

## KEY ISSUES

David Viaggi<sup>1</sup>

### Issues in measuring outcomes

Part V contains two excellent papers that evaluate agri-environmental regulatory policies. The papers take mainly a technical standpoint, focusing on the measurement of the principal environmental issue that was the objective of policy makers, *i.e.* soil erosion in the US and nitrogen loss in Denmark. Both papers show some attention to the dynamics of policy impact, particularly the Danish paper that discusses the trend in nitrogen reduction. The two papers emphasise the good results of the policies under evaluation, even with delays and the presence of climate effects that somehow disturb the clear interpretation of the environmental changes detected. They also emphasise the importance of simple indicators, regularly used over time, with possibilities for benchmarking and comparisons (such as nitrogen balances) and the use of a mix of information sources (primary ambient data, input statistics, etc.). The papers focus on one or a few indicators very much confined to the main target of the policy. This is in fact a very pragmatic approach. However, in order to give these studies a full “evaluation content” it would be necessary to ask at least:

- Are there relevant environmental/economic effects other than the main policy objectives?
- What if we compare effectiveness with costs?
- If we can get information about cost-effectiveness, how would the result compare with other policy instruments (taxes, payments, etc.)?

These issues may be treated through either cost-benefit or multi-criteria analysis. In the context of agri-environmental policies, and taking into account the (partial) pieces of information available at the moment in many countries, multi-criteria analysis may provide the basis for at least some deeper understanding of the trade-offs and a rough analysis of effectiveness, taking into account possibly multiple objectives of the decision makers. It also seems to fit well the framework designed, for example, by the EU for the evaluation of rural development programmes based on a set of common questions and indicators.<sup>2</sup> In any case, different impacts should be to some extent considered in order to avoid misrepresentations of the evaluation framework and incorrect evaluation of policy successfulness.

### How to get back to causes

Getting back to causes of environmental change is always difficult and is something common to all evaluation work. The issue of additionality was often discussed at the Workshop. The US paper provides a relatively easy and elegant way of eliciting the effects exclusively due to the policy under evaluation. It is estimated that only 25% of total erosion reduction is due to the regulatory measure

---

1. University of Bologna, Italy.

2. These considerations are drawn from intermediate results obtained within the EU project SSPE-CT-2003-502070 on Integrated Tools to design and implement Agro Environmental Schemes (ITAES), in which the author is presently involved. They do not necessarily reflect the view of the European Union and in no way anticipate the Commission’s future policy in this area. Bartolini, F., V. Gallerani, A. Samoggia and D. Viaggi (2005), *Methodology for Multi-criteria Analysis of Agri-Environmental Schemes*, ITAES Project, deliverable D11, forthcoming.

examined, after accounting for: farms not involved; independent land use change; non excessive pressure areas; and farms not receiving payments.

However, some issues are touched only in a qualitative way and could further affect the result in different directions. Some of these issues include the:

- positive or negative indirect impacts on farmers not directly affected by the policy;
- induced changes in farming culture and farmers' attitudes; and
- effect of general trends of technology change.

Additionally, in order to understand policy effectiveness, it would be often relevant to elicit the role of different measures acting within the same policy framework. Apparently this is not a problem in Denmark. However, even some pieces of information internal to the paper (e.g. the delay in seeing changes to nitrogen leaching with respect to the policy coming into force) might be used as an argument to support the view that closer attention to the problem of additionality and counterfactual analysis could be necessary.

### **Lessons for policy design and incentives**

The main policy lesson learned from the US experience, and to a lesser extent from the Danish case, is that regulatory requirements are still a matter of incentives, as policy regulation acts in a context of strongly asymmetric information. Farmers are not simply left with the option but to comply. They may give up payments, if the policy is based on cross-compliance as in the case of US, or accept the risk of sanctions associated with non-compliance. In other words, the regulatory policies illustrated are still affected by relevant adverse selection and moral hazard problems. This issue is now widely treated in the literature about agri-environmental schemes, mostly in an *ex ante* perspective.<sup>3</sup> As a consequence, in order to make a policy effective and efficient, a right combination is required of regulation requirements, compliance incentives and enforcement.

This optimal mix has been considered in the US by restricting the regulatory action to sensitive areas and allowing for a high level of flexibility with respect to the individual farm's compliance conditions (such as tailoring regulations to reasonable compliance expectations). This could provide some major insights to the issue of introducing cross-compliance in the EU as part of the 2003 CAP reform.

Both papers highlight the importance of enforcement and the costs associated with it. This brings in the issue of transaction costs and their relevance in determining policy costs, which leads back to the issue of cost effectiveness mentioned above. Regulatory policies may be described as the most cost effective when a reasonable knowledge of individual compliance costs is available and when enforcement is relatively cheap. Otherwise, the balance of costs and benefits compared to other policies becomes rather complex.

Finally, another major issue that many need to be addressed is the interplay with other policies, for example the Conservation Reserve Program in the US. The US paper shows how important such interplay is in providing incentives and in checking the consistency of policy outcomes with respect to the cost effectiveness relationship. In the long run, policy connection needs to go beyond a simple incentive mechanism and explore the consistency and co-ordination with other policies so that farmers receive more consistent signals (see for example the CAP reform and the implementation of the Water Framework Directive in Europe).

---

3. For a recent review see Latacz-Lohmann, U. (2004), *Dealing with limited information in design and evaluating agri-environmental policy*, 90<sup>th</sup> EAAE Seminar, Rennes, [http://merlin.lusignan.inra.fr:8080/eaee/website/pdf/121\\_Latacz](http://merlin.lusignan.inra.fr:8080/eaee/website/pdf/121_Latacz).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<b>FOREWORD</b> .....	3
<b>SUMMARY</b> .....	9
<b>Summary Annex – One-page Summaries of Country Evaluations</b> .....	15

### **Part I EVALUATION DESIGN**

<b>Key Issues</b>	
<i>Markku Lehtonen</i> .....	37
<b>Chapter 1. Evaluating Agri-environmental Policies in the OECD</b>	
<i>Darryl Jones, OECD Directorate for Food, Agriculture and Fisheries</i> .....	39
<b>Chapter 2. Building Accountability Structures into Agri-environmental Policy Development</b>	
<i>Steve Montague, Performance Management Network Inc. and Erwin Allerdings, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada</i> .....	55
<b>Chapter 3. What Constitutes a Good Agri-environmental Policy Evaluation?</b>	
<i>David Pearce, University College London</i> .....	71

### **Part II EVALUATION OF PAYMENTS - MID-TERM EVALUATION OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS**

<b>Key Issues</b>	
<i>David Ervin, Portland State University</i> .....	101
<b>Chapter 4. Evaluation of Agri-environmental Measures in Flanders, Belgium</b>	
<i>Koen Carels and Dirk van Gijsegem, Flemish Agriculture Administration</i> .....	103
<b>Chapter 5. Evaluation of Agri-environmental Policies Implemented in France from 2000 to 2002 under the CTE Farm Contract Scheme</b>	
<i>Jean-François Baschet, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and Rural Affairs</i> .....	117
<b>Chapter 6. The Implementation of Organic Farming: The Case of Peloponnese, Greece</b>	
<i>Konstantinos Kloudas, Nikolaos Michopoulos and Angelos Koutsomichalis, European Enterprise Organisation Group SA; and Elena Kagkou and Amalia Liatou, Ministry of Rural Development and Food</i> .....	129
<b>Chapter 7. The Evaluation of Agri-environmental Measures: A Survey of Different Methods used by Italian Regions</b>	
<i>Annalisa Zezza, Istituto di Servizi per il Mercato Agricolo Alimentare</i> .....	141

**Part III**  
**EVALUATION OF PAYMENTS - OTHER**

**Key Issues**

*Floor Brouwer, Agricultural Economics Research Institute (LEI)..... 159*

**Chapter 8. Evaluating Agri-environmental Schemes in England**

*Geoffrey Radley, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs ..... 161*

**Chapter 9. Alternative Approaches for Evaluating the Performance of Buffer Strip Policy in Finland**

*Jussi Lankoski, MTT Agrifood Research Finland ..... 177*

**Chapter 10. Assessing Long-term Impacts of Agri-environmental Measures in Germany**

*Bernhard Osterburg, Federal Agricultural Research Centre ..... 187*

**Chapter 11. Sweden's Experience with Evaluating Agri-environmental Payments**

*Bo Norell and Martin Sjödaahl, Swedish Board of Agriculture..... 207*

**Chapter 12. Evaluation of Agri-environmental Measures in Switzerland**

*Ruth Badertscher, Swiss Federal Office for Agriculture..... 223*

**Chapter 13. Conservation Policy and Agriculture in the US: Valuing the Impacts of the Conservation Reserve Program**

*Daniel Hellerstein, United States Department of Agriculture..... 231*

**Part IV**  
**EVALUATION OF TAXES**

**Key Issues**

*Iain Fraser, Imperial College..... 261*

**Chapter 14. The Use of Green Taxes in Denmark for the Control of the Aquatic Environment**

*Hans Larsen, Ministry of Taxation..... 263*

**Chapter 15. Taxes as a Tool to Reduce Health and Environmental Risk from Pesticide Use in Norway**

*Erlend Spikkerud, Norwegian Food Safety Authority ..... 281*

**Part V**  
**EVALUATION OF REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS**

**Key Issues**

*Davide Viaggi, University of Bologna..... 293*

**Chapter 16. The Regulation of Nutrient Losses in Denmark to Control Aquatic Pollution from Agriculture**

*Søren Kjaer, Ministry of Environment; Pieter Feenstra, Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries; Søren Mikkelsen, Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences; and Torben Moth Iversen, National Environmental Research Institute ..... 295*

**Chapter 17. Has Conservation Compliance Reduced Soil Erosion on US Cropland?**

*Roger Claassen, United States Department of Agriculture..... 309*

**Part VI**  
**EVALUATION OF ADVISORY AND INSTITUTIONAL MEASURES**

**Key Issues**

*Ingo Heinz, University of Dortmund* ..... 325

**Chapter 18. Evaluating Community-based Programmes in Australia:  
The Natural Heritage Trust and the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality**

*Mike Lee, Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry,  
and Blair Wood, National Land and Water Resources Audit*..... 327

**Chapter 19. The Canadian Shelterbelt Program: Economic Valuation of Benefits**

*Suren Kulshreshtha and Edward Knopf, University of Saskatchewan;  
and John Kort and Julie Grimard, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada* ..... 347

**Chapter 20. Evaluation of the New Zealand Sustainable Farming Fund: A Work in Progress**

*Kevin Steel, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry* ..... 363

**Part VII**  
**EVALUATION OF POLICY MIXES**

**Key Issues**

*John Finn, Teagasc (Irish Agriculture and Food Development Authority)* ..... 377

**Chapter 21. Evaluation of Agri-environmental Policies in Japan**

*Yukio Yokoi, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries* ..... 381

**Chapter 22. Evaluation of the Dutch Manure and Fertiliser Policy 1998-2002**

*Hans van Grinsven, Martha van Eerdt and Jaap Willems,  
National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM);  
Francisca Hubeek, Agricultural Economics Research Institute (LEI);  
and Erik Mulleneers, Ministry of Agriculture Nature and Food Quality (LNV)*..... 389



**From:**  
**Evaluating Agri-environmental Policies**  
Design, Practice and Results

**Access the complete publication at:**  
<https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264010116-en>

**Please cite this chapter as:**

Viaggi, David (2006), "Key Issues", in OECD, *Evaluating Agri-environmental Policies: Design, Practice and Results*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264010116-22-en>

This work is published under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

You can copy, download or print OECD content for your own use, and you can include excerpts from OECD publications, databases and multimedia products in your own documents, presentations, blogs, websites and teaching materials, provided that suitable acknowledgment of OECD as source and copyright owner is given. All requests for public or commercial use and translation rights should be submitted to [rights@oecd.org](mailto:rights@oecd.org). Requests for permission to photocopy portions of this material for public or commercial use shall be addressed directly to the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) at [info@copyright.com](mailto:info@copyright.com) or the Centre français d'exploitation du droit de copie (CFC) at [contact@cfcopies.com](mailto:contact@cfcopies.com).