

DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION OF NEW METHODOLOGICAL
FRAMEWORKS FOR THE EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF
RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES IN THE EU

**COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF
EVALUATION METHODS (WP7):
STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF CURRENT
EVALUATION METHODS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Bernhard Osterburg and Anne Wolff - Thünen Institute

04 July 2013, INEA, ROME



Objectives

Cost-effectiveness: Relate cost to non-monetary units of outcome → Clear understanding of cost of M&E and of its effects (results)

- To review existing methodological approaches in cost-effectiveness analysis, apply them to indicators and evaluation methods
- To estimate the cost of the required resources for evaluation and to analyze determinants of costs
- To assess the effectiveness of developed indicators and evaluation methods based WP6 case studies
- To carry out a cost-impact synopsis feeding into the methodological recommendations in WP8 / WP9

THE FOOD AND ENVIRONMENT RESEARCH AGENCY: NATURAL HERITAGE OUTCOME MONITORING

“Monitoring programmes should be linked to scheme objectives and clear performance indicators should be set. A well designed programme that shows the scheme is ineffective is still producing useful information, especially if it indicates why there has been no response. The worst outcome is a monitoring programme that does not indicate significant effects, and for which it is not possible to determine why; this represents a waste of resources.”

FERA Report (2009), p. 8

The Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (CMEF)

„All time goes for answering meaningless evaluation questions“ (from stakeholder interviews)

- Focus on output and result indicators, few resources left for impact indicators
- No framework or requirements for monitoring impacts
- Monitoring (IACS) designed for financial management
- Weak basis for design of result-oriented measures
- Timing of evaluation reports
- Degree of EU guidance and obligations with regards to impact monitoring and evaluation?

Challenges for evaluating environmental impacts and shortcomings of current evaluation methods I

- Clear objectives and related indicators needed
- Multiple drivers, diversity of landscape / farm structures
- Time lag between intervention and impact
- Lack of monitoring data, esp. of counterfactual cases
- Existing data not specific for evaluation needs (low sample size, weak link to support measures)
- Access to existing data restricted (e.g. only aggregates)
- Merging of data sets not possible: due to missing ID codes or restrictions to data use (data confidentiality)
- Acquisition, merging and analysis of data is very resource intensive, requiring expert knowledge

Challenges for evaluating environmental impacts and shortcomings of current evaluation methods II

“Currently it is rather too much of a formal tick box exercise with little or no public good evaluation”
(from stakeholder interviews)

- Lack of resources for additional data monitoring
- Additional surveys mainly questionnaires for farmers, qualitative questions
- balance between field monitoring and the use of GIS for wide area assessment, which might be not ‘grounded’
- Measures with environmental “side effects” even more difficult to evaluate (lack of monitoring data)
- No / few common evaluation activities beyond single RD programmes

Intended WP7 outcomes

- **Understanding of cost and effects of M&E**
- **Mechanisms & principles to increase cost-effectiveness**
- **Decision tree on how to use limited resources for M&E**
- **Recommendations for monitoring and data use**

Key question:

What are the expected outcomes of M&E

- **Focus on impact indicators**
- **Quality criteria**