



Data for the evaluation of socio-economic effects: Experiences from RDP evaluations in Germany

ANDREA PUFAHL (RESEARCHER, THUENEN INSTITUTE OF RURAL STUDIES)

Background / Context

- RDPs of 5 Federal States
- Ex-post evaluations: 2014-2020
2007-2013, 2000-2006

Related indicators

- Jobs created (R21/T20)
- Rural employment rate (I.14)
- Degree of rural poverty (I.15)
- Rural GDP per capita (I.16)



Evaluation of socio-economic impacts



Micro-level approach

- Quantify result indicators, e.g. Jobs created (R21/T20)
- Approach: Counterfactual analysis
- Data requirements: Data of beneficiaries
Data of non-beneficiaries



Macro-level approach

- Quantify impact indicators (I.14, I.15, I.16) for predominantly rural areas (= NUTS3 units)
- Approach: Modelling
- Data requirements: Context data on NUTS3 or lower
RD spendings on NUTS3 or lower

Key issues identified by data source

	Data source	Key issues identified	General suggestion	Solution that we applied
Controls	Non-beneficiary data (FADN ...)	No (adequate) controls	Experimental approaches (for big measures)	Beneficiaries surveys (R21, death weights)
Context data	I.14 employment, I.15 poverty (Eurostat)	No data for NUTS-3 > level of designation of rural areas	Downscale Eurostat data to NUTS-3 (possible for I.14, collected on LAU2)	Use national data for NUTS-3, but definitions differ
	I.16 Rural GDP (Eurostat)	Data available with time lag of two years or more	Impact evaluation over periods & Member States	Consider RDP impacts of former periods

Key issues identified by data source

Data source	Key issues identified	General suggestion	Solution we applied
RD spendings CATS / X-Tables (Paying agencies)	Do not cover national top-ups, while evaluation/monitoring does	Harmonisation	Add top-ups from other data
	Do not cover RD spendings without EU-cofinance	?	Add from other data
	Changing NUTS classification are not updated on EU-level > lacking data for whole regions	Update NUTS classification, Quality checks (on EU-level)	None
	Variables with implausible values: Location of project (DF500), variables with physical units, sanctioned payments	Refine variable definition, Plausibility checks	Add location of project from other sources

Recommendations for ex-post evaluation

... to the EU-Commission and Member States

- Extend the years covered in ex-post evaluation by considering impacts of previous periods for similar interventions

General recommendations

- Add impact evaluations over various support periods and individual RDPs to capture mid/long term and equilibrium effects (e.g. displacement)
- Promote cross-regional, thematic evaluation studies with a uniform database/method as e.g. by Esposti (2007): Impact of CAP direct payments & RDP on regional growth

Esposti (2007): Regional Growth and Policies in the European Union: Does the Common Agricultural Policy Have a Counter-Treatment Effect? [American Journal of Agricultural Economics](#), vol. 89, issue 1, 116-134.

Recommendations for setting up the data management system for the CAP post-2020 ...

... to EU-Commission and Member States

- Prompt amendments in CATS/X-Tables (see sheet 5)
- Use a single rural typology within a Member State to define eligibility of rural regions and to evaluate impacts
- Support research for & application on experimental approaches

... recommendation to EU-Commission, Eurostat & Member States

- Efforts to improve data should focus to CAP objectives with higher impact rates, e.g. on environment, farm household income

Thank you

Andrea Pufahl

Thuenen-Institute of Rural
Studies

andrea.pufahl@thuenen.de

DATA MANAGEMENT FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF RDP
EFFECTS – 13-14 MAY 2020, ONLINE

