



Brussels, December 2016

EVALUATION STUDY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EUROPEAN INNOVATION PARTNERSHIP FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY AND SUSTAINABILITY (EIP-AGRI)

Contractor: Coffey International Development

Evaluation Sheet

Concerning these criteria, the study report is:	Poor	Satisfac- tory	Good	Very Good	Excel- lent
1. Relevance: Does the study respond to information needs, in particular as expressed in the terms of references?			X		
2. Appropriate design: Is the design of the study adequate for obtaining the results needed to answer the study questions?			X		
3. Reliable data: Are data collected adequate for their intended use and have their reliability been ascertained?		X			
4. Sound analysis: Are data systematically analysed to answer study questions and cover other information needs in a valid manner?		X			
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?			X		
6. Valid conclusions: Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?			X		
7. Clarity: Is the report well structured, balanced and written in an understandable manner?		X			
Taking into account the contextual constraints of the study, the overall quality rating of the report is:			X		

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE EVALUATION

<p>1. Relevance: The contractor has met the information needs identified in the terms of reference. The report addresses the information needs of DG AGRI by providing for the first time a comprehensive, systematic overview and analysis of how MS have implemented the EIP-AGRI. Within the constraints of the fact that implementation is only at an early stage, the study adequately deals with the analysis of the study themes. A justification is provided about the way and the depth to which particular themes are analysed.</p>
<p>2. Appropriate design: The methodology design is appropriate for addressing the objectives of the study. However, substantial input from the steering group was necessary to identify key issues and to develop methodological tools (templates, survey). Information sources and analytical tools are adequate for analysing, within the given constraints, the study themes.</p>
<p>3. Reliable data: Given the early stage of implementation and the fact that only a first series of operational groups (OGs) had been set up, no project results were available yet. The study was therefore based primarily on the approved RDPs, related national legislation and on calls for OGs. It had to rely to a significant extent on how the EIP has been programmed in the RDPs and on what key stakeholders expect and see happening.</p>
<p>4. Sound analysis: The analysis was carried out in a systematic way following established evaluation criteria and indicators, relying on multiple, mostly qualitative data sources (document review, interviews, survey, case study fieldwork). The analysis was challenging given the early stage of implementation which required developing an understanding of the main factors that determine the relevance of EIP-related initiatives as well as the preconditions that need to be in place in order for them to meet their objectives. This required substantial input from the steering group. The development of the typology according to the way MS have implemented the EIP had only limited value for structuring the descriptive chapter and part of the analysis. It provides the basis for selecting the different case studies.</p>
<p>5. Credible findings: The findings are based on clearly defined evaluation criteria and supported by the evidence provided through the analysis. Stakeholder opinions were well considered and reflected.</p>
<p>6. Valid conclusions: The conclusions are substantiated by evaluation findings, which in turn were drawn from the analysis. They address all evaluation questions and they are balanced and prudent. The recommendations are based on the findings and the conclusions, are fair and unbiased, and provide plausible options for improvements.</p>
<p>7. Clarity: The report includes all elements required by the Terms of Reference. The overall structure of the report is clear, however the text in some chapters could be better structured. While messages are clear, the formulations are often not very concise and there are unnecessary repetitions of information.</p>

Caroline RAES
Evaluation Manager