

**ASSESSMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL VALUATION REFERENCE INVENTORY (EVRI)**

AND

THE EXPANSION OF ITS COVERAGE TO THE EU

Report to the European Commission, DG XI

**Ståle Navrud
Mette Vågnes**

March 23, 2000



**Environmental Impact Assessment
Strategic Environmental Management
Environmental Economics**

**Fornebuvn. 11
PB 498, N-1327 Lysaker, Norway
Tel: + 47 67 11 37 00, Fax: + 47 67 11 37 01
E-mail: firmapost@enco.no**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
PART I	3
EVALUATION OF EVRI FOR EUROPEAN CONDITIONS	3
1. Introduction	3
2. Survey sample	3
3. Survey Results	4
4. Overall Assessment of EVRI	10
5. The Questionnaire	11
PART II	19
LIST OF EUROPEAN VALUATION STUDIES	19
1. Introduction	19
2. References to European Valuation studies	20
PART III	56
CAPTURE OF EUROPEAN VALUATION STUDIES IN EVRI	56
1. Introduction	56
2. Results from the capture of studies	56
3. Evaluation of the EVRI Capture Module and suggestions for improvements	59
4. Acknowledgements	60
5. References	60
APPENDIX 1	61
REFERENCES TO SELECTED EUROPEAN VALUATION STUDIES CAPTURED	61
APPENDIX 2	63
INFOBASE DATA ENTRY PROTOCOL	63
APPENDIX 3	92
A STYLE GUIDE	92
APPENDIX 4	97
ADJUSTMENT OF VALUES IN DIFFERENT CURRENCIES USING PURCHASE POWER PARITY INDEXES	97

PART I

EVALUATION OF EVRI FOR EUROPEAN CONDITIONS

1. Introduction

The Environmental Valuation Reference Inventory (EVRI) is a database of valuation studies accessible through Internet. The database contains detailed information of about 700 environmental valuation studies, primarily from North America. EVRI was designed by Environment Canada, and both Environment Canada and US EPA currently use EVRI to guide their policy work. The main aim of this report is to assess how EVRI works for European conditions in order to see what adaptations are needed. Part I of the report contains two parts: the report and the questionnaire. Part II is an as complete as possible list of European valuation studies. Part III concerns the input of data from 14 European valuation studies into EVRI to test out the EVRI Capture Mode under European conditions.

The evaluation is based on a survey of potential users of the database, who were granted free access to EVRI for one month to test the database by conducting searches on topics relevant to their work. They were then asked to fill in an evaluation questionnaire that was sent out by e-mail, and return it by e-mail. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the respondents that participated in the survey. Special thanks go to Jonathan Fischer of the UK Environment Agency, who organised a broad and in-depth assessment of EVRI in the UK. I am also very grateful for excellent comments and help from the people that have developed and administer EVRI at Environment Canada (Paul de Civita, Fern Filion and Jim Fresh), and from the main contact person at the European Commission, DG XI, Matti Vainio.

This paper should be read bearing in mind that one of the uses of EVRI is to facilitate benefits transfer by providing ready access to information on existing valuation studies. Benefits transfer is so called because an estimate of the monetary benefits is taken from an existing study for an environmental asset and is "transferred" to a similar environmental asset of policy interest. Just as the value of one type of apple can tell us about the likely value of another because of their similar characteristics, so can the value of one national park can inform us about the likely value for a similar park. Benefits transfer can be used to produce quick and inexpensive estimates of the monetary value of environmental assets, because it does not require any new fieldwork to be undertaken and is therefore highly relevant to policy making.

2. Survey sample

An evaluation questionnaire for the EVRI trials was constructed in co-operation with European Commission, DG XI and Environment Canada, and sent by e-mail to a sample of individuals at 12 European institutions that could be potential users of EVRI.

The following institutions and persons participated in the trial of EVRI, and filled in the EVRI evaluation questionnaire:

- i) European Commission DG XI (Kevin Flowers and Matti Vainio)
- ii) European Commission DG XII (Katri Kosonen)
- iii) European Investment Bank (EIB) (James Winpenny)
- iv) OECD - Environment Directorate (Jean-Phillipe Barde)
- v) Environment Agency, UK (Jonathan Fisher (co-ordinator of the evaluation), Tim Webb and Frazer Smith)
- vi) Department of Environment and Transport and the Regions (DETR), UK (Andrew Gibbons)
- vii) Federal Ministry of Environment, Austria (Eva Rosenberger)
- viii) National Pollution Control Authority (SFT), Norway (Eivind Selvig)
- ix) Environmental Protection Agency (Naturvårdsverket), Sweden (Katrin Rapp)
- x) CSERGE/University of East Anglia, UK (Ian Bateman)
- xi) Forestry Commission, UK (Joint evaluation by Michael O'Neill and Kate Tench)

If we count the European Commission as one institution (i.e. including the three DGs involved; II, XI, XII), 10 of the 12 institutions originally invited to evaluate EVRI responded. This gives a response rate of 83 %, which is very high in mail surveys. This can be explained by the fact that our sample is carefully selected, and the effectiveness of using e-mail for sending out questionnaire and reminders.. As a results of the UK Environment Agency inviting other government bodies to participate, we got one additional institution which was not originally invited to trial EVRI i.e. the UK Forestry Commission. Thus, a total of 11 European institutions trailed EVRI and filled in the evaluation questionnaire. 10 of them are government bodies and international institutions, while one is an academic user (University of East Anglia/ CSERGE). A total of 14 questionnaires were returned from these institutions. In addition, the European Commission DG II (Heinz Jansen and William Watts) provided general comments/evaluation of EVRI (without filling in the questionnaire) based on their use of EVRI.

3. Survey Results

A statistical summary of the 14 responses is given in tables 1-4. Even though these frequency distributions provide some insights into the answers, the most helpful comments were provided in the "comment" - boxes of the questionnaire and in an in-depth report (by Jonathan Fisher) of the UK Environment Agency's trial of EVRI.

If we look at the "agree" column in table 1, we see that the majority of respondents agreed that:

- the description of each study contained the information they needed (Quest. 3)
- current coverage with respect to valuation methods in EVRI was good (Quest 8)
- easy to extract the economic values from each study (Quest 11)
- specification of geographic location was detailed enough (Quest. 13)

The only statement where the majority of the respondents answered "disagree" was: studies have information on all aspects needed for transfer (Quest. 14)

This last result seems to be inconsistent with the first of the statements above that the majority agreed to, but this reflects that most respondents felt that EVRI provided the information they looked for (question 14), but at the same time recognised that EVRI does not do the actual

benefit transfer. To perform the transfer they would need more information about benefit transfer techniques. While question 14 asks if the record of the studies contained information on *all aspects* needed for benefit transfer, question 10 shows that somewhat fewer respondents agreed that it was easy to assess the transferability of the study (5 versus 8 respondents in question 14). However, the information seems to be sufficient to assess the quality of the valuation studies (question 9). Some respondents requested an evaluation/critique section for each study, while other respondent noted that such an option would easily be highly subjective and that the user should make his/her own evaluation based on the information given in EVRI. However, this demands that the user of the database is familiar with the valuation literature.

Table 1.

Summary of responses from the EVRI evaluation questionnaire, questions 1-17. Number of observations for the three response categories for statements made in questions 1-17. N=14

Question no. Statement	Agree	Partly Agree	Disagre e	No answe r
1. The list of amenities in EVRI corresponds to my needs	2	8	4	
2. The division into different groups of amenities corresponds with the division used in my organisation	2	7	5	
3. The description of each study contain the information I need	9	5		
4. EVRI is difficult to use	1	7	6	
5. The search techniques of EVRI are good	2	11	1	1
6. The searches I performed gave many irrelevant studies	4	6	2	2
7. There should be an option listing all studies found without detailed description of the studies	5		7	2
8. Current coverage with respect to types of valuation methods in EVRI is good	9	3	1	1
9. Easy to assess the quality of the valuation studies	5	6	2	1
10. Easy to assess the transferability	1	5	5	3
11. Easy to extract the economic values from each study	11	2		1
12. Economic values were in the unit I needed	4	4	3	3
13. Specification of geographical location detailed enough	10	4		
14. Studies have information on all aspects important for transfer	1	1	8	4
15. Environmental good (including "background	3	6	4	1

level") specified in sufficient detail				
16. Description of "extent of market" (i.e. affected individuals) provided in sufficient detail	2	5	4	3
17. Response time of EVRI was good	6	6	2	

Only 2 respondents agree that the list of amenities corresponded to their needs and the categories of environmental goods used in their organisation (question 1 and 2, respectively). This was the main problem many evaluators encountered in using the "Search Protocol" of the Searching Module, but in most cases the "Full text search" could satisfactorily perform the task. This is also reflected by the fact that only 2 respondents agreed that the search techniques were good (question 5), and 11 "partly agreed" (mainly because the successfully could use the "Full text" search option. Many respondents also noted that the searches gave irrelevant studies (only 2 out of 12 disagreed with this statement in question 6).

The main comments on question 12 were that exchange rates and other conversion factors were needed, and that the user should be able to specify the currency the values were needed in. Otherwise, most studies were found to specify the values in the unit needed.

Many respondents have obviously not found the "Show record list" on the tool bar of the Searching Module, since 5 respondents agreed that there should be such an option (question 7). Those that disagreed mentioned correctly that the option existing, but some commented that it should provide more information about the studies to be of help in selecting the useful studies more easily.

Most respondents felt there was room for improvement in terms of the specification of the environmental good and description of the "extent of the market" (questions 15 and 16, respectively). Most respondents found the response time in EVRI to be good (question 17).

Only 1 of the 14 respondents agreed that EVRI was difficult to use (question 4). However, 50 % of the respondents partly agreed that EVRI was difficult to use, and again this is due to the difficulties many had in using the "Searching Protocol". Thus, evaluators found EVRI technically easy to use, but the searching module did not work well for European conditions, and reduced the user friendliness of EVRI for European conditions.

Questions 18 on the language selection of the user interface revealed that 11 respondents found English, French and Spanish to be sufficient. 3 respondents thought other languages should be added. German, Russian (for transition economies) and Chinese were the three other languages mentioned.

Currently, EVRI works only in English. Thus, those that tried out EVRI in the other languages currently listed at the site (French and Spanish) correctly observed that this cannot be done now (question 19).

Table 2.

Was the information provided about each study in EVRI sufficient to make a benefit transfer? Summary of responses from the EVRI evaluation questionnaire, question 20. Number of responses in each reply option. N =14

All cases I tried	Most cases	A few cases	No cases	No answer
0	3	3	4	4

Table 2 shows that the majority of respondents (7 of the 10 respondents that answered this question) said benefit transfer based on the information provided in EVRI, without seeing the original study, was possible in only a few or no cases. The three respondents that said that benefit transfer could be performed without seeing the original study had performed their searches on water quality and/or biodiversity in water. This seems reasonable since EVRI best covers this benefit category. The large number of non-responses to this question probably reflects the fact that a few respondents said that they due to other pressing matters had got too little time to test EVRI, and some felt they had too little experience in benefit transfer to answer the question. Thus, there seems to be a need for a European library of original valuation studies. To reduce transaction costs, the papers should be available on the web so that they could be viewed and downloaded. This was also suggested by some respondents.

Table 3.

Would you like EVRI to have a facility, where you could request the original study to be sent to you? (costs will be charged).

Summary of responses from the EVRI evaluation questionnaire, question 21. Number of responses in each reply option. N =14

Yes, definitely	Yes, with qualification	Perhaps	No	No answer
9	5	3	2 *	0

Note: *: One of these two respondents also checked the "Perhaps" option.

Table 3 shows that only 1 respondent did not want EVRI to have an option where the original study could be ordered. 9 of 14 (64 %) say they definitely want this facility. Those that answer "Yes, with qualification" and "Perhaps" comment that this depends on the costs and speed that the original study can be provided. One respondent mention the system used by UNCOVER (<http://uncweb.carl.org/>) as an example of how an EVRI reference library could be constructed (and how the copyright problems could be overcome). The costs of copyright, copying, shipping and handling of a journal article in UNCOVER would typically be about US \$ 30. One respondent that answered "No" (and also "perhaps") says he would probably use their own library to search for the studies, and especially if such a facility is expensive and/or slow. One respondent also mention that they are only interested in seeing the original study if it provides clarifications and additional information.

It seems to be particularly important to have a library of original studies for the "grey literature" (Working papers, Ph.D. and M.Sc. theses etc.) and/or references to where they could be obtained (especially if they are available on the web – mail addressees might not be particularly useful since time is often scarce when benefit transfer have to be made).

Table 4.

Based on your experience, would you recommend that your colleagues should use EVRI.
Summary of responses from the EVRI evaluation questionnaire, question 22. Number of responses in each reply option. N =14

Yes, definitely	Yes, with qualification	Perhaps	No	No answer
1	10	1	0	2

Table 4 shows that 11 out of the 12 respondents (92 %) that answered the question would recommend EVRI to their colleagues, but with some qualification. The most common comment was that they would recommend EVRI to their colleagues if it contained more European studies, and more studies in other benefit categories than water quality and ecosystems. Some also remark that EVRI should only be made available to those with sufficient knowledge and experience to understand the dangers of inappropriate use of the values. Others remark that EVRI could be used by everybody since it is primarily a scooping tool to provide a bibliography of related studies (and implicitly assumes that the benefit transfer as the next step could be conducted by somebody experienced in this area). One respondent mentioned that access cost to the EVRI should be reasonable for them to recommend it to their colleagues.

In question 23, the respondents were asked to list the main strengths and weaknesses of EVRI. The main strengths can be summarised as follows:

- i) Much needed database of environmental valuation studies; very promising; Systematic coalition and analysis of available studies, excellent tool for literature reviews
- ii) Can help develop appropriate methodologies for researching, analysing and reporting valuation studies
- iii) Essential tool for identifying studies suitable for benefit transfer
- iv) Well designed
- v) Easy to use (even for a computer illiterate) and easy access
- vi) Good response time, and can be accessed whenever you want on the web
- vii) You can find studies that you normally would not have even thought of using
- viii) Quite detailed information about reported studies
- ix) Estimated values clearly exposed
- x) Good search facilities; especially the full text search option works well (Some concern that this procedure does not search the full text, but according to the EVRI managers it does; remember to put an asterisk behind the search word "e.g. fish*" to get also fisheries, fishing etc.. However there is a question if all studies are picked up when using the default categories in the Search Protocol.)
- xi) Can use EVRI to identify areas where new original valuation studies are needed

The main weaknesses were identified as:

- i) Takes some time to learn to use EVRI efficiently
- ii) Coverage in terms of studies - more studies, especially European, should be added
- iii) Default categories in "Search Protocol" option are very different from the classification used in most European institutions, and it is difficult to understand what

- kind of valuation studies some categories yield (e.g. strange that forest studies are classified under "open spaces", and no category for recreation, noise etc.)
- iv) Searching protocol difficult to use (but full text search option is good), and search criteria somewhat confusing
 - v) Searches give too many irrelevant studies
 - vi) Americanised English; terms are interpreted differently in UK English
 - vii) Not able to search by commissioning body
 - viii) Do not include implicit valuation studies
 - ix) Do not report whether the valuation studies have been used in decision making

The last three weaknesses were only mentioned by one respondent. The commissioning body is often not reported in the original study, and seems to be of little interest to all other users. Many studies are purely academic studies (i.e. without external funding or funded by national research council and/or by the EC research programs). Implicit valuation studies have no foundation in economic theory, and are therefore not included in EVRI. Whether benefit valuations have had any impact on decision-making is very difficult to trace. Research in this area confirms that many studies are used as decision support, but whether they were decisive and led to better decisions is very difficult to sort out (from the impacts of other types of decision making tools). However, I guess if a ministry or agency funded the study, that is an indication of interest in the results (and thus potential use). Also, results from one study could be used by agencies or ministries in many countries (since results are publicly available) without the author or the funding body knowing about it

Suggested improvements for EVRI (from the list of weaknesses and the "comments" boxes under each question):

- 1) An option to view updates (i.e. new studies captured)
- 2) EVRI should have a library of valuation studies
- 3) Revision of terminology for the amenity categories in the Searching Protocol
- 4) Make terms in searching protocol more in accordance with what is used in UK English
- 5) Results of a search should be presented in "a list of studies" (which is currently done), and with a bit more information about each study than author, year of publishing and title.
- 6) The abstract of each summary record should be placed at the beginning of the record rather than at the end
- 7) General "Health warnings" needed, so that decision makers don't just take simple averages of the values from all identified studies
- 8) Screening Module:
 - the toolbar of the screening module is difficult to understand at first - why not add an explanation of a highlighted tool which pops up when cursor is left there for a few seconds
 - the help function did not work (Under construction)
 - the reference listed on top of the page should change and correspond to the one detailed under "Study reference"
- 9) Each print out should have the study title printed on top
- 10) The order in which different types of information is presented in the record should be changed; i.e. start with environmental change, then methodology, then valuations, then geographic area etc.
- 11) Need easy access to various indices and conversion factors (inflation rates, exchange rates, Purchase Power Parity Indexes etc.)

- 12) Many valuation studies need a better description of what incremental environmental changes are being valued and what elements of benefits are captured (but this is often a weakness of the original study rather than EVRI)
- 13) Much information on methodology, but too technical language. Need explanatory glossary - help facility not helpful. Many error messages.
- 14) Difficult to print records - need a way to reduce font size in records to be able to print the complete record.
- 15) There should be a bibliography on valuation methods (like the one on benefit transfer), and short, non-technical descriptions of different valuation techniques.
- 16) When references are made to other studies in a record, EVRI should enable easy cross reference and access to this other study (Now you have to end the search and start again)
- 17) List of records should in addition to just the reference also list the environmental change being valued and the geographic location of the site and study
- 18) An evaluation/critique section for each study should be included (but other respondents note that such an option would easily be highly subjective and that the user should make his/her own evaluation based on the information given in EVRI - however, this demands an "educated" user).

4. Overall Assessment of EVRI

Currently only 56 out of the more than 650 European Valuation studies are recorded in EVRI. Thus, the main challenge in adapting EVRI to European conditions is to capture more European studies in EVRI.

The structure of the database seems to be well adapted to European needs, with one main exception. For the "Search protocol" to work better, a revision of the categories of environmental goods is needed. Even if EVRI is aiming at being a global database for valuation studies it will be difficult to find one categorisation of environmental goods/public goods that will suit all continents and all potential users. There seems to be room for improvements in terms of constructing a more standardised lists of environmental goods. Meanwhile, the "full text" ("free text") option is a good substitute and works well, but there could be more information on how to use this option more effectively. EVRI could learn from the categories of environmental goods used in ENVALUE (<http://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/envalue/>), the only other web-based environmental valuation database (constructed by New South Wales Environment Protection Authority - NSW EPA). The categorisation of environmental goods in ENVALUE is based on the medium, e.g. air quality, water quality, noise, natural areas etc., and with subcategories, which corresponds better with European needs. However, ENVALUE has no "full text" search option, no "refine search" option, and is in general a much simpler data base with fewer options than EVRI.

EVRI is technically user friendly and gives fast and easy access to the studies, and the record for each study contains the information needed. However, in Europe there is a need for a module with exchange rates, and inflation index and purchase power parity indexes, since results from valuation studies are reported in national currencies (and not Euros, yet) a module, which could be the model for constructing a similar module for EVRI.

ENVALUE has a record (summary) list with information on author, year of study, location, country, and valuation method used, while EVRI only list the references in their record list. More information about the studies in the summary list has been requested by some EVRI evaluators.

ENVALUE also has an option giving brief descriptions of the different valuation techniques, and with references to literature describing the methods in more detail. Such an option was requested by EVRI evaluators less familiar with valuation methods.

ENVALUE was last updated in October 1998, and seems to be a "sleeping" database at the moment. Overall EVRI is a much more comprehensive and detailed database than ENVALUE, but EVRI could benefit from looking at the features of ENVALUE mentioned above.

To conclude, EVRI performs very well in terms of i) containing information about the original studies that are needed for benefit transfer, and ii) technical user friendliness, but needs to improve the categorisation of environmental goods in the "search protocol" option. EVRI scores low on our third evaluation criteria: "policy relevance for Europe" because the database contains less than 10% of the European valuation studies. However, there is a simple solution to this: Add more European studies to the database and develop a reference library for both published and unpublished studies.

5. The Questionnaire

The questionnaire was distributed to this list:

- European Commission, DG XI (K. Flowers, J. Madeira, P. Strosser, M. Vainio and R. Willis), DG XII (K. Kosonen), DG II (H. Jansen and W. Watts)
- Environment Agency, the UK (Evaluation co-ordinated by Jonathan Fisher)
- DETR, the UK
- Ministry of Environment, Austria (Ulrike Eterne)
- Ministry of Economic Affairs, the Netherlands (C. Hiddink)
- Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment, the Netherlands (R. Versfeld)
- National Pollution Control Agency, Norway (E. Selvig)
- Environmental Protection Agency, Sweden (K. Rapp)
- European Investment Bank (Evaluation co-ordinated by James Winpenny)
- OECD – Environment Directorate (J.-P. Barde)
- CSERGE/University of East Anglia (I. Bateman)
- Austrian Institute of Economic Research (A. Köppl)

The questionnaire was followed by this letter:

EVALUATION OF EVRI

Dear all,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the evaluation of the Environmental Valuation Reference Inventory (EVRI). The purpose of this exercise is to assess how EVRI works for European conditions in order to see if it needs adaptation. Based on the responses, I will produce an evaluation report, which will be part of the interim report that I will produce to the European Commission, which is giving some initial financial support to the study. The interim report will naturally be made available to all interested parties.

If you have not yet started to use EVRI, you can access it at www.evri.ec.gc.ca/EVRI/. Once there, choose the language you prefer (English, French or Spanish), click "Subscription Information" and click on where it says that you have been invited to review and assess EVRI and fill in your name and that you accept the conditions. Then, fill in details of affiliation etc. and a user name and password of your choice, and you will receive an e-mail from Environment Canada within a day or two confirming your user name and password, and that you have been granted access to EVRI for 1 month. In the meanwhile you can try out the Demo version ("Tour EVRI") to familiarise/remind yourself about its different components and features.

Enclosed you will find a questionnaire we would like you to use for your evaluation. Any other comments you might have are also most welcome. We need to have your response by May 31. Thank you again for your interest in EVRI and helping us in providing a valuation study database that better suits European conditions

Please fill in the electronic form below, and mail it back to me: stale.navrud@ios.nlh.no
Any other comments you might have are also most welcome. I would appreciate receiving your responses as soon as possible, and latest by June 1. Please note that I have asked if you would like to receive the summary results of the evaluation.

Best regards

Ståle Navrud (sign.)
Project Leader European node of EVRI
E-mail: stale.navrud@ios.nlh.no

QUESTIONNAIRE – EVALUATION OF EVRI

Probably the best way to try out and assess EVRI, is to use one or more case studies where you would need benefit transfer, and search for valuation studies for the specific amenities. This could be a hypothetical case, or one you have worked on or will be working on. When performing the search, keep in mind that the database currently contains valuation studies from North America, and the majority of studies are related to water quality.

Please write your name and affiliation (this will be treated strictly confidentially)

For better understanding your responses, please write what kind of valuation problem(s) /case studies you selected:

Please give your assessment of the following statements

(Tick the box the best reflects your view: agree, partly agree or disagree,

Please use the space below to comment):

The list of amenities in EVRI corresponds to my needs.

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

The division into different groups of amenities corresponds with the division used in my organisation

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

The description of each study contain the information I need

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

EVRI is difficult to use.

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

The search techniques of EVRI are good.

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

The searches I performed gave many irrelevant studies

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

The information presented about each study is too detailed when a search gave a high number of studies. There should be an option listing all the studies found without describing them in detail

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

The current coverage with respect to types of valuation methods in EVRI is good.

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

It was easy to assess the quality of the valuation studies.

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

It was easy to evaluate the transferability of the study to the case I had chosen.

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

It was easy to extract the economic values from each study.

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

The economic values were in the unit I needed.

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

The specification of the geographical location of the studies was detailed enough.

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

The studies have information on all aspects important for transferring the estimate to my case.

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

The environmental good valued in each study (including the "background level of the environmental good ") was specified in sufficient detail

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

The description of "extent of market" (i.e. the number of individuals to aggregate willingness-to-pay over to get an estimate of total benefits) for the studies was provided in sufficient detail

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

The response time of EVRI was good , i.e. time that you had to wait when using EVRI to search for studies.

Agree Partly agree Disagree

Comment

Do you think that the language selection of user interface is adequate (English, French and Spanish)?

Yes No

If no, what languages should be included

Did you try to use EVRI in another language than English ?

Yes No

If NO → Go to question 20

If YES → What other language(s) did you try?

French Spanish

Did EVRI work better, about the same, or worse in the other language(s) you used, compared to English?

Better About the Same Worse

Comment

Do you find it necessary to see the original study, or is the information provided about each study in EVRI sufficient to make the transfer of economic values? The information in EVRI is sufficient for transfer in:

all cases I tried most cases a few cases no cases

Comment

Would you like EVRI to have a facility, where you could request that the original study referred to in EVRI be sent to you (either by mail, e-mail or fax).? The copyright charge, mailing and handling costs would naturally need to be charged.

Yes, definitely Yes, with qualifications (write below) Perhaps No

Comment

Based on your experience, would you recommend that your colleagues should use EVRI?

Yes, definitely Yes, with qualifications (write below) Perhaps No

Comment

In sum, what are the main strengths and weaknesses of EVRI based on your assessment?

List the strengths:

List the weaknesses:

Would you like to receive a summary of all responses?

Yes No

PLEASE USE THIS SPACE FOR ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Thank you very much for your co-operation!