SPARD

Spatial Analysis of Rural Development Measures
Contract No. 244944

Work Package No. 5

February 2013

D5.4

Expert meetings in case study areas

Claudio Signorotti, Davide Viaggi

Based on contributions by:

Cahuzac E., Desjeux, Y., Dupraz, P., Juvančič, L., Piorr, A., Rounsevell, M., Signorotti, C., Travnikar, T., Viaggi, D., Yang, A., Zasada, I.

Document status

Public use		
Confidential use	X	
Draft No.1		
Final		28/03/2013
Submitted for internal review		03/04/2013 28/03/2013

COOPERATION

Table of contents

Background and objectives 3

Methodology and activities 3

Key results per question 3

Conclusions 6

References 6

Annexes 7

Background and objectives

This document summarizes the results of task 5.4 of the SPARD project. The objective of the task was to present results of 5.2/5.3 to end users/experts through a meeting in each Case study area (CSA) and to collect feed-back about the approach and the tool also in order to explore potential for further developments. Feed back to the tool were sough at local/case study level, according to the level of RDP programming authorities.

Methodology and activities

The activity was organised through local meetings in each case study area, by the respective CSA leader. The invited end-users/experts were in principle the same as identified for task 5.1, though this was then treated in a flexible way, due to change in reference experts and to the difficulty in identifying people suitable to understand and express an opinion about the process. Hence the most suitable experts for the 5.4 exercise were basically chosen by each CSA-leader according to their perceived usefulness for the aim of the task. The target was to have 3-6 people really aware of how RDP evaluation works and can comment on the spatial econometrics exercise performed in 5.2.

Each meeting was organised in two steps:

- presentation of the results of D5.2
- collection of feed-back based on few guiding questions.

Key results

A summary of the results from the different CSA is given in Table 1.

Table 1 – Summary of qualitative feed-back from experts

	CSA1-Scotland	**CSA2 - Slovenia**	**CSA3 – Branden-burg**	**CSA4 - France**	**CSA5 – Italy**	**CSA6- The Nether-lands**
Are the results credible?	Yes, exception: nitrate vulnerable zone and 121, woodland	Yes, credible	Yes, despite some doubts about the methods	Credible, windfall effect	Yes credible, exception: use of Census 2000 for socio-	Yes but some doubts about the way the RDP is financed

	and 214, too many variables (collinearity)				economic indicators	
Do you find the information produced new?	Yes, expected results, no similar studies	In line with expectations	Yes	Spatial econometric reveal new information on target indicators	Yes, new information	Yes
Do you find the information produced useful?	Targeting and effectiveness of the scheme	Yes, for strategic planning of RDP	Not really useful for real world applications in daily work	Useful for the effects of agri-environmental schemes	Useful for spatial analysis of RDP	The information from data collection is useful. The indicator HNV is not useful.
How do you see the use of this information in the local decision making process?	Important for next RDP	Important for fine tuning the eligibility of the selection criteria	The new perspective offered by spatial econometrics is particularly valuable for programming	Robust results for measures where eligibility is restricted	There should be a better linkage between participation and RDP priorities	The CMEF indicators do not give a good picture of the results of the program
Do you have any suggestion for further work and	Further look at individual farms that are likely to	Better quality data; the monitoring	Concerns about enlarged reporting	Comparison of regional instabilities for the	Reduce the use of socio-economic	Data could be found more easily, from the

exploitation of the results?	participate	of environmental indicators should be better documented and defined	requirements in the CMEF for the upcoming period. Care for target setting, objective agreement and assignment to impact areas as a new requirement for the next period.	same measure	indicators and use variables that directly address the measures' priorities	Dutch Data Authority for Nature. It would be useful to provide data on RDP expenditure by province, so as to allow regional comparisons.

Without exceptions the respondents have judged the results to be credible, although with some limitations in some cases. Limitations are connected to different issues and mostly refer to mechanisms for specific measure and data limitations, though some data about the methodology has also been raised.

With regard to the information produced, it is deemed to be new especially the use of spatial econometrics for the analysis of rural development plans. However some cases have pointed out that the results meet expectations. This hints at the fact that the methodology is rather useful in order to provide quantitative underpinning to expectations and "soft" evaluations, when data are good enough to allow for it.

The experts have commented that the information of the spatial analysis of the plans is useful in order to improve targeting and study the effects of agri-environmental schemes. However some distance from real world has been emphasized, as well as the limited usefulness of elaborated indicators such as the HNV.

Underlying the usefulness for programming, the respondents have suggested several improvements. Improving data quality is a clear priority, which is also consistent with the perception of researchers, also in order to provide a better documentation of the primary effects against the direct objectives

of the policies . However, avenues for improvement are actually a mix of considerations about the methodology and the future design and evaluation procedures of EU Rural development programs, which suggest a need for further better integration between research and real-life evaluation.

Discussion and Conclusions

In spite of the limitations of the econometric exercise and the potential difficulty with technicalities of the method, the reactions collected with the stakeholders/local end-users was rather positive. The outcome mainly points at four considerations for further conclusions:

- more refined techniques for analysis can in fact support a better understanding and design of RDP; spatial econometrics can contribute in this direction;
- however this depends on individual measures and the ability to represent their impact mechanism; in addition, in well developed evaluation systems this method brings to a better formalization and quantitative corroboration of expected/perceived results rather than to new insights;
- there is an inherent link between evaluation and next programming design, which is at the core of the stakeholders/local end-users attention, and more effort should be put in understanding how these could be linked;
- the quality of the results is dependent on information available, which is a crucial issue; at the same time, attention have to be put on not increasing the already high reporting burden.

References

- Allaire, G., Cahuzac, E. and Michel Simioni, (2013) Determinants of spatial diffusion and adoption of European agri-environmental support for extensive grazing in France, submitted to the American Journal of agricultural Economics

- CHABE-FERRET, S., ET J. SUBERVIE (2012a) : "Econometric Methods for Estimating the Additional Effects of Agro-Environmental Schemes on Farmers' Practices," Ch. 10 in Evaluation of Agri-Environmental Policies: Selected Methodological Issues and Case Studies, Ed. by Alison Burrell, OECD. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264179332-en

- CHABE-FERRET, S., ET J. SUBERVIE (2012b) : "How much green for the buck? Estimating additional and windfall effects of French agro-environmental schemes by DID-matching," *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2012.09.003.

- Espinosa-Goded M., Barreiro-Hurlé, J. & Dupraz, P. (2013). Identifying additional barriers in the adoption of agri-environmental schemes: The role of fixed costs. Land Use Policy, 31, 526– 535. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2012.08.016

- SNH (2012) Rural Development Contracts - Rural Priorities: http://www.snh.gov.uk/land-and-sea/managing-the-land/farming-crofting/grants-and-funding/rural-development-contracts-%28rdc%29/ [Accessed 15 / 12 / 2012]

Annexes

1. D5.4. CSA_Italy
2. D5.4. CSA_Brandenburg
3. D5.4. CSA_France
4. D5.4 CSA_Scotland
5. D5.4 CSA_Slovenia
6. D5.4 CSA_The Netherlands

ANNEX 1.

D5.4. CSA_Italy

1. Meeting features

- The meeting was held March 26th 2013 on the Internet, plus answers in writing to the guiding questions.
- The meeting was attended by: Dr. Andrea Furlan, Regione Emilia Romagna. Other staff from the regional administration and the evaluator company was expected to participate, but finally they could not.
- UNIBO: Claudio Signorotti, Davide Viaggi, Valentina Marconi, Daniele Vergamini
- Programme:
    - Introduction SPARD work progress (15 minutes)
    - Presentation of the SPARD WP5.2/5.3 research results (30 minutes)
    - Discussion of research results (30 minutes)

2. Meeting Outcome

- Credibility of results.

The results are credible but suffer some limitations, partly already highlighted in the document:

- Use of Census 2000 data for socio-economic indicators.
- The variables are not always linked to the RDP selection criteria which will have a greater effect on localisation of participation, especially for measure 121 and 311.

- Novelty of produced information.

The information is new as this is the first study on the application of spatial econometric analysis on RDP in Emilia-Romagna.

- Role of information in local decision making process.

The information produced is mainly useful as methodological advancement in the application of spatial econometric analysis on RDP.

From a programming point of view, a better linkage between participation and measure priorities is needed to study a better targeting of the measures.

For measure 214 the analysis carried at sub-measure level is useful to better understand the localization of participation on the territory and can be used even as ex-ante assessment for improve useful spatial targeting.

- . Suggestion for further work and exploitation of the results.

Use variables that directly address the priority system of the single measures and focus the analysis more than these aspects than socio-economic indicators which have a slight influence on the uptake localization.

3. Summary of the main policy messages

See previous notes.

ANNEX 2

D5.4. CSA_Brandenburg

1. Meeting features

- The meeting was held January 30th 2013 at the Brandenburg Ministry of Infrastructure and Agriculture (MIL) in Potsdam, Germany.
- The meeting was attended by: Dr. Silvia Rabold (Unit 11 Budget, responsible for RDP policy and strategy), Irene Kirchner (Unit EU Paying office), Susanne Jungmann (entera, representative from the evaluating consultancy)
- Initially invited were: Frenzel, Annegret; Dr. Pickert, Jürgen; Herbst, Detlef; Kirchner, Irene; Hanff, Holger; Albrecht, Susann; Behr, Gudrun; Dr. Roffeis, Margret; Dr. Schilde, Carolin; Wienand, Tobias; Dr. Hoppe, Harald (administration), Jungmann, Susanne; Horlitz, Thomas; Stegmann, Susanne (evaluating consultancies)
- ZALF: Dr. Ingo Zasada, Dr. Annette Piorr
- Programme:
    - Introduction SPARD work progress (15 minutes)
    - Presentation of the SPARD WP5.2/5.3 research results (30 minutes)
    - Discussion of research results (90 minutes)

2. Meeting Outcome

- The information presented has been acknowledged as been new, credible and comprehensible, although not all details of the statistical methodology could be followed.
- What is particularly valuable for programming and evaluating body is the new perspective on the implementation of RDP, which spatial econometrics offers. It raises awareness on the existence of spatial spill-over effects as well the role of local framework conditions.
- The discrepancy between the scientific approach and the practitioner's real-world application became clear. The participants assessed the results as ambiotious in scientific terms, but abstract for their daily use. Therefore the 1-to-1-usefulness and applicability of the results was discussed. The ministry expressed general limitations of administering RDP

and is therefore sceptical concerning the implementation of complex and elaborate methodologies in their all-day work.

- Interest was more on impact modelling results then in the participation and expenditure models, although known problems of indicator definition (e.g. HNV farmland) exits.
- While the administrative staff in charge for programming and budgeting found interrelations between explanatory variables interesting, but abstract and not applicable for programme planning tasks (ex-ante), the evaluator acknowledged the fact of having new evidence on interrelations between explanatory variables as valuable, though causal relationships remain unclear.
- 2007 to 2010 have been retrospectively seen as an unfavourable time span, as especially more interesting developments in the RDP funding occurred in the second half of the funding period.
- It has been pointed out that neglecting of effects of former funding periods represents a weakness of the approach. As an example measure 322 (village renewal) was mentioned, where a certain saturation has occurred in the funding pattern of the recent funding period after heavy funding in the 1990ies.

3. Summary of the main policy messages

- The results are considered more relevant within the evaluation context than in the RDP programme planning context as the results provide indications for spatial distribution patterns (concentrations, absence) and relationships to the local context and impacts.
- Other, more general remarks emphasized concerns regarding enlarged reporting requirements in the CMEF for the upcoming period, though a streamlining of the CMEF (certain indicators seen as ballast) was supported. The scepticism referred to (i) the availability of a functioning systematic framework for the envisaged pillar 1 evaluation to come, including lacking clarity on responsibility of the administrative level in charge, and (ii) target setting, objective agreement and assignment to impact areas as a new requirement for the next period.

ANNEX 3

D5.4. CSA_France

1. Meeting features

- Date, location, list of participants, general program

November 13, 2012 a large part of the CSA and the SPARD work were presented at the meeting of the bilateral committee INRA / MEDDE (French Department of Ecology) in Paris (approximately 15 participants). The topic was “The CAP and its change”. Pierre Dupraz has communicated on: "What changes in MAE? Environmental and economic aspects"

2. Meeting outcome

- Short (5-10 lines) textual explanation of the main feed back to each of the guiding questions

    - Are the results credible?

      Compared to what is already known, the results were deemed credible (Chabe-Ferret 2012). The agro-environmental measures suffer from a possible windfall effect (when no effetc). Windfall is strong enough except for organic farming.

    - Do you find the information produced new?

      On targets indicators, spatial econometrics reveals new information: some effects disappear or are maintained when spatial correlations are taken into account. Useful to identify robust effects (214 on Corp Index Diversity for exemple)

    - Do you find the information produced useful?

      Spatial econometrics leads to give additional effects of agro-environmental schemes. Corrected for spillover effect, the remaining effect is partly due to the administrative practices in the territories (Allaire, Cahuzac, Simioni 2009). Additional interaction effects between the previous and the actual programming (PMSEE and PHE affect 214A)

    - How do you see the use of this information in the local decision making process?

      For measures where eligibility is restricted, we find robust results with spatial econometrics. Conversely, aids for organic farming are not targeted (no effect NATURA2000), this seems unfortunate. Therefore, organic farming follows market demand (214D: the effect is strong around areas where population has got higher level of education.

    - Do you have any suggestion for further work and exploitation of the results?

Comparison of regional instabilities for the same measure would be interesting to analyze

3. Summary of the main policy messages

- Key ideas about the usefulness of the approach (spatial econometrics/tool) for RDP evaluation
- General policy implications concerning the evaluation process in RDP
- Perspective insights in view of the 2013-2014 period

It is important to start from local situations and to aggregate these situations clearing for spatial effects (avoid spatial heterogeneities) to see if the latter is the sum of the regional effects. The spatial approach combined with a temporal component (learning effect, continuity in time) is also important.

Policy message 5.1

Measures dedicated to conversion to organic farming (214D) have a cross effect on both the PHAE and the impact indicator such as CDI. This effect is robust to scaling as well as the processing of spatial heterogeneity.

References:

Allaire, G., Cahuzac, E. and Michel Simioni, (2013) Determinants of spatial diffusion and adoption of European agri-environmental support for extensive grazing in France, submitted to the American Journal of agricultural Economics

CHABE-FERRET, S., ET J. SUBERVIE (2012a) : "Econometric Methods for Estimating the Additional Effects of Agro-Environmental Schemes on Farmers' Practices," Ch. 10 in Evaluation of Agri-Environmental Policies: Selected Methodological Issues and Case Studies, Ed. by Alison Burrell, OECD. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264179332-en

CHABE-FERRET, S., ET J. SUBERVIE (2012b) : "How much green for the buck? Estimating additional and windfall effects of French agro-environmental schemes by DID-matching," *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2012.09.003.

Espinosa-Goded M., Barreiro-Hurlé, J. & Dupraz, P. (2013). Identifying additional barriers in the adoption of agri-environmental schemes: The role of fixed costs. Land Use Policy, 31, 526– 535. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2012.08.016

ANNEX 4

D5.4 CSA_Scotland

Objectives: Results of tasks 5.2 will be discussed through a stakeholder/ end-user/ expert meeting (one in each case study area) that will allow policy/stakeholders feedback about the tool and will allow an evaluation of the tool and provide indications for further developments. This will run at local (case study level) and will rely on the same group identified for task 5.1.

Participants (Total 4):

Richard Murray: Head of Rural Analytical Unit, Rural & Environment Science & Analytical Services Division Scottish, Scottish Government
Alistair Gibson: Rural priorities Business Support Team, RPID (Rural Payments & Inspections Directorate - Rural Delivery Division, Scottish Government
Lorraine Gormley: Scottish Natural Heritage, Management Team, Natural Resources Division, Scottish Government
Gillian Diggins: Rural Analytical Unit, Rural & Environment Science & Analytical Services Division Scottish, Scottish Government

Note: *the two experts from the Rural Analytical Unit involved in the previous survey have changed roles, but the individuals who have subsumed those roles were participants in this exercise.*

1. Presentation outline

a. Project background

b. Methodology

- Measure selection
- Scheme selection

- Data collection
- Spatial econometrics

c. Expert survey results

d. Spatial model results

- Spatial lag models payments per UAA ha
  - 121 modernisation of agri-holdings
  - 214 agri-environment holdings
  - Habitat conservation
  - Water habitat
  - Bird conservation

e. Collection of feedback

2 Feedback

f. **Are the results credible?**

- The participants did not seem to have any objections about the majority of explanatory variables and the type of relationship (positive or negative).
  - **NVZ (nitrate vulnerable zone)** was considered unusual as presenting a 'negative' correlation to payments per UAA for measure 121, as experts expected this variable to have a positive impact; as NVZ has been the main driver for slurry storage and management as part of legislative conditions.
- *It was suggested this results occurred as the NVZ is isolated to just the far east of Scotland and therefore if a 'regional' analysis was conducted this area potentially would show to have a positive correlation.*
  - It was questioned why **woodland** had a negative impact on measure 214, as woodland options can receive very high payments and has had reasonable uptake. However it was noted woodland options whilst under come under Axis they do not come under measure 214 were efforts are focussing primarily on agri-businesses as opposed to forestry.
  - *It was asked whether under the classification of UAA, if woodland would be included. This is not the case as UAA includes 'areas of land used for farming' only.*
- When presented with the LISA maps for measure 214 payments per UAA ha, one respondent mentioned that the cluster in the Grampians is predicted to be related to a particularly effective **consultant** who works in the region. This has meant

particularly hedgerows creation option (under measure 214) has had a large uptake Presenting a 'spatial' factor that may not necessarily be able to easily be incorporated into the models but would explain further the variance in the models.

- *Suggested that a dummy variable could be used to account for this.*
- *For the Scottish CSA this was already recognised from further work on stakeholder influences.as 'other determining factors' including access and quality of advice from consultants and others.*
- In regards to SSSI as a positive variable, it was asked whether the datasets used were before the amendments in the scheme for 'on-going approval[1]' of Axis two measures on designated sites e.g. SSSI? In the results SSSI sites did show to have a significant positive relationship with payments for measure 214 and the options groups, however the expert predicted that since 'on-going approval' was introduced that this would have an even stronger impact throughout 2011 and 2012
- *The provided SRDP dataset was from 2008 – June 2011, whereas on going approval was introduced in May 2011 (SNH, 2012). Therefore this would be a useful suggestion to test if more up-to-date datasets were to be made available.*
- It was commented on the high number of variables for some of the models in particular for measure 121, e.g. total 15 explanatory variables. There was concern that there may be too many variables risked co-collinearity.
- *In the analysis this was considered and once ran through the 'step wise' regression model, the variables were again tested through the Geoda diagnostics tests that specifically tests for multi-collinearity between the explanatory variables and had a below critical threshold value. However the 121 payment model showed overall to have lowest model quality in comparison to the others, with comparatively highest AIC (Akaike Information Criterion).*

b. ***Is this new information?***

[1] On-going approval refers approval of applications on an ongoing basis (without referring the application to the RPAC- regional project assessment committee) provided they satisfy the eligibility criteria for these types of applications e.g. relates to management which will benefit the special features on Scotland's nationally important nature sites (SSSIs, SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites). In such cases, Proposals will be assessed and scored in the normal way, but separate arrangements will exist for approvals. The main difference is that they can be considered for approval and receive a contract without having to wait for the next Regional assessment round.

- It was commented that the information is expected and is in line with how those working on the schemes expectations. Furthermore they noted it is very encouraging to have this supported with quantifiable results.
- It was agreed that they weren't aware of any other study of this type.

a. ***Do you find the information useful?***

- It was mentioned that it would be useful to see how the variables relate to the measure objectives to see how they "coincide with what's it was intended to do?"
  - *This relates back to the issue of scale; and at EU level measures are more appropriate whilst at a national/regional scale it maybe more appropriate to refer to individual options to see if they are meeting 'targeting potential'.*
- Experts noted the main question Scottish Government is asking currently is: "is the scheme effective? And where they should put money more efficiently/effectively for the next programme?" This relates to targeting and it was noted that there is a move to focus on this and talk less of 'regionalism'.
  - *While impact was not possible to model in the Scottish CSA, this would likely be of interest*
  - *The potential for this tool, for analysing determinants of uptake and expenditure could assist in assessing targeting potential of options*[2] *help in determining is any of the 'explanatory variables' are part of the eligibility criteria e.g. NVZ for measure 121, or SSSI sites for measure 214*
  - However some options are still very open and it was noted that it may not be possible to direct funding for some e.g. hedgerows were noted as having a positive biodiversity benefit, but perhaps more a question of equity and prioritisation with a the new policy aim for 'better value for money'.
  - *At this point it was highlighted that SPARD originally wanted to use the CMEF indicators as a data source but we were limited by what was available and scale of those datasets.*

b. **Could this information be used in local decision making process? If so, how?**

[2] As opposed to whole measures that have very broad objectives analysis will need to be taken to the individual management options themselves, to be related to the specific on eligibility.

- This wasn't answered directly but there was certainly interest in getting as much information on this scheme, as currently now is important time in terms of deigning the scheme for the next RDP programme period.
- Most the participants expressed an interest in receiving the reports on the project in particular a policy briefing.
- They were also keen to learn about the 'findings from the other CSA's' and what number and type of explanatory variables were significant in comparison to the Scottish CSA e.g. perhaps copies of D5.3 or the fact sheets?

c. **Do you have any suggestions for further work and exploitation of results?**

- It was suggested that a further look at the types of individual farms that are more likely to participate on the scheme and particular measures would be of interest e.g. the size of farms, young entrants etc.
- The analysis was again limited by data availability and disclosure issues, to get a representation of what type of holdings were most likely to participate would require data on the approved and non-approved agri-holdings per parish.
- AS mentioned earlier the introduction of on-going approval on the SSSI variable could be tested by using up-to-date SRDP datasets for measure 214 to test the impact of this policy amendment.
- A suggestion of a regional breakdown of the models e.g. NUTS2 comparison of regions or/and RPAC level. To see 'if' and 'where' influential variables vary. This may also improve model quality as well as for further usability at regional decision-making levels.

3 Summary

The feedback suggested that Scottish government experts overall were interested in the project results, and requested access to the final project reports. The use of spatial autocorrelation and output maps for Scotland on 'participation and expenditure' were of particular interest and it is currently being discussed the potential use of such maps for targeting and for the schemes applications assessment process.

Encouragingly the feedback on results was noted within the experts expectations, and seemed in line with the thinking of the scheme and was noted as useful to have these

predicted affects quantified. There were some useful suggestions on how to take this work further. Although it terms of the type of analysis that is possible with these suggestions, work is limited by available datasets and privacy issues. Analysis of impacts would be of interest and may be possible as the scheme draws to a close. There is also potential that such work on determinants of policy uptake and expenditure could be a useful tool for refining targeting of particular measures and options.

Reference

SNH (2012) Rural Development Contracts - Rural Priorities: http://www.snh.gov.uk/land-and-sea/managing-the-land/farming-crofting/grants-and-funding/rural-development-contracts-%28rdc%29/

ANNEX 5

D5.4 CSA_Slovenia

The report of the meeting with RDP experts (Slovenia)

Annex 1

1. Meeting features

- Date, location, list of participants, general program

2. Meeting outcome

- Short (5-10 lines) textual explanation of the main feedback to each of the guiding questions

3. Summary of the main policy messages

- Key ideas about the usefulness of the approach (spatial econometric/tool) for RDP evaluation
- General policy implications concerning the evaluation process in RDP
- Perspective insights in view of the 2013-2014 period

1. Meeting features

Date: 15. January 2013

Location: University of Ljubljana, Biotechnical faculty, Zootechnical department, Domžale

List of participants:

Luka Juvančič (presenter)

Tanja Travnikar (presenter)

Boštjan Kos (Ministry of Agriculture and Environment, Head of the Sector for Rural Development)

Tanja Gorišek (Ministry of Agriculture and Environment, Head of the Section for implementation of RDP)

Gorazd Gruntar (Ministry of Agriculture and Environment, responsible for programming & implementation of RDP Measure 121)

Vida Hočevar (Ministry of Agriculture and Environment, responsible for RDP monitoring & preparation of annual reports)

Matej Bedrač (Agricultural Institute of Slovenia)

Tone Perpar (Teaching Assistant, Biotechnical faculty, Department of agronomy)

Tomaž Cőr (Chamber of Agriculture and Forestry, Head of the Economics section of the Agricultural Extension Service, regional branch office Kranj)

Stane Kavčič (Associate Professor, Biotechnical faculty, Zootechnical department)

Program of the SCA meeting:

9:30 – 9:50	Brief presentation of the project SPARD, activities and key outputs of the project
9:50 – 10:10	Introduction to spatial econometrics and spatial analysis of rural development measures
10:10 – 10:20	Resources, organization and analytical value of the data for RDP monitoring for the purposes of spatial analysis
10:20 – 10:45	A spatial econometrics analysis of the measure 214: Factors that affect participation under A-E (sub) measures and the level of EAFRD payments
10:45 – 11:00	A spatial econometrics analysis of the measure 121: Factors that affect participation in the measure and range of investment support; preliminary analysis of the effects of the measure 121
11:00 – 11:10	A spatial econometrics analysis of the measure 311: Implications for the design of the measure in the next programming period
11:10 – 11:40	Discussion: - Applicability of the results of the project in the planning, implementation and evaluation of rural development policy - The usefulness of spatial analysis for the design of rural development policy - The potential to improve the databases for the spatial analysis of rural development policy

2. Meeting outcome

Overall, the comments of the participants were mainly focused on the results of the econometric models. For the most part, the results are logical and in line with their expectations. Therefore, participating experts' assumptions are empirically confirmed, which they see as important in terms of providing sound arguments for public interventions.

The results of preliminary spatial analysis (ESDA) could prove beneficial in fine-tuning of the eligibility selection criteria. In this respect the participants saw some usefulness of the method in strategic planning of RDP measures. This was most vividly expressed in the case of (better targeted) agri-environmental measures.

Spatial analysis is seen as appropriate and useful in the evaluation of rural development policy. In their view, spatial econometric analysis could add value to the quality of evaluation reports, which

are currently seen as too abstract, with poor empirical grounding. Having said this, participants have agreed that better quality data are necessary and that monitoring of environmental indicators should be better documented and defined.

In participants' view, better monitoring would substantially improve the empirical merit of spatial econometric analysis of RDP measures. Especially in the case of impact models, the method lacks persuasiveness as the impacts are not monitored at the level of individual beneficiary.

3. Summary of the main policy messages

Spatial econometrics and its accompanying research methods (eg. ESDA) bring potential benefits in terms of more informed planning and evaluation of RD measures. Spatial analysis can be used to simulate various eligibility/selection criteria. Spatial econometric analysis can add value to the (ongoing, ex-post) evaluation of RD measures by substantially improving our understanding of factors affecting participation and impacts of RD measures. Nevertheless, usefulness of the method is inevitably linked with the quality and scope of relevant data. Effective monitoring of RD measures is therefore a prerequisite for effective spatial analysis.

ANNEX 6

D5.4 CSA_The Netherlands

Report of the stakeholders' meeting held at Utrecht, 26 March 2013

1. **Meeting features**

The meeting was held at the office of the RDP National Coordination Bureau. In the Netherlands the RDP is partially centralized and partially a provincial responsibility, so a central location was preferable. Moreover, the analysis had been extended to the Netherlands as a whole, so there was interest in it beyond the province of Noord-Holland – which was the original case study region.

Purpose of the meeting was to discuss the findings of the case study with officials of agencies involved in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the RDP, and in particular to find out how these findings (and the methods used in arriving at them) might be useful to said agencies; furthermore, to hear what suggestions the stakeholders might offer with respect to the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (CMEF).

The following persons participated:

Mr Aart Vorstenburg, RDP National Coordination Bureau
Mr Gideon van Ravenstein, Province of Noord-Holland
Mr Harry Steenbergen, Province of Noord-Holland
Ms Elke Boesewinkel, Province of Flevoland
Mr Paul Sinnige, Ministry of Economic Affairs, dealing with European agricultural policy
Mr Ton Klapwijk, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Regulations Implementation Service (DR, responsible for implementing and monitoring agricultural policy, including the RDP)
Dr Tom Kuhlman, Agricultural Economics Research Institute (LEI)

Apologies: Mr Stephan Melis, Province of Noord-Holland
Ms Heleen Grooteman, Government Service for Land and Water Management (DLG, Ministry of Economic Affairs)

Dr Kuhlman presented the methods and findings of the SPARD case study, inviting participants to interrupt with questions and comments. After the presentation there was discussion on the usefulness of the case study for the RDP and the implications of its findings for monitoring and evaluation.

2. **Meeting outcome**

- Several participants pointed out that the case study report was incorrect in stating that the Dutch RDP should be considered as part of the Investment Budget for Rural Areas (ILG). That programme is only a source of counterpart financing for the RDP.

- The HNV farmland indicator was considered not useful for evaluating the impact of M214, as implemented in the Netherlands.
- The slight negative correlation found between expenditure on agri-environmental schemes during RDP1 and the HNV score on farmland can be explained by the need for more organic manure on peat. Since peat soils have the highest concentration of on-farm nature conservation and manure is required for nature quality, this would lead to a higher nutrient load.
- The experience gained in obtaining the relevant data (and the difficulties) is very useful. However, in some cases data could have been found more easily, for instance from an agency called the Dutch Data Authority for Nature.

3. Summary of the main policy messages

- It would be useful to provide data on RDP expenditure by province, so as to allow regional comparisons.
- The current Dutch RDP is too fragmented: too many different measures are implemented.
- General indicators such as contained in the CMEF (especially impact and baseline indicators) do not give a reliable picture of the results of the programme. Interrelations between indicator scores at local level must be taken into account. This limits the value of a system such as CMEF.
- Result indicators are often impossible to collect in practice.
- Monitoring of the RDP should be integrated with national efforts at monitoring rural development (notably the AVP system).
- Participation of farmers in agri-environment schemes could be enhanced by promoting farmers' nature organizations. These assist farmers with the administrative requirements, making it easier especially for small farmers.
- There are also other subsidies available for on-farm nature conservation. These compete with M214, and for farmers the situation may be confusing.