

Who we are



The Netherlands

JIN - Stichting Joint Implementation Network Stichting

Austria

JR - Joanneum Research

Germany

Fraunhofer ISI - Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft Zur Foerderung Der Angewandten Forschung e.V

United Kingdom

UoS -University of Sussex

Greece

NTUA - National Technical University of Athens

UPRC - University of Piraeus Research Centre

Belgium

CEPS - Centre for European Policy Studies

Finland

VATT - Government Institute for Economic Research

Slovenia

UL - University of Ljubljana

Estonia

SEIT - Estonian Institute For Sustainable Development,
Stockholm Environment Institute Tallinn Centre



Contact Us

Project Coordinator
Joint Implementation
Network - JIN

Web: <http://www.jiqweb.org>

Dissemination Leader
NTUA

Contact Person: Dr. Chara Karakosta

Tel: +30 210 7722084

Fax: +30 210 772 3550

e-mail: contact@apraise.org

Assessment of Policy
Interrelationships and
Impacts on
Sustainability in Europe



Results from the Case Studies



*This project has received funding from the European Union's
Seventh Programme for Research, Technological Development and
Demonstration under Grant Agreement No 283121*

Background

APRAISE main goal is to improve the scientific grounds for assessing environmental policy making, aimed at fostering the transition toward a more sustainable economy in Europe.

The APRAISE approach is to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of specific environmental policies, by means of a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches.



APRAISE combined assessment method has been applied to a number of key EU environmental policy areas, where - for comparative reasons - each assessment has been carried out in two countries.

- ✓ The impact of the EU Renewable Energy Directive on other environmental objectives: Austria and UK,
- ✓ The impact of hydropower generation of river basins: Slovenia and Austria,
- ✓ Policies supporting renewable energy sources: Greece and Slovenia,
- ✓ Waste management - prevention, reuse and recycling of plastic package material: Germany and the Netherlands.
- ✓ Policy interactions in the fields of sustainable buildings: The Netherlands and Greece.

The key results of the implemented case studies are available at:

http://apraise.org/virtual_library/publications

APRAISE Case Studies



The Case of Austria & UK

The fixed biofuel targets and external contextual factors in both Austria and the UK limit the expansion of 1st generation biofuels. 2nd generation biofuels are not likely to make a sizable contribution to meeting 2020 targets.

Both countries have interpreted EU directives and implemented national policies differently. The command and control mechanism in Austria appears to be more effective and efficient in meeting national biofuel targets.

The Case of Austria & Slovenia



Both Austria and Slovenia postponed their 2015 EU goals regarding the Water Framework Directive due to various reasons including the economic crisis. In both countries the conflict of interest between water conservation interest groups and SHPP investors is noticeable.

In Slovenia the biggest issue regarding new SHPP is the length of the procedure to obtain the building permits. In Austria (interim) targets for SHPP expansions are being missed, while Slovenia is on track to meet its targets.



The Case of Greece & Slovenia

National targets for the diffusion of renewables were considered viable, however the RES trajectory should have been more closely monitored in both countries.

No direct trade-off between renewables' support and energy efficiency promotion policies was observed in both Greece and Slovenia. There is a need for more visionary and adaptive policy design framed by a coherent strategy for both countries' Feed in Tariff schemes.

APRAISE Case Studies

The Case of Greece & the Netherlands



The Dutch landfill taxation policy was effective but terminated due to increased administrative costs, while in Greece there is absence of such a scheme.

Unlike the case of the Netherlands, environmental awareness on the benefits of energy efficiency in Greece has remained limited due to fragmented information campaigns. At the same time, lack of proper enforcement of the Buildings Regulations was the result of inadequacies in the monitoring system of the mechanism. Energy Efficiency subsidy schemes have underperformed largely due to the unfavorable investment climate.



The Case of the Netherlands & Germany

Both countries call on the responsibility of the waste producers. The Netherlands use tax incentives, whereas specific minimum quotas are set in Germany.

The different sets of policy instruments used in both countries to transpose the Waste Directive, render it little surprising that also the impacting factors are quite different. In general, positive factors appear to be more abundant in the Netherlands. In the end, however, the effectiveness and the efficiency of the assessed policy instrument turn out to be rather similar in both countries.