1st European Environmental Evaluators Network forum

'Addressing demand side expectations, side effects and methodological challenges of environmental evaluation in an era of performance-based management'

9 - 10 February, 2012 | HIVA - KU Leuven, Belgium

Programme day 1: Thursday 9th of February 2012

8.30	**Registration and coffee**
9.30	**Opening: Welcome, outline and goals of the forum** *Hans Bruyninckx, Director at HIVA - KU Leuven*
9.40	**Keynote address + facilitated plenary discussion 'Advancing the theory, methodology, and practice of environmental evaluation through more systematic and collective learning among evaluators and evaluation users; experience from the US'** *Matt Keene, social scientist at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and coordinator of the US Environmental Evaluators Network*
10.40	**Break and refreshments**
11.00	**Keynote address 'Demand side expectations: the institutional context of policy evaluations at the European Commission and beyond'** *Stephen White, Impact Assessment and Evaluation unit at the European Commission DG Environment* **Keynote address 'Enhancing the use of impact assessment tools in policy making: bridging the gap between science and the policy making community'** *Klaus Jacob, professor at the Freie Universität Berlin and co-coordinator of the LIAISE Network of Excellence*
11.45	**Panel and plenary discussion: 'Demand side expectations: what roles could or should environmental evaluations play?'** *Panel: Stephen White, European Commission DG Environment; Klaus Jacob, Freie Universität Berlin; Marleen Van Steertegem, Flemish Environment Agency; Bart Vercoutere, Royal Haskoning*
12.30	**Lunch**
13.30	**Parallel sessions: thematic contributions on 'methodological challenges', 'demand side expectations' and 'side effects'**
15.30	**Break and refreshments**
16.00	**Keynote address + facilitated plenary discussion 'Evaluating the impact of climate change policies on development'** *Osvaldo Feinstein, professor at the Master in Evaluation of the Complutense University of Madrid, senior consultant with the World Bank Independent Evaluation Group, UNDP's Evaluation Office and the Evaluation Office of the International Fund for Agricultural Development.*

17.00	**Free**
19.00	**Evening Programme** *Conference diner (Faculty Club)*

Programme day 2: Friday 10th of February 2012

8.30	**Coffee**
9.00	**Keynote address + facilitated plenary discussion 'Managing complexity: methodological challenges for determining attribution and contribution'** *Per Mickwitz, Research director Finnish Environment Institute*
10.00	**Break and refreshments**
10.30	**Parallel sessions: thematic contributions on 'methodological challenges', 'demand side expectations' and 'side effects'**
12.30	**Lunch**
13.30	**Parallel sessions: thematic contributions on 'methodological challenges', 'demand side expectations' and 'side effects'**
15.00	**Break and refreshments**
15.20	**Panel and plenary discussion: 'What role for a European Environmental Evaluation Network?'** *Panel: Per Mickwitz, Finnish Environment Institute; Andrew Pullin, Bangor University (to be completed)*
16.20	**Closure** *Hans Bruyninckx, Director at HIVA - KU Leuven*

Overview parallel sessions Thursday 9th from 13.30 to 15.30

Session 1	**13.30**	**Evaluating environmental law and policy in The Netherlands: experiences from the 'STEM' programme** *Frans Oosterhuis, Institute for Environmental Studies at VU University Amsterdam (IVM)*
	14.00	**Environmentally Harmful Subsidies: Identification and Assessment** *Kris Bachus, HIVA - KU Leuven (to be completed)*
Session 2	**13.30**	**Regulatory Impact Analysis in Flanders: policy and trends** *Peter van Humbeeck, Flanders Socio-Economic Council (SERV)*
	14.10	**Institutional Cooperation in Strategic Environmental Assessment a decentralised governance system** *Alessandro Bonifazi, Polytechnic University of Bari and Italian Ministry for the Environment*
	14.50	**Do evaluations contribute to public policy formation? The case of Swedish wolf hunting** *Kerstin Astrand, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency and Finnish Environment Institute*
Session 3	**13.30**	**Climate proofing development co-operation through sustainability assessment: potential and limitations** *Jean Hugé, KLIMOS Research Platform on Climate Change & Development Co-operation, Forest Ecology & Management Research Group at KU Leuven and Centre for Sustainable Development at Universiteit Gent*
,	**14.10**	**The place of climate change impacts in the European Commission's impact assessment system** *Valentine van Gameren, IGEAT - ULB*
	14.50	**Environment within the European Commission: the role of integrated impact assessment** *Emilie Mutombo, IGEAT - ULB*

Overview parallel sessions Friday 10th from 10.30 to 12.30

Session 1	**10.30**	**Evaluating transitions** *Sander Happaerts, Matthias Bussels and Hans Bruyninckx, HIVA - KU Leuven; Derk Loorbach, Dutch Research Institute for Transitions (DRIFT)*
	11.30	**Evaluation of the environmental subsidies to local authorities in Flanders, Belgium** *Annick Gommers, Tritel*
	12.00	**A manual and web based tool to support the valuation of ecosystem services in Flanders, Belgium** *Sara Ochelen, Department of Environment, Nature and Energy of the Flemish government*
Session 2	**10.30**	**Evaluating environmental effectiveness of internationally negotiated tools against deforestation** *Karine Belna, Paris Institute of Technology for life, food a environmental sciences (AgroParisTech)*
	11.00	**Evaluating the impact of voluntary forest management certification on forest ecology - from evaluators and stakeholders' perspectives** *Marion Karmann, Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)*
	11.30	**Evaluation of the Action Plan to Prevent and Control the Deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon** *Jorge Hargrave, Brazilian Institute for Applied Economic Research (Ipea)*
	12.00	**Blaming Outward, Reflecting Inward** *Matt Keene, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency*
Session 3	**10.30**	**The role of monitoring and enforcement in environmental policy evaluation** *Sandra Rousseau, HUBrussel and KU Leuven*
	11.00	**The role of analytical economics in environmental policy evaluation: interaction of waste and energy policies** *Maarten Dubois, KU Leuven*
	11.30	**Linking modes of governance and social-ecological outcomes in environmental evaluation** *Edward Challies and Nicolas Jager, Leuphana University Lüneburg*
	12.00	**Competition effects of the renewable energy policy reform in Flanders** *Annemie Bollen en Peter Van Humbeeck, Flanders Socio-Economic Council (SERV)*

Overview parallel sessions Friday 10th from 13.30 to 15.00

Session 1	**13.30**	**Best practices that shape sustainable urban futures: beyond "examples which are to hand"** *Sofie Bouteligier, Wageningen University; Mark Watts, Arup; Han Vandevyvere, KU Leuven; Bart Vercoutere, Royal Haskoning; Hans Bruyninckx, HIVA - KU Leuven*
Session 2	**13.30**	**Bridging the communication gap between evaluation and decision making: The Network of Knowledge Approach for Europe** *Andrew Pullin, Centre for Evidence Based Conservation at Bangor University*
	14.00	**Using a Scorecard to Assess Progress in Incorporating Climate Change Considerations in Managing the U.S. National Forest System** *David Cleaves, U.S. Forest Service*
	14.30	**Ecosystem service indicators: Are we ready to measure ecosystem performance?** *Wouter Van Reeth, Flemish Research Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO)*
Session 3	**13.30**	**Identifying long-term monitoring needs: combining game theory and critical assumptions for the case of coastline management in the Netherlands** *Leon Hermans, Delft University of Technology*
	14.00	**How to evaluate climate policy: Case of an evaluation-based performance audit of Finnish climate and energy strategy** *Paula Kivimaa, Finnish Environment Institute*
	14.30	**Sweden's environmental objectives: methodological challenges** *Lisa Eriksson, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency*

Abstracts parallel sessions Thursday 9th from 13.30 to 15.30

Session 1

13.30 **Evaluating environmental law and policy in The Netherlands: experiences from the 'STEM' programme**

Frans Oosterhuis, Institute for Environmental Studies at VU University Amsterdam (IVM)

Between 2004 and 2010, the Dutch Ministry of Environment ran a programme 'Structural Evaluation of Environmental Legislation' (Dutch acronym: STEM). It was carried out by researchers from three Dutch universities, with support from Arcadis. A wide variety of projects were executed, resulting in 33 reports. With hindsight, the approach has been hardly 'structural', but rather 'ad hoc'. Nevertheless, the programme has led to useful insights and recommendations for improvements in policy and legislation. Still, a more systematic way of evaluating would be recommendable in order to maximize the learning effect that can be achieved with scarce resources.

14.00 **Environmentally Harmful Subsidies: Identification and Assessment**

Kris Bachus, HIVA - KU Leuven (to be completed)

Session 2

13.30 **Regulatory Impact Analysis in Flanders: policy and trends**

Peter van Humbeeck, Flanders Socio-Economic Council (SERV)

14.10 **Institutional Cooperation in Strategic Environmental Assessment a decentralised governance system**

Alessandro Bonifazi, Polytechnic University of Bari and Italian Ministry for the Environment

This presentation is about how the implementation of the SEA-Directive in the European Union (EU) is contributing to fostering cooperation among environmental authorities. Italy is chosen as a research context, as it illustrates the difficulties of implementing supra-national legislation in a decentralised governance system where regions have a prominent role. Based on a detailed analysis of both national legislation and regional SEA systems in Italy, we designed and carried out a questionnaire survey, and supplemented it with in-depth interviews with key players, covering both institutional actors and planning and SEA experts. The main research issues we focused on included: (i) the distribution of powers and roles under diversified regional systems; (ii) the prevailing modes of interaction among environmental authorities (cooperation, negotiation, competition, conflict, etc.); (iii) the procedures, methods, or informal practices to stage institutional co-operation; (iv) the role assumed for SEA in the decision-making process (e.g. setting objectives, discussing strategies, introducing mitigation measures); (v) how is SEA work shared among environmental and planning authorities; (vi) what influence is SEA actually having on environmental policy integration. The results show that SEA is positively contributing to foster cooperation among different government tiers and environmental agencies, while improving transparency and accountability and, to a certain extent, becoming a gateway for environmental policy integration. On the other hand, time and resource constraints, conflicting political mandates and the inertia of established administrative procedures and hierarchies are hindering collaborative governance in SEA processes.

14.50 **Do evaluations contribute to public policy formation? The case of Swedish wolf hunting**

Kerstin Astrand, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency and Finnish Environment Institute

Environmental evaluations are often thought of as a means to induce learning and development in public policy making. Evaluations of public policies are nevertheless also used for other purposes, such as accountability, negotiation and legitimizing of certain positions. This presentation examines the role of assessments and evaluations in the formation of the Swedish policy on wolf hunt over time. The presentation is primarily

concerned with how the results from assessments and evaluations have been used at central government level. A simple construct of evaluation uses is applied on the case. The presentation particularly explores if policy learning - in terms of conceptual and technical learning - can be detected in the documents examined. The analysis presented is based on a study of both ex-ante and ex-post assessments and evolutions of wolf related issues commissioned by the Swedish government and of how the results from these reports have been used in the government bills on wolf hunting.

Session 3 **13.30** **Climate proofing development co-operation through sustainability assessment: potential and limitations**

Jean Hugé, KLIMOS Research Platform on Climate Change & Development Co-operation, Forest Ecology & Management Research Group at KU Leuven and Centre for Sustainable Development at Universiteit Gent

Climate change adaptation entered the field of development cooperation fairly recently. International organizations, civil society and academics rapidly flooded policy-makers with new jargon, recommendations and best practices. Recipient and donor countries alike need to adjust to this new reality in a very short time span.

Although policy-supporting instruments for environmental integration sensu lato have been used in development cooperation for many years (e.g. EIA & SEA), a two-way perspective is necessary to successfully integrate adaptation into development co-operation: assessing the impacts of an intervention on climate change is not enough, as risks posed by climate change on an intervention also need to be assessed.

Sustainability assessment can provide an answer to this challenge by its intrinsic focus on resilience. However the practice of sustainability assessment is subject to many influences, ranging from shifts in dominant discourses and the existing institutional landscape to organizational capacity issues. Hence discrepancies can potentially arise between policymakers' expectations and the actual performance of sustainability assessment. This contribution provides an analysis of the emerging experience of the Belgian development co-operation sector with sustainability assessment in a climate change adaptation context. Obstacles and opportunities for adaptation-development synergies are identified in the partnerships between Belgium and respectively Morocco and South Africa.

, **14.10** **The place of climate change impacts in the European Commission's impact assessment system**

Valentine van Gameren, IGEAT - ULB

This contribution discusses how the impacts of European policy proposals on climate change are taken into account through the impact assessment (IA) system of the European Commission. Our analysis is based on an evaluation of fourteen selected IA reports. These reports deal with policy initiatives more or less linked to climate change concerns, were prepared by five different responsible Directorates-General (AGRI, TREN, RDT, ENTR, DEV) and stagger from 2005 to 2009. The used methodology is composed from a content analysis of these IA reports as well as interviews with several members of the European Commission. Two assumptions were at the basis of this study. Firstly, we supposed that impacts on climate change would be taken into account in IA reports of policy initiatives related to this topic. This assumption was based on two points: on the one hand, the increasing concern about climate change in the European policy agenda and, on the other hand, the mission of sustainable development integration allocated to the European Commission's IA system. Secondly, we expected that the impacts on climate change would be better evaluated in the IA reports in which DG ENV was involved during the IA process. This second assumption was based on evaluations of the IA system that formulated this recommendation in order to take correctly into account the environmental impacts. According to our results all analysed IA reports integrate the concern of climate change but with remarkable quality differences. However, contrary to our assumption, no correlation was found between this level of quality and the involvement from the DG ENV in the process. Other potential factors of influence were tested (DG responsible, year, juridical kind of the policy initiative, consultation of environmental stakeholders and presence of an advice from the IA Board). Excepted for the DG responsible, no solid correlations were found by our analysis. Finally, other factors

were evoked in the course of the study but were not tested. These are the timing of the IA process, the level of "openness" of the assessed proposal, the teams charged of the IA and the trainings offered to civil servants in this field. Eventually, some lessons of good practices were drawn with regards to our observations.

14.50 Environment within the European Commission: the role of integrated impact assessment

Emilie Mutombo, IGEAT - ULB

In the current context of economic and environmental crisis and their related complexity and uncertainties, what the demand side seems to expect is, among other, robust factual evidences about the effectiveness of its policies and programmes; effectiveness with regard to their core objectives but also with respect to side effects in areas not primarily targeted by the measures. In the environmental domain, this call for evidence finds an answer through ad interim and ex post environmental evaluations, but also through environmental impact assessment (EIA) and strategic environmental assessment (SEA) - ex ante evaluations of projects, policies or programmes which still are to be designed and adopted. In parallel to EIA and SEA, sustainability and integrated impact assessment procedures (SIA and IIA) have now been developed and implemented; the European Commission (integrated) impact assessment (EC-IA) procedure is said to be one of the most institutionalised and successful of those. This internal ex ante integrated evaluation does apply on almost all Commission initiatives and is meant to address "all" potential significant impacts of the foreseen measures with regard to the economic, social and environmental domains. The question we address is whether and to which extent environmental considerations are taken into account in the EC-IA procedure. To answer this question we will present the results of a literature review, based i.a. on the numerous meta-evaluations performed since 2003 and complement these with an analysis of a sample of the latest EC-IA reports with regard to environmental integration at the EC-IA level.

Abstracts parallel sessions Friday 10th from 10.30 to 12.30

Session 1 **10.30** **Evaluating transitions**

Sander Happaerts, Matthias Bussels and Hans Bruyninckx, HIVA - KU Leuven; Derk Loorbach, Dutch Research Institute for Transitions

This session will briefly portray the design and dynamics of the transition management approach, investigating into the possibilities and methodological challenges of evaluating and monitoring transition processes by highlighting some practical experiences.

Transitions touch on the deeply rooted unsustainability of contemporary systems fulfilling societal needs, such as the energy, food or mobility system (Paredis, 2009). Societal progress is heavily predicated on increasing environmental and social pressures. Alleviating these pressures even relatively, let alone substantially, has proven an elusive endeavour as they are firmly rooted and reproduced within our institutions and practices and involve a multiplicity of scales and actors (Loorbach, 2007). Theories focusing on systemic change and societal innovation, aptly called 'transition theories', attempt to address that systemic unsustainability (Kemp & Rotmans, 2001; Kemp & Grin, 2009). One such approach is the transition management approach. This (governance) model, originated in the Netherlands, has recently been adopted by the Flemish government as the framework for its long-term strategy for sustainable development. Acknowledging the manageability of long-term systemic societal change, the model proposes various flexible mechanisms and instruments to be applied during the transition process. Guided by visions on the desired future state of the system, transition paths are drawn up and tentatively explored. Each of these steps is characterized by uncertainty due to the systemic character of the issue involved. The transition process is therefore necessarily propelled by processes of consensus-building and reflexive and social learning (Loorbach & Rotmans, 2006).

Due to the relative novelty of transition theory and the inherent insecurity involving any process of systemic change, constant reflection, monitoring and (re-)evaluation of the targets and actions is crucial for success (Rotmans, 2009). Regardless of many transition processes being set up and put into motion, this particular dimension of transition theory and practice has yet to receive serious scholarly attention. In this session, both the academic traditions of policy evaluation and environmental impact evaluation will certainly prove useful in suggesting potential techniques and approaches of evaluation.

11.30 **Evaluation of the environmental subsidies to local authorities in Flanders, Belgium**

Annick Gommers, Tritel

In the context of the Flemish environmental policy, more than 15 different subsidies are being granted to local authorities (communities, provinces, …) by different and independent agencies of the Flemish environmental administration. The purpose of the ongoing research is to evaluate these subsidies from the regional to the local authorities on criteria such as effectiveness and efficiency. By evaluating all the subsidies in one research project, the regional authority wants to have insight in the most important global strengths and weaknesses, but also in the overlap or additional effects of different subsidies together in order to formulate recommendations both for optimizing individual subsidies as for reorganizing the entire subsidy landscape. The research is performed in three phases. In the first phase the subsidies have been examined on effectiveness based on quantitative data. Therefore, available databases and results of a wide-spread web-inquiry have been combined and effects have been identified by statistical analyses. As far as possible, the causal relation between the identified effects and the subsidies has been checked. In the second phase, hypotheses about the causal relation are being tested in a qualitative way (interviews and focus groups with the local authorities) and other aspects (administrative charges, …) are being examined. In the third phase, conclusions are drawn and – in a participative way – recommendations are worked out. Different options to ameliorate the subsidies from the regional to the local authorities will be compared in a way that the results can be used for the regulatory impact assessment.

12.00 **A manual and web based tool to support the valuation of ecosystem services in Flanders, Belgium**

Sara Ochelen, Department of Environment, Nature and Energy of the Flemish government (LNE)

Ex ante evaluation of new infrastructure projects often relies on cost benefit analysis. Such infrastructure, like a new road or a new dock in a seaport, can have a significant impact on ecosystems and the services they deliver. To facilitate the integration of this impact in the project evaluation, we want to quantify and to express it in monetary terms, the same unit as the other elements of a cost benefit analysis. With this purpose, the Flemish government commissioned a study to quantify and value the ecosystem services of (semi)-natural land use, including forests, grasslands and freshwater ecosystems.

The findings of this study are summarized in a manual and an easy to use web tool called "natuurwaardeverkenner" (nature value explorer). The study looked both into cultural services and regulating services. Cultural services are the amenity and non-use value. Regulating services include denitrification, N, P and C sequestration in soils and forest biomass, improvement of air quality, noise mitigation.

The quantification of regulating services is based on easy to use methods that could be integrated in the web instrument and less on extensive process based models that require expert to operate. Regulating services are mostly valued through avoided (damage) costs e.g. health costs related to air pollution and avoided investment costs to assess the value of nutrient removal. The value of cultural services is based on a large choice experiment. A value function for natural landscapes was estimated and we found that the willingness to pay depends on the characteristics of the natural landscape and characteristics of the respondents.

As the tool/manual needed to serve for a multitude of cases, straightforward unit benefit transfer methods per hectare were considered insufficient. Instead, value function approaches were developed. Specific characteristics of a nature area and its surroundings are taken into account in order to calculate its value.

Session 2 **10.30** **Evaluating environmental effectiveness of internationally negotiated tools against deforestation**

Karine Belna, Paris Institute of Technology for life, food a environmental sciences (AgroParisTech)

Today, conservation of tropical forests is at the core of a number of policies and programs emerging in the framework of the climate change negotiations for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation. Such initiatives are capturing most of the funding devoted to forest conservation (Association for Tropical Biology and Conservation, 2009), and strongly influence the future of tropical forests. For these reasons, assessing their effectiveness from an environmental perspective is a critical issue. However this evaluation remains complex as it raises burning methodological issues related to timeframe, articulation of spatial scales, complexity etc. (Mickwitz, 2003). In this paper, we first discuss to what extent research on environmental regimes' effectiveness and existing approaches of policies and programs' evaluation can help us to design a framework for evaluating the effectiveness of on-going international environmental policies. Drawing on these theoretical resources, we propose a framework that is based on three main issues: the standard of evaluation, the effects which will be considered and the demonstration of causality. If those questions are far from being new in the evaluation field, there are often not explicitly discussed by practitioners in the field of policies addressing tropical forest issues, when framing the evaluation. Secondly, we take as example the main multilateral climate change initiative that supports tropical countries in addressing deforestation: the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility. We consider the normative and methodological choices brought about when designing the evaluation of its effectiveness and argue for an original qualitative evaluation design (Rogers & al, 2000).

11.00 **Evaluating the impact of voluntary forest management certification on forest ecology - from evaluators and stakeholders' perspectives**

Marion Karmann, Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)

Third-party forest management (FM) certification emerged in the 1990s as a tool for assessing and communicating the environmental and social performance of forest operations. The Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) developed in multi-stakeholder processes standards for responsibly managed forests. The nationally adapted standards are widely accepted as being consistent with the principles of good FM. The FSC logo is a powerful incentive for forest managers to improve FM continuously: As of September 2011, FSC has certified more than 1.060 FM companies (with 140 Million hectares) in 79 countries.

In conducting forest audits, FSC-accredited certification companies do not certify that a FM unit has 'achieved sustainability', nor do they require the implementation of uniform sets of FM prescriptions: they certify that FSC requirements for FM have been met. Over the years different authors and research networks analyzed public certification reports and reviewed literature about certification impacts, and found that certification has the potential to and actually has for example helped secure or improve environmental services in certified forests.

Nevertheless FM is an intervention in forest ecosystems. FSC strives to minimize the negative impact on the ecosystem and on social issues while guaranteeing financial viability. Certain stakeholders require stronger reflection of their interests in the standards for FM, which challenges the FSC system for better communication e.g. of certification impacts and of the multi-stakeholder concept.

The presentation will show where individual researchers and evaluation teams can evaluate the interventions' impacts on forest ecosystems and strengths and weaknesses of related public consultation processes.

11.30 Evaluation of the Action Plan to Prevent and Control the Deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon

Jorge Hargrave, Brazilian Institute for Applied Economic Research (Ipea)

The Brazilian Amazon covers an area of more than 5 million km² and is mainly covered by tropical rainforests, which provide irreplaceable environmental services. The fast pace of occupation in the region led to indiscriminated forest clearing. After the reaching of an outstandingly high deforestation rate in 2004 (27.4 thousand km²), the Brazilian Action Plan for Prevention and Control of Deforestation in the Amazon put in place an integrated set of government policies that combine satellite monitoring, enforcement operations and land tenure regularization, alongside initiatives to encourage sustainable activities. In 2010 deforestation reached the lowest rate ever recorded (6.5 thousand km²). During 2010, the Brazilian Ministry of Environment invited the Institute for Applied Economic Research (IPEA), the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) and the German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ) to evaluate the implementation of this Action Plan. The evaluation was carried out by adapting the "Country Environmental Performance Reviews", developed by the OECD, to the framework of this very comprehensive plan. The process was mainly based on interviews with stakeholders, data analysis and field trips to critical areas. It led to the identification of positive and negative experiences, challenges and recommendations concerning the implementation of the plan. A draft version of the evaluation report was used to ensure the continuity of the plan during the transition process between administrations after the elections in 2010, some recommendations are already being adopted and other will be considered during the planning process of the plan's next phase.

12.00 Blaming Outward, Reflecting Inward

Matt Keene, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Evaluators often discuss the challenges faced by the field of evaluation. In our writing (and over our beers) we lament that evaluations are not used, that evaluation is too infrequent, that evidence is misused, that clients are too apprehensive, that budgets are too small, time is too short, data is inadequate and so on. To address the challenges, we recommend, repeatedly, that policies change, programs change, attitudes change, cultures change, etc. The collection of obstacles preventing more efficient progress toward effectiveness are often perceived as external to the field, pressing upon our work from the outside.

Might we look at it another way? In reflecting back upon the field of evaluation – the practice, theory and policy – what do we see? Are there shortcomings and barriers that we create and fortify that separate us from realizing the role that we envision for evaluation? What are the problems with our theory, our practice, our policies and our attitudes? What is our role in clarifying the importance of evaluation? What needs to change in our communications, in our education and in the evidence defining evaluation's importance? What needs to change in us? Participants in this open discussion will tussle, tangle, grapple, wrestle and struggle with the uncomfortable reality that it's not the responsibility of others to embrace evaluation; the onus is on the evaluators to give them something to value.

Session 3 **10.30** **The role of monitoring and enforcement in environmental policy evaluation**

Sandra Rousseau, HUBrussel and KU Leuven

Monitoring and enforcement are essential elements in any environmental policy and their role is crucial in determining the effectiveness of a particular policy. Incomplete enforcement has therefore proved to be a very important factor in the practice of environmental regulation and its implications will be the focus of this contribution. Regulators do not automatically know the compliance status of individuals and firms subject to environmental policy. Site visits and reporting requirements will be needed to establish compliance and to detect violators. These monitoring activities are costly and budgets available to inspection agencies are typically limited. After the first step of detecting non-compliance, the next step involves the decision whether or not to impose an appropriate sanction on the detected violator. Again this sanctioning decision requires the use of scarce resources. Thus it is important to take the budgetary costs of monitoring and enforcement into account as well as the impact on compliance decisions, since they will influence the environmental results obtained from the policy as well as the cost effectiveness of the policy. Besides having a negative effect on the environmental results of the policy, frequently observed (and unpunished) non-compliance can have a corrosive effect on the legitimacy of the criminal justice system and can undermine the public' confidence in police, government, prosecutors and courts.

However, it is not always straightforward to include monitoring and enforcement aspects into policy assessment. The incentives provided by particular penalty schemes can be quite complex. A case in point is a penalty scheme often used subsidy programs whereby the penalty if caught not complying is to repay (with interest) all previous subsidy payments made.

To conclude, in order to correctly evaluate an existing environmental policy or to design an appropriate future policy, it is essential to include monitoring and enforcement aspects. These aspects are as much part of a particular environmental policy as the abatement technology choices and emissions decisions made by firms and individuals.

11.00 **The role of analytical economics in environmental policy evaluation: interaction of waste and energy policies**

Maarten Dubois, KU Leuven

The EEEN forum has the objective to advance the evaluation of environmental policies. As resources become ever more scarce, policy needs well-integrated decisions that take into account side effects on all domains. Environmental economy has an important role to play in policy evaluation. Rather than focusing on single technologies or specific environmental effects, analytical models have a helicopter view on the full welfare impact. Through a focus on efficiency, environmental economics offers a methodology to balance environmental benefits and private investment costs of policies. As waste and energy policies are managed by different administrative bodies, instruments are not integrated. This presentation analyzes, based on an analytical model, the side effects of taxation and subsidies in both domains. The theoretical approach is illustrated with the question whether high calorific waste should be treated in industrial installations to substitute primary fuel (co-incineration) or in conventional waste incinerators. Different energy and waste policy instruments interact in this issue. A second empirical illustration discusses the reasons and effects of integrating waste incinerators in the EU carbon emissions trading system. In both illustrations, taxes and subsidies have a direct impact

on company behavior and environmental impacts.

11.30 Linking modes of governance and social-ecological outcomes in environmental evaluation

Edward Challies and Nicolas Jager, Leuphana University Lüneburg

We address the interrelationships between social and ecological outcomes of environmental policies and programmes under different modes of governance. While environmental policy often produces unexpected social side effects, both positive and negative, policy-makers and scholars have also long recognised potential synergies in combining social and environmental policy goals. With reference to collaborative environmental governance, such as in the case of the European Water Framework Directive, we examine the identification of community participation as a tool for achieving environmental objectives, and consider the implications of this for environmental policy and programme evaluation. We draw attention to the importance of social outcomes both as intermediary goals instrumental in securing environmental outcomes, and as potentially significant in their own right. The instrumental value of socially inclusive modes of governance and decision-making is apparent insofar as participatory approaches have been shown to increase (albeit in contingent ways) the legitimacy and acceptance of policy process and the effectiveness of outputs. Furthermore, participatory modes of environmental governance may yield significant extra-environmental benefits for communities of stakeholders and participants, through fostering new or existing networks, enhancing social capital, or up-skilling, educating or otherwise empowering individuals or groups. While the particular social-ecological consequences of more or less participatory approaches to environmental governance are highly context dependent, we argue that they are deserving of central consideration in the framing of environmental policy evaluation. In addressing the above themes, we draw on our on-going work on the European Research Council-funded project EDGE (Evaluating the Delivery of Environmental Governance using and Evidence-based Research Design).

12.00 Competition effects of the renewable energy policy reform in Flanders

Annemie Bollen en Peter Van Humbeeck, Flanders Socio-Economic Council (SERV)

Abstracts Parallel sessions Friday 10th from 13.30 to 15.00

Session 1 **13.30**

Best practices that shape sustainable urban futures: beyond "examples which are to hand"

Sofie Bouteligier, Wageningen University; Mark Watts, Arup; Han Vandevyvere, KU Leuven; Bart Vercoutere, Royal Haskoning; Hans Bruyninckx, HIVA - KU Leuven

In the search for more sustainable ways of living, policy-makers look for initiatives that have fruitfully contributed to achieving this goal elsewhere. This has led to a proliferation of databases with so-called best practices. In the domain of urban environmental governance, both international organizations (e.g. UN-Habitat) and city networks (e.g. the C40 Climate Leadership Group) have gathered information on successful policies with the aim that will be replicated elsewhere. Also private actors (e.g. multinational environmental consultancies) make play with achievements in other cities around the world to persuade city governments to chose a particular path towards urban environmental sustainability.

Yet, best practices are rarely critically evaluated before translating them to other contexts. Bulkeley (2006) already suggested that the selection criteria behind best practices are obscure and that best practices often simply reflect the "examples which are to hand". Furthermore, in an era in which information and knowledge have become strategic resources (Borja and Castells 1997; Ergazakis et al. 2006; Gertler 2003), the identification and spread of best practices contains an act of power: those who determine which best practices are spread and replicated around the globe have power (Bulkeley 2006; Mol 2008).

The open discussion will be held between researchers and practitioners (involved in city networks and in the environmental consultancy industry) and aims at answering the following questions: (i) What are the major challenges with regard to the identification and replication of best practices? (ii) Could more transparency on the criteria behind the identification of best practices increase these practices' legitimacy? (iii) Could a more critical evaluation make best practices more appropriate means for guiding policy initiatives? (iv) What criteria should be at the basis of such an evaluation?

Session 2 **13.30**

Bridging the communication gap between evaluation and decision making: The Network of Knowledge Approach for Europe

Andrew Pullin, Centre for Evidence Based Conservation at Bangor University

With international initiatives taking major steps forward on biodiversity data, monitoring and evaluation, it becomes increasingly urgent to make knowledge derived from these initiatives accessible for decision-making. Discussions about IPBES and other approaches to improve the science-policy interface have shown that it is not easy to formulate a single approach to address the topic of biodiversity and ecosystem services for several reasons: (i) the knowledge available is scattered across many disciplines, organisations, institutions and individual experts and often collected using a range of protocols; (ii) loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services is a global challenge, but problems and their solutions will often need a focus on the local or regional level; (iii) based on the recent experiences from the climate change debate and the IPCC, conduct of knowledge synthesis, communication of results, and their uncertainties need to be transparent, objective and independent of vested interest.

In the EU-FP7 project KNEU (Biodiversity Knowledge) a prototype structure is being developed to address these challenges - a Network of Knowledge on biodiversity expertise in Europe (www.biodiversityknowledge.eu). The network approach will employ different modes of work, including expert-based, evidence-based and adaptive management approaches, all of which require different processes to involve knowledge holders and to satisfy the knowledge requirements for decision-making. Such integrated and open approaches will be urgently needed on the regional scale and, linked to global and subglobal demands to fulfill requests from the global conventions, will feed the work of IPBES, will make wider use of monitoring and evaluation data.

14.00 **Using a Scorecard to Assess Progress in Incorporating Climate Change Considerations in Managing the U.S. National Forest System**

David Cleaves, U.S. Forest Service

Climate change is a major concern to the U.S. Forest Service. Most of the urgent forest and grassland management challenges of the past 20 years, such as wildfires, changing water regimes, and expanding forest insect infestations, have been driven, in part, by a changing climate. Future impacts are projected to be even more severe. These impacts necessitate the use of evaluation processes to determine the nature and extent of current and predicted impacts as well as the organizational capacity of the U.S. Forest Service to respond to climate-induced disturbances. We developed a Climate Change Scorecard as an evaluation tool to assess the agency's organizational capacity and progress in incorporating climate change considerations in management plans and prescriptions. It will be used in 2011-2015 to assess progress in employing mitigation and adaptation strategies. The Climate Change Scorecard is comprised of ten questions across four dimensions of Forest Service climate change response: organizational capacity; partnerships, engagement and education; adaptation; and mitigation and sustainable consumption, and is completed by 113 reporting units. The information provided by the scorecard has been useful for individual Forest Supervisors, Regional Foresters, and the National Climate Change Advisor's Office to identify areas for improvement as well as support needed by the operating units. This presentation includes a description of the scorecard development process, synthesis of the baseline assessment, 2011 scorecard results, and the lessons learned in developing and using a scorecard to assess progress in meeting the strategic goals of the Forest Service and Department of Agriculture.

14.30 **Ecosystem service indicators: Are we ready to measure ecosystem performance?**

Wouter Van Reeth, Flemish Research Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO)

Since the publication of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) policy makers and other stakeholders are increasingly embracing the idea that ecosystems are capital assets that can yield a valuable flow of services, if they are properly managed. Ecosystem restoration with the purpose of safeguarding or optimizing ecosystem services has become an explicit policy objective at an international, European, national and regional level. As a result, the performance of ecosystems to deliver services and support human well-being also becomes an explicit part of policy planning, design of policy instruments, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Review studies like the MA and 'The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity' (TEEB) advocate the development of ecosystem service indicators to better inform this policy cycle. Building on concepts from ecological economics and public administration, we propose a conceptual framework for measuring 'ecosystem performance' in a DPSIR-context. Traditionally biodiversity policy in Flanders has predominantly been motivated from an ecocentric perspective, based on nature's intrinsic value. Ecosystem performance is proposed here as an antropocentric perspective on ecosystem management. It captures the capital base (stock), output (flow of goods and services) and outcome (socio-economic benefits) of ecosystems. A well-balanced set of indicators may help in visualising synergies or trade-offs between both perspectives. Next we present assessment of the indicators that have recently been proposed in Flanders. We conclude with some recommendations for the development and use of ecosystem service indicators, in the context of the new policy objectives that have been formulated at the international and European level.

Session 3 **13.30** **Identifying long-term monitoring needs: combining game theory and critical assumptions for the case of coastline management in the Netherlands**

Leon Hermans, Delft University of Technology

Environmental evaluations are helped tremendously when useful and accurate monitoring data are available that help to trace developments and impacts over time. Yet collecting monitoring data requires efforts and investments upfront, without a guarantee that these

data will be useful for future evaluation. Furthermore, where policy-makers and politicians may be hesitant to commission evaluations, the idea of setting up monitoring systems that enable and support future evaluations may be even less appetizing.

Thus, it is important to be able to identify the key monitoring needs upfront in order to keep the necessary monitoring efforts limited but to the point. How can choices be made in designing monitoring systems, identifying the key indicators that should be monitored because they seem more interesting than others?

During this presentation an approach will be proposed to support such choices by looking at the policy processes that preceded a policy decision. We will do so by applying game theory to capture the most important interactions among actors that shaped a decision. We will then apply key insights from assumption-based planning and adaptive policy-making to look for the critical assumptions that actors have been making in their policy games. This idea is tested by looking at Dutch coastal policy, in three decision-rounds over the past 25 years. Could we, by reconstructing past decisions as games, identify monitoring needs associated with those past decisions? And could the resulting monitoring information have helped to inform and support subsequent decisions that occur years and years later?

14.00 How to evaluate climate policy: Case of an evaluation-based performance audit of Finnish climate and energy strategy

Paula Kivimaa, Finnish Environment Institute

Evaluations of climate policy are challenging both prior and after implementation of new policies. They are complicated by uncertain cause-effect chains, multiple other causes and policies influencing in desired and opposite directions, slowly changing practices, and long time periods before outcomes can be measured. Compared to some other environmental policy evaluations, climate policy evaluations are more challenging as their design and implementation is often a result of several administrative sectors. Climate policy typically requires coherence between, for example, energy, transport, forest and agricultural policies. Previous evaluations can point out possible methods to carry out climate policy evaluations but also areas in need of further improvement. This presentation provides an example through an evaluation-based performance audit of the preparation and implementation of Finnish Climate and Energy Strategy.

Performance audits, carried out by supreme audit institutions, typically assess the efficiency and effectiveness of government organisations, activities, and policies by investigating outputs and outcomes of organisations, activities, and policy programmes. They are similar to evaluations and use many common methodologies. Between August 2010 and October 2011, an audit of the Finnish Climate and Energy Strategy, issued in 2008, was carried out by the National audit office of Finland. The implementation part of the audit focused on the efforts for consistency, effectiveness and cost-efficiency from the perspective of climate change mitigation. In particular, evaluating the effectiveness was challenging, because the outcomes of policies on emissions could not be detected after a short time period. Thus, the outcomes were evaluated tentatively based on the identified outputs. The audit used a variety of methods and data sources to derive conclusions on the level of implementation and outcomes, including a stakeholder questionnaire, analysis of government budget appropriations, expert interviews, policy documentation and statistics. It pointed out that a climate policy evaluation based on multiple quantitative and qualitative data sources can not only trace the outputs but also produce a provisional evaluation of effectiveness.

14.30 Sweden's environmental objectives: methodological challenges

Lisa Eriksson, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency

The Swedish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) has overall responsibility that Swedens´s environmental objectives are achieved. The SEPA is facing big methodological challenges concerning how to evaluate these goals in a policy context. The goal system consists of goals of different kind. There is one generational goal, defining the direction of the changes in society that need to occur within one generation if the environmental quality objectives are to be met. There is also the Environmental quality objectives, defining the state of the Swedish environment which environmental action is to result in. Decisions on all these goals will be taken by the Riksdag. Step by step the SEPA is finding

its way in this complexity. In the suggested presentation and discussion we wish to point out these challenges as well as the actions taken place or being suggested to meet these methodological challenges. This we think could lead to a fruitful discussion on how to address the problems and possibilities. The discussion aims to share views, knowledge and experiences. The presentation will be held by Lisa Eriksson and Anna Lundmark Essen at the SEPA´s Evaluation Section at the Research and Assessment Department.