



Brussels,
D(2014)

ASSESSING FARMERS' COSTS OF COMPLIANCE WITH EU LEGISLATION IN THE FIELDS OF ENVIRONMENT, ANIMAL WELFARE AND FOOD SAFETY

AGRI -2011-EVAL-08

Evaluation Sheet

Concerning these criteria, the report is:	Unacceptable	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
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 study responds correctly to the information needs of the commissioning body and meets the requirements of the tender specifications. The items of the descriptive part and the study questions are addressed and the geographical and time scopes of the study are covered.</p>
<p>2. Relevant scope: The study covers the geographical scope (12 Member States in EU27 and 10 third countries) as requested in the tender specifications and focuses for details on selected case studies. As requested, all relevant legislations and sectors are covered. The reference year is the year 2010. Respecting tender specifications, this period is as recent as possible for the purpose of a correct assessment including legal obligations and related costs.</p>
<p>3. Defensible design: The methodology was proposed by the contractor and it respects the requirements of the tender specifications. It was followed adequately by the contractor and has proven to be useful, especially for literature review, screening of legislative obligations, case studies, and sectorial findings and conclusions. However, this methodology has certain limitations as regards the overall, horizontal conclusions.</p>
<p>4. Reliable data: The study has accumulated a tremendous quantity of data. Available information has been completed with case studies and interviews with panel of farmers and local experts.</p>
<p>5. Sound analysis: The challenge has been to extract and summarize from already available and collected information the most relevant facts to answer the objectives of the study. Regardless of some relevant findings, some factual elements remain still rough and the analysis is not very detailed.</p>
<p>6. Validity of the conclusions: The conclusion tries to provide a comprehensive view of the main findings, even if for some cases there is a lack analytical view. Nevertheless it also highlights the methodological limitations of the obtained results.</p>
<p>7. Clearly reported: As the steering group had insisted on significant improvements throughout the duration of the project, the final version of the report is well-structured.</p>

Please see the comments in the analytical note document.

Emmanuel PETEL
Technical Manager

Contact:

Emmanuel PETEL
Telephone: +32 229-66544
E-mail: Emmanuel.Petel@ec.europa.eu