

## QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

**Study of the best ways for producer organisations to be formed,  
carry out their activities and be supported**

**DG AGRI, Unit G1**

**Officials managing the evaluation:**

Annette Kliemann, later replaced by Alexander Stein

**Contractor:**

Arcadia International and Ernst & Young

**Assessment carried out by:**

Steering group

**Date of the Quality Assessment:**

August 2018

### **(1) RELEVANCE**

*Does the evaluation respond to information needs, in particular as expressed in the terms of references?*

<b>SCORING</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
				X	

**Arguments for scoring:**

The study provides an overview and background knowledge about recognised and non-recognised producer organisations (POs) and associations of producer organisations (APOs) in the EU. The study further investigates the incentives agricultural producers have to create or join POs, as well as the benefits these POs bring their members and the food supply chain.

### **(2) APPROPRIATE DESIGN**

*Is the design of the evaluation adequate for obtaining the results needed to answer the evaluation questions?*

<b>SCORING</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
			X		

**Arguments for scoring:**

Given the budgetary and time constraints the study's design is adequate for obtaining helpful results.

### **(3) RELIABLE DATA**

*Are data collected adequate for their intended use and have their reliability been ascertained?*

<b>SCORING</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
		X			

**Arguments for scoring:**

Given the budgetary and time constraints the collected data is adequate for the intended use, even if parts of it are necessarily anecdotal.

### **(4) SOUND ANALYSIS**

*Are data systematically analysed to answer evaluation questions and cover other information needs in a valid manner?*

<b>SCORING</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
			X		

**Arguments for scoring:**

The collected data is compiled systematically and reported in the text as well as in figures, tables, and annexes.

### **(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?*

<b>SCORING</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
			X		

**Arguments for scoring:**

Findings are based on the collected primary and secondary information to respond to the pre-established questions.

### **(6) VALID CONCLUSIONS**

*Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?*

<b>SCORING</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
				X	

**Arguments for scoring:**

Statements and conclusions in the text are referenced and based on primary or secondary information compiled for the study.

### **(7) HELPFUL RECOMMENDATIONS**

*Are areas needing improvements identified in coherence with the conclusions?  
Are the suggested options realistic and impartial?*

<b>SCORING</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
		X			

**Arguments for scoring:**

The study identifies some areas needing improvements throughout the text but does not present a coherent set of recommendations.

### **(8) CLARITY**

*Is the report well structured, balanced and written in an understandable manner?*

<b>SCORING</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
		X			

**Arguments for scoring:**

The report is balanced and overall well-structured, but there are repetitions, some sections with poor writing, and case-wise inconsistent presentation of the data.

## **OVERALL ASSESSMENT** **OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**Is the overall quality of the report adequate, in particular:**

- Does the study fulfil contractual conditions?

**Yes.**

- Are the findings and conclusions of the report reliable, and are there any specific limitations to their validity and completeness?

**Given the budgetary and time constraints, the findings and conclusions of the report are useful, even if some information is more anecdotal.**

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

**Yes.**