

Quality Assessment for evaluation of the impact of the CAP on habitats, landscapes, biodiversity - Final Report

DG/Unit AGRI unit C.4 Monitoring and evaluation

Official(s) managing the evaluation: Uwe Glufke (AGRI C.4)

Evaluator: Alliance Environnement GEIE

Assessment carried out by(*):

Steering group (ISG) X

Evaluation Function X

Other (please specify) []

(*) Multiple crosses possible

Date of assessment 10/12/2019 – Interservice Steering Group (ISG)

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
1. Scope of evaluation	Confirm with the Terms of Reference and the work plan that the contractor :		
	a. Has addressed the evaluation issues and specific questions	Y	The contractor addressed all issues from the Terms of References (ToR) and replied to the evaluation study questions (ESQs).
	b. Has undertaken the tasks described in the work plan	Y	The draft final deliverable was rejected once, due to some missing elements.
	c. Has covered the requested scope for time period, geographical areas, target groups, aspects of the intervention, etc.	Y	The geographical and the time scope (data availability) were covered. The complex intervention logic focussed on direct and indirect impacts of CAP instruments/measures. Even though

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
			there were some data limitations, the CAP's indirect impact on biodiversity could have been more clearly identified.
2. Overall contents of report	Check that the report includes:		
	a. Executive Summary according to an agreed format, in the three required languages (minimum EN and FR)	Y	The executive summary was delivered in EN and FR according to DG AGRI's Framework Contract.
	b. Main report with required components	Y	The contractor addressed all elements of the ToR in the main report.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Title and Content Page ▪ A description of the policy being evaluated, its context, the purpose of the evaluation, contextual limitations, methodology, etc. ▪ Findings, conclusions, and judgments for all evaluation issues and specific questions ▪ The required outputs and deliverables ▪ Recommendations as appropriate 		
c. All required annexes	Y	All deliverables were submitted according to the ToR.	

3. Data collection	Check that data is accurate and complete		
	a. Data is accurate	Y	The contractor performed a basic consistency check. ISG colleagues provided considerable input, in particular for consistency between assessment parts (ESQs), corresponding findings, conclusions and recommendations.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data is free from factual and logical errors ▪ The report is consistent, i.e. no contradictions ▪ Calculations are correct 		
	b. Data is complete	Y	The contractor used the possible range of available EU and

		<p>external databases/warehouses for this evaluation. The project team also performed a comprehensive data and literature review. For the data collection, the contractor conducted case studies in ten Member States according to established selection criteria. In general, the data collected was fit for the purpose of this evaluation. However, the available data on individual projects respectively at beneficiary level were limited, as well as data for some statistical indicators over the entire assessment period. For certain evaluation criteria, only qualitative elements were available.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relevant literature and previous studies have been sufficiently reviewed ▪ Existing monitoring data has been appropriately used ▪ Limitations to the data retrieved are pointed out and explained. ▪ Correcting measures have been taken to address any problems encountered in the process of data gathering 	

4. Analysis and judgments	Check that analysis is sound and relevant		
	a. Analytical framework is sound	Y	The analytical framework was sound. The methodological approach used by the contractor combined quantitative, semi-quantitative, and qualitative elements in the assessment part dedicated to the ESQs replies. The contractor addressed the different types of analysis that were required by replying to the ESQs. The findings are not surprising but addressing the ESQs.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The methodology used for each area of analysis is clearly explained, and has been applied consistently and as planned ▪ Judgements are based on transparent criteria ▪ The analysis relies on two or more independent lines of evidence ▪ Inputs from different stakeholders are used in a balanced way ▪ Findings are reliable enough to be replicable 		
	b. Conclusions are sound	Y	The contractor performed the assessments on the established evaluation criteria, which resulted in findings backed up by the various data sources used. Critical issues have been tried to reply to in a fairly balanced way. However, given the scope, time limitations and resources, not all assessments could be performed by the project team in the requested detail.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conclusions are properly addressing the evaluation questions and are coherently and logically substantiated ▪ There are no relevant conclusions missing according to the evidence presented ▪ Findings corroborate existing knowledge; differences or contradictions with existing knowledge are explained ▪ Critical issues are presented in a fair and balanced manner ▪ Limitations on validity of the conclusions are pointed out 			
5. Usefulness of recommendations	a. Recommendations are useful	Y	The contractor strictly kept the logical approach that recommendations were only provided when based on conclusions and underlying findings. Some interesting recommendations have been provided for future policy design, and valuable proposals have been addressed at Member States' level concerning their CAP implementation choices.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations flow logically from the conclusions, are practical, realistic, and addressed to the relevant Commission Service(s) or other stakeholders 		
	b. Recommendations are complete	Y	Main recommendations were clearly set out in the executive summary. Some recommendations in the report could have been further
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations cover all relevant main conclusions 		

			detailed concerning the concrete way they can be implemented.
6. Clarity of the report	a. Report is easy to read	Y	Taking into account that the subject is very technical, the report is relatively easy to read. This is in particular true for the executive summary.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Written style and presentation is adapted for the various relevant target readers ▪ The quality of language is sufficient for publishing ▪ Specific terminology is clearly defined ▪ Tables, graphs, and similar presentation tools are used to facilitate understanding; they are well commented with narrative text 		
	b. Report is logical and focused	Y	The structure of the report follows the ToR and the agreed form of the deliverable. Form and content of the executive summary are set out by the framework contract.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The structure of the report is logical and consistent, information is not unjustifiably duplicated, and it is easy to get an overview of the report and its key results. ▪ The report provides a proper focus on main issues and key messages are summarised and highlighted ▪ The length of the report (excluded appendices) is proportionate (good balance of descriptive and analytical information) ▪ Detailed information and technical analysis are left for the appendix; thus information overload is avoided in the main report 		
Overall conclusion			
The report could be approved in its current state, as it overall complies with the contractual conditions and relevant professional evaluation standards		Y	The deliverables were approved by written consultation of the ISG.