difficult to trace back how the details were derived. Conclusions regarding drivers and barriers are based on the questionnaire and the focus groups meetings and are presented with respect to regional differences. Conclusions on RD instruments are weak as are those based on the FFSIM simulations.
7. Clearly reported: Overall the report is written in an understandable language and can be considered satisfactory. More logical links and references between the different parts would have been helpful for the orientation of the reader.

Andreas PILZECKER
Technical Manager

Contact:
Andreas PILZECKER , Telephone:56682, andreas.pilzecker@ec.europa.eu