



Evaluation results from the National Renewable Energy Action Plans

Mario Ragwitz*, Gustav Resch°

*Fraunhofer Institute Systems and Innovation Research

°Energy Economics Group (EEG), Vienna University of Technology

REPAP2020 Parliamentary Dinner

"Taking stock:

Evaluation Results of the National Renewable Energy Action Plans"

15th March 2011

Objective:

- Facilitate the process of implementation of the RES Directive on a national level

2 phases:

- before notification of National Renewable Energy Action Plans (NREAPs) to the European Commission
- after notification of National Renewable Energy Action Plans (NREAPs) to the European Commission

- 21 out of 27 NREAPs have been evaluated so far
- NREAPs submitted are of rather different quality and completeness
- NREAPs foresee the overachievement of RES target by ca. 0.6 %-points
- Cooperation mechanisms are considered by most Member States but are of low total volume
- Focus rather on continuing and gradually adjusting current policy than on major changes
- e.g. only 9 MS plan RES building obligations or comparable measures
- Slight mismatch between proposed trajectories and planned measures...?

- Detailed questionnaire assessing the following main topics:
 - administrative procedures and spatial planning,
 - infrastructure development and electricity network operations,
 - support measures in the electricity, heating & cooling and transport sector.
- Detailed information gathering based on the NREAPs, replies from the RES sector and additional sources like RE-Shaping on RES support assessment, AEON report on non-cost barriers or the Wind-Barriers project
- A general challenge is the combination of information on status quo and NREAPs planning

Assessment of the
NREAPs (country cluster A)

Administrative
procedures and
spatial
planning

Austria	😊
Denmark	😊
Finland	😞
France	😞
Greece	😐
Ireland	😐
Latvia	😞
Lithuania	😞
Malta	😞
Portugal	😞
Spain	😐

Critical aspects

- No one-stop shop scheme / Missing **coordination** between authorities (e.g. FI, FR, IE, LV, LT, PT)
- Legal regulations for administrative procedures on RES are missing (e.g. LV, LT)
- Exaggerated number of permits (e.g. LV, LT)
- Complex procedures (e.g. FI, FR, LV, LT, MT, PT)
- Missing transparency (e.g. FR, LV, LT, PT)
- Inadequate representation in spatial planning (e.g. FI, FR, LV, LT, MT, PT)
- → **leading to long lead-times** (e.g. FI, FR, GR, LV, LT, MT, PT ...)

Critical aspects

- RES represents “a new issue” (e.g. BG, RO)
- Theory (i.e. calculation of fees, one-stop shop scheme) differs from practice (e.g. BG, CY, RO, IT)
- Exaggerated number of permits (e.g. BG, CY, RO, IT)
- Complex procedures (e.g. IT, RO, SE)
- Missing transparency (e.g. IT, RO)
- Bias of local authorities against certain RES (e.g. CZ)
- Missing linkage between authorities (e.g. CY)
- Inadequate representation in spatial planning (e.g. CZ, SI)
- → **leading to long lead-times** and not optimal network operation (e.g. BE (offshore wind), CY, CZ, IT, SI, ...)

Administrative procedures and spatial planning

Assessment of the NREAPS (country cluster B)

Belgium	☹️
Bulgaria	☹️
Cyprus	☹️
Czech Republic	☹️
Germany	😊
Italy	☹️
Romania	☹️
Slovenia	☹️
Sweden	☹️
United Kingdom	😊

Assessment of the NREAPs (country cluster A)

Country	Infrastructure development and electricity network operations
Austria	☹️
Denmark	😊
Finland	☹️
France	☹️
Greece	☹️
Ireland	☹️
Latvia	☹️
Lithuania	☹️
Malta	☹️
Portugal	😊
Spain	☹️

Critical aspects

- No strict implementation of guaranteed grid access (e.g. FR, IE, LV, LT)
- RES expansion as challenge to the grid due to weaknesses (e.g. FR, GR, IE, LV, LT, MT)
- No transparent information on cost, at least in the NREAP (e.g. GR, LT, MT)
- No rules for priority dispatch (e.g. LT)
- → **leading to long lead times** for grid connection and not optimal network operation (e.g. FR, GR, IE, LV, LT, MT)



Infrastructure development
and electricity
network
operations

Assessment of the
NREAPs (country cluster B)

Belgium	☹️
Bulgaria	☹️
Cyprus	☹️
Czech Republic	☹️
Germany	☹️
Italy	☹️
Romania	☹️
Slovenia	☹️
Sweden	😊
United Kingdom	☹️

Critical aspects

- RES expansion as challenge to the grid due to weaknesses (e.g. BG, IT, DE)
- Grid connection temporarily put on hold (e.g. BG)
- No transparent information on cost, at least in the NREAP (e.g. CZ, IT, SI)
- No rules for priority dispatch (e.g. IT, SE)
- → **leading to long lead times** for grid connection (e.g. BE (offshore wind), CY, CZ, IT, UK)

Critical aspects

- Insufficient support for key technologie(s) (e.g. FI, MT, PT)
- No long-term security of investment support (e.g. FI, MT, LT)
- Technology neutral support ignores innovative RES technologies (e.g. FI)

Assessment of the NREAPs (country cluster A)	RES electricity support measures
Austria	☹️
Denmark	☹️
Finland	☹️
France	😊
Greece	😊
Ireland	☹️
Latvia	☹️
Lithuania	☹️
Malta	😞
Portugal	☹️
Spain	☹️

Critical aspects

- Insufficient support for key technologies (e.g. BE (offshore wind))
- “Panic” reaction due to unexpected strong deployment (e.g. CZ (PV))
- No long-term security of accompanying investment support (e.g. CZ, IT, SI)
- Technology neutral support ignores innovative RES technologies (e.g. BE, SE)

Assessment of the NREAPs (country cluster B)	RES electricity support measures
Belgium	☹️
Bulgaria	☹️
Cyprus	☹️
Czech Republic	☹️
Germany	😊
Italy	😊
Romania	☹️
Slovenia	😊
Sweden	☹️
United Kingdom	☹️

Assessment of the
NREAPs (country cluster A)

RES heating
and cooling
support
measures

Austria	☺
Denmark	☺
Finland	☺
France	☺
Greece	☹
Ireland	☺
Latvia	☺
Lithuania	☺
Malta	☹
Portugal	☹
Spain	☺

Critical aspects

- No or insufficient support available at present (e.g. GR, IE, MT)
- Missing plans for RES building obligations or comparable instruments (e.g. IE, MT)
- Funding for RES is dependent on governmental budget (e.g. AT, FR, PT)



RES heating and cooling support measures

Assessment of the NREAPs (country cluster B)

Belgium	☹️
Bulgaria	☹️
Cyprus	😊
Czech Republic	😊
Germany	😊
Italy	😊
Romania	☹️
Slovenia	😊
Sweden	😊
United Kingdom	☹️

Critical aspects

- No or insufficient support available at present (e.g. BE, BG, RO, UK)
- Significant potentials for strengthening support for certain technologies in almost all countries
- Scarce information on RES support available in the NREAP (e.g. BG, CY, CZ, UK)
- Funding for RES is dependent on governmental budget (e.g. BE, DE)
- RES obligation only implemented (or planned) in very few countries (no plan in BE, CY, RO, SI, SE)

Critical aspects

- No or insufficient support available at present (e.g. CY, RO, SE)
- No long term security of support (e.g. LT)
- Scarce information on RES support available in the NREAP (e.g. CY, CZ, ...)

Assessment of the NREAPs (country cluster A)	RES transport support measures	Assessment of the NREAPs (country cluster B)	RES transport support measures
Austria	😊	Belgium	😐
Denmark	😊	Bulgaria	😞
Finland	😐	Cyprus	😞
France	😊	Czech Republic	😞
Greece	😐	Germany	😊
Ireland	😊	Italy	😞
Latvia	😐	Romania	😞
Lithuania	😞	Slovenia	😞
Malta	😐	Sweden	😞
Portugal	😐	United Kingdom	😊
Spain	😐		