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Workshop: Good Practice workshop: „From On-going Evaluation towards the Evaluation Plan“, Vienna, May 14th, 2012
Overview

- Structure and organisation
- Realisations of on-going evaluation 2007-2012
- Success factors of ‘in house’ on-going evaluation
- Difficulties encountered during the process
Structure and organisation (1)

Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries

Department of agriculture and fisheries

Agency of agriculture and fisheries

Division organisation and strategic policy

Managing authority RDP

Division Monitoring and Study

Responsible for monitoring and evaluation RDP

Paying agency

Divisions executing RDP measures

RDP management committee (every 1.5 month)

Divisions executing RDP measures Ministry of Environment
Structure and organisation (2)

Division monitoring and study

Data gathering

One task: **FADN-network** extend with environmental data

Reporting

Task: reporting using FADN data and all other available data sources

Analysis

Task 1: Policy related studies on demand of minister of agriculture and the other divisions

Task 2: Monitoring and evaluation of RDP (1.5 full time equivalent)

  Task 2.1: Monitoring: annual report and strategic monitoring report

  Task 2.2: Follow-up of ex-ante, mid-term and ex-post evaluation: administration **and content**

  Task 2.3: **On-going evaluation** of RDP
Structure and organisation (3)

• **Steering group on-going evaluation**: Division monitoring and study (4 people) but reporting and involvement of RDP management committee (and by this also MA)
• **Activities of on-going evaluation in Flanders**:
  • Provide high quality data sources for ex-ante, mid-term and ex-post evaluation
  • Execute RDP evaluation studies internally
  • Launch calls for external RDP evaluation studies: administration and content
  • Participation to evaluation expert committee and activities of EENRD
  • Exchange of experience regarding monitoring and evaluation with other regions
  • Capacity building regarding monitoring and evaluation:
    ▪ Development of IT-system
    ▪ Training
Structure and organisation (4)

• Detailed on-going evaluation plan:
  • Yearly, we started with it in January 2010
  • Before it was not written down and it was more on a ‘ad hoc’ basis
  • Why we started with it?:
    ▪ Principles of project management that are used within team:
      ▪ A detailed plan of execution is part of it

• Since 2012 the on-going evaluation’s main focus is on preparation of the new programming period
Realisations of on-going evaluation 2007-2011 (1)

- **Realisation 1**: IT-system (SAS®) for monitoring (annual report):
  - Made ‘in house’ with 10 days guidance of consultant
  - Customer made Excel-sheets have to be filled in by data providers, as much as possible data is requested on a **yearly** basis
  - Excel sheets are read in SAS®, over year cumulating and other data treatments (including quality control) are done; at the end the data is outputted to the Excel-file (web application) of EC
  - Advantages:
    - Minimisation of work to be done by data providers
    - Maximisation of data quality
- **Realisation 2**: Evaluation of environmental impact of investment support (121 and 311)

- **Why?:**
Realisations of on-going evaluation 2007-2011 (3)

• During on-going evaluation (‘in house’):

  • For each type of investment indicators were developed
  • These indicators are situated on the ‘output indicator level’
  • At average for each investment type, 5 indicators were added at the IT management system for the investment files
  • Indicators are registered by the file managers of the Flemish Agricultural Investment Fund with input from the farmers if necessary

• During mid-term evaluation (work done by consultant):

  • Out of the type of investment specific output indicators, the impact indicators (for example avoided GHG emissions) were calculated
Realisations of on-going evaluation 2007-2011 (4)

- Low ammonia emission stables for chickens
- Low ammonia emission stables for pigs
- Photovoltaic cells
- Scrubbing
- Flue gas condenser
- Heat buffer
- Double/coated glazing
- Insulation of stables
- First energy saving screen
- Energy saving screen
- Heating on biofuel
- Heating on gas
- CHP
• **Realisation 3**: Databases made available for mid-term evaluator:
  - FADN database coupled to different kind of other databases:
    - Investment database
    - Database of training courses
    - Agri-environmental measures database
    - Farm Advisory System database
  - GIS-databases
  - Privacy?: no names, addresses and identification numbers were provided to the mid-term evaluator

• **Realisation 4**: method ready for mid-term evaluator to calculate result indicator: Gross Value Added:
  - Farms: FADN and extra data of private accounting firms
  - Agri-food companies: data National Bank of Belgium
Realisations of on-going evaluation 2007-2011 (6)

- **Realisation 5**: ‘In house’ studies (in Dutch, English translation):
  - Indicators for the monitoring of agricultural land with a high nature value (HNVF). An exploratory analysis (Danckaert et al., 2009)
  - Green and blue services in Flanders (Danckaert et al., 2009, 2011)
  - Less Favored Area with natural handicaps in Flanders (Van Zeebroeck et al., 2010, 2011)
  - Cohesion policy in relation to rural development policy (Van Zeebroeck, 2011)
  - Agro-environmental measures: thoughts of the farmers (Maertens, 2011)
  - Stimulation of cooperation in agriculture: Part 2: Possibilities of rural development policy (Vuylsteke and de Regt, 2011)
  - Investment support in agriculture: an European comparison (Van Zeebroeck, 2012)
• **Realisation 5**: studies to be completed in 2012 in preparation of 2014-2020 period:
  • Tool to calculate the on-farm costs to execute agro-environmental measures
  • Scenarios for new Farm Advisory Systems in Flanders
  • Study about the management (administrative) costs of agro-environmental measures
  • Study on European Innovation Partnership
  • Preparation of SWOT for rural development program
  • Launch of call for ex-ante evaluation
• **Realisation 6**: Ordered studies (in Dutch, English translation):
  - Impact of RDP measures on biodiversity in Flanders (Strubbe et al., 2010)
  - Agro-biodiversity: a starting point for 3th generation agro-environmental measures? (D’Haene et al., 2010)

• **Realisation 7**: Continuous monitoring network in order to measure net impacts of Rural Development measures on meadow birds and birds typical for arable land (2012-?)
  (initiated by the study impact of RDP measures on biodiversity, 2010)

• **Realisation 8**: exchange of experience and information (apart from focus group meetings):
  - Exchange with the Netherlands: Utrecht (2008) and Scherpenheuvel (2011)
Success factors of ‘in house’ on-going evaluation

- Direct access to all data sources (FADN and administrative databases)
- Direct communication with managing authority and executers of the RDP measures
- Flexibility: pool of 15 people that be used for on going evaluation studies
- Evaluation knowledge: ‘high level’ communication with external consultant of ex-ante, mid-term and ex-post evaluation: quality control
- Competent head of division with an open mind and a good network (also in Ministry of Environment); experience in RDP evaluation since 2004
- Cheaper than an external on-going evaluator?
Difficulties encountered during the process

- No success: Webservice provided by EC; design too complex for MS implementation
- Three different public institutions. Not straightforward to achieve a full picture of the M&E needs of all measures.
- As a consequence: control of steering group on axis 3 and 4 on-going evaluation activities is low
- Policy impact of (on-going) evaluation results on current RDP program period on the low side
- Impact of (on-going) evaluation results on RDP program development 2014-2020 will be greater, but possibly still weak
Thanks for your attention

Exchange about monitoring and evaluation with the Netherlands (Fort Vechten, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 2008)