

+

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

Title of the evaluation:

MAPPING AND ANALYSIS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CAP

DG/Unit: DG AGRI, Unit E4

- Official(s) managing the evaluation: Andre Kolodziejak together with Yves Plees

Evaluator/contractor: Ecorys

Assessment carried out by:

- Steering group with the active participation of units B2, C.1, C.2, D1, D.2, D.3, E.1, E.2, E.3, E.4, H.1, H.3, H.4, I.1, J.1 and R.1 of DG AGRI¹, and SG, DG BUDG, DG ENV and DG TRADE

Date of the Quality Assessment: November 2016

¹ Organigram of 1.10.2016

(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 describes the implementation choices made by the Member States in the area of direct payments and rural development policy, including the importance attached by the Member States to the different general objectives – and elements thereof – described in Article 110 (2) of Regulation 1306/2013 when making and justifying their implementation choices. Furthermore the evaluation study assesses the relevance, coherence and effectiveness of the implementation of the CAP by Member State, as well as elements of their efficiency, such as the impact of the CAP implementation on administrative burden and potential for simplification.

The evaluation adequately responds to the information needs of the commissioning body and meets the requirements of the terms of reference. The geographical scope and time scope for the evaluation have been fully covered.

(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 methodology design is appropriate for addressing the study objectives such as producing mapping fiches, a typology of the implementation choices of the Member States and an assessment of the likely impacts of the implementation choices (relevance, coherence and effectiveness). It included both desk and field work. The methodology for answering evaluation questions combined literature research, ten case studies and national expert knowledge.

The combination of these approaches allowed addressing the all evaluation questions of the implementation choices in a credible way.

(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 evaluation uses a variety of quantitative and qualitative data:

- a) **data of DG AGRI, Eurostat, FADN, national and regional statistics, Rural Development Plans, notifications and implementation reports**
- b) **information from national experts and interviews in the Member States as well as information gathered through the case studies**

The evaluators have exploited available data sources. The limitations of analysis related to the number of years available and the non-availability of beneficiaries' implementation choices are clearly explained.

(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 analysis was carried out in a systematic way following established evaluation criteria and indicators, relying on multiple quantitative and qualitative data sources.

The examination was well developed both in quantitative and qualitative terms, while the limitations of approaches were clearly presented and taken into account in the interpretation of the results.

The analysis was challenging given the very limited time of realisation of the new CAP and the necessary simultaneous analysis of Pillar 1 and Pillar 2 instruments. The clustering of countries according to their use of instruments produced some problems (such as the omission of the ANC instrument for countries like Finland, Malta, Slovenia, Luxembourg and Sweden) and several rounds of adaptations were necessary.

(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 based on clearly defined evaluation criteria and supported by the evidence provided through the analysis.

(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 substantiated by evaluation findings, which in turn were drawn from the sound analysis. Given the data constraints, they are balanced and prudent.

(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 recommendations are based on the evaluation conclusions.

They can realistically be considered for improving CAP policies, in particular the strategic policy approaches of the Member States towards the overarching three objectives (viable food production, sustainable management of natural resources and balanced territorial development) as well as contributing to the reduction of the administrative burden of the policy instruments.

(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 evaluation report is structured and balanced, following the elements required by the terms of reference. Sentences are often too long but the overall clarity of the report is good.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Overall, the quality of the report is assessed to be **good**.

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

- Does the evaluation study 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 and clear.

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

The evaluation study e.g. its clustering of Member States can serve as a basis for subsequent evaluation studies and as a help to improve policies in future, in particular the strategic coordination of policies in Pillar 1 and 2 and the limitation of the administrative burden.