



Ex post evaluation of RDP's environmental results and impacts: what are the expectation and the use?

Vilnius, 27th October 2015

Yves Plees & Fernando Fonseca

DG AGRI, Unit E.4 'Evaluation and studies'

Content

- **Why do we need to evaluate ex post EU rural development policy**
- **Legal framework**
- **Focus of ex post evaluation**
- **Lessons from the mid-term evaluation**
- **What are the Commission's expectations from ex post evaluation**
- **Issues to resolve**

Why do we need to evaluate ex post EU rural development policy

- **Transparency** and **Accountability**
- Show **what** was spent, **how** it was spent and **with which effects**
- Assess **impacts** and **added value** at RDP and EU level
- Contribute to **improve implementation** of RDPs 2014-2020
- Feed into further policy-making and policy learning

Legal framework

- Community strategic guidelines for rural development
- Council Regulation (EC) 1698/2005
- Council Regulation (EC) 74/2009 [Health Check]
- Commission Regulation (EC) 1974/2006
- Guidance on CMEF to implement the legal framework

Focus of ex post evaluation

- **Relevance**
- **Effectiveness** and **efficiency**
- **Results** and **impacts**
- **Achievements**
- **Success** and **failure** factors
- **Good practice**
- **Draw lessons**

Lessons from the mid-term evaluation

- Few MTE reports assessed environmental effects
 - Very few MTE reports used advanced assessment of impacts of environmental indicators
 - Insufficient monitoring hindered data availability and quality
 - The four environmental impact indicators do not encompass the multitude of output and result indicators
- Progress has been made to which ENVIEVAL project has certainly contributed!

What are the Commission's expectations from ex post evaluation

- Use full set of **common indicators and common evaluation questions**
- Measuring progress of result and impact indicators **against targets**
- Use of **counterfactuals** and **netting out of effects**
- Using **advanced quantitative and qualitative methods** for assessment of impacts
- Triangulation of methods (cross-confirming qualitative and quantitative analysis)
- Use of programme-specific indicators and evaluation questions to capture a full picture of the impact of the RDP
- Conclusions and recommendations **based on empirical findings** and consistent with each other

What are the Commission's expectations from ex post evaluation (2)

- Sound **evidence**, sufficient **data** quantity and of high quality is key for the success of evaluation
- **Timing of data collection**
 - data needs must be determined at the earliest stage
 - data collection must occur in due time and in a cost-effective way
 - establishing baselines is a must
 - data collection shall encompass various sources

What are the Commission's expectations from ex post evaluation (3)

- **Showcasing**: Key messages clearly showing **WHAT** was achieved, **HOW** and **WHY**
- Use good examples, TRUE success stories
- Not only compliance with legal requirements
- BUT also clear failures, demonstrating what went wrong and why
- Robust conclusions and recommendations for the future policy

What are the Commission's expectations from the ex post evaluation (4)

- To what extent can we show/demonstrate RDP's environmental effects (especially impacts)?
- For improvements to become visible we need time!
- Some MS have been very ambitious on environmental objectives at programming stage. Have these initial ambitions been realised or not and why (what were the success and failure factors?)
- To what extent can we show what Health Check money delivered?

Issues to resolve

- Environment is influenced by
 - direct and indirect programme effects
 - expected and unexpected programme effects
 - positive and negative external factors
- various factors, sometimes difficult to separate/differentiate from each other.
- Are there methods to assess **net effects** of RDPs on the environment?
- If not possible to assess net effects, which alternative proxies can be used?

Issues to resolve (2)

- **Productive investments:** to what extent have negative effects on the environment been avoided?
- Areas where there have been problems should be given close attention.
- The case of irrigation could be looked at, in contrast to other productive investments
- **Afforestation:** there were no minimum environmental requirements in the past. Were there negative effects on environment?

Issues to resolve (3)

- **Less-favoured areas:**
 - To what extent LFA measure contributes to maintaining farming activity ?
 - Is it also delivering on environment?
 - Have LFA managed to avoid land abandonment and to maintain the countryside?

Issues to resolve (4)

- **Agri-environment** targeting:
 - Some MS target AE payments on areas with most acute environment problems or on certain objectives (i.e. nature conservation), others spread support throughout entire MS/regions
 - To what extent can we assess effects of both approaches, conclude which is most cost-effective?
 - Does a more targeted approach have stronger benefits (even though on a fewer number of objectives), whereas a less targeted approach has weaker benefits (but on a wider number of objectives)?

Issues to resolve (5)

- **NATURA 2000/biodiversity:**
 - Recent mid-term review of biodiversity strategy shows that biodiversity indicator has not improved for period 2007-2012
 - Forest-environmental payments were not successful
 - What were the reasons, despite efforts and/or funds invested?
 - Effects not yet observable?
 - Policy did not work?
 - What needs to be changed?

Issues to resolve (6)

- **Water Framework Directive:**
 - The objective for 2015 was to achieve a good ecological status of water; but only half waters are in good qualitative state
 - What went wrong? Irrigation contributed to this or not? Are there good practices to showcase?
- **Non-productive investments:**
 - To what extent can we assess the way they have delivered on environment and provided public goods (i. e. preserving landscape)?
 - Can we show good practice, success stories?

Issues to resolve (7)

- **Climate change mitigation and adaptation:**
 - To what extent the contribution of RDPs will be assessed using quantitative methods; otherwise an alternative approach?
- **Advisory services and training actions:**
 - To what extent have these measures contributed to awareness raising and dissemination of good practices?
 - Can we demonstrate if there is a clear link between them and achievement of environmental objectives?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION !