



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Directorate H - Sustainability and Quality of Agriculture and Rural Development
H.4. Bioenergy, biomass, forestry and climate change

Brussels, 31.1.2011

AP D(2011)

"PROSPECTS FOR THE MARKET SUPPLY OF WOOD AND OTHER FOREST PRODUCTS FROM AREAS WITH FRAGMENTED FOREST-OWNERSHIP STRUCTURES"

TENDER No. AGRI 2008 EVAL 11

Evaluation Sheet

Concerning these criteria, the evaluation report is :	Unaccep- table	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: Are the necessary policy instruments represented and is the product and geographical coverage as well as time scope sufficient for the impact assessment?			X		
3. Defensible design: Is the applied methodology appropriate and adequate to ensure a clear and credible result?					X
4. Reliable data: To what extent is the selected quantitative and qualitative information adequate?					X
5. Sound analysis: Is the quantitative and qualitative information appropriately and systematically analysed and have the respective tasks been correctly fulfilled?				X	
6. Validity of the conclusions: Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are the conclusions based on credible information?			X		
7. Clearly reported: Does the report clearly describe the problem, the procedures and findings of the evaluation, so that information provided can easily be understood?				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. Meeting the needs: The contractor has performed all the tasks specified in the tender specifications. The study adequately addresses the information needs of the commissioning body, as expressed in the ToR and specified in the Steering Group meetings.</p>
<p>2. Relevant scope: The study fully covers the scope defined in the tender specifications as regards product, time and geographical coverage (case study regions). The forward-looking dimension required by the ToR is somewhat underdeveloped.</p>
<p>3. Defensible design: The methodology chosen is adequate: for the collection of primary information, for the identification of mobilisation obstacles, for the evaluation of possible remedial instruments.</p>
<p>4. Reliable data: Whenever available, the contractor used all relevant data sources. The ToR required extensive primary data collection in the case study regions, a task which the contractor mastered very well, given the difficulties he encountered in the new member states.</p>
<p>5. Sound analysis: The analysis has been performed according to the requirements set out in the tender specifications. The methodology is appropriate, analysing the qualitative and quantitative data in a valid manner. The limitations of methodological tools are clearly presented and fully taken into account in the interpretation of the results.</p>
<p>6. Validity of the conclusions: Overall, the conclusions are drawn in a clearly understandable and sufficiently detailed manner. They are substantiated by the findings, which are based on sound collection of primary information. The study emphasises how the instruments to be chosen depend on the overall context of the forest-based sector in the region considered. However a more hands-on approach, linking recommendations even better to the regional context, would have been even more convincing.</p>
<p>7. Clearly reported: Generally, the report is clearly written and readable. Most parts offer very well structured, concise information and precise conclusions, whereas a few parts are less dense in terms of information and less precise as to their conclusions.</p>

(signed)

Andreas PILZECKER
Technical Manager

Contact:

Andreas PILZECKER , Telephone:56682, andreas.pilzecker@ec.europa.eu