



Brussels,

**STUDY ON THE
"MANDATORY ORIGIN LABELLING FOR PIG, POULTRY AND SHEEP&GOAT MEAT"**

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

| |
|--|
| <p>1. Meeting the needs: The contractor has met the information needs identified in the Terms of References (ToR). It addresses the information needs of DG AGRI by providing for the first time a clear analysis of different options of origin labelling of unprocessed meat.</p> |
| <p>2. Relevant scope: Following the regulatory background the study covers the meat of pigs, poultry sheep and goats as requested in the ToR. The case studies cover the relevant Member States for the respective species.</p> |
| <p>3. Defensible design: In proposing a number of options for an in depth analysis the contractor found a good balance between a broad range of theoretically possible ones and practically feasible ones.</p> |
| <p>4. Reliable data: The data were collected from reliable sources.</p> |
| <p>5. Sound analysis: The analysis is sound. Aspects of consumer information, administrative burden, production costs were properly analysed. The informative value on the impact of enforced traceability systems that certain options would require is limited as well as for the cost analysis for public administrations.</p> |
| <p>6. Validity of the conclusions: The report provides a clear and comprehensive overview about the pros and cons of different options of mandatory labelling schemes for unprocessed meats.</p> |
| <p>7. Clearly reported: the report is clear, well presented with numerous graphs and tables and easy to read and understand. The executive summary contains all the fundamental elements of the study presented in a very concise and clear way.</p> |

(Signed)

Miguel Garcia Navarro
Technical Manager