

Glossary for the practice documentation

“Evaluating the outcome of restoration projects – collaborative learning for the future”

This glossary explains a selection of key terms from the factsheets and technical sheets.

Term (source)	Definition
Combined project	Flood protection project with additional financing under the WPA (increased space provided for waters, extended length).
Evaluation (BAFU 2012)	An evaluation comprises two elements – the <i>implementation evaluation</i> and the <i>outcome evaluation</i> .
EXTENDED outcome evaluation	Nationally standardised outcome evaluation of selected restoration projects, designed to answer specific practice-related questions, with the aim of supplementing and deepening the knowledge obtained from the <i>STANDARD outcome evaluation</i> .
Implementation evaluation (BAFU 2012)	An implementation evaluation is used to review whether the projects defined in the planned measures have been initiated; it also provides information on the measures implemented. The implementation evaluation, together with the <i>outcome evaluation</i> , forms part of the <i>evaluation</i> .
Indicator (Lorenz et al. 1997; Woolsey et al. 2005)	Indicators are measurable quantities which provide valuable information on the condition of an ecosystem and its relevant processes. Indicators yield both a measurement and a rating, i.e. a classification of closeness to a natural state or goal attainment. The step from measurement to rating is taken, for example, with the aid of a <i>value function</i> .
Indicator set	Synergies exist between numerous <i>indicators</i> , i.e. the relevant data collection procedures are similar, are conducted at the same site, or can be readily combined. <i>Indicators</i> which can be determined synergistically are combined into indicator sets. For the <i>STANDARD outcome evaluation</i> , 10 indicator sets are available.
Individual project (BAFU 2018)	Complex measures with spatial planning implications which need to reconcile various interests and to be coordinated at all levels (federal, cantonal, communal) are generally treated as individual projects. These are not included in a programme agreement, but are decided on individually at the federal level.
Objectives hierarchy (Reichert et al. 2011)	The breaking-down of a higher-level objective into a hierarchy of more concrete sub-objectives. The sub-objectives should each cover a relevant aspect of the corresponding higher-level objective and should as far as possible be complementary.
Outcome evaluation (BAFU 2012)	An outcome evaluation is used to investigate whether a restoration project which has been implemented shows the desired effects, i.e. whether the defined objectives have been met and the resources have been effectively deployed. The outcome evaluation, together with the <i>implementation evaluation</i> , forms part of the <i>evaluation</i> .
Project size	Based on construction costs, four different project sizes are distinguished in the <i>STANDARD outcome evaluation</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small projects: < CHF 250,000 • Medium-sized projects: > CHF 250,000 – CHF 1 m • Large projects: > CHF 1 m – CHF 5 m • <i>Individual projects</i>: > CHF 5 m <p>The project size influences the scope of the <i>STANDARD outcome evaluation</i> (which indicators, how many at most).</p>
Restoration (WPA Art. 4 let. m)	Re-establishment by means of civil engineering of the natural functions of channelled, straightened, covered or culverted surface waters.

Term (source)	Definition
STANDARD outcome evaluation	Nationally standardised outcome evaluation to assess <i>typical goals of restoration projects</i> on the basis of a large number of projects receiving funding from a federal restoration credit.
Typical goals of restoration projects	Nine goals which can be assessed as part of the <i>STANDARD outcome evaluation</i> . The nine goals were identified in a multistep process on the basis of four documents: the Waters Protection Act, Waters Protection Ordinance, Explanatory Report on the Amendment of the Waters Protection Ordinance (BAFU 2011) and Handbook on Programme Agreements (BAFU 2015). The decisive factors were the frequency with which goals were mentioned, amenability to influence by restoration projects, and the availability of <i>indicators</i> .
Value function (Eisenführ & Weber 2003; Schlosser et al. 2013)	A value function can be used to determine, for an indicator, the degree of goal attainment or closeness to a natural state. In this process, a rating – i.e. a dimensionless value between 0 (non-natural) and 1 (near-natural) – is assigned to a measured value (e.g. depth variability at bankfull discharge). The value function can reflect different associations (e.g. linear).