

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

Title of the evaluation:

**EVALUATION OF PROMOTION AND INFORMATION ACTIONS FOR
AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS**

DG/Unit: DG AGRI, Unit L4

- Official(s) managing the evaluation: Martin Szentivany

Evaluator/contractor: ADE (Analysis for Economic Decisions)

Assessment carried out by:

- Steering group with the active participation of units D4, I1, C2, C3, C4, G1, K1, H3, L4 of DG AGRI and DG BUDG and DG ENTR

Date of the Quality Assessment: November 2011

(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:

This evaluation project consists of two parts:

- a) **First part providing a comprehensive synthesis of the evaluation reports on promotion programmes carried out within the framework contracts (commissioned by DG AGRI in 2006, which assessed the effectiveness of information and promotion programmes on the EU internal market and in third countries).**
- b) **Second part building on the first part, evaluating the relevance and effectiveness of the EU information and promotion policy for agricultural products with respect to achieving the objectives laid down in Council Regulation 3/2008 as well as its coherence with other promotion measures applied under the CAP.**

The evaluation covered the period of 2002 to 2010.

The synthesis and the evaluation adequately cover the themes and evaluation questions as defined in 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 evaluation objectives.

It combines several approaches:

- a) **Desk research to draw up a comprehensive synthesis based on 9 evaluation reports produced by the framework contract evaluations commissioned by DG AGRI (4 sector-specific evaluations on the internal market and 5 country evaluations of promotion programmes in third countries).**
- b) **Desk research of the relevant regulations, guidelines and other relevant Commission documentation, including promotion budget analysis.**
- c) **Electronic survey among competent authorities in all 27 MS.**
- d) **Analysis of a sample of 15 promotion programmes originating in 9 EU MS (programme document analysis and stakeholders interviews performed for those programmes in all 9 MS).**

The combination of the above mentioned methodological approaches allowed addressing adequately all evaluation questions in a credible way. It should be noted, however, that evaluating effectiveness of programmes adopted after 2008 proved to be particularly difficult since these programmes have been still in operational phase. Thus, only limited statistical evidence on their impact was available. On a more general note, there are a number of specific inherent challenges that complicate evaluation of promotion and information campaigns, such as the way how post-campaign measurement is taken, lack of reliable primary data on programme impacts or difficulties in attributing impacts to promotion or external factors.

(3) RELIABLE DATA

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

	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
SCORING				X	

Arguments for scoring:

The evaluation relied on various data sources. The contractor had access to the data provided by the Commission services, which were treated in an appropriate way. Furthermore, the evaluators needed to exploit other data sources, such as those on EU and world production, consumption and trade.

The data coming from the EU MPP (Management of Promotion Programmes Database) were used to analyse evolution of promotion programmes in the studied period.

The quantitative data were completed by qualitative information collected during field trips in selected 9 Member States, covering major MS beneficiaries of EU promotion funding, MS where multi-country/multi-product programmes were implemented or MS representing the EU-10 (France, Italy, Greece, The Netherlands, Spain, United Kingdom, Germany, Portugal, Poland). Yet, some of potential data sources, such as those on acceptance/rejection rates of programme proposals at Member State were not exploited.

(4) SOUND ANALYSIS

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

	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
SCORING			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The analysis was carried out in a systematic way and developed in quantitative and qualitative terms. Due to inherent limitations in measuring impact of promotion programmes (mentioned under section (2) Appropriate design) the evaluators needed to rely heavily on the results of on-line survey to competent authorities and face-to-face interviews with the competent authorities and Commission services, which somewhat limited overall robustness of the analysis. This sometimes complicated establishing a clear cause-effect analysis. The limitations of each of the analytical approaches and tools were presented and taken into account in the interpretation of the results.

(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. However, some of the evidence is mainly supported by qualitative data (survey, interviews), which made formulation of unbiased findings challenging. Overall, the evaluators could have been more cautious in the presentation of some findings, where the information basis was not robust enough to make a clear judgement.

(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 were drawn from the analysis. They address all evaluation questions. Given the data constraints, they are balanced and prudent.

(7) HELPFUL RECOMENDATIONS

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 impartial and based on the evaluation findings. They identify possible improvements, which could be considered in the upcoming promotion policy redesign.

(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 well structured and balanced. However, some of the text could have been more streamlined and clear in order to adapt it to a broader audience without a special technical knowledge. Furthermore, the main report remains rather long, which makes it at times less user-friendly.

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 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 conclusions of the report are reliable and clear, limitations are identified.
- Is the information in the report potentially useful for designing intervention, setting priorities, allocating resources or improving interventions?
The evaluation report identifies possible improvements, which could be considered in the upcoming promotion policy redesign.