

EVALUATION OF REGIONAL POLICIES : METHODS AND EMPIRICALS RESULTS
Uddevalla International Workshop 99
17-19 June 1999

**Crucial evaluation indicators for cooperative regional policies and programs in France :
methods and applications**

Maurice Baslé, Jean Monnet Professor of European Economics,
With the assistance of Franck Pelé

Faculty of Economic Sciences,
University of Rennes 1, CREREG-IREIMAR-CNRS, 7 place Hoche, 35065 Rennes Cedex,
E-mail: maurice.basle@univ-rennes1.fr

Member of the Scientific Evaluation Council, Paris 1995-1999

Key words: production of statistical information, regional economy, selection of evaluation indicators,
evaluation of public policies.

Introduction

In France, statistical information is geared to meet the needs of the various official or private users. Some kinds of contextual or other information may be useful to everyone; others may serve particular needs. Among those needs is the new objective of official authorities to evaluate public policies. It is probably the pressure of financial constraints on national or local public expenditure, but also the desire for more information and greater transparency, and the modernist movement within the French administration over the last five years that have led to the development of this need for information on public policies and their effects in context. These needs are being felt at both national and regional level.

At national level, the institutional context for evaluation in France has for five years been marked by the decree of 22 January 1990 on the evaluation of public policies, the circular of 9 December 1993 on the implementation of evaluation in contractual procedures (plan contracts, city contracts), and the prime minister's circular of 13 July 1994 on the plan for modernising financial procedures for the purpose of devolution (BASLE, M., 1994). A new National Council of Evaluation (decret of 18 november 1998) has been installed. The main objective is to develop the assessment of efficacy of public policies from State Régional authorities and public services at a national or local level.

At regional level, new evaluation practices have also appeared within territorial authorities: the crucial problem then was that in France statistical information has remained very much national. Among other things, the regional development of evaluation, both light and in-depth, brings with it a growing need for regional statistical information. For many and various reasons, not only for evaluation purposes, **the small quantity and poor quality of regional statistical information in France will have to be tackled**: improvements will therefore have to be proposed. In our view, those improvements should in particular make use of certain general ideas on the need to make more inter-regional comparisons in Europe. It is our contention here that they should also be useful for evaluating regional policies. We will be showing here how it might be possible to draw on the experience of specific work that has been done in the field of evaluating public policies, bearing in mind that such work often starts with a statistical phase that consists of looking for information on the policy and the context, the field where the action takes place.

The intention of this paper is also to make a first assessment, along these lines, of policy evaluations of the new generation of plan contracts (1994-1998), especially of the regional policies of plan contracts (BASLE, M., 1994). Despite the attempts at coordination made by the Commissariat général du plan [General Planning Commission] (CGP, 1995), the exercise is in fact little known and little analysed. We will then look at

the case of Brittany, because it is probably the best example, to illustrate current practice and arrive at recommendations on the needs for regional statistical information (BASLÉ, M. 1999).

As you may be aware, **in Brittany**, the State and the Regional Council of Brittany created in 1990 a regional mechanism for evaluating public policies, for the purpose of conducting and implementing such evaluations. Its remit was therefore to give territorial authorities a common instrument for exchange and analysis enabling them to develop and coordinate, on request, local initiatives for the evaluation of public policies. A memorandum of agreement between State and Region, signed in September 1991, set out the principles for a structure comprising a Committee and a Scientific Commission, which were set up during the fourth quarter of 1992 after two years of experimentation. In January 1995, this memorandum of agreement was amended with the establishment of a new body, the Consultative Committee on Evaluation, which brought in the four Breton departments (General Councils and prefects). The inclusion of evaluation in the 1994-1998 plan contract helped to give the mechanism a new dimension by encouraging its organisational and functional development. The original memorandum was strengthened and complemented by the signing, by the State and the Region, of an implementing agreement setting out the conditions for implementation of the policy evaluation provided for in the 1994/1998 State-Region plan contract¹. Beyond the pursuit, in a limited number of fields, of in-depth evaluations using methods already tried out by the Regional Evaluation Committee, a new direction was chosen in 1993: **the implementation of "light" evaluations of all the programmes in the plan contract**. Encouraged by the new obligation to evaluate contractual procedures (plan contracts, city contracts), the State and the Region of Brittany decided to put a light evaluation mechanism in place. As conceived and implemented in Brittany, **light evaluation** has several aims. Upstream, its aim is to encourage better management of contract programmes and actions: it sees itself as a tool for enhancing the work of the services responsible for the programmes so as to provide them with data that will enable them to keep elected representatives and partners better informed about the actions undertaken and the impact they are having. Downstream, the light evaluation mechanism is also intended to help in the preparation of feasibility studies and tender specifications for in-depth evaluations. The desire to set up and/or perfect a statistical information system justified an approach aimed at increasing the "evaluability" of public policies by means of new, jointly produced (State and Region) information and an improvement in the quality of existing information.

We will begin by presenting the specific problems of evaluation of cooperative regional policies and programs (I) then, we will present the indicators used by the light evaluation mechanism for the plan contract between the State and the region of Brittany (II). These will then be illustrated by a specific example of a light evaluation performance indicator for the years 1994-1998 for a number of activities (III). We will then conclude from this initial review that regional statistical information needs to be considerably strengthened and that the new surveys will have to allow for the possibility that at least some of the regional statistical information collected might be used for evaluation purposes. Evaluation of cooperative regional policies could only be developed if we have sufficient basic construction of knowledge about spatial, economic and social contexts of public action.

I - SPECIFIC PROBLEMS OF EVALUATING COOPERATIVE REGIONAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS IN FRANCE

A) For choosing and using quantitative and qualitative, there is a priori no difference between national policy evaluation and regionalised policy evaluation. Scientific norms, Knowledge and Know-how are homogeneous and standards of monitoring the evaluation converge. The main difference is probably the effect of smaller budgets, necessity of some local proximities and relational network, and the choice of smaller consulting teams.

B) From the point of view of the "evaluability", specific problems are more important. The more smaller the area concerned with the effects of a public policy, the more problematic is the inventory of local incidence : externalities of public actions are looked for and spillovers are numerous. For example, you can have a local look and assessment on the monitoring of a local program directed to a purer water. But you cannot have a knowledge of the combined effect of different programs and water policies in the larger area. Systemic effects are impossible to assess by addition of local effects. Intermediary efficacy indicators are to be used.

¹ REGIONAL PUBLIC POLICY EVALUATION COMMITTEE (Brittany). 1995. *"The regional public policy evaluation mechanism and what it has achieved"*. September. 3 rue du Général Guillaudot, 35000 Rennes.

C) For the procedure, a necessity of partnership emerge. A good local governance is a cooperative game between financing local authorities and monitoring local actors. In France, this cooperative game is very difficult to be in application at a national level. At a local level, we could have a better probability of acceptance (BASLÉ, M. 1999).

II - THE NEED FOR REGIONAL STATISTICS AND THE CREATION OF INDICATORS FOR EVALUATING REGIONAL POLICIES.

The chief objective when frames of reference need to be provided for the light evaluation of a plan contract is to propose a *grid of indicators*. The procedure in mind breaks down into four stages. The first involves making the range of **proposed** indicators as wide as possible. In the second stage, the services must **select** from each type of indicator previously defined, those crucial or warning indicators which are considered the most relevant, representative and operational having regard to the characteristics of each programme or each line of action within those programmes. In the third stage, the Scientific Commission uses its **expertise** to select the indicators proposed. Finally, in a fourth stage, the proposals for indicators incorporating the Scientific Commission's observations and suggestions are returned to the services of the State and Region for **final validation** before actually being put into use.

The elaboration procedure is thus the prior production of a *frame of reference*. This means giving some thought to the data that are to be produced and the transformation of a collection of facts and figures into an information product that is useful for public action, and the light and possibly the in-depth evaluation of it.

A - Stage 1: The creation of the different types of indicators

The creation of the different types of indicator is a practical operation: it depends on the inherent characteristics and conditions of implementation of the programme in question, but also on the how far the follow-up procedures are advanced. The announced priorities (official objectives), the nature of the objectives to be achieved (quantitative or qualitative), the means of action or even the modes of intervention are therefore important elements to be taken into account.

The various types of theoretical indicator created fall into 12 categories:

- 1 - Physical monitoring indicators.
- 2 - Financial monitoring indicators.
- 3 - Indicators of keeping to the programme timetable.
- 4 - Indicators of the achievement of the programmes' intermediate objectives.
- 5 - Indicators of the achievement of the official objectives in the quantitative or qualitative reference unit in which they are expressed.
- 6 - Indicators of the first rank impact or effects on the beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries or third parties (effects include the official objectives).
- 7 - Indicators of the higher rank effects of the programme.
- 8 - Indicators of unintended effects.
- 9 - Indicators of beneficiary satisfaction.
- 10 - Indicators of satisfaction of eligible non-beneficiaries.
- 11 - Indicators of satisfaction of third parties with respect to public actions (local or regional public opinion).
- 12 - Indicators of the relevance of the programme's objectives to the needs (these indicators may be combined indicators constructed *in fine*, especially at the highest level, by elected representatives or politicians).

The implementation of heavier evaluations of action programmes could require the use of other indicators such as indicators of efficiency (relationship between means and ends) or consistency.

B - Stage 2: Choice of crucial or warning indicators

The variety of potential indicators is very great. But collecting the information necessary for producing those indicators obviously has a cost and, in any case, not all information has the same value for the conduct of an action. A selection of indicators has to be made by services, *ad hoc* groups (monitoring groups) of the Scientific Commission. This means giving some thought to the information and paying attention to it.

Within each type or class of indicators, the choice of existing or potential indicators is made pro rata to the information that exists (data banks on the progress of the programmes) or that will be created to satisfy the priority needs and objectives of the light evaluation of the action programmes in the State-Region Plan Contract. The possibility of further work to add to the information already available may be useful in some cases. The general idea underlying the procedure is to select from among the existing or potential indicators those that seem best able to render account of the programme's performance (efficiency, effectiveness, etc.).

The choice, i.e. the selection of indicators from within each type, is made in consultation between the Regional Evaluation Committee and the services of the State and the Region responsible for implementing the programmes. In a spirit of cooperation, collaboration and adaptability, meetings were organised with those services in order to discuss, on the basis of proposals, the relevance and feasibility of and information channels for the potential indicators. After a process of toing and froing between State and Region in which the indicators were discussed, a genuine consensus was reached, resulting in a common choice of the light evaluation indicators that would be used.

The grid of potential indicators that was provided served as a *frame of reference* for the formation and/or operational fine-tuning of the computerised databases. The various types of theoretical indicator developed and discussed fall into twelve categories.

1 - Physical monitoring indicators

The physical monitoring indicators proposed obviously could not be applied to all the programmes in the Plan Contract. They were largely conditioned by the nature of the programme(s) to be developed and especially by the populations affected by their implementation.

The definition of such indicators requires a quantification in advance of the objective of the physical work expected from the programmes to be implemented under the State-Region Plan Contract for 1994/1998. The *target value* so defined must then be capable of comparison with a *base or reference value* justifying the objective to be achieved. This assumes a prior diagnosis designed to target, on the basis of their real needs, the populations or territorial areas that will be affected by the action programme(s). Among the physical monitoring indicators, we can distinguish:

- Physical execution indicators (planned/actual)
- Capacity indicators (proposed/achieved)
- Target population identification indicators
- Indicators characterising the territories of application

Examples of physical execution indicators

- Number and type of public projects to be implemented (target value).
- Number and type of private projects to be supported (estimate of the population satisfying the specific criteria for public intervention).
- Number of specific amenities created.
- Number of amenities or specific structures renovated or rehabilitated.

Examples of hypothetical capacity indicators

- Maximum demand relative to existing capacity.
- Maximum demand relative to increased capacity (e.g. transport infrastructure programme)
- Resources or ability to fund the programme.
- Human resources mobilised to carry out the programme.
- Organisational resources put in place for the application of the programme.

Example of indicators for identifying the populations targeted by the programme

- Number of beneficiaries (proposed/actual)
- For individuals (professional situation, place of residence, age, sex, family situation, number of children, level of income, level of education, etc.)
- For enterprises (sector of activity, specialisation, legal status, workforce, turnover, location, etc.)
- For public or collective organisations (composition, status, vocation or functions, resources, number of members, etc.)

Example of indicators identifying the territory where the programme will apply

- Demographic context: population density, population growth by age and sex, migratory balance, natural balance, etc.
- Socio-economic context: state of the labour market (sectoral breakdown of employment, proportion of wage earners, proportion of female workers, unemployment rate, etc.), economic activities, wealth of local authorities, wealth of residents, supply of services and businesses, etc.
- Environmental context: natural, cultural, architectural, touristic assets, etc.
- Spatio-organisational context: territorial structures and group dynamics (levels of inter-municipal solidarity, networks)

2 - Financial monitoring indicators

Financial monitoring indicators are essentially quantitative and are concerned with money.

- Indicators of budgetary resources with their origin (State, budget heading, etc.)
- Ratios
- Indicators of financial costs (totals, by origin)
- Indicators of the use of credits.

Examples of indicators in absolute value

Basic indicators of budgetary resources:

- Overall cost of the programme.
- Overall financing plan for the programme (State, Region, Other).
- Overall budget allocated by action and line of action.
- Breakdown of credits allocated by action and line of action (State, Region, Other).
- Breakdown of aids by type of investment (tangible, intangible).

Basic indicators of budget appropriations

- Total cost of operations or projects financed.
- Total cost of subsidies granted.
- Amount of subsidisable expenditure by operation or project financed.
- Consumption of credits by programme, action and line of action.
- Consumption of credits by financier

Examples of ratios

Concerning budgetary resources:

- Structure of the breakdown of budget funds by action and line of action of the programme.
- Each investor's share in the overall funding of the programme (State, Region, Other).

- Structure of the breakdown of aids by type of investment (tangible, intangible).

Concerning budget appropriations:

- Rate of subsidy of actions relative to total cost, incl. tax.
- Rate of subsidy of actions relative to the amount of subsidisable expenditure, incl. tax.
- Rate of consumption of credits by programme and line of action.
- Rate of consumption of credits by programme financier.
- Rate of consumption of credits by the appropriate time.
- Amount of credits allocated to the programme relative to the number of its beneficiaries (credit per capita).

The periodicity of monitoring these indicators may be annual or more frequent (quarterly, half-yearly).

3 - Indicators of keeping to the programme timetable

A programme may have as a stated priority the strict adherence to a timetable for its implementation. Indicators allowing adherence to the timetable to be monitored must therefore be preferred here.

- Programme timetable (date of commencement, date of completion of planned work)
- State of progress on the programme relative to the timetable (late, on time, ahead)

4 - Indicators of the achievement of the programmes' intermediate objectives

Construction of these indicators requires the clear and precise identification of the intermediate objectives serving the achievement of final objectives or of the programmes drawn up.

Examples:

- Increasing capacity to meet the increase in numbers of university students (the final objective being to increase the level of higher education).
- Number of additional university institute of technology departments opened.
- Increased tourist accommodation capacity to satisfy tourists' demand for accommodation.
- Improving the quality of the accommodation (so as to improve the supply of services).

5 - Indicators of the achievement of the official objectives in the quantitative or qualitative reference unit in which they are expressed (results compared with the announced objectives)

The effectiveness or performance of a programme of actions depends on its ability to meet the set objectives. However, the development of indicators to monitor a programme's objectives requires the prior fulfilment of a number of conditions of measurability. If the objectives are to be capable of assessment, they must in fact be *standardised*, i.e. quantified or linked to a reference value (the "height" of the target serves here as a reference standard for assessing the results obtained).

In the absence of numerical objectives (as is the general rule), we need to be able to say how the initial situation justifying public intervention has been changed. Finally, even though measurement of the discrepancies between the aims in view and the objectives achieved is an essential process of evaluation, it is nonetheless insufficient. We need in fact to be able to complete the information (with a view to a heavier evaluation) so as to give the persons concerned the means of determining the factors behind any discrepancies found or the processes behind the results observed.

Some examples of quantified indicators of official targets to be achieved:

- Modernisation of some 1 000 craft and commercial enterprises (target value).
- Improving the competitiveness of 300 enterprises.
- Encouraging the creation of a Commercial Union per canton (collective actions).
- Facilitating access to employment for young persons aged 16 to 25 in an enterprise following a 6 month course, etc.

6 - Indicators of the first rank impact, results or effects on the beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries or third parties: indicators of effectiveness

Indicators of impact or effect only have real meaning in relation to the precise measurement of a basic environmental context that is to be corrected, which justify public intervention. A programme's impact is by definition *differential*. The indicators describe the difference observed between an initial situation, which is to be changed, and a final situation. Measuring the impact of a programme in the field where it is applied means taking account of the value of indicators describing the initial environment that is to be transformed (diagnosis or analysis of the situation at point zero, i.e. before the intervention begins) and monitoring how they change as time goes on in order to judge the level of the effects produced by the implementation of an action scheme. Most often, this will require an in-depth evaluation (as we go along or afterwards).

Example of absolute value indicators

- Initial capacity (reference value)/Capacity expected after completion (target value)/Capacity achieved (final value).
- Impact on regional development (sectoral diversification, etc.). Differential between an initial state and a final state.
- Impact on the environment (*ex post* appraisal of the situation in the zone concerned).
- Economic profitability of the project assisted.
- Leverage effect in terms of private investment (amount of investment made/amount of subsidy granted).
- Leverage effect in terms of public investments (*idem*).
- Return on investment.
- Indices of existing capacity (in terms of employment, accommodation available, etc.).
- Increased capacity (in terms of employment, accommodation available, etc.).
- Jobs created, unemployment reduced.
- Impact on the accommodation available in the context of a tourism policy, etc.

Example of ratios

- Survival rate of the companies or enterprises assisted.
- Rate of growth in initial capacity resulting from public intervention (difference between an initial state and a final state).
- Rate of growth in employment in the enterprises assisted.
- Change in the percentage of nitrates or phosphates in water.
- Incentive rate of aids on the decision to invest and the date, quality or quantity of investments (incentive effect of public aid).
- Rate of participation in collective activities or dynamics.
- Rate of penetration or awareness of a programme among the target public (number of applications for aid/population potentially eligible for aid) etc.

This list is only an indication and could obviously be expanded or varied according to the announced characteristics of each of the programmes in the State-Region Plan Contract.

7 - Indicators of the higher rank effects of the programme.

An action programme may have (knock-on) effects on agents or sectors of activity other than those targeted by its implementation. Such higher rank spillover effects may in some cases be felt in the monetary and financial spheres through the creation of additional markets.

A sectoral programme may have indirect effects on other sectors of activity that were not originally in view. The potential spin-offs may be economic, social, environmental or even psychological (renewed optimism). Here again, only additional surveys will throw light on such knock-on effects:

- on the building sector from a programme to assist in the creation or modernisation of physical structures (for production, accommodation, etc.).
- on other sectors of activity resulting from public intervention (business or architectural consultancy, etc.).

- Effect of aid to an enterprise for the purpose of preserving employment feeding through into the amount of business tax collected locally.
- Effect of imitation or contagion from one sector to another.
- Effect of image or reputation.

8 - Indicators of unintended effects.

The main purpose of indicators of unintended effects (beneficial or otherwise) is to highlight certain observable but unexpected phenomena by analysing the interactions between the programme and its environment (the vision is systemic). Among the effects encountered, we often find:

- Opportunist behaviour (seeking to get as much financial aid as possible for investments that were planned at lower cost).
- Production of positive or negative external consequences (map of the pollution resulting from the implementation of a transport infrastructure programme, for example).
- Disruption to the operational mechanism of competition on the market.
- Acquisition by certain interest groups of the income created by the regulations concerning aids (capture of the "regulator").

9 - Indicators of satisfaction of the target populations (beneficiaries)

Measuring *the degree of satisfaction* of the beneficiaries of a public action programme is a commonly accepted approach. Opinion polls are the rule here. We can also imagine heavier questionnaires including a description of hypothetical situations of the offer or non-offer of such and such public policy and the formalisation of questionnaires on the expectations and demands of the agents targeted (including in terms of performances to be paid for and performances to be received).

- Rate of beneficiary satisfaction with the systems of aid and their operation (collection of views or opinions on the way applications are dealt with, aids are granted or, more precisely, on the service rendered by a particular public policy).
- Rate of beneficiary satisfaction with the investments made (link between expectations and results).
- Rate or degree of satisfaction with the general interest structures or bodies through which action programmes are applied (e.g. opinion of the consultancy or technical assistance provided).

Monitoring such indicators would require further investigations in the field (specific surveys and methodologies).

10 - Indicators of satisfaction of eligible non-beneficiaries

It may also be useful and relevant to survey categories of the population (public bodies, associations, enterprises, individuals) that are not beneficiaries but would be eligible for a particular public incentive scheme so as to ascertain their attitudes towards or their images of public aid systems or procedures. Here, too, surveys will have to be carried out to measure the reactions of non-beneficiaries, asking more or less leading questions in order to uncover views, opinions or value judgments on the public actions potentially concerning them but which they did not want to take part in or did not know how to. One might, for example, seek for the reasons or motivations for not making use of a particular aid procedure (lack of information on the mechanisms available, no need for it, coming at the wrong time, refusal of any outside interference, etc.).

11 - Indicators of satisfaction of third parties with respect to public actions (general local or regional public opinion)

It may also be interesting to conduct surveys or opinion polls of third parties about the policies or programmes implemented. Satisfaction indicators can be constructed and monitored to measure and assess the effects of action programmes as they may be perceived locally in the places where they apply through the outside eyes of persons with resources (elected representatives, presidents of various structures, technical assistants of chambers of commerce, traders, artisans, restaurant owners, etc.). In this case, what the indicators measure is mainly qualitative and the collection of information depends largely on the

characteristics or specific features of the programmes put in place. For example, in the case of a policy to assist the development of tourism in rural areas, measurement of the degree or level of third party satisfaction may be combined with consideration of opinions on the various aspects of the policy:

- general opinion of the policy
- opinion of the economic, social and political spin-offs,
- opinion of the actions of the structures through which the policy is applied,
- opinion of which actions should be given priority,
- opinion of the cooperation between various agencies involved.

12 - Indicators of the relevance of objectives to needs

The indicators of the *relevance* of a public intervention relate to the needs actually felt by the populations targeted by the action programme. It may nevertheless be difficult to ascertain both the characteristics of those whom the action is intended to benefit (and therefore to analyse whether the mechanism meets their expectations and needs) and to take account of the characteristics of the social and economic environment and to assess whether the programme is geared to the specific nature of that environment. The work to evaluate relevance is therefore a final task that can and must be carried out at the highest level of policy implementation (that is, at the level of elected representatives or of central government). This explains why this final class of indicators is not effective in Brittany.

Examples:

- Can we judge the relevance of an objective seeking to modernise 1 200 craft trade and commercial enterprises without knowing the potential number of enterprises with real needs for modernisation or renovation?
- Can we enlist young people in a vocational retraining scheme without first studying the local employment market?
- Can we encourage a local development project in a rural canton without placing it in a wider national or European spatio-economic context?

This means that it must be possible for *indicators of need* to be constructed *beforehand* so that the relevance of any objective can be assessed. They are generally constructed on what economists call the political market.

C - Stage 3: Expert report by the Scientific Commission on the indicators chosen by the State and the Region

The Scientific Commission of the Regional Evaluation Committee, which guarantees the scientific nature of the work undertaken, then has to use its expertise to make a scientific appraisal of the indicators. It gives its opinion on the relevance, quality and performance (in the light of the programmes' stated objectives) of the indicators developed jointly by the State and the Region.

D - Stage 4: Final validation of the indicators by the State and the Region and their implementation

Lastly, in the final stage the proposed indicators are reformulated on the basis of the Scientific Committee's observations and suggestions and returned for final validation in the services of the State and the Region. This final stage signals the actual implementation of the indicators.

III - SOME EXAMPLES OF THE NEEDS FOR REGIONAL STATISTICS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF LIGHT EVALUATION INDICATORS OF THE STATE-REGION PLAN CONTRACT FOR BRITTANY, 1994-1998

The following regional public policies are chosen here:

- programme 6, Agriculture and agri-foodstuffs, "forests" action.
- programme 8, action 3, intangible investments, aid for the recruitment of executives
- programme 8, action 4, foreign trade, aid for locating abroad
- programme 9, action 2, programmed operation to improve and renovate trade and crafts (OPARCA)
- programme 11, Breton road action plan

- PROGRAMME 6, Action 7: Forests, Source: CRE/FP/BL/October 1997

INDICATORS	SRPC entries 1994/98	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Total amount of credits put in place (F.)	43 000 000	8 100 000	7 900 000	9 060 000	5 787 000	6 505 000
State (Financial authorisations)	27 000 000	4 900 000	4 700 000	5 860 000	3 087 000	3 805 000
Region	16 000 000	3 200 000	3 200 000	3 200 000	3 200 000	2 700 000
Total amount of credits allocated (F.)		4 250 000	6 162 200	6 788 600	6 432 757	4 383 968
State		3 630 000	3 865 000	4 275 200	3 939 700	2 559 600
Region		620 000	2 297 200	2 513 400	2 493 057	1 824 368
Total amount of investments made (in F.)		14 760 000	23 605 000	23 030 000	18 177 000	10 947 000
Tangible	14 700 000	23 500 000	22 470 000	18 060 400	10 497 000	
Intangible	60 000	105 000	560 000	116 600	479 700	
Area of thicket transformed into broad-leaved forest		5	35	6	12	0
Area of agricultural land planted with trees (ha), of which:	240	222	260	297	248	
Broad-leaved		-	-			
Conifers		-	-			
Poplars		-	-			
Area of forest replanted (ha), of which:	89	65	34	144	0	
Broad-leaved		-	-			
Conifers		-	-			
Poplars		-	-			
Declared afforested area of Brittany (ha)		334	322	300	453	248
Kilometres forest roads created		1.3	21.8	8.2	1,8	0
Number of outbreaks of fire:		288	450	592	593	253
Côtes d'Armor		12	15	26	26	37
Finistère		11	48	88	101	35
Ile-et-Vilaine		3	11	30	115	5
Morbihan		262	376	448	340	196

Source: Regional Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry (DRAF - Brittany).

SRPC entries 1994/98 [=State-Region Plan Contract]

Action 7: Forests

INDICATORS	1994	1995	1996		1997		1998	
Annual area destroyed by fire (ha) (forest and sub-forest vegetation)	437	330.5	1780.5	160.5²	458	117	146	17
Côtes d'Armor	11	21.5	94.5	26	40	12	13	0
Finistère	19	48	1 137	37.5	143	0	28	0
Ille-et-Vilaine	6	53	175	66	76	40	3	2
Morbihan	401	208	374	31	199	65	102	15
Total amount of investments made (in F.) by:	8 730 000		16 255 000		15 380 000		8 725 000	
Foresters and forestry enterprises	0		1 285 000		2 390 000		5 500 000	
First-stage timber processing enterprises (saw mills)	8 730 000		14 970 000		12 990 000		3 225 000	
Subsidisable amount of investments made (in F.) by:	8 630 000		10 161 000		14 787 000		8 359 000	
Foresters and forestry enterprises	0		1 076 000		2 127 000		5 134 000	
First-stage timber processing enterprises (saw mills)	8 630 000		9 085 000		12 660 000		3 225 000	
Volume sawn by Breton saw mills (in m ³):	189 104		209 670		207 640		207 000	
Broad-leaved	54 591		54 780		51 496		43 500	
Conifers	111 029		119 070		118 033		117 900	
Poplars	23 484		35 820		38 111		45 600	
Number of paid posts:	2 136		2 420		2 101		1 920	
. Forestry enterprises	80		161		122		120	
. Saw mills	2 056		2 259		1 919		1 800	
Number of meetings in the field	50		50		50		50	
Number of technicians' days	220		220		180		180	

Source: Regional Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry (DRAF - Brittany).

² These figures refer to the area of forest destroyed by fire (excluding all sub-forest vegetation).

PROGRAMME 8, Action 3: Intangible investments

Sub-action: Aid to executive recruitment (ARC), Source: CRE/FP/BL/December 1997

INDICATORS	SRPC entries 1994/98	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Total amount of credits in the budget (put in place) in F.:	56 500 000	5 450 000	5 950 000	5 450 000	8 892 500	7 709 00
State (Financial authorisations)	29 250 000	/	/	/	5 242 500	4 059 00
Region	18 250 000	5 450 000	5 950 000	5 450 000	3 650 000	3 650 000
Other (European Union)	9 000 000	/	/	/		
Total amount of subsidies allocated (in F.):		5 840 702	18 683 099	11 236 970	7 627 902,5	9 688 535
State (Payments)		2 920 351	6 615 262	3 362 561	2 894 812,5	3 665 665
Region		2 920 351	6 690 262	3 362 561	1 683 640	2 317 500
Others		-	5 377 575	4 611 848	3 049 450	3 705 370
Number of executive recruitments supported		44	144	90	70	92
Number of enterprises having recruited and breakdown by sector of activity:		44	144	90	70	90
Industry		24	66	36	25	39
Agri-foodstuffs		5	23	12	8	13
Transport, building and public works		7	21	13	9	10
Other		8	34	29	28	28
Breakdown by size of enterprises having recruited:		44	144	90	70	90
Fewer than 50 employees		30	108	73	53	71
50 - 100 employees		9	24	10	11	12
100 - 200 employees		4	9	7	4	6
Over 200 employees		1	3	0	2	1
Breakdown of executives recruited by type of job (function):		38	123	72	52	75
Direct subordinate to the manager or director		12	36	11	12	17
New functions in the enterprise, of which:		22	54	31	22	34
Quality		8	19	9	5	7
Environment		0	1	0	1	1
Organisation of production		14	34	22	16	26
Other		4	33			30
Management ratio in the enterprises assisted		no reply	no reply	no reply		Taux de 3 Cadres en moyenne
Average management ratio in Breton enterprises		-	-	-		
Number of executives or functions still active one year after the ARC operation		no reply	no reply	no reply		

Sources: Regional Directorate for Industry, Research and the Environment (DRIRE-Brittany)
 Directorate for Economic Development and Research (Brittany Regional Council).

CRE/FP/BL/September 1997

PROGRAMME 8, Action 3: Intangible investments
Sub-action: Aid to Executive Recruitment (ARC - EXPORT)

INDICATORS	SRPC entries 1994/98	1994	1995	1996
Total amount of credits in the budget (put in place) in F:	12 000 000	2 400 000	1 980 000	3 036 000
State (Financial authorisations)	6 000 000	1 200 000	780 000	1 836 000
Region	6 000 000	1 200 000	1 200 000	1 200 000
Other (European Union)				
Total amount of subsidies allocated (in F.):		908 800	2 678 823	3 628 300
State (Payments)		454 400	1 375 540	1 017 600
Region		454 400	1 303 283	2 610 700
Other (European Union)				
Total amount of subsidies paid (in F.):		0	803 518	
State		0	360 000	1 372 000
Region		0	443 518	
Other (European Union)				
Number of executive recruitments supported		7	21	13
Number of enterprises having recruited and breakdown by sector of activity:		7	21	13
Industry		/	9	4
Agri-foodstuffs		6	3	6
Transport, building and public works		/	/	1
Other		1	9	2
Breakdown by size of enterprises having recruited:		7	21	13
Fewer than 50 employees		2	18	9
50 - 100 employees		3	1	2
100 - 250 employees		1	1	2
250 or more employees		/	1	0
Breakdown of executives recruited by type of job (function):		7	21	13
Direct associate of the manager or director			4	1
New functions in the enterprise			/	0
Other		6	17	12
Average management ratio in the enterprises assisted				
Average management ratio in Breton enterprises ³				
Number of executives or functions still active one year after the end of the ARC procedure				

Sources: Regional Directorate for Foreign Trade of Brittany
 Directorate for Economic Development and Research of the Brittany Regional Council.

CRE/FP/BL/September 1997

³ Source: INSEE

PROGRAMME 8, Action 4: Foreign trade (aid for locating abroad)

INDICATORS	SRPC entries 1994/98	1994	1995	1996	1997
Total amount of credits in the budget (put in place) in F.:	8 000 000	2 300 000	1 580 000	800 000	800 000
State (Financial authorisations)	4 000 000	800 000	780 000	0	0
Region	4 000 000	1 500 000	800 000	800 000	800 000
Other					
Total amount of State/Region/Other subsidies allocated (F.):		0	577 100	516 500	496 908
Breakdown by type of establishment created:					
Establishment of sales agencies		/	/	218 400	115 000
Establishment of subsidiaries		/	577 100	298 100	381 908
Establishment of exhibition sites		0	0	0	0
Other		/	/	0	0
Breakdown by geographical area:					
EEC		/	327 100	516 500	496 908
OECD (non-EEC)		0	0	0	0
Newly Industrialised Countries (NIC)		0	250 000	0	0
Other		0	0	0	0
Breakdown by sector of activity:					
Agri-foodstuffs		0	108 100	92 300	0
Capital goods		0	219 000	218 400	115 000
Consumer goods		0	250 000	0	0
Services		0	0	0	0
Other		0	0	0	381 908
Total number of applications:		0	3	3	3
Breakdown by geographical area					
EEC		0	2	3	3
OECD (non-EEC)		0	0	0	0
Newly Industrialised Countries (NIC)		0	1	0	0
Other		0	0	0	0
Breakdown by sector of activity					
Agri-foodstuffs		0	1	1	0
Capital goods		0	1	1	0
Consumer goods		0	1	0	0
Services		/	/		
Other		0	0	1	0

Sources: Regional Directorate for Foreign Trade of Brittany
 Directorate for Economic Development and Research of the Brittany Regional Council
 CRE/FP/BL/October 1997

PROGRAMME 9, Action 2: Programmed Operation for the Improvement and Renovation of Trade and Craft Industries (OPARCA)

INDICATORS	SRPC entries 1994/98	1994 (Reminder)	1995 (Reminder)	1996
Total amount of credits in the budget (put in place) in F.	155 000 000	3 675 000	16 814 000	13 015 600
State	35 000 000	6 960 000	5 830 600	6 015 600
Region	30 000 000	1 500 000	7 500 000	6 000 000
Departments	45 000 000			
Europe	45 000 000		3 000 000	1 000 000
Total amount of subsidies allocated (in F):		2 500 000	7 220 230	12 282 734
State		1 000 000	5 020 730	4 312 234
Region		1 500 000	2 119 500	7 970 500
Departments				
Europe				
Total amount of subsidies paid (in F.):		1 250 000	10 403 242	8 692 986
State			4 634 560	4 475 085
Region		1 250 000	1 534 692	2 750 441
Departments		/		
Europe (Investment+Operation+Promotion)		/	4 233 990	1 467 460
Amount of operations approved (in F.) and paid for		6 225 129	70 581 780	154 539 703
Breakdown:				
<u>Collective promotion:</u>		613 546	2 611 574	5 421 710
Collective actions				401 414
Individual pre-diagnostics		/	460 811	848 588
Training of craftsmen and tradesmen		/	104 238	997 453
Commercial unions or associations		/		717 270
Local authorities or groups of local authorities		/	338 851	770 727
Other (Compensation to Commercial Companies)		613 546	1 707 674	1 686 258
<u>Tangible investment (Property+Equipment+Purchases):</u>		5 286 453	67 970 206	149 117 993
Modernisation of buildings		4 062 805	48 011 448	114 749 179
of which: compliance with health and safety requirements		1 336 663	8 489 537	30 864 597
Technological modernisation		1 223 648	19 958 758	34 368 814
of which: compliance with health and safety requirements		0	2 346 696	2 850 509
Number of applications approved for tangible investments ⁴		8	172	418
Modernisation of buildings		4	129	337
of which: compliance with health and safety requirements				
- buildings alone		3	18	86
- buildings and tools		0	5	6
Technological modernisation		4	43	81
Number of applications approved for the recovery of enterprises		0	5	14
% of total OPARCA applications		0	3.20 %	3.65 %
% of total applications (incl. non-OPARCA)		0	2.91 %	3.35 %

Sources: Regional Delegation for Trade and Crafts (DRCA-Brittany)

⁴ Breakdown impossible, since expenditure for modernisation and for compliance with health and safety requirements may be part of the same application.

PROGRAMME 9, Action 2: Programmed Operation for the Improvement and Renovation of Trade and Craft Industries (OPARCA)

INDICATORS	1994 (Reminder)	1995 (Reminder)	1996
COLLECTIVE PROMOTION			
Number of collective actions per zone ⁽⁵⁾ :	0	2	24
zone 1	/	2	22
zone 2	/	/	2
zone 3	/	/	/
zone 4	/	/	/
Number of collective actions by sector	0	3	
Crafts/Non-food trade	/	/	
Crafts/Food trade	/	/	
Craft production	/	1	
Craft agri-food	/	/	
Other	/	2	
Number of enterprises for which pre-diagnostics provided	/	439	804
Number of assisted Commercial Unions and associations	/	1	5
Rate of penetration of the mechanism ⁽⁶⁾	0.05	1.01	2.24
Total number of OPARCA applications	8	172	418
Zone 1 ⁽⁷⁾			
Number of applications	5	128	223
Rate of penetration	0.11	2.90	5.05
Zone 2 ⁽⁸⁾			
Number of applications	1	9	134
Rate of penetration	0.02	0.21	3.20
Zone 3 ⁽⁹⁾			
Number of applications	1	8	20
Rate of penetration	0.02	0.18	0.44
Zone 4 ⁽¹⁰⁾			
Number of applications	1	11	6
Rate of penetration	0.03	0.28	0.15
Number of non-OPARCA applications	0	16	35

Sources: DRCA and ARIARCA

⁵ The OPARCA collective promotion stage is based on pre-established zoning. Action will be spread over periods each of one year and progressively to the four chosen intervention zones (zone 1 = 2nd half 1994 - 1st half 1995, zone 2 = 2nd half 1995 - 1st half 1996, etc.).

⁶ Number of applications/Number of potential beneficiaries

⁷ Base 1994: 4 416 potential beneficiaries

⁸ Base 1994: 4 194 potential beneficiaries

⁹ Base 1994: 4 539 potential beneficiaries

¹⁰ Base 1994: 3 909 potential beneficiaries

PROGRAMME 9, Action 2: Programmed Operation for the Improvement and Renovation of Trade and Craft Industries (OPARCA)

INDICATORS	1994	1995	1996
Total number of craft and trade jobs ¹¹ :			
Zone 1			
Zone 2			
Zone 3			
Zone 4			
Total number of craft and trade jobs ⁹ :			
Crafts/Non-food trade			
Crafts/Food trade			
Craft production			
Craft agri-food			
Other			
Average trend in employment (paid workforce) in the craft and trade enterprises assisted			
Average trend in turnover of the craft and trade enterprises assisted			

CRE/FP/BL/October 1997

¹¹ Sources: INSEE, CCI, CM.

Action 2: Programmed Operation for the Improvement and Renovation of Trade and Craft Industries (OPARCA)

INDICATORS	SRPC entries 1994/98	1994 (Reminder)	1995 (Reminder)	1996	1997	1998
Total amount of credits in the budget (put in place) in F.	155 000 000	3 675 000	16 814 000	13 015 600	11 911 400	8 600 150
State	35 000 000	6 960 000	5 830 600	6 015 600	4 911 400	3 100 150
Region	30 000 000	1 500 000	7 500 000	6 000 000	7 000 000	5 500 000
Departments	45 000 000					
Europe	45 000 000		3 000 000	1 000 000		
Total amount of subsidies allocated (in F.):		2 500 000	7 220 230	12 282 734	28 631 335	31 915 480
State		1 000 000	5 020 730	4 312 234	7 688 470	7 913 380
Region		1 500 000	2 119 500	7 970 500	6 112 800	5 319 700
Departments					7 988 095	8 600 540
Europe					6 841 970	10 171 790
Total amount of subsidies paid (in F.):		1 250 000	10 403 242	8 692 986	12 323 442	21 653 983
State			4 634 560	4 475 085	2 825 735	4 832 002
Region		1 250 000	1 534 692	2 750 441	4 943 271	4 688 397
Departments		/				5 851 344
Europe (Investment + Operation + Promotion)		/	4 233 990	1 467 460	4 554 436	6 282 240
Amount of operations approved (in F.) and paid for:		6 225 129	70 581 780	154 539 703	160 591 836	186 812 941
Collective promotion:		613 546	2 611 574	5 421 710	6 275 537	2 791 409
Collective actions				401 414	1 209 090	428 878
Individual pre-diagnostics		/	460 811	848 588	571 317	448 623
Training of craftsmen and tradesmen		/	104 238	997 453	1 040 279	1 132 773
Commercial unions or associations		/		717 270	765 507	172 698
Local authorities or groups of local authorities		/	338 851	770 727	539 552	143 013
Other (Compensation to Commercial Companies)		613 546	1 707 674	1 686 258	2 150 092	465 424
<u>Tangible investment</u> (Property + Equipment + Purchases):		5 286 453	67 970 206	149 117 993	154 316 299	184 021 532
Modernisation of buildings		4 062 805	48 011 448	114 749 179	127 882 126	132 054 597
of which: compliance with health and safety requirements		1 336 663	8 489 537	30 864 597	32 194 740	28 394 169
Technological modernisation		1 223 648	19 958 758	34 368 814	26 434 173	92 966 933
of which: compliance with health and safety requirements		0	2 346 696	2 850 509	1 491 804	5 195 385
Number of applications approved for tangible investments ¹²		8	172	418	430	476
Modernisation of buildings		4	129	337	365	358
- buildings alone		3	18	86	78	82
- buildings and tools		0	5	6	7	8
Technological modernisation		4	43	81	65	118
Number of applications approved for the recovery of enterprises		0	5	14	28	13
% of total OPARCA applications		0	3.20 %	3.65 %	6.91 %	3.14
% of total applications (incl. non-OPARCA)		0	2.91 %	3.35 %	6.51 %	2.73

Sources: Regional Delegation for Trade and Crafts (DRCA-Brittany)

¹² Breakdown impossible, since expenditure for modernisation and for compliance with health and safety requirements may be part of the same application.

Action 2: Programmed Operation for the Improvement and Renovation of Trade and Craft Industries (OPARCA)

INDICATORS	1994 (Reminder)	1995 (Reminder)	1996	1997	1998
COLLECTIVE PROMOTION					
Number of collective actions per zone ⁽¹³⁾ :	0	2	24	26	44
zone 1	0	2	22	15	4
zone 2	0	0	2	10	21
zone 3	0	0	0	1	19
zone 4	0	0	0	0	0
Number of enterprises for which pre-diagnostics provided	/	439	804	469	440
Number of assisted Commercial Unions and associations	/	1	5	4	7
Rate of penetration of the mechanism ⁽¹⁴⁾	0.05	1.01	2.24	2.52	2.79
Total number of OPARCA applications	8	172	418	430	476
Zone 1 ⁽¹⁵⁾					
Number of applications	5	128	223	17	20
Rate of penetration	0.11	2.90	5.05	0.38	0.45
Zone 2 ⁽¹⁶⁾					
Number of applications	1	9	134	211	26
Rate of penetration	0.02	0.21	3.20	5.03	0.62
Zone 3 ⁽¹⁷⁾					
Number of applications	1	8	20	148	290
Rate of penetration	0.02	0.18	0.44	3.26	6.39
Zone 4 ⁽¹⁸⁾					
Number of applications	1	11	6	29	78
Rate of penetration	0.03	0.28	0.15	0.74	2
Number of non-OPARCA applications	0	16	35	25	62

Sources: DRCA and ARIARCA

¹³ The OPARCA collective promotion stage is based on pre-established zoning. Action will be spread over periods each of one year and progressively to the four chosen intervention zones (zone 1 = 2nd half 1994 - 1st half 1995, zone 2 = 2nd half 1995 - 1st half 1996, etc.).

¹⁴ Number of applications/Number of potential beneficiaries

¹⁵ Base 1994: 4 416 potential beneficiaries

¹⁶ Base 1994: 4 194 potential beneficiaries

¹⁷ Base 1994: 4 539 potential beneficiaries

¹⁸ Base 1994: 3 909 potential beneficiaries

Action 2: Programmed Operation for the Improvement and Renovation of Trade and Craft Industries (OPARCA)

INDICATORS	1994	1995	1996
Total number of craft and trade jobs ¹⁹ :			
Zone 1			
Zone 2			
Zone 3			
Zone 4			
Total number of craft and trade jobs ⁹ :			
Crafts/Non-food trade			
Crafts/Food trade			
Craft production			
Craft agri-food			
Other			
Average trend in employment (paid workforce) in the craft and trade enterprises assisted			
Average trend in turnover of the craft and trade enterprises assisted			

CRE/BL/FP/July 1997

¹⁹ Sources: INSEE, CCI, CM.

PROGRAMME 11, Action: Breton Road Plan

INDICATORS	SRPC entries 1994/98	1994	1995	1996	1997
Total amount of credits in the budget (put in place) in F.	4 354 400 000	647 181 000	888 031 000	493 238 000	530 093 000
State (Financial authorisations)	2 558 000 000	460 019 000	500 949 000	299 815 000	267 173 000
Region	956 700 000	93 979 000	201 940 000	113 796 000	153 207 000
Other (Local authorities)	839 700 000	93 183 000	185 142 000	79 627 000	109 713 000
Total amount of State/Region/Other works completed in the year (in F.):		647 181 000	888 031 000	493 238 000	530 093 000
Breakdown of total amount of works for the year by type of operation (in F.):		647 181 000	888 031 000	493 238 000	530 093 000
Urban environment		163 234 000	198 972 000	112 810 000	80 490 000
Open countryside		483 947 000	689 059 000	380 428 000	449 603 000
Total amount of works planned (in F.) (1)		4 354 400 000	4 354 400 000	4 354 400 000	4 354 400 000
Total amount of works completed to date (in F.) (2)		647 181 000	1 535 212 000	2 028 450 000	2 588 543 000
Rate of completion of works since start of plan (2)/(1)		14.86 %	35.26 %	46.58 %	58.73 %
Rate of allocation of credits by financier since start of plan (credits allocated/credits provided in SRPC)		14.86 %	35.26 %	46.58 %	58.76 %
State		17.98 %	37.57 %	49.29 %	59.73 %
Region		9.82 %	30.93 %	42.83 %	58.84 %
Other (Local authorities)		11.10 %	33.15 %	42.63 %	55.69 %
Rate of allocation of credits since start of plan (credits allocated/credits provided in SRPC)		14.86 %	35.26 %	46.58 %	58.76 %
Open countryside		14.62 %	35.44 %	46.93 %	60.51 %
Urban environment		15.63 %	34.68 %	45.48 %	53.19 %
Number of kilometres brought into use ²⁰ :		37.345	14.515	36.940	0.840
Of which: <u>Urban environment</u>		<i>4.045</i>	-	<i>6.240</i>	<i>0.840</i>
2 X 2 lane		4.045	-	6.240	0
1 X 2 lane		-	-		0.840
Doubling		-	-		0
Of which: <u>Open countryside</u>		<i>33.300</i>	<i>14.515</i>	<i>30.700</i>	<i>0</i>
2 X 2 lane		33.300	9.260	21.700	0
1 X 2 lane		-	3.755		0
Doubling		-	1.500	9.000	0
Number of motorway link roads safety operations, of which:		-	-	-	2
Urban environment		-	-	-	0
Open countryside		-	-	-	2

Source: Regional Highways Directorate of Brittany

²⁰ Not referring exclusively to the 1994/1998 Plan Contract, but work completed during the contract period 1994/1999 (allowing for slippage or overlapping of plans in bringing new stretches into service).

IV - INCORPORATING LIGHT EVALUATION NEEDS INTO THE NEW SURVEYS AND DATA COLLECTIONS.

The evaluations of regional policies in the plan contracts can be light, in the sense described above, or in-depth. In both cases, they always require the following statistical information:

- **background information,**
- **statistical information on policies** carried out (their cost and time scale), and more specific statistical information on one of the policy's given target groups (the beneficiaries: households, enterprises, territories, etc.)
- **(quarterly, six-monthly or annual) monitoring of this information** to see how long it takes for the effects of the regional policies to appear.

In view of the information we have just provided on the methodology and results of Brittany's experiences with evaluation, we could advance the following proposals:

- **For background statistical information,** it is necessary to gain a firm grasp of the basic data relating to the existing infrastructure (roads or motorways already constructed before the new road plan, for example), the surface areas of educational or other buildings, etc. in order to calculate the ratio of new investment to existing stock. It should be possible to do the same for employment statistics (e.g. trends in employment in the craft or commercial sectors) or production statistics, turnover (e.g. the trend in turnover by commercial or craft enterprises compared with the trend in turnover by enterprises assisted by a specific target policy). The above-mentioned statistics - investment, employment, turnover, etc. - are the most frequently requested. They are also requested at various geographical levels: regional, regional authority action area, areas defined by zoning policy (for European cross-financing policy, these may be Objective 5b areas; for other policies, employment areas or urban agglomerations, etc.)
- **For statistical information on the policies carried out in the region,** it is necessary to call on public authority finance departments, computerised procedures for dealing with applications and the minutes of discussions on eligibility and the granting of loans to this or that operation or beneficiary. In this case, the national statistical institutes need to be relayed information by the public authorities' statistical departments.
- **Information which allows one to monitor and assess the impact and various direct, indirect, intentional and unintentional effects** is often the same as the above-mentioned background information. It can, however, also include a vast range of information which is not produced or collected regularly under the standard surveys conducted by the national statistical institutes. The statistical departments of the various public authorities can, in certain cases, be asked to contribute without any new research - e.g. the Ministry of Agriculture or Regional Directorate for Industry, Research and the Environment. However, in a number of cases where the information has to be created, there are two possible scenarios: it can be done at low cost, or not at all. In some cases, the public authorities, in their role as lead managers or awarding authorities, should lay down the conditions regarding information feedback more authoritatively and more professionally: non-responses could be punished by the suspension of aid. This could allow savings to be made on additional surveys, which are expensive and generally unpopular. One problem with these "return-ticket" operations, even when carried out professionally, is that certain information can be manipulated by the respondent, especially when there is a link between certain responses on the effects of aid and the granting of the final instalment, or further instalments, of this aid...

CONCLUSION

Eurostat's efforts towards standardisation at different territorial levels tend towards the regionalisation of statistics. This has to be based on the needs of a wide variety of private and public users who need to carry out international comparisons and evaluations of the effects of their policies. On this latter level, new ideas about light evaluation performance indicators should be of greater use in devising and selecting relevant and useful indicators. In the new information society, at all territorial levels, we need to be more effective in providing efficient, reliable, useful and accessible information.

Bibliography:

ALBAEK, E., (1989-90), "Policy Evaluation: design and utilisation", *Knowledge in Society*, volume 2, n°4, pp. 6-19.

BASLE, M., PELE, F., (1994), "L'évaluation des politiques et des contrats de plan Etat-Région en France: la situation en France en fin 1994", *Cahiers économiques de Bretagne*, volume 39, n°4, pp. 1-29, Rennes.

BASLE, M., (1995a), "Problèmes de transposition de la méthode d'évaluation contingente au cas des services collectifs publics et sociaux", *Politiques et management public*, volume 13, n°2, juin, pp. 1-19, Paris.

BASLE, M., (1995b), "Essai sur les jugements de valeur et les méthodes d'évaluation..." in *Changement institutionnel et changement technologique*, BASLE, M., DUFOURT, D., HERAUD, J.A., PERRIN, J., éditeurs, Editions du Centre National de Recherche Scientifique, Paris.

BASLE, M., (1999), "L'évaluation territorialisée des politiques publiques en France : organisation, constat et problèmes spécifiques", Premier congrès de la Société française d'Évaluation, Marseille, 4-5 juin 1999, ronéoté.

Commissariat Général du Plan, (1995), Rapport sur le colloque de Toulouse d'octobre 1994, ronéoté.

CONSEIL SCIENTIFIQUE DE L'EVALUATION, (1996), *Petit guide de l'évaluation des politiques publiques*, La documentation française, Paris.

CONSEIL SCIENTIFIQUE DE L'EVALUATION, (1993, 1994, 1995), *L'évaluation en développement. Rapport sur l'évolution des pratiques d'évaluation des politiques publiques*, La Documentation Française, Paris.

GAUDY, C. (1996), *Bilan des expériences en matière d'évaluation des programmes européens, objectif 2 et 5b*, Centre d'études de projets, une étude financée par la Délégation française à l'aménagement du territoire.

RIST, R.C., editor, (1995), *Policy evaluation. Linking theory to practice*, The international library of comparative public policy, an Elgar Reference collection, Edward Elgar.