



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Directorate G. Economic analyses and evaluation

G.2. Quantitative analyses, forecasts, statistics

Brussels,
quality judgement

IMPACT ANALYSIS: STUDY ON BASELINE AND IMPACT INDICATORS FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMING 2007-2013

Quality judgement of the final report

BACKGROUND

On September 20, 2005, the Council of the European Union adopted the EU's rural development policy for the next programming period 2007-2013¹. The new council regulation on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) reinforces the control, monitoring, evaluation and reporting. A common monitoring and evaluation framework has been implemented in collaboration with the Member States in order to support the programme management and maximize the impact of the rural development programmes.

The study 'Impact analysis: Study on baseline and impact indicators for rural development programming 2007-2013' contributed to the preparations by DG Agriculture of this common monitoring and evaluation framework. More specifically, the study provided guidance on the use of the baseline and impact indicators that form the basis ex-ante definition of programme strategy and ex-post evaluation of rural development programmes.

¹ Council Regulation (EC) N° 1698/2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD), O.J., 21.10.2005, L277/1

Concerning these criteria, the study report is :	Unac- ceptable	Poor	Satisfac- tory	Good	Excel- lent
1. Meeting the needs: Does the study adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and fit the terms of reference?			X		
2. Relevant scope: Is the rationale of the policy examined and its set of outputs, results and outcomes/impacts examined fully, including both intended and unexpected policy interactions and consequences?			X		
3. Defensible design: Is the study design appropriate and adequate to ensure that the full set of findings, along with methodological limitations, is made accessible for answering the main study questions?			X		
4. Reliable data: To what extent are the primary and secondary data selected adequate. Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?				X	
5. Sound analysis: Is quantitative and qualitative information appropriately and systematically analysed according to the state of the art so that study questions are answered in a valid way?			X		
6. Credible findings: Do findings follow logically from, and are they justified by, the data analysis and interpretations based on carefully described assumptions and rationale?			X		
7. Validity of the conclusions: Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are conclusions based on credible results?				X	
8. Usefulness of the recommendations: Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personal or shareholders' views, and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?				X	
9. Clearly reported: Does the report clearly describe the policy being evaluated, including its context and purpose, together with the procedures and findings of the study, so that information provided can easily be understood?			X		
Taking into account the contextual constraints on the study, the overall quality rating of the report is considered			X		