

# **QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM<sup>1</sup>**

**Title of the evaluation:**

**EVALUATION OF CAP MEASURES APPLIED TO THE STARCH SECTOR**

**DG/Unit: DG AGRI, Unit L.4**

- Official(s) managing the evaluation: Jana KLIMOVA

**Evaluator/contractor: AGROSYNERGIE G.E.I.E.**

**Assessment carried out by:**

Steering group with the active participations of Units C-5, D-1, L-3, L-4 of DG AGRI and DG ENTR

**Date of the Quality Assessment: November 2010**

---

<sup>1</sup> Refer to the ['Guide on Scoring the Criteria'](#) for how to assess each criterion.

### **(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	

The evaluation replies to all evaluation questions and covers both analyses requested by the Terms of Reference:

- ex-post evaluation of the CAP measures applied to the starch sector after the 2003 CAP reform,
- prospective analysis of full decoupling in the potato starch sector.

### **(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	

In designing the methodology for both the ex-post analysis and the prospective analysis the evaluator duly took into account data constraints with respect to the starch sector.

The methodology was based on 4 approaches:

- theoretical analysis of coupled, partially coupled and decoupled payments on the farmers' behaviour,
- quantitative empirical assessment,
- qualitative empirical assessment,
- analysis of bibliography.

A significant part of the analysis is found on FADN data. The analysis based on FADN data was a key analysis for answering the evaluation questions of the theme 1 concerning the effects on the farm sector but it served for replying to the evaluation questions in other themes too, such as with respect to the impact on supplies to starch manufacturers. The evaluator was able to cope with the limits of the FADN sample for the particular purpose of this evaluation and developed a sophisticated methodology for carrying out the analysis.

To overcome a lack of secondary data and to obtain qualitative information on the sector, the evaluator undertook a survey among starch manufacturers, interviews, national studies and case studies.

### **(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	

Secondary data from public and private sources were used. Furthermore, the evaluator made a huge effort to collect primary data via a survey among starch manufacturers, interviews, national studies and case studies.

#### **(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	

The analysis was carried out in line with the established methodology. The results of the quantitative analysis, run for the ex-post evaluation and for the simulations of the situation of full decoupling, were cross-checked with the information obtained via the survey among starch manufacturers, the interviews and the case studies.

The limitations of each of the analytical approaches and tools are clearly described and taken into account in the interpretation of the results.

The evaluator made an effort to distinguish the impact of the policy measures from the effects of other factors.

#### **(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	

The findings of the evaluation are formulated in a detailed manner and are supported by the evidence provided through the sound analysis.

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

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

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
				X	

The conclusions are substantiated by the evaluation findings. The conclusions for the ex-post analysis and for the prospective analysis are clearly distinguished.

#### **(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			

The recommendations are clear, unbiased and supported by the evaluation results and conclusions. However, they stay rather general and address imminent challenges for the sector (as identified in the framework of the evaluation) only to a certain extent.

## **(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			

**The report is drafted in a very detailed manner and it is not sufficiently concise.**

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

Overall, the quality of the report is assessed to be **very 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 findings and conclusions of the report are reliable and clear, limitations are indicated.

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

The report provides a sound evaluation of the impacts of the CAP policy on the starch sector. Despite the fact that the decision concerning full decoupling of the starch potato support scheme has already been taken, the results of the analysis of likely effects of this policy change are useful.