



Brussels, 16 February 2009

## Study on

# MODELLING OF FEED CONSUMPTION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

## QUALITY GRID

Concerning these criteria, the evaluation report is :	Unacceptable	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
<b>1. Meeting the needs:</b> Does the study adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and fit the terms of reference?				X	
<b>2. Relevant scope:</b> Is the product, price and geographical coverage as well as time scope sufficient for the terms of reference?				X	
<b>3. Defensible design:</b> Is the applied methodology appropriate and adequate to ensure a clear and credible result?			X		
<b>4. Reliable data:</b> To what extent is the selected quantitative and qualitative information adequate?			X		
<b>5. Sound analysis:</b> Is the quantitative and qualitative information appropriately and systematically analysed and have the respective tasks been correctly fulfilled?			X		
<b>6. Validity of the conclusions:</b> Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are the conclusions based on credible information?			X		
<b>7. Clearly reported</b> Is the work clearly set-out in the study report, understandable for those not specialised in the subject matter?				X	
<b>Taking into account the contextual constraints of the study, the overall quality rating of the report is:</b>			X		

## JUSTIFICATION FOR THE EVALUATION

<p><b>1. Meeting the needs:</b> the study provided a comprehensive overview of feed consumption in the EU and a model that can be very useful in assessing feed consumption and the feed stuffs market, in line with the criteria set out in the terms of reference.</p>
<p><b>2. Relevant scope:</b> the scope of the model (in terms of coverage of geography, animal sectors, feed concentrates, time frame) follows the conditions set out in the terms of references. Certain modifications were discussed and agreed with the Steering Group and implemented adequately.</p>
<p><b>3. Defensible design:</b> the model used for compound feed estimates is good, whereas the module for estimates of farm mixed feed is clear, but less developed. The integration of the two modules could be improved.</p>
<p><b>4. Reliable data:</b> The contractors used a wide variety of source to obtain nutritional and technical coefficients. With regard to animal and cereal production data were taken from Eurostat. Compound feed data from FEFAC, the European feed manufacturers' association, were used, as the only comprehensive source available. A great number of price quotations from numerous sources have been used, enhancing precision, while reducing user efficiency.</p>
<p><b>5. Sound analysis:</b> Keeping in mind that the achieved model development was a complex technical undertaking and that the simulations provide a broad set of results, the quantitative and qualitative information subject to analysis concerned principally cereals and oilseeds as the key feed ingredients.</p>
<p><b>6. Validity of the conclusions:</b> While the simulated results, specifically the tendencies of consumption of the major feed ingredients such as cereals and oilseeds, are reasonable, considerable differences with external data remain with regard to other feed ingredients. These differences can largely be explained by the limited module on feed "mixed on-farm".</p>
<p><b>7. Clearly reported:</b> the report provides a brief and good description of the modelling effort. The manual and user guide for the model are clear and comprehensible.</p>

(signed)  
Gijs SCHILTHUIS  
Technical manager