

*PROGRAM • PROGRAMME*

*Bewertung für Qualität*

*Evaluation for Quality*

*Evaluation pour la Qualité*

*Edinburgh • Edimbourg*

*18-19 / 09 / 2000*





# Fourth European Conference on Evaluation of the Structural Funds

Edinburgh International Conference Centre

18-19 September 2000

Organised by the **European Commission** at the invitation and with  
the support of the **Scottish Executive**

## Objectives of the Conference

This conference continues the sequence, begun in Brussels in 1995, of events bringing together academics, practitioners and users of evaluation to examine how better to use this vital tool. The theme of this year's conference, 'Evaluation for Quality' builds on the basis established in previous years, exploiting the experience previously gained to prepare for even more effective evaluation, and therefore efficient programmes, in the future.

## MONDAY 18 SEPTEMBER 2000

Opening of the  
Conference

09.15

**Donald Dewar, MSP**, First Minister of Scotland  
**Guy Crauser**, Director-General, Regional Policy DG

09.45

**Evaluation of Structural Policies; The Challenges 2000-2006**  
**J.C. Leygues**, Director, Regional Policy DG

**From the third to the fourth conference: Evolution of trends in evaluation in the member states**  
**E. Monnier**, Professor

10.30 - 11.00



FIRST SESSION

11.00

### APPLICATION OF EX ANTE EVALUATION

#### *1st Workshop: Evaluating a major Plan*

**President: C. Garnier**, Head of Unit, Economic and Financial Affairs DG

**Moderator: A. Skouras**, Professor

#### **Speakers:**

- **D. Hegarty, J. FitzGerald**: Ex ante evaluation for the 2000-2006 period in Ireland
- **G. Pellegrini, M. Bagarani**: Ex ante evaluation of the Objective 1 plan in Italy
- **J. Bradley, E. Morgenroth, G. Untiedt**: Evaluation of the impact of a CSF: the case of Objective 1 regions in Germany
- **F. Mazzola**: Regional econometric modelling; a sensitivity analysis, the case of the Mezzogiorno

#### *2nd Workshop: Evaluating a Programme, SPD, or Community Initiative Programme.*

**President: C. Imrie**, Scottish Executive

**Moderator: J-L. Chomel**, Head of Unit, Agriculture DG

#### **Speakers:**

- **V. J. de Klein**: Ex ante evaluation of Structural Fund interventions, 2000-2006
- **B. Bour-Desprez, H. Genin**: Ex ante evaluation of the Nord-Pas-de-Calais programme
- **R. Banks**: A SWOT approach to ex ante evaluation
- **P. Uusikylä, P. Virtanen, M. Kuoppala**: An ex ante evaluation of the Objective 3 Policy Frame of Reference in Finland, 2000-2006
- **E. Holzinger**: Evaluation of the environmental impact of the Objective 1 programme in Burgenland
- **F. Mantino**: Ex ante evaluation – rural development – in the Piemonte region



# Edinburgh Edinburgh Edinburgh Edinburgh Edinburgh

### ***3rd Workshop: Evaluating at the Level of the Project***

**President:** : **M. Beschel**, Head of Unit, Regional Policy DG

**Moderator:** **P. Geraud**, European Investment Bank

**Speakers:**

- **M. Florio**: An international comparison of base line indicators for cost benefit analysis
- **T. Exer**: Scoring systems for the selection of small projects
- **F. Liva, C. Hernandez**: Experiences from the ex post evaluation of the Cohesion Fund with a view to improved analysis of projects
- **A. Faulk, P. Immirzi**: Project level evaluation of environmental impact: the Scottish experience

13.00 - 14.30



SECOND SESSION

14.30

## **THEMATIC AND EX POST EVALUATIONS**

### ***1st Workshop: Thematic Evaluations***

**President:** : **A. Mairate**, Regional Policy DG

**Moderator:** **R. Arnkil**, Professor

**Speakers:**

- **L. Tsipouri**: Evaluation at European level; the R&D experience
- **A. Naldini; B. Bittarelli**: Experience of the mid term evaluation of R&D in Italy
- **A. Silvani, R. Brancati, C. Cavallaro, A. Frinolli**: Regional technological development; lessons from evaluation activities
- **A Reid**: What can we learn from thematic evaluations?

### ***2nd Workshop: Sectoral Thematic Evaluations***

**President:** **L. Vandendorpe**, Premier attaché, Minister for the Walloon Region, Belgium

**Moderator:** **A. Bucher**, Head of Unit, Employment DG

**Speakers:**

- **J. Haahr, N. Ejler, T. Bjønkilde, C. Bason, P. Sidelmann**: Evaluation at European level; the Adapt Community Initiative
- **U. Stockbauer**: Research findings and practical experiences from evaluating the Community initiatives ADAPT and EMPLOYMENT at European level
- **F. Papageorgiou**: Evaluating a social exclusion programme; lessons from the Greek experience
- **H. Armstrong; B. Kehrer, P. Wells, A. Wood**: The evaluation of community economic development initiatives in United Kingdom Objective 2 Structural Funds programmes
- **O. Fornara, S. Volpi**: Evaluating the pathways to integration in Italy

### ***3rd Workshop: Transversal Thematic Evaluations***

**President:** **E. Helander**, Director, Regional Policy DG

**Moderator:** **V. Gaffey**, Regional Policy DG

**Speakers:**

- **R. Fitzgerald, R. Michie**: Experiences, good practice and lessons for evaluating gender equality in the Structural Funds
- **L. Horelli**: Self-evaluation instruments as mobilisers of women and young people into regional policies
- **M. Galaverni, B. Bittarelli, L. Menniti**: Evaluation of equality of opportunity in the programmes supported by the Structural Funds
- **E. Seyfried, O. Schwab**: Innovation and mainstreaming: the European wide evaluation of the EMPLOYMENT Community Initiative

# QUANTIFICATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT: METHODOLOGY AND PRACTICAL ASPECTS.

Lola Manteiga & Carlos Sunyer<sup>1</sup>

IV European Conference on Evaluation of the Structural Funds  
18-19 September 2000  
Edinburgh

## *Summary*

As a result of several experiences in the development of environmental evaluation methodologies with top-down and bottom-up approaches, the main conclusion was that to achieve the main evaluation objectives a much more simple methodology was needed. This paper makes a presentation on this simpler methodology, and on the experience in designing environmental indicators for the evaluation and monitoring of the structural funds programming.

**Key words:** environmental evaluation, environmental indicators

## *Index*

- 1- Background
- 2- Introduction
- 3- An improved methodology
  - Stage 1. Establishment of an assessment framework
  - Stage 2. Assessment of the environmental situation
  - Step 3. Ex ante assessment
  - Monitoring

## *1- Background*

During recent years, TERRA has developed different experiences in relation with the environmental assessment and monitoring of the new structural fund programming period. These have included top-down and bottom-up approaches, such as:

- The preparation of a methodology for the *ex ante* environmental assessment of structural fund programming 2000-2006.
- Indicators to monitor and assess programming.
- *Ex ante* environmental assessment of a region.

---

<sup>1</sup> TERRA, environmental policy centre. C/ Jorge Manrique 1; E-28420 La Navata (Madrid).  
Tel/Fax 34 91 8586827  
E-mail: lola@terracentro.org & csunyer@terracentro.org

- Environmental assessment of a regional rural development programme within a SPD.

It is noted that the first two were developed for the national environmental authorities network, and that the methodology was approved as the basic tool for the Spanish regions (<http://www.mma.es/docs/calidadamb/red/doc/doc.htm>).

These experiences have made it possible to measure the efficiency and effectiveness of environmental assessment methods, giving rise to an improved methodology which is presented in this paper.

## ***2- Introduction***

The starting point for preparing this methodology was the document “A handbook on environmental assessment of regional development plans and EU structural fund programmes”, produced and distributed by DG Environment to all Member States as a practical guide.

At first it was attempted to adapt the steps and the methodological development of this guide, which follows those of Strategic Environmental Assessment, to the Spanish needs and situation.

However, when applying a bottom-up approach it was soon found that at regional level, where the programming is prepared, this level of complexity and detail was not efficient to attain the final objectives. This was because:

- This is the first programming period in which environmental authorities have participated, and at the beginning they were not fully prepared for it.
- Strategic Environmental Assessment is not fully extended as a common tool, and therefore environmental authorities are not used to it.
- The time schedule was very tight, considering the aforementioned limitations.
- Environmental information is still not readily available.
- Programming documents do not usually provide sufficient detail.

Therefore, a first conclusion in order to achieve the environmental objectives of the assessment was that a much simpler methodology was needed. To this end the challenge has been to prepare a methodology which is able to:

- Establish a clear assessment framework, defining targets and sustainable reference values.
- Focus on the main issues, avoiding the background noise that frequently arises with too detailed assessments.
- Set up a clear and efficient basis for the monitoring system (indicators).
- Simplify the methodology in order to avoid overloading the already scarce human resources at regional level.
- And at the same time, fulfil the obligations of the structural funds regulation with regard to environmental assessment and the promotion of environmental integration.

## ***3- An improved methodology***

This methodology is organized in three stages:

Stage 1. Establishment of an assessment framework.

Stage 2. Assessment of the environmental situation.

Stage 3. Environmental assessment.

STAGE	PRODUCT
1. Establishment of an assessment framework	Environmental targets Core indicators
2. Assessment of the environmental situation	Environmental deficit Sector's limitations
3. Environmental assessment 3.1. Environmental integration in the programming objectives 3.2. Impact of measures versus deficit 3.3. Impact of measures versus limitations	Monitoring indicators Recommendations

### ***Stage 1. Establishment of an assessment framework***

As mentioned above, the environmental assessment of structural fund programming is an extremely ambitious objective if a detailed vision of the cause-effect relationships of the different environmental problems is expected. Therefore, in order to achieve an effective evaluation, it is indispensable to set out a clear reference framework.

This is the reference starting point of the whole process, which structures the later steps, identifies clear targets and gathers the baseline information. As a key stage of the whole process, if it is not well developed it will impair the quality of the results.

The assessment framework is based on the topics and sectors of the 5<sup>th</sup> Environmental Action Programme, which are adapted to regional and national needs and to the administrative structure.

At this stage the following key issues must be defined:

- Environmental targets and sustainable reference values on which environmentally sustainable programming should be focused. Both will arise from what is set out in EU, national and regional legislation and policies for each topic and sector. These are the basic references for monitoring the impact of the programming.
- Core indicators. Targets and reference values lead to these. Most already exist in the form of the baseline environmental information used to inform the EEA and other institutions. These core indicators will help to quantify the baseline situation.

### ***Stage 2. Assessment of the environmental situation***

The aim of the second stage is to obtain a picture of the regional environmental situation at the beginning of programming, as a reference for monitoring and further assessments (mid-term evaluation, final evaluation).

For each area (atmosphere, biodiversity, waste, etc.) the environmental situation of the region is assessed in relation to the quantified targets and indicators identified at the previous step. Taking the targets and sustainable reference values as a reference, the 'environmental deficit' of the region can be evaluated. This will contribute to:

- Determining the environmental priorities of the region.
- Identifying environmental strengths and potentialities for sectorial development.
- Preventing, assessing and monitoring the environmental impact of the structural funds.

In the same way, the environmental pressure from the sectors it is also addressed. This permits the identification of the main direct impacts originated by each sector. To this end the criteria followed by the European Environmental Agency in its assessments have been used (1998) and direct impacts have been taken as those with only one cause-effect relationship. Indirect or multi-source impacts have been considered to be addressed within other assessment frameworks.

The analysis of the sectors and the study of alternatives have been excluded, being delegated to the corresponding sectorial analyses and other assessment frameworks. As an example, an environmental evaluator does not have to assess the transport sector as a whole in order to give alternatives or development potentialities, but only to explain clearly and if possible with quantified information its environmental limitations in the context of sectorial pressures (e.g. emissions, habitat fragmentation, etc.).

### ***Step 3. Ex ante assessment***

The objectives of this stage are:

- To foresee the environmental impact of programming.
- To produce recommendations in order to guarantee that investments will contribute to the attainment of environmental objectives.
- To prepare indicators for the monitoring of the programme.

It can be divided into three steps:

- Assessment of environmental integration in the programming objectives.
- Impact assessment of the measures in relation with the regional environmental deficit.
- Impact of the measures in relation with sectorial environmental limitations.

All three are based on qualitative analysis due to the lack of detailed information in the programming documents.

The first step uses the same method as the DG Environment proposal. The second is for assessing the impact of the measures in relation with the environmental deficit previously identified. We believe that good environmental integration should contribute to reducing this. The assessment uses a matrix in which the programme's measures are confronted with the environmental deficit. The potential environmental impact of the measures is assessed in terms of cost ( C ), benefit ( B ), or not clear (?), leaving the boxes blank when there is no relation between the two.

The same is done for the assessment of measures in relation with the environmental limitations identified for each development sector.

From these three assessments a report should be addressed back to the programme, indicating:

- Whether the objectives and priorities of the plan are considered to integrate the environmental objectives and the principles of sustainable development.
- Identification of the main impacts.
- Recommendations for avoiding and reducing environmental impacts.
- Recommendations for better environmental integration.
- Monitoring indicators.

Therefore this step is also of key importance for the monitoring and future assessments of the programme.

### ***Monitoring***

We have defined two type of indicators:

Core indicators: Those aimed at informing about the contribution of programming to the baseline environmental situation. Their main characteristic is that they do not inform by themselves, but need a target. For instance, the contribution of programming to waste management, water treatment, etc. To be used as information on the programme's contribution they need to include the target and a reference value (regional information).

Secondary indicators: Those aimed at informing about the deviation of programming with regard to sustainable development. For instance, water savings in industry, number of industries with EMAS, efficiency of irrigation schemes, etc.

However, much greater efforts must be made in order to achieve the operational implementation of these indicators in the context of programming. The environmental authorities, responsible for most of the core indicators, must ensure that the information is available and centralized on time, while the sectors and the final authorities implementing the projects must take responsibility for obtaining and channelling information relating to the secondary indicators.