

# Proposal Evaluation Form

	<b>EUROPEAN COMMISSION</b>  CONSUMERS, HEALTH, AGRICULTURE AND FOOD EXECUTIVE AGENCY - Promotion of Agricultural Products	<b>Evaluation Summary Report - AGRI-MULTI-2019</b>
---	--	--

**Call:** AGRI-MULTI-2019  
**Type of action:** AGRI-MULTI-IM  
**Proposal number:** 874593  
**Proposal acronym:** LetsTalkAboutPork  
**Duration (months):** 36  
**Proposal title:** Let's Talk About Pork  
**Activity:** MULTI-A-2019

N.	Proposer name	Country	Total Cost	%	Grant Requested	%
1	INTERPORC	ES		40.48%		40.48%
2	INTERPROFESSION NATIONALE PORCINE	FR		40.10%		40.10%
3	AGRUPALTO -- AGRUPAMENTO DE PRODUTORES AGROPECUARIOS S.A.	PT		9.71%		9.71%
4	ALIGRUPO--AGRUPAMENTO DE PRODUTORES DE SUINOS, BOVINOS, OVINOS E CAPRINOS, CRL	PT		9.71%		9.71%
Total:						

## Abstract:

Pork is the most consumed meat in all of Europe. Despite this, its consumption has been falling, which is a major concern for all players in the industry. The factors that led to this evolution are several but mainly relate to attacks on the sustainability of our meat and animal welfare. This project intends to inform the consumer about the reality of production in the entire pork chain. We are going to demystify the attacks that we have been targeting, showing our conditions of production in the farms with scrupulous respect for the highest standards of animal welfare, and then proving the sustainability of our production process and proving how we contribute to nitrogen fixation in the soil, as well as the conditions of well-being and hygiene of slaughterhouses. A very important factor is also the dissemination of our traceability systems throughout the entire production chain that gives the total guarantee to the consumer who has at his disposal a meat that respects all food safety standards. Consumer habits differ from country to country, but this will be the horizontal message in all the countries of covered by this application, and then specific actions are planned in each country. The total budget for this application is € to be applied in three years. The division will be € for Portugal and € for Spain and France, each. The motto of the campaign will be "let's talk about pork", being directed at young people up to 35 years old and will have a series of true and false messages that are intended to provoke and make the young people know the reality of the pork line.

## Evaluation Summary Report

### Evaluation Result

**Total score: 77.00 (Threshold: 62)**

### Form information

#### SCORING

Scores must be in the range 0-5.

#### Interpretation of the score:

- 0— The proposal fails to address the criterion** or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
- 1— Poor.** The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
- 2— Fair.** The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
- 3— Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.
- 4— Very good.** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
- 5— Excellent.** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

### Operational Capacity

Status: **Yes**

If No, please provide a short explanation. In any case, evaluate the full proposal applying below award criteria.

Not provided

### Criterion 1 - Union dimension

Score: **17.00** (Threshold: 14/20.00 , Weight: 100.00%)

(a) Relevance of proposed information and promotion measures to the general and specific objectives listed in Article 2 of Regulation (EU) No 1144/2014, aims listed in Article 3 of that Regulation, as well as to priorities, objectives and expected results announced under the relevant thematic priority;

**(b) Union message of the campaign;**  
**(c) Impact of project at Union level.**

(a)  
*The objectives of the proposal correlate with the specific objectives set in the legal base, as it aims to highlight the strict and high production standards of EU pig meat, to increase competitiveness and to raise awareness of pork meat products among target consumers in Spain, France and Portugal.*

*Proposal refers to sustainability, food safety, traceability, authenticity, quality, taste, diversity or traditions as well as to European production and animal welfare aspects. These aspects are translated into the programme strategy, activities and messages.*

(b)  
*The strategy identifies the main messages of the campaign, adapted to the various aspects to be highlighted. Most of those campaign messages do not explicitly reflect a European dimension.*

*A logo has been created for the campaign, but it is unclear if it is considered as the main Union message.*

*Not all messages make reference to the EU, to the CAP, EU legislation, EU products or EU production standards.*

(c)  
*Programme is of significant scale and has potential to increase awareness and market share of pork meat in France, Spain and Portugal. Programme has significant coverage and is focused on 18-30 years old consumers who are strongly influenced by media promoting eating habits with low meat consumption.*  
*Impact of the programme is quantified on the level of the proposing organisations' Member States.*  
*One of the proposing organisations - INTERPORC - manages a similar EU funded project "PORK LOVERS EUROPE" (Simple programme), but the impact and the reason for a continuation of this project are not clearly described in the proposal.*  
*Programme has potential to benefit other EU pork producers.*  
*Sustainability in terms of economic, social and environmental aspects is sufficiently taken into account. Employment aspects are very well developed.*

## **Criterion 2 - Quality of the technical proposal**

Score: **27.00** (Threshold: 24/40.00 , Weight: 100.00%)

**(a) Quality and relevance of the market analysis;**  
**(b) Coherence of the programme strategy, objectives and key messages;**  
**(c) Suitable choice of activities with respect to objectives and programme strategy, adequate communication mix, synergy between the activities;**  
**(d) Concise description of activities and deliverables;**  
**(e) Quality of the proposed evaluation methods and indicators.**

(a)  
*The market analysis covers target markets of the proposal; it is based on sound and up to date market research and trade data with references quoted.*

*The market analysis points out to trends and challenges to be tackled by the programme; they are presented in a SWOT analysis. Some items tend to be an analysis of the production base rather than of factors such as consumer taste, preferences and practices. Besides, the SWOT analysis contains incoherent or unexplained items, e.g: I+D+i Investment:*

*The market analysis insufficiently describes the competitive position of the proposing organisations and the products to be marketed, of other EU suppliers as well as competitors from third countries. There is little reference to price-quality positioning versus other meats, especially poultry, an equally intensive farming product, but with rising consumption.*

*The market analysis identifies and quantifies the target group of the programme (young consumers 18-30 years old), but their pork consumption habits are not supported with sound data.*

*The market analysis describes the structure and functioning of distribution and retail channels only for one of the targeted countries - France, but not for Spain and Portugal.*

(b)  
*The programme objectives are coherent with the market and SWOT analysis, as proposal aims to tackle the decreasing image of pork meat on the target markets and to increase consumption.*

*The programme objectives are specific, measurable, result-focused and time-bound.*

*However, with regard to achievability, it is unclear how the campaign will result in a 3% of increase in the per capita consumption of the total population if the target group is restricted to millennials.*

*The awareness objectives are defined, but not disaggregated by Member State.*

*The strategy partly addresses the challenges identified in the market analysis, because the proposal aims to target only the millennials, although the downward trend is relevant to the whole population. The objectives and the strategy are not in line in terms of target population.*

*The key message focuses on the welfare, food safety and the production system, whereas the market analysis suggests that the primary reason for declining pork consumption are health concerns and not to the attributes of the production methods.*

(c)  
*The activities and communication mix correspond well to the target group. The negative basis of the proposed campaign (fake news) is not proven to be effective.*  
*The planned activities strengthen each other.*

(d)  
*Activities are well described in order to answer the questions: who, what, when, where, why? The description is detailed enough to estimate*

their cost efficiency.

(e)

Evaluation includes a study to assess the programme's impact undertaken by an independent external body.

The methodology is in line with the one suggested in Annex III.

The proposed Output and Result indicators are aligned with the principles exposed in Article 22 of the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/1831, but this is not the case for the Impact Indicators.

Baseline data regarding awareness objectives are not proposed.

The target value for the economic objective is established as 3% increase in per capita consumption for the whole population, which is not aligned with the strategy and the chosen activities.

### Criterion 3 - Quality of the project management

Score: **10.00** (Threshold: 6/10.00 , Weight: 100.00%)

(a) Project organisation and management structure;

(b) Quality control mechanisms and risk management.

a)

The management structure and roles of the staff involved with the programme implementation are clearly described.

The division of tasks between the implementing/evaluation bodies and applicants is well defined.

An efficient internal coordination strategy in terms of managing different partners and implementing bodies is presented.

Adequate competitive procedures by which the implementing body was selected and the evaluation body will be selected are described.

b)

Appropriate procedures for supervising the work of implementing bodies and other subcontractors are defined.

Both quality of deliverables and respect of timing and budget will be appropriately monitored.

Adequate major risks which could hamper the outcome of the project are identified and correctly classified and mitigating actions to be put in place are presented.

### Criterion 4 - Budget and Cost-effectiveness

Score: **23.00** (Threshold: 18/30.00 , Weight: 100.00%)

(a) Justification of the overall level of investment;

(b) Suitable allocation of budget in relation to the objectives and scope of the activities;

(c) Clear description of the estimated costs and accuracy of the budget;

(d) Consistency between the estimated costs and deliverables;

(e) Realistic estimation of costs of project coordination and of activities implemented by the proposing organisation, including number and rate of person-days.

(a)

The overall level of investment is partially justified by the expected return on investment and increase of awareness.

Positive ROI calculation is based on an expected 3% increase in per capita consumption of the total population. However the chosen activities do not efficiently support this expected result: Given that the specific segment (millennials) represents 14%-20% of the population, the uplift in their consumption will have to be 3-4 times the expected objective of 3%. A similar limitation applies to the presentation of the awareness return on investment.

ROI calculation method lacks details. For example: average sales price/kg, population, which products.

(b)

The budget is efficiently split between the activities.

The budget allocated to activities is high enough to allow for their impactful result in line with the described strategy and indicators.

(c)

For each deliverable, costs are described and presented by using unit costs, except for some activities, where lump sums are used. E.g., WP6.2 Events: Production cost and Personnel costs.

There are few minor errors in the analysis of costs in part B and in the detailed budget table.

The detailed budget table is reconciled with the budget presented in Part A of the proposal, and with the description in Part B, Section 6.

(d)

The costs of activities are coherent with the description and scope of the deliverables.

Unit costs of individual activities are mostly comparable to the usual market rates in the target country, except for certain activities. For example, the following costs are too high:

WP3.2 - Creation of an Instagram account and posts for [REDACTED] EUR/year; [REDACTED] EUR for creation and updates of six Social Media accounts.

WP5 - [REDACTED] EUR/country for the adaption of a video (voice-over).

Samples are not stated as a deliverable and as a cost in the budget analysis, but tastings are predicted as part of WP2 and WP6 activities.

(e)

The number of person-days estimated for activities implemented by the applicants is proportional to the level of its involvement in the programme implementation. The rates of person/days are justified.

The exact role of the company hired to carry out Administrative Coordination is not clarified.

### Overall comments

There are a few minor errors in the analysis of costs in part B and in the detailed budget table.

- WP 05 Press Kits: The amount of [REDACTED] EUR appears to be counted twice.