



Brussels,

STUDY "ASSESSING THE ADDED VALUE OF PDO/PGI PRODUCTS"

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?				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, 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

1. Meeting the needs: The contractor has met the information needs as identified in the Terms of References (ToR). The study provides a high number of case studies (13) with an assessment of the added value of producing a GI compared to corresponding standard product taking into account the costs, in particular at the level of producers.

2. Relevant scope: The study meets the minimum requirements of the scope as identified in the ToR. 13 case studies were conducted in 8 EU countries (AT, BE, DK, ES, FR, IT, SI, UK). In terms of sectors, it covers wines (2), cheeses (3), oils and fats (2), fruit (1), vegetables (2), fresh meat (1), meat products (2). The time span covered is in line with the requirements of the ToR.

3. Defensible design: The data collection strategy for the study was based on a combination of different methods and tools, aimed at collecting the necessary evidence base made up of both primary and secondary data. It consisted mainly of direct sourcing of primary data from relevant stakeholders (especially national/local institutions dealing with GI products; GI producer organisations; individual producers of GI products and standard products) and collection of secondary data (where available) through desk research.

4. Reliable data: Data on prices, costs and margins are very sensitive data to collect. In most cases, the contractor sourced directly primary data from relevant stakeholders. A quality control system was implemented to check the reliability of primary data.

5. Sound analysis: The analysis is sound. The collected quantitative and qualitative data were analysed. This resulted in an overview for the 13 case studies indicating whether producers of a GI product obtain a higher price and/or higher gross margin compared to the producers of a standard product. The reasons behind (factors for success and failure) were analyzed and this was complemented by other factors of added value.

6. Validity of the conclusions: The number of case studies carried out is limited if compared to the overall number of registered GI names in the EU. This implies that the selection of case studies cannot be considered representative of the wide variety of GI names registered in the EU, and hence that the conclusions of the study cannot be generalised to the more than 2500 GIs in the EU.

7. Clearly reported: The report is clear, well presented with several figures and tables and easy to read and understand. The executive summary contains all the fundamental elements of the study presented in a concise and clear way.

Diederik DE SMEDT
Technical Manager