
SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP: MEASURING SUCCESS THROUGH PERFORMANCE (Group II)

Facilitators: Durwood Zaelke
Doug Wright
Rapporteur: Peyton Sturges

GOALS

Consider the role of enforcement indicators in environmental compliance and enforcement initiatives generally and the INECE Enforcement Indicators Proposal for a multiyear INECE project

1 INTRODUCTION

Questions presented by facilitators:

- How do we ensure relevance to all nations internationally?
- Who are the stakeholders and how do we secure or assure their involvement?
- Are the principles set forth in the project proposal appropriate or do we need to include additional principles?
- Does the model set forth in the proposal need modification or enhancement?
- Is the methodology set forth in the proposal satisfactory?
- What additional case studies are needed?

2 PAPERS

INECE Secretariat, *The INECE Enforcement Indicators: Executive Summary and Annotated Outline for a Multiyear Project* (6th Conference, Volume 2).

3 DISCUSSION SUMMARY

At the facilitators' suggestion, the participants first discussed the preceding panel presentations by Mike Stahl and Brad May, and then reviewed the INECE Enforcement Indicator Project using a series of questions that were written on the flip chart. The questions included how best

to address the different needs of developing and developed countries, who the stakeholders were, what principles should guide the development of indicators, what model should be used, what methodology, and what case studies would be most useful.

The participants then proceeded to discuss the panel presentations, including the developing/developed country differences. The participants discussed the critical role of performance indicators for a wide range of enforcement applications including measuring progress toward attaining empirical environmental quality goals, engendering support, both public and financial, for investments in enforcement resources, and generally to demonstrate to the public, government officials, and the regulated community that enforcement initiatives and resources are properly directed. The participants agreed that enforcement measures designed for one country or region may not be viable for other larger, smaller, or less developed countries or regions. There was also agreement that the process for developing enforcement was relevant for all countries, and that output measures and outcome measures were both useful.

The ability of enforcement indicators to provide a feedback loop was discussed, and it was noted that such feedback would be useful for enforcement

managers to determine how effective their efforts were, and to legislators, policy makers, and the public. The need to link enforcement indicators to improvements in environmental quality was stressed, as was the difficulties of attributing any particular enforcement action or program to specific improvements in environmental quality. It was suggested that there was a spectrum of enforcement indicators that would be useful, ranging from output measures of activities, to intermediate measures—such as the additional funding invested by companies in the wake of an enforcement effort or the rate of recidivism—to measures of environmental quality, with much of the most useful work initially focused on the outputs and intermediate measures.

Participants also stressed the need to describe indicators in terms that were easily communicated to the public, such as the number of days public beaches are closed due to pollution. The participants concluded that the utilization of a range or variety of performance measures is not an either/or proposition; that enforcement entities are best advised to adopt that combination of performance measures that suit the specific needs and considerations of the entity adopting them.

With respect to the INECE Enforcement Indicators Project, the participants responded strongly that the project was important and should move forward, in response to the question whether the project was appropriate for INECE. It was noted that it would be very useful to identify a sort of “best practices” for enforcement, as the IMPEL network has done for minimum criteria for inspectors. The value of having an international, non-governmental body prepare enforcement indicators was stressed, and it was noted that such international indicators could assist enforcement agencies advocates in improving their

programs.

The principles presented in the Secretariat’s background paper were discussed next. One participant noted that the principle that the indicators should be “comparable” should not be used as an excuse not to move forward immediately, although there is of course value in ensuring that at least some indicators are comparable. The suggestion was offered for a new principle of “feedback.” Another participant noted that in addition to “policy relevance,” the indicators should have “political relevance,” which could, for example, include the approach noted by Mr. Stahl who explained that much of the motivation for US EPA indicators came from the Government Performance and Results Act. Another principle suggested was “synergy” among environment, economic, social, and sustainability. “Environmental quality” was suggested as another principle, and it was noted that “technological sophistication” was appropriate in some instances, although other indicators must be more basic—perhaps a core set. The participants also suggested that the indicators should stress the positive benefits from enforcement and compliance, which, it was noted, can often exceed costs.

4 CONCLUSION

The participants felt that the INECE Enforcement Indicator Project was important and should move forward.