


# The 10 best climate mitigation measures in the Nordic Baltic Region



AIR POLLUTION AND CLIMATE SERIES 30

## The 10 best climate mitigation measures in the Nordic Baltic Region

By Janis Brizga (Latvia), Sören Dyck-Madsen (Denmark), Arni Finnsson (Iceland), Valdur Lahtvee (Estonia), Fredrik Lundberg (Sweden), Thomas Martinsen (Norway), Gunnar B.Olesen (Denmark), Meri Pukarinen (Finland), Linas Vainius (Lithuania).

About the authors: The national reports were written by eight energy and climate policy experts from environmental NGOs in the Nordic Region. The synthesis report was written by energy experts Fredrik Lundberg from Sweden and Gunnar B.Olesen (INFORSE) from Denmark.

**Cover illustration:** Lars-Erik Håkansson (Lehån).

**Graphics and layout:** Sven Ängemark

**Language consultant:** Malcolm Berry, Seven G Translations, UK

**ISBN:** 978-91-979623-2-2

Published in October 2013 by the Air Pollution & Climate Secretariat (Reinhold Pape) in cooperation with the Minor Foundation for Major Challenges (Tore Killingland, Tore Braend) in Norway.

**Address:** AirClim, Box 7005, 402 31 Göteborg, Sweden.

**Phone:** +46(0)31 711 45 15.

AirClim would like to sincerely thank the The Minor Foundation for Major Challenges for all support which made this report possible. [www.minor-foundation.no](http://www.minor-foundation.no)

**Website:** [www.airclim.org](http://www.airclim.org).

The Secretariat is a joint project by Friends of the Earth Sweden, Nature and Youth Sweden, the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation and the World Wide Fund for Nature Sweden.

The report is also available in pdf format at [www.airclim.org](http://www.airclim.org).

The views expressed here are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the publisher.

## Contents

<b>Synthesis .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Introduction.....	8
1. CO <sub>2</sub> and energy taxes.....	9
2. Feed-in tariffs .....	11
3. EU Structural Funds for energy efficiency.....	12
4. Building efficiency, building codes and requirements for renovation .....	13
5. Other subsidies for renewable energy .....	14
6. Energy efficiency agreements .....	15
7. Vehicle taxation .....	16
8. Promoting and planning for cogeneration and district heating .....	18
9. Planning for wind power .....	19
10. Local initiatives, .....	20
Other policies.....	22
Climate law.....	22
Smart grid strategies .....	23
Congestion charges.....	23
Technology procurement .....	23
EU-ETS .....	23
Net metering .....	23
Mandatory use of straw .....	24
EU policies.....	24
Method: Selection of the Ten Best Measures.....	24
<b>Danish Initiatives for Reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> and Energy use or more Renewables: .....</b>	<b>26</b>
37 Instruments: .....	26
1. Energy taxation for households.....	26
2. CO <sub>2</sub> taxation for business – including energy savings agreements.....	27
3. Fuel Taxes.....	29
4. Energy distribution companies energy savings obligations.....	29
5. Building codes .....	30
Renovation .....	30
Low energy 2015 .....	31
Low energy 2020 .....	31
6. Cogeneration and district heating.....	32
7. Implemented taxes and duties relevant to consumption and emissions of HFCs, PFCs, and SF6.....	33
8. Registration tax for cars .....	34
9. Annual green ownership tax for cars.....	35
10. Biofuels and exemption of registration tax for electric and hydrogen cars .....	36
“Electricity and biomass in the transport sector.....	37
11. Planning publicly accessible buildings near public transport .....	37
12. Feed-in tariffs for wind turbines on-shore, near-shore and off-shore .....	37
Production of Renewable Energy .....	38
“A green and sustainable energy supply based on renewable energy .....	39

13. Increasing use of biomass – mandatory use of straw for power production.....	39
“Converting to green heating.....	40
“Large increase in consumption of renewable energy.....	40
“More renewable energy in industry.....	42
14. Establishing conditions for Smart Grid.....	43
“Smart Grids.....	43
15. PV – letting the meter run backwards (netmetering).....	43
16. Research and development.....	43
“More research, development and demonstration.....	44
17. Energy labelling of buildings.....	45
18. Electricity Savings Trust – Centre for Energy Savings – Danish knowledge centre for energy savings in buildings.....	45
19. Energy labelling of appliances.....	45
20. Heat Pump initiative for replacing old oil burners.....	46
21. Scrapping of oil-fired boilers.....	46
22. Banning of new oil-fired boilers.....	47
“More renewable energy in buildings.....	47
23. Mandatory for public authorities to make energy savings in their own buildings.....	47
24. Green public procurement.....	47
Regions.....	48
Municipalities.....	48
25. Loan possibility for local communities and regions for energy savings.....	49
26. Action Plans for the Aquatic Environment I and II and Action Plan for Sustainable Agriculture.....	49
27. Ban on burning straw in fields.....	50
28. Ammonia action plan and statutory order on manure.....	51
29. Planting of windbreaks.....	52
30. Biogas plants.....	52
“Better framework conditions for biogas expansion.....	53
31. Afforestation on agricultural land and elsewhere.....	53
32. Taking vulnerable agricultural areas out of production.....	53
“Fewer greenhouse gases.....	54
33. Ban on combustible waste in land fills.....	54
34. Waste tax.....	55
35. Package tax.....	56
36. Recycling of waste packaging plastics.....	56
37. Support for gas recovery at landfill sites.....	56
Appendix 1:.....	58
Emissions of CO <sub>2</sub> from energy consumption and overall greenhouse gas emissions.....	58
Danish emissions of Greenhouse gases 2010.....	58
Historical Emissions of GHG in Denmark.....	58
Carbon dioxide, CO <sub>2</sub> .....	59
Nitrous oxide, N <sub>2</sub> O.....	60
Methane (CH <sub>4</sub> ).....	61
Industrial gases HFCs, PFCs and SF <sub>6</sub> .....	62

<b>Best GHG mitigation measures in Estonia .....</b>	<b>64</b>
Current situation with GHG emissions.....	64
GHG mitigation measures in Estonia .....	70
<b>Ten best mitigation measures in Finnish climate and energy policy.....</b>	<b>76</b>
Introduction.....	76
Trends in Finnish emissions.....	76
Implementation of EU policy forms the basis of national policy.....	78
Overarching policy framework: climate and energy strategies.....	78
Measures to meet the renewables target.....	80
Measure 1: Feed-in tariff for wind power, biogas and wood-based fuels from plants .....	81
Measure 2: Removing bureaucratic hurdles in wind energy development .....	82
Measure 3: allowances to households replacing oil and direct electric heating with renewables.....	83
Energy efficiency measures.....	84
Measure 4: energy efficiency agreements.....	84
Measure 5: energy efficiency standards for new buildings.....	85
Measure 6: energy efficiency measures in old buildings .....	86
Measure 7: energy savings through Energy Performance Contracting (EPC) .....	87
Reducing emissions from transport .....	88
Sub-national measures.....	88
Measure 9: carbon-neutral municipalities as forerunners .....	89
Measures in preparation .....	90
Measure 10: climate law enhancing the effectiveness of policy measures .....	90
Mitigation measures ranked .....	92
List of references.....	92
Appendix 1. NGO experts having ranked the measures.....	95
<b>The 10 best Mitigation Measures in Iceland .....</b>	<b>95</b>
Special status? .....	96
These 10 key actions are: .....	97
Implementing a trade system with emission allowances (ETS).....	97
14/CP.7 .....	97
Carbon tax .....	98
Cars in public ownership (state and municipalities) must be fuel-efficient and eco-friendly .....	100
Strengthen the net of pathways for pedestrians, roads for bikers as well as public transport as an alternative for transportation ..	100
Utilizing biofuels for fishing vessels.....	100
Fuel fish meal factories with electricity.....	100
Sequestration - More afforestation and soil conservation.....	101
Wetland reclamation .....	101
Mitigation potential.....	101
10. Provide more support for research and innovation with regard to climate issues.....	102
Interconnector .....	102
<b>Climate Policy instruments in Latvia .....</b>	<b>104</b>
Introduction.....	104
Climate Change Mitigation Policy .....	105

Emission trading.....	106
European Union Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS) .....	106
International Emissions Trading .....	107
EU Structural Funds .....	109
Taxes.....	110
CO <sub>2</sub> tax .....	111
Other taxes .....	111
Policy instruments by sector.....	112
Transport .....	112
Feed-in tariffs .....	112
Industrial processes .....	113
Agriculture.....	113
Forestry .....	113
Waste .....	113
Communication instruments .....	114
Energy efficiency labelling.....	115
Local-level initiatives .....	115
Research & science.....	115
<b>Best GHG mitigation measures in Lithuania.....</b>	<b>116</b>
General situation: .....	116
<b>Best practice policies for climate change mitigation, Norway .....</b>	<b>120</b>
Foreword .....	120
Introduction.....	120
Brief history of emissions of greenhouse gases in Norway .....	120
Norwegian policies influencing greenhouse gas emissions .....	123
1.1 Taxation .....	123
Direct regulation.....	124
Research, development and deployment.....	125
Selected best practice measures.....	125
CO <sub>2</sub> tax on emissions from oil and gas production (D) .....	125
Emission quota on N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from fertilizer production .....	126
All new gas-fired power stations must have carbon capture and storage (M).....	126
Automobile purchase tax (D) .....	126
Incentive for increased deployment and use of electric vehicles (J).....	127
Voluntary agreement with the industry (S) .....	127
Outlawing and taxation of biodegradable waste deposited in landfills (M).....	127
Stricter requirement for insulation of buildings in the Building Code (L) .....	128
Economic support to replace oil-fired boilers for heating (H) .....	128
Government grant for public transport to cities implementing measures to reduce car use (B) .....	129
Industrial energy efficiency network (I) .....	129
Compulsory evaluation of alternatives to new large road projects (B) .....	129
Guide to categorization and criteria.....	130

<b>Climate Policy Instruments in Sweden.....</b>	<b>131</b>
Top 10 instruments, ranked .....	131
1. Energy and carbon dioxide taxes.....	131
2. Building regulations .....	133
3. Congestion charges.....	133
4. Climate investment programmes.....	134
5. EU ban on incandescent lamps.....	135
6. Programme for energy efficiency in industry (PFE).....	135
7. Railway investments and improved railways .....	136
8. Electricity certificates .....	136
9. Technology procurement .....	137
10. Special initiatives for wind and solar power.....	139
(Other instruments, not ranked) .....	139
Emissions trading .....	139
Environmental Code (environmental quality targets, etc.).....	140
Planning and Building Act .....	141
‘Energy check’ – energy saving for SMEs.....	141
Investment support for conversion of heating systems and energy-efficiency measures.....	141
Building regulations .....	142
Research and development funding .....	142
Heat Research .....	143
Eco-labelling and Green Electricity .....	144
Green car rebates and other advantages for cars.....	145

# Synthesis

*Compiled by Fredrik Lundberg (Sweden), Gunnar B. Olesen (Denmark)*

## Introduction

When we asked a number of national environmental NGOs to describe and rank their ten best climate measures we had thought that those measures would be at least to a great extent universal.

Instead we have found an overwhelming diversity. This diversity reflects the fact that different people focus on different aspects and time scales, but that is not all there is to it.

Hardly any country seems to have noticed what their neighbours are doing. So all climate policymakers should take a look, not only at the ten winners, but at the full smorgasbord of measures in neighbouring nations. Yes it is heterogeneous and messy, small is mixed with big, long-term is mixed with short-term, proven is mixed with what hopefully might work etc. – but the lasting impression is that there are a lot of things to do. It is a wonderful exposé of options. Thanks all respondent NGOs for your great work!

The national NGO reports are largely based on the National Communications (NC5) to the Climate Convention, but several other measures are included in some of the reports. The results and expectations of each measure are also seen in a different light in different countries. Even the same measure is judged in a different way in the different national reports.

We hope this synthesis report and the national NGO reports will be used to inspire stronger climate policies and as input in the preparation of the next National Communication, NC6.

The heterogeneous reporting reflects the complexity of the task. It is messy, but not all bad.

The good news: much can be done to cut the greenhouse emissions, and we know this for sure, because it already has been done, in another country. You do not have to re-invent the wheel.

The bad news: Our politicians do not learn very much from each other, or have not so far. It is not because it is very difficult to cut emissions.

Most of us have lower emissions now than 1990, without trying very hard, and on the whole, while GDP and living standards have risen.

Some of the changes in emissions are caused by structural changes, such as de-industrialisation in e.g. Denmark, but in the sectors with the biggest reductions in emissions, such as the housing sector or electricity production, policies have played a major role.

Politicians want things to be quick, simple, uncontroversial and cheap. But you cannot have all of it at the same time.

We can produce carbon-free power from wind and replace coal, as Denmark has shown. We can shut down dirty and obsolete industry, as the Baltic republics had to, and still survive. We can buy, and produce, much more

efficient cars, as Sweden has done. We can build much more efficient buildings, as we are all beginning to do, with Norway and Denmark as the best examples.

It is happening, but slowly, slowly. Why is it so slow? The reason is that some of the most efficient measures are political dynamite: very high energy and CO<sub>2</sub> taxes are known to work wonders for emissions, but are not perceived as popular with the electorate.

It also takes very different tax rates to bring about change. It takes a very low CO<sub>2</sub> tax to make industry save energy or shift fuels. It takes a very high CO<sub>2</sub> tax to make people travel more by train and less by car. Many economists who advise governments rely on simplistic models, and give governments useless advice.

Other measures, which are also known to be very effective in the long term, do not achieve much very fast. Stricter building codes and subsidies for renewable energy are examples.

Selecting the very best ten measures all over the region, from about 100 candidates, is not such a straightforward task as judging the European Song Contest. There is not one list with a differing number of votes.

The following “10 best” are for this reason a subjective distillate. Some have produced results long ago; others are just proving their value.

What is best cannot be seen in isolation. Every measure can be enhanced by other measures in synergy, or be cancelled out by measures working in the opposite direction. The context is important, because even very strong incentives may not have much influence if people do not believe that they will be lasting. That is why overall national climate policies with targets and timetables are so important, especially if they have a broad parliamentary majority behind them.

One criterion is replicability. We have ranked a measure higher if the same thing can be done in many other countries. But it is also important to use what you have. Geothermal power stations are rather unique to Iceland, but can still be of great importance. The good use of the EU Structural Funds in the Baltic republics is not an option for the Nordic countries, but still a great improvement in the Baltic countries.

## **1. CO<sub>2</sub> and energy taxes.**

CO<sub>2</sub> and energy taxes have been cornerstones of Nordic energy and climate policies for almost 25 years and have achieved many million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> reductions in fossil fuel use, especially of oil for heating and coal for district heating. They are still effective ways to reduce fossil fuel use, promote energy efficiency and limit emissions. There are distinct CO<sub>2</sub> taxes and energy taxes, but they are often used together.

The taxes are often different for different consumers, with household consumers typically paying the highest amounts. Poor consumers are then compensated via the social security systems rather than with lower energy taxes or with direct subsidies.

Some taxes are closely linked with other measures, such as the Danish and Swedish energy taxation of industries linked with voluntary agreements on energy efficiency: companies that implement energy efficiency can get a lower tax. This combination was evaluated to be effective, but is now being replaced by EU-level taxes and by EU Emissions Trading (EU-ETS).

The CO<sub>2</sub> and energy taxes are sometimes combined with taxation of other pollutants: SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and others.

A Danish evaluation from 2005 showed that the Danish CO<sub>2</sub> and energy taxes saved 1.5 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>, equivalent to almost 3% of Danish CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. In Sweden, the sectors covered by the taxes have had much larger reductions, 6 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> reduction in space heating alone since 1990, but this is an effect of a combination of measures and other developments, not of the tax alone. With these reductions, emissions from Swedish space heating have been reduced by a factor of three between 1990 and 2011. In Norway, the CO<sub>2</sub> and energy taxes also cover oil and gas extraction and they have had a significant influence on emissions from the large Norwegian oil and gas production.

The taxes are quite different between the different countries and have evolved over time. While energy taxes have been used in the Nordic countries since the 1970s, Sweden was the first country to introduce a sizeable CO<sub>2</sub> tax of SEK 250/ton of CO<sub>2</sub> (about €25) by 1 January 1991. This level was gradually raised to the current level of SEK 1100/ton of CO<sub>2</sub> (2012), but with increasing exemptions for business. Light industry now pays SEK 330/ton of CO<sub>2</sub> while industry covered by EU-ETS is exempt. Denmark introduced a CO<sub>2</sub> tax in March 1992, but at a considerably lower level than the Swedish (by 2000 on the level of DKK 100 equal to €14/ton of CO<sub>2</sub>). Denmark has supplemented this relatively low CO<sub>2</sub> tax with increasing energy taxes. Like Sweden, Denmark has reduced rates and exemptions for industry.

In Estonia an ecological tax reform was introduced in 2006 by doubling the emission and resource use fees combined with the introduction of an electricity excise duty. Latvia also introduced environmental taxes in 2006, in the form of a CO<sub>2</sub> tax (part of a natural resource tax) at an increasing level, reaching LVL 2 (€2.8)/ton of CO<sub>2</sub> in 2013.

The philosophy behind the energy and CO<sub>2</sub> taxes is both to give a price signal to consumers of the otherwise external environmental costs, and to tax resource use rather than work. This has the result that when consumers react to the price signal and reduce fossil fuel consumption (including consumption of electricity and heat produced with fossil fuels), the revenues for the state are reduced. As a consequence of this, Denmark has decided to tax all fuels, including biomass, although at a lower rate than for fossil fuels, from 2014.

CO<sub>2</sub> and energy taxes were ranked highest by the participating NGOs in three of the countries and were also among the priorities in three more countries. This gives these policies a comfortable first place in the ranking.

## 2. Feed-in tariffs

### Denmark, Estonia, Finland, and Latvia

Feed-in tariffs were the cornerstone of successful Danish wind power development and are also used, more recently, in Estonia, Finland and Latvia.

Danish feed-in tariffs started in the early 1980s, when this policy instrument paved the way for the Danish development of wind power. The Danish feed-in tariffs with the highest tariffs for cooperatives created a bridge between the first major investment in wind power in California in the early 1980s and the enormous wind power programme in Germany that started around 1990 and which overtook Denmark in 1995, also based on feed-in tariffs. Denmark has remained a big player in wind power, with a sizeable home market until the feed-in tariff was abolished in 2002 and with a large manufacturing industry.

Development in Denmark and later Germany, Spain and other countries has led to a global wind power capacity of 300 GW today, reducing at least 300 Mtons of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions<sup>1</sup> per year, and with the current trend likely to increase capacity to 1500 GW and achieve 1500 Mtons of CO<sub>2</sub> reductions by 2020. To put these figures in perspective, Denmark emitted just over 40 Mtons of CO<sub>2</sub> in 2012 from energy use.

If Denmark had not supported wind power with feed-in tariffs, the wind power success would still have come, but later. That makes a huge difference in an exponential development. And time is of the essence for the climate.

How did Denmark do this? Initially there were both feed-in tariffs and investment support, but the investment support was abandoned<sup>2</sup> in 1988. The main instrument has been, and still is, feed-in-tariffs, first fixed tariffs and later also feed-in premiums with a fixed premium to the power pool price. The feed-in tariff for cooperatives started at 85% of the consumer electricity price and was later set at DKK 0.60 (8 ¢cent)/kWh. This was not cost-effective in the sense that it was not the cheapest way to cut CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for Denmark at that time (that was energy efficiency and gas-fuelled CHP, both of which were also promoted). But the feed-in tariffs served Denmark well by creating the foundation for a big new industry, and they served the world well.

Feed-in tariffs now exist in more than 50 countries so the principle is well established, including in several Nordic-Baltic countries.

One advantage of feed-in tariffs compared to green certificates (another support mechanism, described under “5. Other subsidies for renewable energy”) is that they actively promote a specific technology, e.g. wind power. Another advantage is that they are predictable for investors because of the fixed price. Compared to direct investment subsidies they create strong incentives for maximum generation.

1 Assuming that the wind power replaces a mixture of old coal power at about 1 kg/kWh, gas power at 0.3-0.5 kg/kWh and nuclear power at <0.1 kg/kWh. In the wind power dominants China and the US, this is a very conservative figure.

2 [www.gwec.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/IRENA\\_GWEC\\_WindReport\\_Full.pdf](http://www.gwec.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/IRENA_GWEC_WindReport_Full.pdf) p54ff

The downside of feed-in tariffs is that if they are set too high, they cost too much money and lead to unhealthy booms, while if they are set too low they will not deliver. This requires regular political intervention adjust the tariffs, and creates risks of frequent and unpredictable political changes.

The Danish story shows the importance of political commitment. During the years 1993-2002 capacity grew from 500 to over 3000 MW. Then the feed-in tariffs were abandoned, and only 129 MW was installed between 2004 and 2008.

Feed-in tariffs were ranked highest by the participating NGOs in two of the countries and were also among the priorities in two more countries.

### **3. EU Structural Funds for energy efficiency**

#### **Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania**

In spite of the bad publicity surrounding the EU Structural Funds (SF), the use of these EU funds is effective in increasing energy efficiency and renewable energy received in the Baltic countries, such as Latvia that receive large structural funds.

In Latvia, the SF Operational Programmes have supported renewable energy including biogas and liquid biofuels, cogeneration of heat and power, energy efficiency improvements in district heating, and improved energy efficiency in apartment buildings, including a special programme for energy efficiency of social housing.

In Latvia, the EU funds in the programming period 2007-2013 support a number of measures that either directly or indirectly lead to reduced greenhouse gas emission reductions, e.g. over €340 million has been allocated to fund clean energy and efficiency measures.

The Latvian operational programme “Infrastructure and Services” promoted the use of renewable resources in the development of cogeneration power plants. The public service providers received 50 per cent funding to build new renewable energy co-generation power plants or to convert existing boiler plants to use renewable energy resources with CHP. The EU funding was EUR 97.817 million (LVL 68.746 million). The same Operational Program also supported “Measures for the district heating system efficiency” including the reduction of heating lost in transmission and distribution systems as well as the replacement of fossil fuels in energy generation plants with renewable resources. A total of 58 projects have been approved in the first three rounds with funding totalling almost LVL 33 million.

Structural funds also supported heat-efficiency improvements in apartment buildings, with total funding available of EUR 57 million. Thermal energy savings supported by this fund should be no less than 20% of the heat consumption. The support covers 50-60% of the total eligible costs.

Financial support for the production of energy from biogas is provided through structural funds for rural development, but this programme has not fulfilled expectations.

EU funding will also be available for the period 2009–2014 via the “National climate policy” programme to support elaboration of national climate policy, and others.

In Lithuania, EU Structural Funds have supported modernisation of multi-apartment buildings, modernisation of public buildings, and others. There was successful implementation of the programme for modernizing public buildings, and most of the projects have been completed for the 2007–2013 programmes. These included renovation of administrative buildings, university student halls, general education schools and libraries. The savings target for 2010 was 30 GWh, and for 2016 it is 100 GWh.

In Estonia EU Structural Funds were used to support investments in the conversion of boiler plants, district heating networks and the construction of renewables (wind, biomass and biogas).

The use of SF for energy efficiency and renewable energy received top priority in Latvia, and also ranked highly in Lithuania. In Estonia an SF-funded programme was ranked highly.

#### **4. Building efficiency, building codes and requirements for renovation**

##### [Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Norway, and Sweden](#)

Building codes and other instruments to improve thermal efficiency in buildings are ranked highly in many of the national NGO reports.

The reason is obvious. A rule of thumb says that 40 per cent of energy input goes to heat and cool buildings. This is a huge direct source of greenhouse gases if heated by fossil fuels. It is a huge indirect source if electricity or district heating is used. Wasteful use of biomass for heating should also be avoided, as this leaves less biomass for vehicle fuel and for replacement of fossil materials.

It is not only of huge importance. It is also a field in which legislative action has huge importance. Energy requirements for new buildings differ by a factor of 1.5–2 between Denmark and Estonia, which have not very different climates.

The legal requirements for new buildings and renovation of existing buildings differ a lot between nations, for no very good reason. Almost every square meter indoors has to be heated in the winter, and a lot of offices and other commercial buildings have to be cooled in the summer. The need for heating, as well as cooling, can be much reduced by improved buildings.

Building codes, are strictly intended for new buildings, but standards can also be enforced or incentivized for existing buildings, for example as a requirement for subsidies or soft loans.

Denmark is a good example in both respects, with strict requirements for new buildings, measured in kWh/m<sup>2</sup> per year, with additional requirement for maximum heat losses through different parts of the building, and how much air the building is allowed to leak.

This is probably stricter, both in kWh/m<sup>2</sup> and U-values, than probably all the other countries, at least in Sweden, Norway, Finland, according to a Swedish study<sup>3</sup>, and Estonia. But as metrics are not the same, comparability is difficult.

In Denmark there are also requirements for the renovation of buildings.

As energy requirements can differ by a factor 1.5-2, this has a huge impact over a long time.

Much more energy is, however, used by existing buildings. Many of them will probably be there for another 100 years. Codes for new buildings have only an indirect influence on them; people who live or work in old buildings will raise their demands for indoor climate and economy once they have experienced what actually can be done. It also raises the professional standard of the construction industry.

Another way to raise that standard is promotion of low-energy building, in Denmark called Low Energy 2015 and Low Energy 2020 (still stricter), named after expected future building codes.

As discussed in the Finland report, energy labelling and certification could possibly create a market for efficiency, but it may not be enough.

Denmark has requirements for building components, such as circulation pumps, boilers and windows after renovation, both for new and renovated building. These requirements will be stricter from 2015.

The Norwegian government has expressed its intention to strengthen the building codes “so as to reach passive house standard within the next decade”. If this is enacted with a strict quantitative meaning, it will transform the construction business in Norway and set an example for everybody else, but that has not happened yet.

Other countries will follow the EU directive on energy performance of buildings, and adopt “near zero energy houses” before 2020.

## **5. Other subsidies for renewable energy**

### **Estonia, Finland, Lithuania, Sweden and Norway**

Apart from the feed-in tariffs (above), there are many other support schemes for renewable energy.

Sweden introduced electricity certificates in 2003. Norway joined the system in 2012. This specifies a quota of new renewable electricity sold to (most) customers. In Sweden it mandates 25 TWh of new renewable energy by 2020 from a number of renewable sources, of which the most important are wind, biomass and hydro.

In 2012, Sweden installed 846 MW of wind power, the highest per capita in the whole world. 2011 showed similar results, and placed Sweden in the Global Wind Energy Council’s Top 10, in absolute numbers.

---

3 [http://www.boverket.se/Global/Om\\_Boverket/Dokument/diarium/Yttrande%20%C3%B6ver%20remisser/2012/5433-2011-3.pdf](http://www.boverket.se/Global/Om_Boverket/Dokument/diarium/Yttrande%20%C3%B6ver%20remisser/2012/5433-2011-3.pdf) p7, table 2 (in Swedish).

Sweden is also almost unique in the EU for having already met the EU 2020 renewables targets.

Feed-in tariffs have probably produced earlier and better results globally, but the certificates (and the very similar Energy Portfolio Standards) have also delivered, and in Sweden at a low cost. Certificates for renewable energy have been strongly debated since the idea was formulated in the 1990's, and many renewable energy supporters are worried that they will create a poor investment climate for renewable energy.

Estonia has an investment support scheme, financed from structural funds. According to the report, this led to a 60-fold increase in renewable electricity capacity. Though the expected result of 80 GWh/year is not impressive, wind power has begun to take off. By the end of 2012, 269 MW of wind power was in place<sup>4</sup>, more than in Finland and Lithuania, and much more than in neighbouring Latvia.

Estonia has also a support scheme for single family houses for renewable (PV, solar heating) and efficiency (heat pumps), financed from sales of surplus emission allowances (AAU auctions). Expected savings are 0.5 per cent of the total energy use, however, depending on how much money the AAU sales bring in (probably not very much, as things look late April 2013). The objective is also to increase acceptance of such technology, which may produce more impact.

Finland has a support scheme for allowances to replace oil heating and direct electric heating. The Finland NGO report is doubtful of whether it is relevant or adequate.

Sweden had a very similar scheme in 2005-2010, which did achieve some change but was deemed not cost-effective.

Norway has a similar subsidy for replacing oil with district heating, solar, heat pumps or biomass, in place since 2008, and estimated to have achieved a reduction of 9.5 kton/year by 2010.

Lithuania has legislated targets for renewable energy, with a considerable growth in wind, biomass CHP, biogas CHP and photovoltaics by 2020, though absolute numbers are modest.

## 6. Energy efficiency agreements

### Sweden, Finland, Norway and previously in Denmark

The European Union legislated on a minimum tax on electricity from 2005. The Swedish energy-intensive industry had never had to pay such a tax before, and was offered a conditional exemption.

The condition was participation in a programme for energy efficiency (PFE). Though the tax was very low, about €0.5/MWh, it was very visible, and almost all eligible companies joined the programme, with absolutely astonishing results.

---

4 EWEA annual statistics 2012, published February 2013, at [www.ewea.org](http://www.ewea.org)

During the first five years, the companies had undertaken more than a thousand measures to save electricity. The predicted saving was 0.6 TWh/year.

The actual saving was 1.45 TWh/year for an investment of SEK 708 million– about €5/year per MWh. This means an average payback of 1-2 years.

With a very small carrot in sight, the companies mobilized resources to act in their own interest.

Despite the huge success, PFE will be discontinued by 2014, as it is deemed incompatible with present or future EU legislation.

It is of course sad that Sweden did not even try to make its case before the Commission or the European Court. But though a clear-cut success story, it is not necessarily a prescription for the future and for everybody. The timing was important. Sweden had a long-standing tradition of very low electricity prices for heavy industry, and subsequent wasteful use of it. Prices were now going up, so they had to start thinking about saving energy, PFE or not.

Two problems with voluntary energy agreements, noted in the Finland report, is that they may be an alternative to more legal requirements (which may be more effective) and that it is hard to evaluate them because one cannot tell what would have happened without the agreements. The latter is a very real concern, as unavoidable technological change in core processes in an industry often leads to greater energy efficiency or reduced greenhouse gas emissions – though the objective is primarily to save money, to improve quality, to minimize waste, or to comply with environmental legislation or cut labour costs.

Nevertheless, the evaluations, such as they are, show impressive results for Finland: 4 million tons since 1997. There are also good results reported from Norway on SF<sub>6</sub> reduction, though, as the report concludes “Negotiating this type of policy is probably most successful when there is a threat of applying other measures, e.g., direct regulation”.

Sometime soon it may be possible to compare the voluntary agreement approach for SF<sub>6</sub> in Norway with the different – tax – approach for the same gas in Denmark.

## 7. Vehicle taxation

### Denmark, Finland, Norway

Denmark has a bonus/malus system that reduce the **registration tax** for more efficient cars and increases that tax for gas-guzzlers. The bonus is 4000 DKK for each extra kilometer/liter the car runs above 16 km for petrol, 18 km for diesel. The malus means an extra 1000 DKK for below the same standard.

A **CO<sub>2</sub>-differentiated registration tax** in Norway has increased the demand for new cars with low specific emissions and reduced the average specific emission of CO<sub>2</sub> from cars in Norway from about 180 g/km in 2006 to 140 g/km in 2010. The specific emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> exhibit a reduction of 22 %.

Iceland has has a CO<sub>2</sub> tax for vehicles (and ships), additional on previous taxes, based on 75-100 percent of th EU CO<sub>2</sub> price. This was never much,

and is now next to nothing. It is still a great improvement on the old system, which The Icelandic economic crisis, and the following devaluation of the Krona, led however to much higher prices for fuel in the local currency. This has led both to lifestyle changes (fewer kilometers driven) and that new cars are much energy efficient.

Finland has a **differentiated annual car tax** which presently is €85 for a car with CO<sub>2</sub> emission of 100 grams and €214 for a car which emits 200 grams, with some more tax based on weight<sup>5</sup>. The emission reduction potential is estimated to be 2,1 – 2,3 million tons per year.

Iceland also has a policy that **Cars in public ownership** (state and municipalities) **shall be fuel efficient** and eco friendly.

One important measure is, of course, real fuel prices. A higher price gives incentives to smaller, more fuel efficient cars, to travel less by car (and more by foot bicycle, bus, train, or using the same car for more people, or skypping etc.) The real prices are a kind of reality check of climate policy. Here are the petrol prices by April 21-22 2013. Petrol prices<sup>6</sup>, in Euros, by April 21-22 2013 for the Nordic-Baltic countries. Some of the bigger EU nations are added for comparison:

Country	Unleaded 95 RON	Diesel
Denmark	1.703	1.499
Estonia	1.279	1.279
Finland	1.642	1.519
France	1.750	1.499
Germany	1.573	1.385
Iceland	1.575	1.564
Italy	1.754	1.640
Latvia	1.338	1.260
Lithuania	1.405	1.333
Norway	1.958	1.777
Poland	1.363	1.356
Sweden	1.645	1.608
United Kingdom	1.595	1.663

There are many reasons why just a high tax on petrol and diesel will not alone do the trick. People who buy new cars do not always care a lot about the fuel economy, either because they are rich enough or because fuel is a small part of the total cost per kilometer: the big part is loss of value, or because many

5 [http://www.ambetsverket.ax/files/fordonsskattens\\_struktur\\_och\\_grundskatt\\_112013.pdf](http://www.ambetsverket.ax/files/fordonsskattens_struktur_och_grundskatt_112013.pdf) (in Swedish)

6 <http://www.fuel-prices-europe.info/>

of the new cars are company cars and are selected for other reasons such as prestige and company car taxation legislation. In Denmark the change in vehicle taxation lead to lower costs of some popular, smaller types of cars, leading to higher sale of cars. It remains to be seen if this will off-set the savings from the individual cars getting more efficient with the taxation.

The surest way to reduce emissions from cars is to use all methods: registration tax, annual car tax, according to emissions, and as high tax on fuel as is politically possible. To judge from the table above, there is a substantial freedom for governments to act.

## **8. Promoting and planning for cogeneration and district heating**

Promoting cogeneration of heat and power (CHP) and district heating is important for the transition of societies to sustainable energy with high efficiency of the energy system (avoiding wasteful condensing power production) and with the flexibility to use many heat sources for district heating and to store heat in easy ways using hot water tanks.

Increased use of CHP and enlarged district heating areas have been the main elements of the Danish strategy to promote RE and the efficient use of energy resources since the end of the 1970s. Effective heat supply planning has ensured the highest share of district heating and CHP in the western hemisphere. This has secured early markets for district heating technologies and a cheap avenue for the use of many renewable energy sources like straw, municipal waste, wood waste and geothermal energy. More than half of Denmark's domestic electricity consumption is co-generated with heat at CHP plants, even though some the CHP is coal-fired, and the potential for further use of CHP is limited. For this reason, only a smaller increase in CHP production is expected in the future, but the share of CHP in thermal electricity production could increase up to about 90% with more heat storage, more PV to produce electricity in the summer when less heat is needed, and more intelligent energy networks.

Two surveys entitled "Varmeplan Danmark" (Heat plan Denmark) show that an increase in district heating to include about 10–15% more buildings would be cost effective, but with increasing energy efficiency in houses, the total district heat consumption is not likely to increase.

CHP has been promoted partly by the tax system, partly by electricity production grants for small-scale CHP plants and, lastly, by prioritizing electricity from small-scale CHP plants.

In Lithuania, promotion of CHP is part of the national energy strategy that includes the following targets:

- CHP should make up to 20% of the total energy generation balance in 2010;
- The share of CHP plants in the total electricity generation balance should reach 35% by 2025;
- At least 75% of district heat shall be generated from CHP by 2020;
- Unfortunately little progress has been achieved so far, partly because priorities were changed due to the promotion of the Visaginas nuclear power plant project.

- An ongoing revision of plans suggests the promotion of biomass in district heating up to 2020:
- CHP using biomass, currently 80 MW, planned 600 MW;
- boilers using biomass, currently 310 MW, planned 525 MW;
- boiler additional capacity with support schemes 300 MW (currently 0 MW).

Renewable energy for district heating is proposed to be no less than 60% by 2020, mainly from wood based biomass

In other countries district heating and CHP are in widespread use, such as in Finland.

In two countries the NGOs evaluating measures ranked the promotion of CHP and district heating including planning (the measure received 4th priority and lower).

## 9. Planning for wind power

The dedication of sites to wind power allows a better debate on the siting of wind power than single projects, and when the planning application is submitted it simplifies the planning decision process for the individual projects and speeds up projects. This will be an important element in a wind power strategy that also includes for instance a feed-in tariff, regulation of grid connections, and preferably promotion of local ownership

In Estonia, thematic spatial planning for the development of wind energy has been prepared in four counties in the Western part of the country. In 2012–2013 the thematic plans will be adopted by the County Governors. Other counties may follow the same approach from 2013 onwards.

This planning approach creates opportunities to speed up approval of construction of wind generation capacities. The area covered by the planning process may be suitable for up to 1300 MW of wind power. One result of the planning process is increased acceptance of wind energy.

Offshore wind power is also being considered in Estonia with a new regulation for use of sea areas for construction of offshore installations. This regulation creates the opportunity to seek permits for establishment of offshore wind parks. Three wind park projects are under preparation with an expected installed capacity of 1490 MW. Construction of the offshore wind parks is expected to take place in 2013–2020

In Finland, planning has removed bureaucratic hurdles for wind power development. In spite of the Finnish feed-in tariff, wind energy development has not taken off as expected. This is due to a range of issues, ranging from local acceptability over flight security and impacts on radars used by the military to noise issues, and others. The permission processes are lengthy and tiresome. The government has now addressed these issues in 2012 and is making suggestions to overcome them. The suggested improvements to remove the barriers identified have been taken forward and wind energy development can be expected to finally take off.

This underlines the importance of coherent policy planning: feed-in tariffs alone will not suffice unless the whole policy environment is favourable.

It still remains to be seen whether all the obstacles will be removed in an optimal manner or whether perverse incentives still remain. One Finnish expert stated that those barriers that are rather mechanical in nature are easy to remove, but the politically touchier obstacles, namely the impact of wind turbines on radar used by the military, are unlikely to be removed. Due to these concerns, the measure was given a middle ranking.

In Denmark, wind power is included in land-use planning, and in the 1990s, good land-use planning, including sites for wind power, was part of the Danish success of wind power in the 1990s.

The benefit of removing bureaucratic obstacles in wind energy development lies in enabling the feed-in tariff to be effective. On the flip side, simpler regulation as regards the complaint procedure in wind energy development may be problematic from the point of view of nature protection. This is a common point of view in NGOs focusing on traditional nature conservation. On the other hand, if regional planning is carried out to allocate the optimum sites for wind power, nature conservation issues can be included in the evaluation criteria before developers start to push for permits for specific sites.

Land-use planning to allocate sites for wind power was prioritised in two countries (2nd priority and 8th priority) and has also been used with success in at least one other country.

## **10. Local initiatives,**

Local initiatives by municipalities, NGOs, etc. are important parts of many national climate and energy policies, and they are also important to realise future sustainable energy transitions.

In 2008, five Finnish municipalities launched a climate project, known as carbon-neutral municipalities, that is unique not only in Finland but internationally too. The objective was to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by more than that required by EU targets: these municipalities have committed to an 80 per cent emission reduction by 2030 from the level of 2007.

The project aimed to create tools and procedures to enable Finnish municipalities to mitigate climate change and promote the adoption of climate-friendly technologies. Suitable solutions were sought through close cooperation between researchers, the public sector and businesses. The aim was that successful tools and practices could also be applied elsewhere in Finland and abroad. The municipalities were to define short-term goals and plan required measures together with experts. Consequently, achieving concrete results within just a few years was envisaged. The project aims at greenhouse gas emission reductions both in the near future (2–5 years) and in the longer term (6–20 years). The ultimate goal is a carbon-neutral municipality.

Since the beginning of the project, the number of municipalities involved has grown to 103. The municipality most praised is Uusikaupunki, which is aiming for a 30 per cent reduction by 2012, compared to the 2007 emissions level. One of the project's most significant private sector measures comes in the shape of the Yara fertiliser plant's investment in catalyst technology.

This will cut the factory's greenhouse gas emissions by approximately 90 per cent. Another remarkable initiative is the closed circulation energy solution devised by Sybimar Oy. This facilitates the utilisation of nutrients, water and carbon dioxide in energy and food production.

The activities undertaken in carbon-neutral municipalities vary from enhancing energy efficiency to installing renewable power capacity. In one case a beneficial "green loan" by a local bank enabled households to switch from oil heating to renewables, as well as testing a new technology in biogas production, multiplying the energy output manifold. Some municipalities have created energy efficiency standards in public procurement for IT and other office equipment, logistics, building projects and heat and electricity purchases.

The single most important reason for the initiative taking off is the commitment from the highest possible level – mayors. New forms of cooperation within and between municipalities are another success driver. The role of the media in showcasing success stories has also been an important factor.

In Sweden, the Local Investment Programmes (LIP) in 1998-2002 were intended to both reduce unemployment and to improve the environment, with climate mitigation as only one parameter. About half of the projects and project money were dedicated to greenhouse mitigation. The LIPs were funded by the national government after local government applications usually co-financed by local government or private industry.

The LIPs did not state preference for any specific technology or method, but left that to the local governments (which are fairly strong and independent in relation to the national government). This innovative "let a hundred flowers bloom" approach actually did produce a broad spectrum of results.

The programme was, for Sweden, well funded. LIP and its follower KLIMP (climate investment program 2003-2012) spent about €500 million with added funding from other sources.

Some projects were clearly additive. One example is the biogas factory that uses slaughter residue, in Linköping 200 km south of Stockholm. Buses, taxis and many cars in Linköping were converted to biogas. Swedish Biogas<sup>7</sup>, the operator of the biogas plants, owned by the local government, became a leading developer of biogas projects in Sweden. This development started before LIP, but was reinforced by LIP projects, for example the construction of a public filling station for biogas, conversion of some refuse collection vehicles from diesel to biogas and collection of refuse from school kitchens etc. The positive results from those biogas projects, as well as very positive results from life cycle analyses compared to other fuels, led to an emphasis on biogas in the following KLIMP projects.

Though evaluation is difficult, and may underestimate the long-term effect, the official account<sup>8</sup> says that LIP achieved a GHG reduction of close to

7 <http://www.swedishbiogas.com/>

8 <http://www.naturvardsverket.se/Documents/publikationer/978-91-620-6357-3.pdf> (in Swedish)

one Mton, and the KLIMP 0.9 Mton. For KLIMP, the cost per ton of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent was estimated at SEK 100/ton (roughly €10/ton). The electricity consumption reduction, 874 GWh/year was not credited. If the electricity is assumed to be marginal coal or lignite power in surrounding countries, this would add an extra million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per year. If it is assumed to be natural gas power (or a mix to that effect), it is still worth some 350 000 tons.

KLIMP came to an end in 2012, but is overlapped by its successor, Hållbara Städer (sustainable cities and towns), which began in 2009, and shares some of its features.

In Latvia some municipalities have developed climate initiatives, e.g. ten municipalities in Latvia have joined the European Covenant of Mayors, which aims to improve energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources in their territories. Through their commitment, the covenant signatories aim to meet and exceed the European Union's 20% CO<sub>2</sub> reduction objective by 2020. However, only four municipalities in Latvia (Riga, Jelgava, Tukums and Jekabpils) have adopted sustainable energy action plans.

In Norway, the city of Oslo has been providing direct economic support to residents since 2008 to replace oil-fired boilers for heating with alternatives using bio-energy, heat pumps, solar thermal energy or connection to the district heating network. The level of support depends on the choice of technology as well as the size of the building in question. By 2010 the emission reduction was already estimated at 9500 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>.

In the four countries mentioned above, the participating NGOs prioritised local initiatives as important policies.

## **Other policies**

The selection of the 10 most effective policies leaves out important policies in fields not covered by the selected policies. They can be very important, however. An example of this is R&D, which was prioritised in two countries (9th and 10th priority). While R&D is important for the medium- to long term, it is less important in the short term, where policies that promote investment and other elements of the transition are more important. Another example is consumer information, which is important for the success of many of the policies, but is less effective for large-scale changes as a stand-alone measure.

One of the selection criteria was to select policies that were proven successes and seem to be replicable, while other policies that are only at the planning stage, or are only used with success in one country, were not selected. They could be future successes, and therefore we think it is important to highlight them, which we do below.

## **Climate law**

Climate laws that make targets and timetables for emission reduction a legal requirement, are planned in several countries in the region (and already in place in Britain) and they were prioritised in two countries. They may be important frameworks for future climate policies in the region.

### **Smart grid strategies**

Smarter energy grids (electricity, heat) are seen as an important part of integration of large-scale renewables. They were prioritised in one country, but are likely to be important in all countries. A strategy for implementing smarter grids with requirements for smarter meters, more online communication of power production data, etc. is important for realising a future smart grid, and thereby facilitating the change to renewable energy.

### **Congestion charges**

Congestion charges were prioritised in Sweden (3rd priority), and are also used with success in Norwegian cities, and in the centre of Riga in Latvia. They are likely to be an important part of a sustainable transport policy, even though they have not spread more widely, mainly because of the strong road lobby against them.

### **Technology procurement**

The coordination of purchases of energy-consuming equipment and renewable energy to increase sales and reduce prices has been carried out in Sweden with considerable success. This has been a national priority and considerable experience exists that other countries can also benefit from. It was prioritised in Sweden (9th priority).

### **EU-ETS**

The EU Emissions Trading Scheme was prioritised in two countries, including Iceland, where it received top priority, but based on expectations, not based on realised results. The reason for the top priority in Iceland is that “it looks to be one of the most promising mitigation actions”. Even though the EU-ETS has been implemented in all countries, NGOs have not given it priority as an effective policy based on realised results, and thus, it generally receives a low or zero score as an existing effective policy. According to the response from Iceland, it is, however, a promising future policy (with improvements to the existing system or with a better, future system).

### **Net metering**

Photovoltaics have usually not been given much thought in our region. Germany, parts of which is less sunny than parts of our countries, has however showed that solar PV panels can produce large amounts of electricity: 28 TWh in 2012. Support schemes have existed in several countries, but produced very modest results. The Danish net-metering system seems to have brought photovoltaics to above 100 MW for the first time for any nation in the Nordic-Baltic region. Net metering allows the owner to run the meter backwards when a house with solar PV panels produces more electricity than needed, and to use this surplus at a later time. The success in Denmark led, however to a change in PV support to a feed-in like system.

### **Mandatory use of straw**

While use of dedicated crops for biofuel often invites controversy, the use of bark, sawdust etc., from wood, biogas from sewage, and agricultural by-products have no such problem. The Danish insistence on using straw has paid off, and now accounts for about 20 PJ/year, mainly for power and heat.

Almost every nation in the world has an energy resource in waste from agriculture, but unlike in Denmark, very little of this resource is mobilized.

#### Transport policies

A number of transport policies were included with lower ranks in some countries: promotion of railways and other public transport, “green” annual tax on cars, planning for public transport, promotion of electric and hydrogen vehicles including tax exemption, public vehicles’ standards. We did not evaluate these policies to be among the 10 most effective, but that does not mean that they are not important. It is rather a result of the fact that sustainable transport policies have not been very successful in the Nordic-Baltic regions that have experienced increasing fossil fuel use in transport until the start of the recent economic crisis. Therefore, in general the energy and climate measures for transport have not been very effective in the region. If implemented more forcefully, they could be more effective, as is the case in some German regions.

### **EU policies**

Some EU-policies were prioritised in some countries, for instance the phase-out of incandescent bulbs. As these measures are decided at EU level with very little national influence, and because they were not given high priorities, we did not include them among the 10 highest-ranking policies.

### **Method: Selection of the Ten Best Measures**

In each country the NGOs have selected ten or more best measures, and have ranked them. We based the selection of the ten best measures from the region on these national selections. The measure with the most top rankings became the best measure, the one with the second highest priorities became the second best measure, and so on. For the higher priorities we only used the national priorities 1–6, but to select the lower priority measures, we included seventh and eighth priorities as well. One general criterion was that we only included measures that were prioritised in at least two countries.

This gave the following selection and ranking:

1. CO<sub>2</sub> and Energy Taxation: three top priorities, one second priority, one third priority, one fifth priority out of the first six priorities in each country\*
2. Feed-in Tariffs : Two first priorities out of the first 6 priorities in each country
3. EU Structural Funds: One first priority, one third priority; in addition another country had given second priority to measures funded by structural funds.
4. Building Codes: One second priority, two fifth priorities, two sixth priorities out of the first 6 priorities in each country\*

5. Subsidies for Renewable Energy (other than feed-in tariffs): Two third priorities out of the first 6 priorities in each country\*
6. Energy Efficiency Agreements: Two fourth priorities
7. Vehicle Taxation: Two eighth priorities and one priority without ranking
8. Promoting and Planning for Cogeneration and District Heating: One fourth priority, one sixth priority
9. Planning for Windpower: One second priority, one eighth priority
10. Local Initiatives: One second priority, one ninth priority

\* For these measures, some national NGOs gave them priority more than once, as they had divided the measures into several, more detailed measures. Only the highest priorities from each country are included.

The following measures with priorities in at least two countries were not selected among the 10 best at regional level:

- Emissions Trading Scheme (EU-ETS): Received one first priority and one eighth priority, but the first priority was based on future expected results not on achieved results, and was as such evaluated lower.
- Electric Vehicles: One third priority, one tenth priority, which gave a lower ranking than the 10 best.
- Climate Law: one fifth priority, one tenth priority. Ranking was based on future expected results not on achieved results, and this measure had a lower ranking than the 10 best.
- Public Transport: one seventh, one eighth and one ninth priority, which gave a lower ranking than the 10 best, no priority among the 6 best.
- Afforestation: One eighth priority and one ninth priority, which gave a lower ranking than the 10 best, no priority among the 6 best.
- Research and Development: One ninth priority and one tenth priority, which gave a lower ranking than the 10 best, no priority among the 6 best.
- Mandatory use of straw: One tenth priority and one thirteenth priority, which gave a lower ranking than the 10 best.

A different selection method could change individual orders in the ranking, but would not have changed the general priorities much. Probably the most important criterion was not to base the selection on future expectations, as some national NGOs had done, but only use realised results. If expectation had been given equal weight, EU-ETS would have been included among the 10 best, but only looking at results, it cannot be given priority.

The priority ranking does not necessarily reflect the most important measures, but a combination of importance and success. This is why public transport measures, which are very important, were not prioritised, as they were seen as less successful than the other measures over the last two decades that the NGOs used as reference. If the evaluation had been limited to transport, the results would have been radically different.



DENMARK

## Danish Initiatives for Reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> and Energy use or more Renewables:

*Compiled by Søren Dyck-Madsen, The Danish Ecological Council*

Since 1990, Denmark has had an energy policy that aims to increase the use of renewables and improve energy efficiency to encourage sustainable development. This policy consists of a large number of instruments (measures) that in combination are expected to lead to 100% renewable energy by 2050, with 2020 as an important milestone. This paper describes the most significant instruments

### 37 Instruments:

#### 1. Energy taxation for households

“Denmark has had taxes on energy for many years. Since the first oil crisis in the early 1970s these taxes have been set with the aim of reducing consumption and promoting the instigation of more energy-saving measures. Lower energy consumption will reduce the emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) associated with combustion of fossil fuels. Energy taxes from 1999 to 2009 are stated in Table 4.4 below. Behind the taxes is also a philosophy of taxing resource use rather than work.

TABLE 4.4 ENERGY TAXES 1999-2009

Source: Ministry of Taxation

	Unit	1999	2000	2001	2002-2004	2005-2007	2008 <sup>1</sup>	2009
Coal	DKK/toe	1,884	1,968	2,051	2,135	2,173	2,211	2,252
Natural gas	DKK/toe	1,536	1,672	2,048	2,111	2,134	2,173	2,211
Natural gas	DKK/m <sup>3</sup>	1.47	1.60	1.96	2.02	2.042	2.079	2.116
Oil products: Diesel	DKK/toe	2,030	2,255	2,255	2,432	2,439	2,439	2,547
Fuel oil	DKK/toe	1,967	2,008	2,060	2,122	2,155	2,194	2,233
Electricity: For heating	DKK/kWh	0.42	0.47	0.486	0.501	0.511	0.52	0.529
Other	DKK/kWh	0.48	0.54	0.551	0.566	0.576	0.587	0.596
Waste: Heating from waste	DKK/toe	209	335	427	540	540	548	561
Other compostable biomass	DKK/toe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

<sup>1</sup> As from 1 January 2008 the tax rates are following a yearly regulation of 1.8% in the period 2008-2015.

	2011	2012
Electricity tax for heating – more than 4000 kWh per year	0.614 DKK/kWh	0.624 DKK/kWh
Other electricity use tax	0.73 DKK/kWh	0.742 DKK/kWh

Most companies can get almost all of the electricity tax refunded – so they practically do not pay electricity tax.

Danish energy taxes are laid down in the four Danish tax acts on mineral oil, gas, coal, and electricity, respectively. In the years 2002-7 the energy taxes were not indexed according to inflation, and therefore their real value was reduced. But from 1 January 2008 the tax rates set in these four tax acts have been subject to a yearly increase of 1.8% over the period 2008-2015. The indexation was estimated to lead to a reduction in emissions of 0.14 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> in 2008 and 0.98 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> in 2015.

The introduction of CO<sub>2</sub> taxes and the increase in the rates of individual energy taxes since 1990 have had an effect on the consumption of a number of energy products and have therefore reduced the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with consumption of these products.

The Effort Analysis from 1 April 2005 made an estimate of the effects of the measures implemented in the period 1990-2001. The report's calculations show that the total effect of the introduction of CO<sub>2</sub> taxes and raised energy taxes meant a reduction in annual emissions of about 1.5 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents in 2001.

The socio-economic reduction costs were estimated at DKK 325/tonne. The expected average reduction in emissions for the years 2008-12 is the same as for 2001, namely about 1.5 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents."

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

In March 2012 a broad energy agreement was reached, including new taxes that will be introduced in the coming years.

The agreement stipulates:

- that the increased efforts within energy savings made by energy companies are to be financed via the tariffs on energy distribution,
- that funding for expanding renewable energy that is supplied to the electricity and gas grids is to be financed via PSO (Public Service Obligation) schemes and thus via the energy bill,
- that a space heating tax (called "security of supply tax") is to be introduced to cover government funding for biogas, industrial CHP, state funds for energy savings in privately owned rental properties, renewable energy in businesses, as well as the government's loss of fossil fuel tax revenues due to lower consumption of fossil fuels,
- that a share of the security of supply tax is to be offset against lower energy taxes on electricity and fuel for industry with a view to maintaining Denmark's competitiveness.

*Source: "Short summary of the Energy agreement in Denmark from 22.3.2012"*

## **2. CO<sub>2</sub> taxation for business – including energy savings agreements**

"The CO<sub>2</sub> tax on energy products was introduced on 1 March 1992. CO<sub>2</sub> tax is placed on different types of energy products relative to their CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, cf. Table 4.10.

TABLE 4.10 CO<sub>2</sub> TAX RATES, 2000-2009, STATED IN DKK PER TONNE OF CO<sub>2</sub>

Source: Ministry of Taxation

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008 <sup>1,2</sup>	2009 <sup>2</sup>
<b>Basic rate</b>										
Heating in industry	100	100	100	100	100	90	90	90	90	90
<b>Light industrial processes</b>										
Basic rate	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
With a voluntary agreement	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68
Resulting subsidy	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
<b>Heavy industrial processes</b>										
Basic rate	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
With a voluntary agreement	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Resulting subsidy	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22

<sup>1</sup> As from 1 January 2008 the tax rates are following a yearly regulation of 1,8% in the period 2008-2015.<sup>2</sup> With the implementation of an amendment of the energy taxes, which is currently pending approval by the European Commission, only subsidies regarding CO<sub>2</sub> tax on electricity to firms with a voluntary agreement will be given.

The voluntary agreement for companies with a heavy industrial process actually was very successful in delivering energy savings at a very cost-effective level.

Table 4.11 shows examples of the different types of CO<sub>2</sub> taxes converted into consumer units.

TABLE 4.11 EXAMPLES OF CO<sub>2</sub> TAXES

Source: Ministry of Taxation

	Unit	15.5.1992-31.12.2004	1.1.2005-31.12.2007	1.1.2008-31.12.2008 <sup>1</sup>	1.1.2009-31.12.09
Gas oil and diesel oil	<i>DKK/litre</i>	0.27	0.243	0.247	0.252
Fuel oil	<i>DKK/kg</i>	0.32	0.288	0.293	0.298
Electricity	<i>DKK/kWh</i>	0.10	0.09	0.088	0.089
Lignite	<i>DKK/tonne</i>	242	217.8	221.7	225.7
Natural gas and town gas	<i>DKK/Nm<sup>3</sup></i>	0.22	0.198	0.202	0.205
Petrol	<i>DKK/litre</i>	-	0.22	0.224	0.228

<sup>1</sup> As from 1 January 2008 the tax rates are following a yearly regulation of 1,8% in the period 2008-2015.

In addition to this, there are CO<sub>2</sub> taxes on heating tar, crude oil, coke, crude oil coke, lignite briquettes and lignite, LPG, and other gases. As evident from Table 4.11, the CO<sub>2</sub> taxes were reduced from 1 July 2004. This reduction, however, does not mean a reduction in the tax burden and resulting increased CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

The tax reductions were part of a reorganization of the energy taxes to make them more transparent, and the energy taxes on the different energy products have been raised correspondingly, so that the overall tax on the individual product is the same. As part of the reorganization of the taxes, from 1 January 2005 a tax was placed on petrol and the energy tax on petrol was reduced correspondingly, so that the total tax burden on petrol remains unchanged. This reorganization was introduced in order to make it possible to exempt biofuels from CO<sub>2</sub> tax. As from 1 January 2008 the CO<sub>2</sub> tax is subject to a yearly increase of 1.8% over the period 2008-2015, like the energy taxes.”

Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009

### 3. Fuel Taxes

“The increased fuel taxes have led to an annual reduction of about 1.2 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents in 2001 with a socio-economic reduction cost of DKK 775/tonne. The average for 2008-12 is expected to be at the 2001 level.”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

### 4. Energy distribution companies energy savings obligations

“As a part of the 2005 political agreement, grid and distribution companies in the electricity, natural gas, district heating and oil sectors are obligated to realize savings in the final energy consumption of end-users. Furthermore the companies are obligated to provide information to their own customers on energy consumption and provide advice on saving energy. The companies have a high degree of freedom regarding methodology.

These obligations are implemented as a voluntary agreement between the minister for climate and energy and trade associations representing the electricity grid, natural gas, district heating, and oil companies.

In the 2008 political agreement the companies' obligation to deliver energy savings was increased by more than 80% from 2.95 PJ to 5.4 PJ. The elevated obligation of 5.4 PJ will enter into force from 1 January 2010.

Electricity companies have worked with energy savings since the early 1990s. Natural gas and district heating companies' activities have only been formalized in recent years. Today's costs are in principal financed through energy prices.”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

In the new Danish Energy Agreement from 22 March 2012, the demand for energy savings from energy distribution companies is increased.

“Energy efficiency improvements are crucial if DK is to increase the share of renewable energy in its total energy consumption. This is good for enterprises and households in today's age of increasing and volatile fossil fuel energy prices. With the agreement's initiatives, in 2020 Denmark will have reduced its final energy consumption (excluding consumption for transport) by almost 7% compared to 2010. (Around half of the reduction comes from final energy savings and half comes from conversion to wind turbines that reduces losses at power plants). The agreement contains the following elements:

- Energy companies must realize specific energy savings exceeding today's requirements, e.g. by consulting energy experts and by offering subsidies to e.g. households and businesses,
- Energy companies must increase efforts by 75% from 2013 to 2014, and by 100% from 2015 to 2020 compared to 2010-12,
- A comprehensive strategy for energy renovation of all Danish buildings will be developed.”

*Source: The Danish Energy Agreement from 22 March 2012*

## 5. Building codes

The Building Regulations 2010 (BR10) contain rules for the construction of buildings in Denmark, both private and commercial. Regulation is primarily based on functional requirements. BR10 also contains requirements for low-energy buildings class 2015, and in an appendix also for low-energy buildings 2020.

See: <http://www.ebst.dk/link/42549/link>

*Most important requirement concerning energy in BR2010*

In the case of dwellings, student accommodation, hotels etc., the total energy demand of the building for heating, ventilation, cooling and domestic hot water per m<sup>2</sup> of heated floor area must not exceed 52.5 kWh/m<sup>2</sup>/ year plus 1650 kWh/year divided by the heated floor area counted on the outside of the house (including walls).

For offices, schools, institutions etc., the total energy demand of the building for heating, ventilation, cooling and domestic hot water and lighting per m<sup>2</sup> of heated floor area must not exceed 71.3 kWh/m<sup>2</sup>/year plus 1650 kWh/year divided by the heated floor area.

These requirements are supplemented by a number of maximum heat losses through different parts of the building envelope to ensure that no part of the building can be constructed too badly.

Air changes through leakage in the building envelope must not exceed 1.5 l/s/m<sup>2</sup> of the heated floor area when tested at a pressure of 50 Pa.

The surface temperature of window frames in external walls must not be lower than 9.3°C measured with an indoor temperature of 20°C and an outdoor temperature of 0°C.

### Renovation

Energy savings must be implemented if the conversion or alterations affect the building envelope. Specific measures only apply to that part of the building envelope which is affected by the alterations.

For renovation the specifications are weaker – and can be avoided if cost-effective-calculations show that the below cited requirement is too costly to implement.

When replacing windows, the net energy loss (heat loss minus useful solar input) through the window in the heating season must not be more than 33 kWh/m<sup>2</sup>/year. When replacing roof lights, the net energy loss through the window in the heating season must not be more than 10 Kwh/m<sup>2</sup>/year.

When replacing windows after 1 January 2015, the net energy loss in the heating season through the window must not be less than minus 17 kWh/m<sup>2</sup>/year. When replacing roof lights after 1 January 2015, the energy loss in the heating season through the roof light must not be more than 0 kWh/m<sup>2</sup>/year. When replacing roof lights after 1 January 2015, the U value of the roof lights including frames must not exceed 1.40 W/m<sup>2</sup>K.

### **Low energy 2015**

A building may be classified as a class 2015 low energy building when the total energy demand for heating, ventilation, cooling and domestic hot water per  $\text{m}^2$  of heated floor area does not exceed  $30 \text{ kWh/m}^2/\text{year}$  plus  $1000 \text{ kWh/year}$  divided by the heated floor area.

Offices, schools, institutions and other buildings may be classified as class 2015 low-energy buildings when the energy requirement for heating, ventilation, cooling, domestic hot water and lighting per  $\text{m}^2$  of heated floor area does not exceed  $41 \text{ kWh/m}^2/\text{year}$  plus  $1100 \text{ kWh/year}$  divided by the heated floor area.

Buildings covered by the low-energy performance framework must be built such that the design transmission loss does not exceed  $4.0 \text{ W per m}^2$  of the building envelope in the case of single-storey buildings,  $5.0 \text{ W per m}^2$  for two-storey buildings and  $6.0 \text{ W}$  for buildings with three storeys or more.

In the case of low-energy buildings, air changes through the building envelope must not exceed  $1.0 \text{ l/s pr. m}^2$

For buildings supplied with district heating, an energy factor of 0.8 for district heating applies for verification of compliance with the low-energy performance framework.

The energy loss in the heating season through the windows must not be more than  $17 \text{ kWh/m}^2/\text{year}$ . There must not be energy loss in the heating season through the roof lights (loss below  $0 \text{ kWh/m}^2/\text{year}$ ). The U value of the roof lights including frames must not exceed  $1.40 \text{ W/m}^2\text{K}$ .

The provision for surface temperature of window frames in external walls will be re-assessed.

### **Low energy 2020**

Buildings covered by the low-energy performance framework for 2020 buildings must be built such that the design transmission loss does not exceed  $3.7 \text{ W per m}^2$  of the building envelope in the case of single-storey buildings,  $4.7 \text{ W per m}^2$  for two-storey buildings and  $5.7 \text{ W}$  for buildings with three storeys or more.

The energy gain in the heating season through the windows must not be less than  $0 \text{ kWh/m}^2/\text{year}$ . The energy gain in the heating season through the roof lights must not be less than  $10 \text{ kWh/m}^2/\text{year}$  (requiring net gain instead of net loss). The U value of the roof lights including frames must not exceed  $1.20 \text{ W/m}^2\text{K}$ .

In the case of low-energy buildings 2020, air changes through the building envelope must not exceed  $1.0 \text{ l/s pr. m}^2$

For low-energy buildings 2020 – in the case of dwellings, student accommodation, hotels etc – the window glass area shall be at least 15% of the floor area in rooms that are used for living, and for kitchens.

In case of collective renewables production that is established in connection with new low-energy buildings (2020 standard) and where the building owner economically invests in the construction of the renewables, the size of this

production can be subtracted when calculating the building's total energy demand. The renewables production has to be installed at the building or nearby.

For buildings supplied with district heating, an energy factor of 0.8 for district heating and an energy factor of 1.8 for electricity apply for verification of compliance with the low-energy performance framework.

In offices, schools and institutions it must be ensured that the content of CO<sub>2</sub> in the indoor air does not exceed 900 ppm for extended periods of time.

In low-energy buildings 2020, airborne heating must not be the only source for heating the building.

#### *Component requirements for new buildings and for retrofitting old ones*

Circulation pumps in heating, hot water, geothermal heating and cooling systems must be A rated or must comply with the corresponding energy requirements. Ventilation installations must incorporate heat recovery with a dry temperature efficiency of no less than 70%. The heat recovery unit can be combined with a heat pump for heat recovery. This must have a minimum COP (coefficient of performance) of 3.6 in heating mode. To be CE labelled, oil-fired boilers must have a fuel use efficiency of no less than 93% at full load and 98% at part load. To be CE labelled, gas-fired boilers must have a fuel use efficiency of no less than 96% at full load and 105% at 30% part load. Oil-fired hot air units for heating buildings must meet the requirements for class A air heating systems.

## **6. Cogeneration and district heating**

“Increased use of CHP and enlarged district heating areas have been the main elements of the Danish strategy to promote RE and the efficient use of energy resources since the end of the 1970s. Effective heat supply planning has ensured the highest share of district heating and CHP in the western hemisphere. This has secured early markets for district heating technologies and a cheap avenue for the use of many renewable energy sources like straw, municipal waste, wood waste and geothermal energy. More than half of Denmark's domestic electricity consumption is co-generated with heat at CHP plants, and the potential for further use of CHP is limited. For this reason, only a smaller increase in CHP production is expected in the future, but the share of CHP in thermal electricity production could increase up to about 90% with more heat storage, more PV and more intelligent energy networks

The surveys “District heating in Denmark 1.0 and 2.0” show that an increase in district heating to include about 10–15% more buildings would be cost effective, but with increasing energy efficiency in houses, the total district heat consumption is not likely to increase

CHP has been promoted partly by the tax system, partly by electricity production grants for small-scale CHP plants and, lastly, by prioritizing electricity from small-scale CHP plants.”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

## 7. Implemented taxes and duties relevant to consumption and emissions of HFCs, PFCs, and SF<sub>6</sub>

“Since 1 March 2001, imports of the industrial gases HFCs, PFCs, and SF<sub>6</sub> (F-gases) in the industrial/business sector have been subject to taxation. The tax is based on the Danish CO<sub>2</sub> tax correlated with GWP up to a maximum of DKK 400/kg, cf. the examples in Table 4.14.

TABLE 4.14 EXAMPLES OF TAXES ON F-GASES  
Source: Ministry of Taxation

Substance	GWP	Tax in DKK per kg
HFC-134a	1300	130
R404a (a combination of 3 HFCs)	3780	378
SF <sub>6</sub>	23900	400

Regarding the effect of taxes on the consumption of HFCs, PFCs, and SF<sub>6</sub> on emissions of greenhouse gases, the Effort Analysis has estimated that the tax on the industrial gases HFCs, PFCs, and SF<sub>6</sub>, in combination with the effect of regulation adopted and introduced, led to a **reduction** of 49,000 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents in 2001. In 2005, reduction was expected to be somewhere around 150,000 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents, increasing to around 370,000 tonnes in 2010. The socio-economic reduction cost is estimated at about DKK 200/tonne CO<sub>2</sub>.

Please note that it has not been possible to calculate the effects and costs of taxes and regulation separately.

The tax reform on 1 March 2009 has raised the tax on consumption of HFCs, PFCs, and SF<sub>6</sub> to bring it in line with the new CO<sub>2</sub> tax rate of DKK 150 per tonne. In addition to this, taxes are imposed on other greenhouse gasses than CO<sub>2</sub> in relation to use of energy. The tax rates on these greenhouse gasses will likewise equate to the new CO<sub>2</sub> tax rate.

TABLE 5.8 EMISSIONS OF INDUSTRIAL GREENHOUSE GASES (HFCs, PFCs AND SF<sub>6</sub>), 1990-2007 ARE OBSERVED.

Source: 1990-2007: National Inventory Report (NIR), the National Environmental Research Institute (NERI), April 2009.  
2008-2025: Projection of greenhouse gas emissions 2007 to 2025. NERI Technical report no. 703, 2009.

'000 tonnes of CO <sub>2</sub> equivalents	1995	2000	2007	"2010"	2015	2020	2025
HFC <sub>5</sub>	218	605	840	786	488	152	152
PFC <sub>5</sub>	1	18	15	10	7	6	6
SF <sub>6</sub>	107	59	30	58	123	59	59
F-gases total	326	682	886	855	619	217	217

Taxes corresponding to their GWP have been imposed on each of the greenhouse gases from March 2001 in combination with the Danish CO<sub>2</sub> tax of DKK 0.1 per kg CO<sub>2</sub> as described in section 4.3.3. This means that HFC-134a is subject to a tax of DKK 130/kg, as it has a GWP of 1,300. There is a ceiling of DKK 400/kg, so although SF<sub>6</sub> has a GWP of 23,900, the tax is only DKK 400/kg and not DKK 2,390/kg.

The tax is imposed on import of the substances because none of them are produced in Denmark. The tax is payable whether the substances are imported as pure substances or are part of imported products. If the content in the products is not known, the tax is based on a fixed tariff.

The tax is payable on a wide range of products, including:

- Refrigerating and freezing plants
- Air-conditioning plants
- PUR foam for cooling plants, district heating pipes, insulated gates and doors, panels for refrigeration and freezer rooms, extruded polystyrene for insulation (XPS foam), jointing foam
- Spray canisters
- Insulation gas

The tax is also payable on service on existing and new installations/products.

The projection of the emissions is based on implemented and adopted policies and measures, including a statutory order on phasing out certain industrial gases.

This statutory order will result in a **reduction** in greenhouse gas emissions of, on average, 0.4-0.7 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents per year in the period 2008-2012. It is covered by a ban on the use of HFC as a coolant in the retail trade and stationary A/C systems from 1 January 2007, except for the refilling of existing systems, and as a foaming agent in PUR foam from 1 January 2006.

With regard to process emissions, unchanged market and production conditions have been assumed consistently.

The only deviations are, that from 2004 production of **nitric acid** ceased in Denmark; that in the period 2002-2007 an increase of 5% in the production of clinker for cement production is assumed; and that emissions of process CO<sub>2</sub> from steel production from 2005 are assumed to be at the 2001 level as from 2010 production will resume after a period of zero production from 2002-2007.

On the basis of the effects described above, for example, it can be assumed that the resumption of **production of nitric acid** in Denmark – using the same technology as prior to the cessation in 2004, which in practice will probably not be the case – will increase annual emissions in 2008-2012 by about 1 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents. In other contexts it has also been assumed that any relaxation of Danish regulations regarding F gases to align with EU regulation will increase Danish emissions of F gases by 0.4-0.7 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents per year in 2008-2012.”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

## **8. Registration tax for cars**

“The registration tax for passenger cars and vans has since 15 June 2007 been reduced or increased according to the fuel efficiency of the vehicle. Petrol and diesel driven passenger cars and vans receive a tax reduction of DKK 4,000 for each kilometre in excess of 16 kilometres (18 kilometres) the vehicles run per litre of petrol or diesel. Similarly, a tax increase of DKK 1,000 for each

kilometre less than 16 kilometres (18 kilometres) the vehicles run per litre of petrol (diesel) is received.

This is expected to lead to a yearly emission reduction of 0.05 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub><sup>9</sup>. This incentive replaces a reduction in the registration tax for highly energy-efficient private cars, which was introduced on 1 January 2000.

In the transport sector a higher annual tax was imposed on LCVs and the registration tax on taxis was reorganized. These changes increased the incentive to buy more energy-efficient vehicles.”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

## 9. Annual green ownership tax for cars

“Since 1 July 1997 the annual tax on motor vehicles has been based partly on energy consumption (the green owner tax) measured in accordance with EU Directive 93/116/EC. Before this date, the taxation was based only on weight. 24 classes of energy consumption have been defined for both petrol-driven and diesel-driven vehicles. Examples of classes from 2009 are shown in Table 4.12.

TABLE 4.12 EXAMPLES FROM THE DANISH STRUCTURE OF TAX INCENTIVES BASED ON ANNUAL TAXES ON MOTOR VEHICLES (2008-09), DKK/YEAR

Source: Ministry of Taxation

Class of motor vehicle		Fuel consumption (km/l)	Annual tax (DKK/year)
Petrol	1	> 20.0	520
	11	10.0 – 10.5	5,500
	24	< 4.5	18,460
Diesel	1	25 > 22.5	1,960
	12	10.2 – 11.3	9,620
	24	< 5.1	25,060

From 1 January 2000, three new classes were defined for diesel-driven private cars. The annual tax is given in Table 4.13.

TABLE 4.13 ANNUAL TAX FOR DIESEL-DRIVEN PRIVATE CARS, DKK/YEAR

Source: Ministry of Taxation

DKK/year	2000	2001	2002-2009
> 32.1 km/l	140	200	160
28.1-32.1 km/l	700	780	740
25-28.1 km/l	1,280	1,380	1,320

The reason for the fall from 2002 and onwards is a reduction in the green owner tax as a consequence of rising fuel taxes. With effect from 1 January 2002, there was an increase in the tax on diesel.

Tax differentiation based on air pollution (the Euro norms) has also been introduced – giving reductions on annual taxes for light commercial vehicles (LCVs) fulfilling the EURO3 and EURO4 standards. But as these standards

9 The quotation is correct, but the effect seems very small.

became obligatory, these reductions of annual taxes for light commercial vehicles (LCVs) as an incentive to buy vehicles which fulfilled these standards were no longer relevant. From 1 January 2007, a reduction of DKK 4.000 in the tax base for the registration tax was implemented for diesel-driven personal cars and LCVs fulfilling the standards for emission of particles set out originally in EU Council directive 70/220/EØF, dated 20 March 1970.

In 2001, the introduction of the green owner tax meant an approx. 2% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from cars, corresponding to 0.158 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents. The average for 2008-12 is expected to be around 7% (0.540 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents).”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

## **10. Biofuels and exemption of registration tax for electric and hydrogen cars**

“In 2008 the government reached an energy agreement with the majority of the parliament for the period 2008 to 2011. For the transport sector, the government’s aim is that biofuels should account for a total of 5.75 per cent by 2010. In the energy extrapolation, biofuel is implemented over the period 2008 to 2010 (1.5 per cent in 2008 and 3 per cent in 2009). Only biofuel can be used to meet the goals of the agreement in that biofuel meets the demands formulated by the EU as to the future sustainability criteria.

The CO<sub>2</sub>emissions of the transport sector are expected to increase over the period, however not in the period 2009 to 2010, since the energy agreement determines that there should be a blending of 5.75 per cent biofuels in petrol and diesel. The use of biofuels in the transport sector gets full impact on the transport sector’s CO<sub>2</sub>emissions.

Hydrogen cars are exempted from charges until 2015. The exemption from charges for electric cars was also extended until 2012, but has now been extended further. A test programme for electric cars has been established with an appropriation of DKK 10 million yearly in 2008-09, followed by DKK 5 million yearly in 2010-12.

In January 2009 the government reached a green transport agreement with the majority of the parliament with an overall aim to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the transport sector. Green Transport Vision Denmark is a long-term vision aiming at creating a green transport system that rests on a three-legged base of being able to effectively reduce greenhouse gas emissions and at the same time maintain mobility in society.

The focus of Green Transport Vision Denmark is an environment-friendly renewal of car taxes, more and better public transport plus new sustainable technologies.

The long-term effort is a combination of a concrete endeavor to diffuse and mature for market new technologies through a comprehensive trial and a marked strengthening of research into sustainable technologies in the transport sector.

Denmark will become a laboratory, so to speak, for the development of sustainable technologies within the field of transport. With the establishment of the Centre for Green Transport, Denmark is stepping up the development of sustainable technologies. Foreign partners are to think of Denmark as an attractive place to test new technologies. Funds worth DKK 200 million have been allocated for expanding and maturing the market for new technologies, including large-scale trials of electric cars. A number of initiatives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions will be taken as early as 2009 as a means of supporting increased energy effectiveness in the transport sector in the short term.”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

It was politically agreed in the broadly politically backed Energy agreement on 22 March 2012 to extend the exemption from charges for electric cars until 2015.

### **“Electricity and biomass in the transport sector**

In the long term, the transport sector will face a radical conversion from fossil fuels to electricity and biofuels. The March 22 agreement contains the following elements:

- preparation of an overall strategy for the promotion of energy-efficient vehicles,
- subsidies of a total of DKK 70 million are to be earmarked for recharging stations for electric cars, infrastructure for hydrogen as well as infrastructure for gas in heavy transport,
- fuels must contain 10% biofuels in 2020.” (This is, however, subject to a coming analysis of sustainability of biofuels).

*From “Short summary of the Energy agreement in Denmark from 22.3.2012”*

## **11. Planning publicly accessible buildings near public transport**

The Danish planning laws require all buildings with some amount of public accessibility to be placed less than one kilometre from a public transport service point. This has a double effect – people without a car can access public services, and people who own a car are incentivized not to use the car for public service.


## **12. Feed-in tariffs for wind turbines on-shore, near-shore and off-shore**

Since the amendment of the Electricity Supply Act entered into force on 1 January 2005, most environmentally friendly electricity, i.e. electricity from wind turbines and other renewable energy (RE) plants, decentralized co-generation of heating and power etc., has been sold on market conditions + a supplement depending on technology. The previous support for environmentally friendly electricity, where consumers had an obligation to take the electricity at a fixed price, was converted to financial support in the form of a price supplement on the market price for electricity.

In order to reduce the environmental impact of electricity production, support is granted in the form of a price supplement for environmentally friendly electricity from wind turbines and many other RE plants (straw, woodchips, hydro power etc.) and decentralized cogeneration of heating and power. Biogas and some small-scale biomass technologies receive a fixed feed-in tariff. Solar PV and some small-scale solutions below 6 kW capacity can be connected with grid-metering (see below). Due to the energy agreement from February 2008 all price supplements were increased as a measure for meeting the RE goals and they are to be adjusted again following the agreement on 22 March 2012. The supplement and feed-in tariff is paid by most electricity consumers via a public service obligation (PSO) on the electricity price. Industries are exempted. The RE legislation is gathered in the Renewable Energy Law

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

### Production of Renewable Energy



“Renewable energy includes solar energy, wind energy, hydropower, geothermal energy, biomass (including bio-degradable waste), biodiesel, bioethanol, biogas, and heat pumps.

In 2010 production of renewable energy was calculated at 137.0 PJ, which is 11.0% more than the year before. Between 1990 and 2010, renewable energy production increased by 187%.

Wind power production was 28.1 PJ in 2010, which is 16.2% more than in 2009.

Energy production based on biomass was 93.6 PJ in 2010. Of this, straw accounted for 23.6 PJ, wood accounted for 45.8 PJ, renewable waste accounted for 22.4 PJ, and bio oil accounted for 1.9 PJ. Compared with 2009, Energy production bases on biomass increased by 11.1%.”

*Source: The Danish Energy Agency: Energy Statistics 2010*

The supplement for new wind turbines is at the moment 0.25 DKK/kWh for 22,000 full load hours + 0.023 DKK/kWh in balancing costs + 0.004 DKK/kWh to a green fund. After 22,000 full load hours (typically 8-10 years) the

production from the wind turbines is supposed to be sold at market price level.

### **“A green and sustainable energy supply based on renewable energy**

The agreement secures substantial expansion of wind power, corresponding to the annual consumption of 1½ million households. Thus in 2020, wind power will account for approximately 50% of our electricity consumption compared to 25% today. The agreement implies:

- that 600 MW of offshore wind turbines will be built at Kriegers Flak and 400 MW of offshore wind turbines will be built at Horns Rev before 2020.
- that a further 500 MW of offshore wind turbines will be installed near the coast before 2020.
- new planning tools will encourage development of onshore wind turbines with a total capacity of 1,800 MW up until 2020. This will mean that electricity production from onshore turbines will increase despite the decommissioning of older turbines.
- that subsidies for wind turbines are reduced by introducing a cap on high electricity prices in order to prevent over-compensation,
- that over a period of four years, a total of DKK 100 million will be committed to funding development and the use of new renewable energy technologies for electricity production (solar, waves, etc.) as well as DKK 25 million for wave power demonstration facilities.”

*From “Short summary of the Energy agreement in Denmark from 22.3.2012”*

### **13. Increasing use of biomass – mandatory use of straw for power production**

“The main tendency during the last 25 years has been that biomass has mostly been used in the form of solid biomass (wood, straw and waste); that biomass is used in larger and larger plants because of the economic advantages of scaling up; and that biomass is increasingly used for cogeneration instead of just heat production. The latter is part of the overall energy policy that has the goal of optimizing energy conversion, which among other things can be done by promoting cogeneration instead of just heat production.

The biomass agreement from 1993 is part of this development. A broad majority in the Danish Parliament is behind the agreement that mandates power plants to use 1.4 million tonnes of straw and wood, adding up to almost 20 PJ per year. The energy agreement from 21 February 2008 would further increase the use of biomass by up to 700,000 tonnes in 2011 – this implies that the renewable energy part of the overall energy use will be increased by 1.2 percentage points.”

*Source: Web page of The Danish Energy Agency*

### “Converting to green heating

Heating consumption must also gradually be converted to renewable energy.

The agreement contains the following elements:

- converting from coal to biomass at large-scale power plants will be made more attractive by amending the Heating Supply Act,
- the smaller open-field plants that are struggling in the wake of high heating prices will be allowed to produce cheap heating based on biomass”


*From “Short summary of the Energy agreement in Denmark from 22.3.2012”*

### “Large increase in consumption of renewable energy

Consumption of renewable energy increased from 145 PJ in 2009 to 170 PJ in 2010, which corresponds to an increase of 17.4%. This development is mainly due to a considerable increase in the use of biomass for electricity and district heating production in 2010.

Calculated according to the EU’s method of calculation, the share of renewable energy grew from 20.1% to 22.3% in 2010. Production of electricity from renewables accounted for 33.1% of Danish domestic electricity supply in 2010. Of this figure, wind power accounted for 20.7%.”

#### Consumption of renewable energy



Please note that this graph is incorrectly labelled. The orange is the share covered by net imports, and the green is the share covered by indigenous production.


“Production of renewable energy has increased dramatically since 1980. In addition, net imports have increased. In 2010, net imports of renewable energy were 32.9 PJ, as 35.7 PJ (primarily biomass) were imported and 2.8 PJ (biodiesel) were exported.

In 2010 total consumption of renewable energy was 169.9 PJ, as opposed to 144.7 PJ in 2009 and 47.7 PJ in 1990. Final consumption of renewable energy was 17.4% higher in 2010 than the year before.

The increased use of renewable energy makes a significant contribution to reducing Danish CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.”

*Source: The Danish Energy Agency: Energy Statistics 2010*

### Renewable energy - share of total energy consumption



“Total consumption of renewable energy in 2010 (production plus net imports) was 169.9 PJ, of which 109.6 PJ was used in the production of electricity and district heating. Renewable waste, wood pellets and wind power were predominant in the production of electricity and district heating, accounting for 28.1 PJ, 21.1 PJ and 18.2 PJ, respectively.

Consumption of wood, straw and biogas accounted for 17.7 PJ, 18.8 PJ and 3.3 PJ, respectively.

A total of 60.3 PJ renewable energy was included in final energy consumption, i.e. for process consumption and consumption for heating in the agriculture and industry sector, in the trade and service sector, as well as for space heating in households. In final energy consumption, biomass, particularly firewood, is most prominent.

Observed energy consumption shows the registered amount of energy consumed in a calendar year. In 2010 renewable energy covered 20.1% of total observed energy consumption, as opposed to 17.9% the year before. In 1990 this figure was 6.3%.

Adjusted gross energy consumption is found by adjusting observed energy consumption for the fuel linked to foreign trade in electricity, and by adjusting for fluctuations in climate with respect to a normal weather year. In 2010 renewable energy’s share of adjusted gross energy consumption was 20.2%, as opposed to 17.8% the previous year. In 1990 this figure was 6.1%.

Except for years with large net exports of electricity, the renewable energy share shows an identical trend when calculated according to the following two different methods.

Renewable energy includes solar energy, wind energy, hydropower, geothermal energy, biomass (including bio-degradable waste), biodiesel, bioethanol, biogas, and heat pumps.

In 2010 production of renewable energy was calculated at 137.0 PJ, which is 11.0% more than the year before. Between 1990 and 2010, renewable energy production increased by 187%.

Wind power production was 28.1 PJ in 2010, which is 16.2% more than in 2009.

Production of biomass was 93.6 PJ in 2010. Of this, straw accounted for 23.6 PJ, wood accounted for 45.8 PJ, renewable waste accounted for 22.4 PJ, and bio oil accounted for 1.9 PJ. Compared with 2009, biomass production increased by 11.1%.”

Source: The Danish Energy Agency: Energy Statistics 2010

#### Production and consumption of renewable energy

Direct energy content [TJ]	1980	1990	1995	2000	2005	2008	2009	2010	Change '90-'10
<b>Production of renewable Energy</b>	<b>24 085</b>	<b>47 688</b>	<b>58 160</b>	<b>77 519</b>	<b>110 153</b>	<b>123 464</b>	<b>123 371</b>	<b>137 003</b>	<b>187%</b>
Solar energy	50	100	213	335	419	519	585	653	554%
Wind power	38	2 197	4 238	15 268	23 810	24 940	24 194	28 114	1 180%
Hydro power	123	101	109	109	81	93	68	74	-26,3%
Geothermal energy	-	96	94	116	344	499	483	425	342%
Biomass	23 384	41 980	48 817	55 194	74 978	84 029	84 255	93 618	123%
- Straw	4 840	12 481	13 050	12 220	18 485	15 853	17 354	23 581	88.9%
- Wood chips	-	1 724	2 340	2 744	6 082	8 237	9 798	11 184	549%
- Firewood	7 621	8 757	11 479	12 432	17 667	24 038	23 054	24 580	181%
- Wood pellets	-	1 575	2 099	2 984	3 262	2 410	2 452	2 407	52.8%
- Wood waste	3 710	6 191	5 694	6 895	6 500	7 289	6 879	7 604	22.8%
- Waste, renewable	7 213	10 508	13 904	17 870	22 222	24 408	23 095	22 377	113%
- Bio oil	-	744	251	49	761	1 794	1 622	1 886	153%
Biogas	184	752	1 758	2 912	3 830	3 928	4 171	4 278	469%
Bio diesel	-	-	-	-	2 632	3 713	3 268	2 875	•
Heat pumps	306	2 462	2 931	3 585	4 058	5 743	6 348	6 966	183%
<b>Imports of renewable energy</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>2 466</b>	<b>16 286</b>	<b>21 962</b>	<b>24 428</b>	<b>35 735</b>	<b>•</b>
Firewood	-	-	-	-	1 963	2 090	2 005	2 137	•
Wood chips	-	-	-	305	1 521	3 530	4 199	4 793	•
Wood pellets	-	-	233	2 161	12 802	16 131	17 984	27 676	•
Bioethanol	-	-	-	-	-	210	204	1 118	•
Bio diesel	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	11	•
<b>Exports of renewable energy</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2 632</b>	<b>3 661</b>	<b>3 122</b>	<b>2 846</b>	<b>•</b>
Bio diesel	-	-	-	-	2 632	3 661	3 122	2 846	•
<b>Consumption of renewable energy</b>	<b>24 085</b>	<b>47 688</b>	<b>58 393</b>	<b>79 985</b>	<b>123 807</b>	<b>141 765</b>	<b>144 677</b>	<b>169 892</b>	<b>256%</b>

Source: The Danish Energy Agency – Energy Statistics 2010

#### “More renewable energy in industry

Industry must also convert to a greener energy system. Therefore the agreement lays down that:

- a subsidy should be given to help promote investment in energy-efficient use of renewable energy in the production processes of enterprises. In the period 2014 to 2020, the subsidy will be increased to DKK 500 million a year from DKK 250 million in 2013,
- funding of DKK 30 million per year from 2013 to 2020 will be introduced to maintain and promote industrial CHP in industries and greenhouses.”

From “Short summary of the Energy agreement in Denmark from 22.3.2012”

## 14. Establishing conditions for Smart Grid

### “Smart Grids

High electricity consumption in combination with wind power requires an intelligent energy system. Therefore the agreement lays down that:

- a comprehensive strategy for establishing smart grids in Denmark is to be drawn up,
- an agreement with grid companies on roll-out of remotely readable hourly electricity meters is to be accomplished.”

*From “Short summary of the Energy agreement in Denmark from 22.3.2012”*

## 15. PV – letting the meter run backwards (netmetering)

In Denmark the support scheme for Photovoltaic (PV) electricity has been managed by allowing the “meter to run backwards”, known as net-metering. In principle this means that you could cover your own electricity use over a year by producing electricity with PV with most of production during the summer. Taxes, VAT, distribution payments etc. are only paid for the net consumption. If production exceeds consumption, a small price is paid for the surplus electricity.

The effect of this kind of support scheme depends heavily on the investment cost for PV, the actual current electricity price and the estimation of future electricity prices that will not be fully paid.

The recent decrease in investment cost and increase in electricity costs for households and public authorities has led to a boom, with investment in PV increasing from an installed capacity in 2007 of only 500 kW to an installed capacity in 2011 of 11 MW, and a prediction for 2012 of 120 MW of installed capacity. The 11 MW of PV produces 0.03% of the total Danish electricity production.

The support scheme works well for consumers with their own meter and own roof partly facing south, such as single-family houses, but it generally leaves out consumers in flats with individual meters and a common roof, as well as houses without roofs with good solar access. Flats etc. could benefit from a revised system, where larger co-owned PV fields could be shared among several consumers

## 16. Research and development

Research and development activities in the field of energy are not motivated solely by climate issues, but are relevant to climate issues, since they contribute to determining the overall framework for the CO<sub>2</sub> intensity of energy production and consumption in the future.

In 2008, the former Energy Research Programme (EFP) run by the Ministry of Climate and Energy was replaced by the Energy Technology Development and Demonstration Programme (EUDP). EUDP focuses on the development and demonstration of new energy technologies. A board, nominated by the Minister, is responsible for the allocation of funds. The Board is served

by a secretariat established in the Danish Energy Agency. The overall objective of EU DP is to support the government's energy policy objective of providing a cost-effective, environmentally friendly and safe energy supply, and to contribute to promoting the competitiveness of Danish enterprises in the field of energy. Its activities focus on new and efficient energy technologies. EU DP was established in 2008. Available funds in 2009 and 2010 were 227 million DKK and 409 million DKK. On average, 35 percent of the activities under the programme are financed by EU DP.

Energy research, development, and demonstration are supported by PSO funds (Public Service Obligation). The transmission system operator Energinet.dk also has a scheme for research and development in environmentally friendly power production technology, in 2009 administering support funds amounting to DKK 130 million.

Under this scheme support is given to activities relating to fuel cells and renewable energy, for instance solar cells, biomass, hydropower and wave energy. Energinet.dk also administers a new programme in 2008-11 with annual funding of DKK 25 million for the deployment of new technologies.

Furthermore, on behalf of the power distribution companies, the Danish power association Dansk Energi administers a scheme of support for research and development in the energy-efficient use of electricity. In 2009, DKK 25 million was available under the scheme, which aims at the development of energy-efficient products and processes in buildings, industry etc.

Activities relating to strategic energy research were increased in 2003. These activities are administered by the Strategic Research Council under the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation, and are aimed at strengthening the knowledge base within renewable energy and environment, including support for inter-disciplinary projects that involve technical, environmental, health, social, economic and political aspects. In the

years 2009-10 available funding for the Ministry's energy research efforts is expected to be DKK 170 million and 304 million.

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

### **"More research, development and demonstration**

The focus on research and development is continued in the latest energy strategies:

Investments in RD&D are essential if we are to develop and test Danish green solutions and create green jobs in Denmark. Therefore the agreement lays down that:

- efforts to uphold a high level of RD&D in energy technology where there is a commercial and growth potential should be maintained,
- DKK 9.5 million is to be committed to the project of making the Island of Samsø fossil-free."

*From "Short summary of the Energy agreement in Denmark from 22.3.2012"*

## **17. Energy labelling of buildings**

“Denmark has long experience with energy efficiency and energy savings in buildings. Since 1980 energy consumption for heating has been reduced by 27% per m<sup>2</sup>. The goal is to reduce energy consumption in new buildings by 75% by 2020. The benefits of reducing energy consumption are tangible: less fossil fuel is consumed and the environment has improved substantially. Strict and progressively tightened building regulations since 1977 have ensured stable demand for energy-efficient building technologies.

Energy labelling of buildings must be implemented after finishing the construction of a building and on the sale or rental of the building – primarily heating consumption. This applies in principle to all buildings, regardless of size, apart from production facilities, factories etc.

Energy labels and an energy plan must be prepared regularly every five years for all large buildings over 1,500 m<sup>2</sup> (1000 m<sup>2</sup> at July 2009) and for all public buildings over 60 m<sup>2</sup> – primarily heating consumption and air conditioning systems.”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

## **18. Electricity Savings Trust – Centre for Energy Savings – Danish knowledge centre for energy savings in buildings**

The Electricity Savings Trust originally set up requirements for energy companies, negotiated and marketed fixed-price agreements, advised customers, and granted subsidies. It prepared market analyses and campaigns focusing on the price and efficiency of energy appliances. It made it simple, safe, and cheap to trade in an energy-appropriate manner. Its activities were financed by a small levy on electricity.

On 1 March 2011 The Electricity Saving Trust was replaced by The Centre for Energy Savings (“Go’Energi”/ “Good Energy”), with the purpose of contributing to the development and implementation of campaigns, market impact activities, etc. covering the use of heating as well as electricity.

Following the Danish Energy Agreement of 22 March 2012 The Centre for Energy Savings will be closed, while some of its activities will be continued by the Danish Energy Agency, and some will be dropped. (See also 19).

## **19. Energy labelling of appliances**

Energy labeling (A-G) of white goods, lighting etc. is compulsory, following EU regulation. There are also voluntary labeling schemes, such as Energy Star, for a number of products, and Energy labelling (A-F) for windows, boilers, and other products. Danish authorities play an active role in securing compliance with the compulsory requirements. The Danish Electricity Saving Trust ran a comprehensive programme in order to promote energy-efficient appliances and products.

The fact that both the Danish Electricity Savings Trust and “Go’Energi” were kept independent from direct political influence by having their own board made it possible for them to focus on their purpose, including taking a front runner concept – promoting the most efficient products and taking up the fight with many producers of legal, but less efficient products.

The Danish Electricity Savings Trust followed by “Go’Energi” developed a “top runner” certificate for different kinds of products in order to include more effects than just energy use and in order to promote the very best products in each class to inform consumers of the best, energy-efficient buy. It also aimed to motivate retailers to actually put the best products on the shelves and run promotion campaigns for the best products using the “Recommended by Go’Energi” certificate – rather than mainstream products or the worst allowed by law. This labeling scheme has gained more and more interest from buyers and can be said to have been one of the major drivers for the demands for A-marked appliances for new buildings and for replacement of appliances.



As a result of the broad political energy agreement reached on 23 February 2012, “Go’Energi” will be shut down, and its task split between the energy distribution companies, which will handle energy savings campaigning and the Danish Energy Agency, which will take over the rest. Whether or not this is an acceptable solution is still to be discussed, since the Danish Energy Agency will not be independent – and thus will have difficulties keeping up the top runner concept.

## **20. Heat Pump initiative for replacing old oil burners**

A pool of 30 million DKK over two years (2010 and 2011) for information campaigns, labelling of efficient pumps, limited subsidy schemes, etc. aimed at heating consumers outside of the areas with collective heat supply.

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

## **21. Scrapping of oil-fired boilers**

“Allocation of DKK 400 million to support the substitution of individual oil-based furnaces with modern, low-emission heating solutions, including systems based on renewable energy, such as heat pumps and solar heating. Reduces emissions by 0.05 million tonnes annually on average 2008–2012.”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

## **22. Banning of new oil-fired boilers**

### **“More renewable energy in buildings**

The agreement on 22 March 2012 supports the phasing-out of oil-fired boilers in existing buildings by:

- banning installation of oil-fired boilers and natural gas boilers in new buildings from 2013,
- banning installation of new oil-fired boilers in existing buildings in areas where district heating or natural gas is available from 2016,
- committing DKK 42 million in 2012-15 to fund the conversion from oil-fired boilers and natural gas boilers in existing buildings to renewable energy.”

*From “Short summary of the Energy agreement in Denmark from 22.3.2012”*

## **23. Mandatory for public authorities to make energy savings in their own buildings**

A statutory order on energy-efficiency in state institutions (including implementation of profitable energy savings, energy-efficient procurement, and energy-efficient behaviour and operation) made it mandatory for state authorities to make energy savings with a simple payback time of 5 years or less – identified through the energy certificate report for the buildings.

The agreement now also covers buildings owned by the regions, and under a voluntary agreement buildings owned by municipalities are also covered by the mandate.

## **24. Green public procurement**

The action plan for a renewed energy saving efforts from 2005 also contains a number of initiatives with the objective to save energy in the public sector. The main initiatives in this respect are:

Guidelines for procurement in the public sector, e.g. through preparation of environmental guidelines for large buyers in the public sector.

Energy labelling and energy-checking of large properties.

A club for public institutions, introduced by the Electricity Saving Trust.

The members of the club undertake only to buy energy-efficient appliances that meet specific requirements given in guidelines for procurement and in a positive list.

Campaigns by the Electricity Saving Trust for energy-efficient lighting, ventilation and office equipment, etc.

Consultancy by supply companies for institutions.

The Ministry of Finance is responsible for the governmental procurement policy. The purpose of the policy is to simplify and streamline governmental procurement. These requirements are explained in the Departmental Circular on Procurement.

The practical implementation of government procurement policy is performed by the State Procurement (Statens Indkøb). State Procurement has been established by the Ministry of Finance and is located at the Danish Agency of Modernisation. State Procurement makes framework agreements that all governmental institutions are obliged to use. Regions and municipalities can choose to use the governmental agreements.

While “Statens Indkøb” makes mandatory agreements for the state, the State and Municipal Procurement (“Statens og Kommunernes Indkøbsservice”/ SKI) makes voluntary agreements for the state and the municipalities. The state can use these for product groups where there are no mandatory agreements.

### **Regions**

The Association of Danish Regions coordinates the procurement strategy for the five regions in Denmark. They coordinate common projects, outsourcing, public-private partnerships and function as secretariat for the network of the regional Procurement Officers. The regions have established a common procurement strategy.

### **Municipalities**

Local Government Denmark (LGDK – the association of municipalities, in Danish KL) coordinates the procurement strategy for the Danish municipalities. A joint procurement strategy has been established for the municipalities. The strategy describes how the municipalities can optimize their procurement power and thereby obtain financial benefits. SKI (see above) does the work on behalf of KL, developing criteria for GPP etc. From January 2011 mandatory agreements for municipal procurement are also developed by SKI. The first to be completed is on copying and printing. It is only mandatory for municipalities that decide to join the system. 70 out of 98 municipalities have now decided to join these agreements.

#### *b) Implementation and development of GPP*

The Danish Ministry of the Environment has the overall responsibility for Danish GPP policy. The ministry focuses on the following areas:

- Intensified efforts to promote GPP within the following sectors: transportation, building and food
- Intensified efforts to promote GPP within the municipalities, since 2/3 of the public procurement budget is spent in the municipalities
- Intensified efforts to promote GPP in private companies
- Increase awareness of existing tools and advances in GPP and sustainable procurement

GPP/SRPP is an element of the governmental procurement strategy being implemented by State Procurement and SKI. State Procurement is responsible for the implementation of this strategy within state institutions.

The Danish Energy Agency has the overall responsibility for energy-efficient procurement in governmental institutions. The policy has been implemented in a Departmental Circular on Energy Efficiency. The Energy

Agency has also entered a voluntary agreement with Danish Regions and Local Government Denmark on energy-efficient procurement within the regions and municipalities. Mandatory agreements for municipalities are now also being reached, see above.

In 2008 The Danish Government published an action plan for corporate social responsibility (CSR). According to this action plan CSR should be implemented in all common procurement agreements, as stated in the conventions on which the principles of the UN Global Compact are based. The Danish Government Centre for CSR at the Commerce and Companies Agency has the task of implementing the action plan.

Large businesses (businesses over a certain size) and government-owned companies must report on CSR policies, strategies and actions in their annual business reports. The aim is to inspire businesses to take an active position on social responsibility and communicate this. The statutory requirement is part of the Government's action plan for CSR and is intended to help improve the international competitiveness of Danish trade and industry.

*Source: Mainstreaming GPP in the Nordic countries – a scoping study, Nordic Council of Ministers, 2012 – and Rikke Dreyer, SKI, 2 May 2012*

## **25. Loan possibility for local communities and regions for energy savings**

Regions and municipalities normally have very strict and government-regulated possibilities for taking loans. But when it comes to energy savings, new loans can be taken without having to consider these restrictions. This has the advantage of providing communities, municipalities and regional authorities with investment capital without the need to cut down on other activities in order to invest in profitable energy savings.

To be able to get those extra loans it is necessary that the energy savings project in question has been recommended in connection with the building energy certificate or a similar energy audit.

## **26. Action Plans for the Aquatic Environment I and II and Action Plan for Sustainable Agriculture**

“These action plans have, in particular, reduced the emissions of nitrous oxide.

There have presumably also been small effects on methane emissions from manure stores, particularly as a consequence of increased use of anaerobic fermentation of manure in biogas plants. The increased use of catch crops, larger areas with organic farming and re-establishment of wetlands must also be expected to lead to increased storage of carbon in the soil.”

“Most of the changes in nitrous oxide emissions from agriculture in the period since 1990 can be attributed to these action plans. However, it has been calculated that even without the action plans there would have been a reduction in emissions, although to a much lesser extent. The effect of these action plans on emissions of nitrous oxide has been calculated at about 2.2 million tones of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents/year<sup>19</sup>.

There are no estimates of the effect of the Action Plans I and II on the Aquatic Environment and the Action Plan for Sustainable Agriculture on carbon storage in the soil.”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

Name of measure or initiative	Objective	GHG affected	Type of instrument	Status for implementation	Implementing entity/ player	CO <sub>2</sub> reduction in 2001 mill. tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	Emissions reduction 2010 mill. tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> eq.
<b>Agriculture</b>							
Action Plan for the Aquatic Environment I-II and Action Plan for Sustainable Agriculture	Reduction of N run-off from agriculture by 100,000 t N/year	N <sub>2</sub> O	Regulation (order), economic, information	Implemented (1987, 1991, 1998)	State and county authorities	1.6	2.2
Action Plan for the Aquatic Environment III	Further reduction of N and P losses from agriculture	N <sub>2</sub> O	Regulation (order), economic	Implemented (2004)	State and county authorities		0.2 <sup>1</sup>
Ban on burning straw on fields	Less air pollution	N <sub>2</sub> O	Regulation (order)	Implemented (1989)	State and county authorities		
Ammonia action plan and the new statutory order on manure	Reduced emissions of ammonia	N <sub>2</sub> O	Regulation (order)	Implemented (2001)	State and county authorities		0.03
Planting of windbreaks	Binding of CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	Economic (subsidies)	Implemented (1960s)	State		0.14
Biogas plant	Reduced CO <sub>2</sub> and methane emissions and better exploitation of manure	CO <sub>2</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O and CH <sub>4</sub>	Economic (subsidies)	Implemented (1987)	State	0.2	0.036

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

## 27. Ban on burning straw in fields

“The purpose of the ban has been to reduce air pollution from the burning of straw. The ban has resulted in greater recycling of carbon into the soil and increased use of straw as a fuel. Both uses will result in a net reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Not burning straw prevents emissions of methane and nitrous oxide associated with burning. On the other hand, there are some emissions of nitrous oxide in connection with the recycling of nitrogen into the soil when the straw is ploughed into the soil.

The measure works by regulating behaviour, and the ban was introduced from 1990. The measure was implemented in the form of a statutory order under the Environmental Protection Act, and compliance is monitored by the local authorities.

The initiative has also caused increased carbon storage in the soil, but this has not been quantified separately so far.”

For effect see the table above.

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

## 28. Ammonia action plan and statutory order on manure

“Ammonia emitted from agriculture will stimulate emissions of nitrous oxide when it is deposited in other ecosystems. Reducing ammonia evaporation will therefore also result in a reduction of nitrous oxide emissions. An Ammonia Action Plan which was adopted in 2001 will, together with the Action Plan for the Aquatic Environment I and II, reduce ammonia emissions by 15-20,000 tonnes of nitrogen annually. This means that ammonia evaporation from agriculture should be reduced from 90,000 tonnes of nitrogen in the mid 1990s to approx. 60,000 tonnes of nitrogen in 2004.

The measures covered by the Ammonia Action Plan are:

1. Optimisation of manure handling during housing of cattle, pigs, poultry and fur animals.
2. Rules on covering storage facilities for solid manure and slurry tanks.
3. Ban on surface spreading and reduction of the time from field application of manure to incorporation.
4. Ban on ammonia treatment of straw.

These measures are estimated to lead to a reduction in emissions of nitrous oxide corresponding to 34,000 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents annually by 2010. A shorter period of manure spreading has the greatest effect of 13,000 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents annually.

The main reason for the drop in the emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O in the agricultural sector of 31% from 1990 to 2007 is legislation to improve the utilization of nitrogen in manure. The legislation has resulted in less nitrogen excreted per unit of livestock produced and a considerable reduction in the use of mineral fertilizers.”

See the table in topic 26.

“Means: Ammonia action plan and the new statutory order on manure

Purpose: Reduced emissions of ammonia – will also lead to reduction of N<sub>2</sub>O

Authority: Implemented (2001) State and county<sup>10</sup> authorities

Reduction: 0.03 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

According to the EU directive on National Emission Ceilings (NEC directive), Denmark should reduce its total emissions of ammonia to 69,000 tons per year by 2010. The goal was achieved.

Source: <https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=12631>

---

10 Denmark had 14 counties. In 2007 they were changed to 5 regions

## 29. Planting of windbreaks

“The objective of planting windbreaks is to reduce wind erosion and ensure greater biodiversity. Planting of windbreaks is supported under conditions described in the Statutory Order on subsidies for planting windbreaks and biotope-improving measures (Statutory Order no. 1101 of 12/12/2002). Support is granted under the EU Rural Districts Programme. Since the end of the 1960s about 1,000 km of tree-lined windbreaks have been planted with government subsidies. It is also estimated that about 30% more has been planted without subsidies. Estimates indicate that planting of windbreaks leads to CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in woody biomass of about 130,000 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>/year.”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

## 30. Biogas plants

Biogas from digestion of manure and organic wastes has a number of advantages when used to substitute fossil energy: reductions in emissions of greenhouse gases, better utilization of manure as fertilizer, recycling and use of organic wastes for energy and fertilizer purposes, including recycling of phosphorous.

In order to ensure renewed growth the politically fixed subsidy on the sales price of electricity production based on biogas was adjusted by the Energy Policy Agreement of 21 February 2008. The agreement resulted in the Law on Promotion of Renewable Energy of 27 December 2008. All new and existing biogas plants have since 2008 received a fixed electricity price of 0.745 DKK per kWh or a fixed-price premium of 0.405 DKK per kWh when biogas is used in heat and power plants. The fixed electricity price and price premium is adjusted by 60% of the increase in the net price index.

As part of the Green Growth plan from 2009 (see above) the government set a goal for utilization of 50% of Danish manure for biogas. Consequently the latest projection from the Danish Energy Agency expects an increase in biogas production from 4 PJ in 2007 to 12 PJ in 2020. This is expected to imply a five- to six-fold increase in the volume of manure digested, meaning that close to 30 percent of all manure will be used for biogas generation before 2020.

The increase is expected to result in annual emissions of methane and nitrous oxide from agriculture being additionally reduced by approx. about 0.2 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents by 2020. An additional reduction of 0.4 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> in greenhouse gas emissions from the energy sector is expected by 2020 due to reduced CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from substitution of fossil fuels, primarily natural gas, with the increased production of biogas.

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

### **“Better framework conditions for biogas expansion**

A more ambitious plan for biogas expansion will be implemented. With a view to putting this expansion on the right track and achieving the necessary progress, the agreement includes the following elements:

- The current funding of biogas for CHP is to be increased,
- Other opportunities for using biogas – in the natural gas grid, in industrial processes or in the transport sector – are to be made financially more attractive by introducing a series of new funding schemes,
- Capital installation subsidies are to be increased from 20% to 30%,
- A task force is to be established. This task force is to support specific projects and make recommendations for additional initiatives, if, in 2012-13, it is assessed that the expansion process is too slow.”

As part of the general energy agreement from 22 March 2012 it was also decided to increase the fixed electricity price from biogas plants to DKK 1.15 per kWh. This is expected to secure the implementation of the above-mentioned goal.

*Source: Danish Energy agreement of 22.3.2012*

### **31. Afforestation on agricultural land and elsewhere**

The Danish Forest and Nature Agency<sup>11</sup> is responsible for policies on afforestation on private agricultural land and on state-owned land. Afforestation on 18,000 hectares of privately owned farmland, corresponding to additional binding of 323,000 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>, was subsidized in 1990-2007. The state, counties, and municipalities have contributed approx. 7,200 hectares of new forest since 1990.

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

### **32. Taking vulnerable agricultural areas out of production**

“The government (Venstre and De Konservative [Venstre, the Danish Liberal Party and The Danish Conservative Party]) and Dansk Folkeparti [The Danish Peoples’ Party]) have signed an agreement on Green Growth. The purpose of the agreement is to ensure that a high level of environmental, nature and climate protection goes hand in hand with modern and competitive agriculture and food industries.

To support establishment of a total of 75,000 ha of new nature by 2015, including:

- About 800 ha of new woods close to urban areas.
- About 6,900 ha of new private woods.
- About 13,000 ha of wetlands and river valleys.
- About 4.300 ha of new nature in Natura 2000 sites.
- About 50,000 ha of spray-, fertilizer- and cultivation-free buffer zones.
- Establishment and operation of five national parks with walking trails, cycling and riding trails, bird hides and overnight accommodation”

*Source: “Agreement on Green Growth”, Danish Parliament, June 16th 2009*

---

11 Today just called the Nature Agency

### **“Fewer greenhouse gases**

- Reduction of the agricultural sector’s emissions of greenhouse gases by an anticipated 800,000 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> annually as a consequence of the energy, nature and environment initiatives proposed in Green Growth.
- The opportunities for further reduction of emissions from the agricultural sector using a market-based model (quotas/taxes) will be analysed in more detail. This analysis will be integral to a collective, cross-sectional analysis of possible instruments within the European Climate Action and Renewable Energy package for the entire non-quota area. The analysis will be presented in the autumn of 2009.
- The government will present a collective, cost-effective climate strategy for the non-quota area up to 2020 based on this analysis.”

*Source: “Agreement on Green Growth”, Danish Parliament, June 16th 2009*

### **33. Ban on combustible waste in land fills**

“The emission of methane from Danish landfills is calculated to have been 71,100 tonnes gross in 1990, increasing to a maximum of 76,500 tonnes in 1996, corresponding to 1.6 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents. As a consequence of the ban on landfill disposal of waste suitable for combustion, from 1 January 1997, methane emissions from Danish landfill sites will fall in the years ahead. Annual emissions of methane in 2008-2012 are thus, calculated to be 63,000 tonnes, corresponding to approx. 82% of the maximum in 1996.

The total quantity of waste incinerated rose from 2,216,000 tonnes in 1994 to 3,489,000 tonnes in 2006, i.e. an approximately 57% increase. The energy produced from the incineration plants is included as part of the renewable energy production in the Danish energy statistics. The international greenhouse gas inventories include greenhouse gases from incineration of the content of oil-based products, such as plastics in waste.

In accordance with the targets in the Waste Strategies, waste incineration plants are designed so as to optimize energy utilization.

Besides the direct effect of waste management on greenhouse gas emissions, the emissions are also affected indirectly through recycling of paper, cardboard, plastic, metals, etc., which means less energy consumption and thus lower CO<sub>2</sub> emissions during the production of raw materials and new products.”

“Means: Obligation to send combustible waste to incineration (in practice a ban on landfilling).

Purpose: Reduce landfilling, energy production, larger recycling, CH<sub>4</sub> reduction

Authority: Implemented State and local authorities

Effects: CO<sub>2</sub> reduction in 2001: 0.02 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> reduction in 2010: 0.3 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>”

*Source: Denmark’s Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

TABLE 4.23 MEASURES WITHIN THE WASTE SECTOR TO REDUCE EMISSIONS OF GREENHOUSE GASES.  
Source (on effects): Danish EPA and Denmark's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions - the effort in the period 1990-2001 and the associated costs

Name of measure or initiative Waste sector	Objective	GHG affected	Type of instrument	Status for implementation	Implementing entity/player	CO <sub>2</sub> reduction in mill. tonnes CO <sub>2</sub>		
						in 2001	in "2010"	in 2020
Obligation to send combustible waste to incineration (in practice a ban on landfilling).	Reduce landfilling, energy production, greater recycling, CH <sub>4</sub> reduction	CH <sub>4</sub>	Regulation (admin.)	Implemented	State and local authorities	0.02	0.3	
The waste tax	Greater recycling, least possible landfilling	CH <sub>4</sub>	Economic	Implemented	State authorities /waste plants			
Weight-and-volume-based packaging taxes	Waste reduction	CH <sub>4</sub> , CO <sub>2</sub>	Economic	Implemented	State authorities			
Subsidy programme – Enterprise Scheme (special scheme for businesses)	Reduce environmental impacts from waste	CO <sub>2</sub> and CH <sub>4</sub>	Financial	Implemented	State authorities			
Increased recycling of waste plastic packaging	22,5% recycling of waste plastic packaging in 2008 onwards	CO <sub>2</sub>	Regulation	Implemented	State and local authorities/ enterprises and the public		0.005	
Implementation of the EU landfill directive	More focus on gas in environmental approvals, less waste to landfills	CH <sub>4</sub>	Regulation	Implemented	State and local authorities			
Support for (construction of facilities for) gas recovery at landfill sites	Increase CH <sub>4</sub> recovery at landfills	CH <sub>4</sub>	Financial	Discontinued	State authorities	0.2	0,10	
Subsidy programme for cleaner products	Waste reduction, pollutants out of waste	CH <sub>4</sub>	Financial	Discontinued	State authorities			
The waste tax on incineration of waste	Greater recycling, least possible landfilling	CH <sub>4</sub>	Economic	Discontinued	State authorities /waste plants			
Energy and CO <sub>2</sub> tax on waste incineration	To increase cost-effectiveness of waste incineration and improve the structure of tax on waste incineration	CO <sub>2</sub>	Economic	Implemented	State authorities/ waste plants			

Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009

### 34. Waste tax

The contribution of the waste sector to greenhouse gas emissions consists primarily of methane from the decomposition of organic waste that takes place at landfill sites. Greenhouse gas emissions from wastewater treatment include both methane (81%) and nitrous oxide (19%). Of the total greenhouse gas emissions from the waste sector – 1.4 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents in 2007, corresponding to 2.1% of total Danish greenhouse gas emissions – the proportion from landfills was 78%, and the proportion from wastewater was 22%.

Please note that all incineration of waste in Denmark is associated with energy utilization, which is why the emission of CO<sub>2</sub> from the incineration of plastic waste is included under the energy sector.

A tax on landfilling and incinerating waste was introduced in 1987. Since 1993 the tax has been differentiated to reflect the prioritization of the different forms of treatment. It thus costs most to deposit waste, less to incinerate it and no tax to recycle it. The waste tax has been increased several times

and it is now DKK 375 per tonne of waste for landfilling and DKK 330 per tonne of waste for incineration. The size of the tax thus provides an incentive to recycle as much of the waste produced as possible and to use non-recyclable, combustible waste as fuel in energy production instead of depositing it at a landfill site.

It is not possible to make a quantitative estimate of the effects of the various measures in the waste sector. The objectives in the national waste plans are related to waste amounts and their treatment. Developments are monitored through the annual waste statistics. However, changes in the treatment of waste cannot immediately be converted into changes in emissions of greenhouse gases.

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

The waste strategy expires in 2012. The government has declared that the next will be a resource strategy, with much more emphasis on waste minimization and recycling.

### **35. Package tax**

“Weight-and-volume-based taxes (e.g. on various packaging, carrier bags and PVC film) encourage a reduction in packaging consumption and thus the quantities of waste. The weight-based tax is based on an index that reflects the environmental burden of the materials used.”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

### **36. Recycling of waste packaging plastics**

“As a result of the EU Packaging Directive, collection of plastic packaging waste for recycling has been increased to 22.5%, corresponding to an increase in recycling of about 11,000 tonnes of plastic per year from 2008, through an amendment to the Statutory Order on Waste requiring municipalities to improve the opportunities for people and enterprises to separate and deliver plastic packaging waste for recycling.”<sup>12</sup>

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

### **37. Support for gas recovery at landfill sites**

“According to the Danish Energy Authority's inventory, Biogas, Production, Forecast and Target Figures, Denmark had in total 25 landfill gas plants in the autumn of 2002. These installations produced 10,000 tonnes of methane annually, compared to approx. 1,700 tonnes in 1993. In 2004, methane recovery from landfills amounted to 7,700 tonnes methane. The same study shows that, through optimizing existing plants, a further 1,800 tonnes of methane

---

12 In spite of this, Danish recycling is on a low level compared with several other Northern European countries.

per year could be recovered over the next five years. Furthermore, the establishment of new gas-collection equipment at five landfills could contribute an additional 1,300 tonnes of methane per year over the next five years.

As a consequence of the new landfill strategy, only a few landfill gas plants are expected to be established in the future. The maximum quantity of methane recovered peaked in 1998 at about 13,200 tonnes. The quantity of methane recovered will continue to fall gradually over many years.

On the basis of the above, net emissions of methane (methane produced minus methane recovered) from Danish landfill sites have been calculated at 63,600 tonnes in 1990, rising to 65,900 tonnes in 1993, and then falling steadily to 51,800 tonnes in 2012. The average annual net methane emissions in 2008–2012 correspond to about 1.1 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents.”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

## Appendix 1:


### Emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> from energy consumption and overall greenhouse gas emissions

Observed CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from energy consumption rose by 0.8% in 2010. Adjusted for fuel consumption linked to foreign trade in electricity and fluctuations in climate, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions decreased by 4.9%.

Since 1990 Danish-adjusted CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from energy consumption were reduced by 23.2%.

A preliminary statement of Denmark's total observed emissions of greenhouse gases shows an increase of 0.7% from 2009 to 2010. Compared with the base year, observed emissions decreased by 11.4%.


### Danish emissions of Greenhouse gases 2010



Source: Danish Energy Statistics 2010 – Danish Energy Agency

### Historical Emissions of GHG in Denmark

#### CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from energy consumption



The figure shows emissions of greenhouse gases, excluding the effects of CO<sub>2</sub> removal in forests and land use.


Observed emissions of greenhouse gases were 61.0 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent in 2009, which is 4.2% less than in 2008. Compared with the base year, observed emissions decreased by 12.0%.

Adjusted for climate fluctuations and fuel consumption linked to foreign trade in electricity, emissions of greenhouse gases were 61.4 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents in 2009, which is 6.3% less than in 2008. Compared with the base year, observed emissions decreased by 20.6%.

Source: National Environmental Research Institute [www.dmu.dk](http://www.dmu.dk)

Source: Danish Energy Statistics 2010 – Danish Energy Agency

### Observed net-emissions of greenhouse gases by origin



Emissions from energy consumption make the largest contribution to total net emissions of greenhouse gases. Such emissions derive from the energy and transformation sector as well as from final energy consumption. The second-largest contribution derives from agriculture.

In 2009, observed emissions were: Emissions from energy consumption 79.8%, emissions from agriculture 16.0%, industrial processes, flaring etc. 3.7%, forests and land use -1.9%, and other emissions, 2.2%.

Source: National Environmental Research Institute [www.dmu.dk](http://www.dmu.dk)

Source: The Danish Energy Agency: Energy Statistics 2010

### Carbon dioxide, CO<sub>2</sub>

The figure below shows the expected development in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Denmark's economic sectors. The biggest source of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Denmark is combustion of fossil fuels, including electricity, heat production and transport.


“The transport sector has had the biggest increase in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions since 1990, and the emissions are expected to continue rising for the whole of the projection period. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the transport sector were 10,528 Gg of CO<sub>2</sub> in 1990 and had risen to 13,986 Gg of CO<sub>2</sub> in 2007, whereas the projection for 2008-2012 is 13,585 Gg of CO<sub>2</sub> annually. Emissions from

energy production, including conversion and distribution, have varied in 1990-2007 due to great variations in exports/imports of energy.

Total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions without land-use change and forestry (LUCF) were 52,793 Gg in 1990 and 53,228 Gg in 2007, while for the period 2008-2012 it has been calculated that the average annual CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will be 53,000 Gg CO<sub>2</sub>.

Another reason for not including the LULUCF sector in the projections is that only specific parts of the emissions and removals estimated in accordance with the rules under the UNFCCC are to be taken into account under the Kyoto Protocol's Articles 3.3 and 3.4 in the period 2008-2012. And for the period after 2012, the effect of activities in the LULUCF sector on Denmark's efforts to achieve its post-2012 reduction targets will not be known until detailed accounting rules have been decided for the accounting of emissions and removals in the LULUCF sector under an international post-2012 agreement."

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*



## Nitrous oxide, N<sub>2</sub>O


"Agriculture is by far the main source of emissions of nitrous oxide because it forms in soil through bacterial conversion of nitrogen in fertilizer and manure. The projections are shown in Figure 5.8. The main reason for the reduction in total nitrous oxide emissions from 10,527 Gg of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents in 1990 to 6,780 Gg of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents in 2007 is a combination of the Action Plans for the Aquatic Environment I and II and the Action Plan for Sustainable Agriculture. The projection for 2008-12 is 6,674 Gg of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents annually. This substantial reduction is not least due to the fact that Denmark ceased to produce nitrous acid in 2004, as shown under the

Business sector (industrial processes) in Figure 5.8. Contributions from the transport and energy sectors are expected to increase, whereas contributions from agriculture are expected to be somewhat less than in 2001.”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

**FIGURE 5.8 PROJECTIONS OF DENMARK'S NITROUS OXIDE EMISSIONS IN 2008-25, EMISSIONS IN 1990-2007 ARE OBSERVED**

Source: 1990-2007: The National Inventory Report (NIR), NERI, April 2009.  
2008-2025: Projection of greenhouse gas emissions 2007 to 2025, NERI, February 2009




## Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>)

“Most of the methane emissions come from farm animals’ digestive systems (enteric fermentation). The projections are shown in Figure 5.7. The very small changes in emissions from agriculture from 1990 to 2012 and the continued reductions in the projection period are primarily due to very little changes in cattle stocks. The second largest source of methane is landfills, from which emissions were also reduced from 1990 to 2007. Methane emissions from the energy sector have, however, increased considerably during the same period, due to an increase in the use of gas-driven motors. This has altogether led to an increase in total methane emissions from 5,695 Gg of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents in 1990 to 5,748 Gg of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents in 2007, whereas the projection for 2008-2012 is lower, i.e. 5,702 Gg of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents annually.”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

FIGURE 5.7 PROJECTIONS OF DENMARK'S METHANE EMISSIONS 2008 – 25, EMISSIONS IN 1990-2007 ARE OBSERVED

Source: 1990-2007: The National Inventory Report (NIR), NERI, April 2009.  
2008-2025: Projection of greenhouse gas emissions 2007 to 2025, NERI, February 2009



### Industrial gases HFCs, PFCs and SF<sub>6</sub>

“In accordance with the possibilities offered in the Kyoto Protocol, Denmark has chosen 1995 as the base year for emissions of the industrial gases, or F-gases, HFCs, PFCs and SF<sub>6</sub>. Total emissions of these gases corresponded to 326 Gg of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents in 1995 and annual emissions have more than doubled since the year 2000. The rate of increase has decreased since 2003, when emissions corresponded to 746 Gg of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents. In the projections, total F-gas emissions are expected to peak in 2008 at 895 Gg of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents.


As can be seen from Figure 5.9, the trends for the three individual types of F-gas are very different due to the different uses of these gases. With HFCs being the major contributor, the trend for HFC emissions follows the trend for total F-gas emissions closely.

The slowdown in the rate of increase is primarily due to taxes and regulations introduced concerning the use of new installations/products. For the period 2008-12, total emissions of industrial gases corresponding to 786 Gg of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents annually are projected, after which a major reduction in emissions of HFCs is expected and will result in a considerable reduction in emissions of industrial gases following the first period of commitment.”

*Source: Denmark's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change, December 2009*

FIGURE 5.9 PROJECTIONS OF DENMARK'S INDUSTRIAL GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS (THE F-GASES) IN 2008-25, EMISSIONS IN 1995-2007 ARE OBSERVED

Source: 1990-2007: The National Inventory Report (NIR), NERI, April 2009  
 2008-2025: Projection of greenhouse gas emissions 2007 to 2025, NERI, February 2009





ESTONIA

## Best GHG mitigation measures in Estonia.

Compiled by Valdur Lahtvee, Senior Research Fellow, SEI Tallinn Centre.

Measures were discussed and ranked by members of Estonian Council of Environmental NGOs ([www.eko.org.ee/](http://www.eko.org.ee/)) and the Estonian Renewable Energy Association ([www.taastuenergeetika.ee/en/](http://www.taastuenergeetika.ee/en/)).

### Current situation with GHG emissions.

Estonia, officially the Republic of Estonia, is a state in the Baltic region of Northern Europe. It is bordered to the north by the Gulf of Finland, to the west by the Baltic Sea, to the south by Latvia (343 km), and to the east by Lake Peipsi and the Russian Federation (338.6 km). Across the Baltic Sea lies Sweden in the west and Finland in the north. The Estonian territory covers 45,227 square kilometres, and is influenced by a temperate seasonal climate. Estonia is a democratic parliamentary republic and is divided into 15 counties and 246 municipalities. About 69% of the population is urban. The capital and largest city is Tallinn. With a population of 1.34 million, Estonia is one of the least-populous members of the European Union, Eurozone and NATO. Today, Estonia has the highest GDP per person of any country that used to be part of the Soviet Union. GDP, PPP was 27,616,870,958 USD (2010), equivalent to 20,608 USD per capita.

**Table 1: GDP development of Estonia**


		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Gross domestic product (GDP)	billion USD current PPPs	25.7	28.5	29.2	26.6	27.6
GDP per capita	USD current PPPs	19 134	21 262	21 802	19 876	20 608
Gross national income (GNI) per capita	USD current PPPs	18 134	19 795	20 626	19 414	19 682
Household disposable income (deflated)	Annual growth %	10.8	11.8	0.4	-6.7	-2.7

Source: OECD

Estonia is listed as a high-income economy by the World Bank and a high-income OECD member. The United Nations lists Estonia as a developed country with a Human Development Index of “Very High”. The country is also ranked highly for press freedom, economic freedom, democracy and political freedom and education.


The energy and material content of Estonian GDP are 4-5 times higher than the EU average due to the low efficiency of energy production and dependency of the energy sector on domestic mineral-rich oil shale and the low efficiency of natural resource use.

Table 3: Material productivity of Estonian GDP (EUR/kg)



Source: Eurostat


Table 4: Material productivity of EU member states 2007



Source: Eurostat


Estonia’s energy production is heavily dependent on imported liquid fossil fuels for the transport sector and domestic oil shale for electricity production. The natural gas share of energy production is modest, but all gas is imported from the neighbouring Russian Federation. The share of renewable fuels and sources in primary energy production is relatively high due to the tradition of using biomass (wood) for heat production by households. Recent years are witnessing rapid deployment of wind power and biomass use in electricity production due to purchase obligations and attractive feed-in tariffs designed to support renewable electricity since 2007. Basic energy data from 2006 to 2010 (where available) are presented in the following tables. Availability of domestic renewable energy resources (wind, biomass) in Estonia is several times higher than needed to cover the energy demand of the country.

Table 5: Energy production in Estonia.



Source: World Bank

**Table 6: Energy use in Estonia**




Source: World Bank

**Table 7: Final energy consumption**




Source: World Bank

**Table 8: Share of renewable energy in gross final energy consumption**



Source: Eurostat

**Table 9: Primary energy production from renewable sources**




Source: Eurostat

**Table 10: Electricity production in Estonia**




Source: World Bank

**Table 11: Electricity consumption in Estonia**




Source: World Bank

**Table 12: Electricity production from renewable sources in Estonia**



Source: Estonia's national report to EU Commission on RES development, 2011


**Table 13: Distribution of renewable energy production by source**



Source: Estonia's national report to the EU Commission on RES development, 2011


Due to the high concentration of power production, the fact that the majority of the electricity production in condensing oil shale power plants with an efficiency of 32-36%, the high share of fossil fuels in energy production and the relatively high losses during the distribution of electricity and heat and during final use, Estonia's energy sector and economy as a whole are high emitters of greenhouse gases. Per capita GHG emissions were 12.43 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents in 2009.

**Table 14: Emission of Greenhouse Gases (GHG) in Estonia**



Source: UNFCCC


**Table 15: GHG emissions per capita in Estonia**



Source: UNFCCC

The energy sector has been the biggest emitter of GHG in Estonia, accounting for about 70% of total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in 2010. When looking for possible mitigation measures one must note that the household share of energy consumption is relatively high and still growing, and exceeded 30% in 2010. Agriculture and services have a relatively small share, accounting together for about 20%, while industry and the transport sector each have a share of around 25%.

**Table 16: Energy consumption by sectors in Estonia**




Source: Enerdata

Over the period 1995-2009 primary energy intensity (primary energy consumption per unit of GDP) fell at the rapid pace of 4.4 percent/year, which is more than twice as fast as the EU average. Nevertheless, the country's primary energy intensity, measured at purchasing power parity, remains 82 percent higher than the EU average. Final energy intensity (final energy consumption per unit of GDP) decreased slightly less rapidly (by 3.8 percent/year). Such

improvement in energy efficiency is linked to the sharp decrease in the energy intensity of the industrial sector (-7.4 percent/year between 1995 and 2008); efficiency gains were lower between 2000 and 2008 (-4.1 percent/year), which in part limited the reduction in final energy intensity over that period. The main reasons behind the shift towards higher efficiency are structural changes in production towards less resource- and energy-consuming products and the assembly of pre-produced products, as well as the replacement of old technologies with modern and technology that is more energy efficient.

CO<sub>2</sub> intensity (CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per unit of GDP) fell by 5.2 percent/year between 1995 and 2009; 47 percent of this improvement was achieved through the fall in final energy intensity, 22 percent through efficiency gains in the energy transformation sector and 21 percent through fuel substitutions in favour of low-carbon energies. Despite this rapid improvement, Estonia's CO<sub>2</sub> intensity remains more than twice as high as the EU average, which is mainly due to the importance of oil shale in the country's energy supply.

**Table 17: Estonian CO<sub>2</sub> emissions 2000-2010**



*blue line – CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from electricity production, Mt*

*red line – Estonia's total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, Mt*

*Source: Estonian Environmental Information Centre*

Between 1996 and 2009, the ODEX for the household sector as a whole decreased by 27%. Due to poor statistics on energy consumption in households, the efficiency analysis has to be based mainly on case studies and expert estimations. The efficiency improvement (2.4%) is to a great extent a result of the renovation of building envelopes – additional insulation of outer walls and roofs, replacing windows, etc. An important factor has been the introduction of heat metering (incl. hot water meters in apartments) which gives incentive to take efficiency measures. The specific heat consumption in new dwelling houses is lower due to more strict thermal standards in building codes. At the same time, there is an opposite trend – new dwellings are larger and higher living standards need more energy. The latest study on energy consumption in multi-flat dwellings, which were built as standard during the 1970s in the Capital area (Tallinn Technical University, 2010), revealed that the average energy use of households is 238 kWh/m<sup>2</sup> per year, of which space heating accounts for 62%, water heating accounts for 13% and electricity for running household equipment accounts for 25% of total energy use.

### **GHG mitigation measures in Estonia**

In order to mitigate climate change, Estonia is implementing a range of policy measures including setting quantitative goals and targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; establishing energy efficiency requirements for buildings and introducing energy efficiency labelling systems for buildings, equipment and vehicles; providing credit, guarantees and support for energy efficiency renovation of buildings for both the private and public sectors; implementing tax reforms which largely focus on increased taxation of fossil

energy products; supporting research and development and raising awareness of energy efficiency, energy saving and climate, as well as promoting the development of renewables through purchase obligations and feed-in tariffs for electricity produced from renewables and from efficient co-generation. At the same time the government has not yet abolished, either direct or indirect subsidies for oil shale energy production, which are several times higher than the support for renewable energy, distort the energy market and do not give fair treatment to all energy producers. Full deregulation of the electricity market opening is expected after 1 January 2013, but at present the market is open for about 30–40% of larger consumers but not for households.

Mandatory targets set by the Directive on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources for Estonia are as follows:

25% share of RES on the final consumption of energy in 2020;

at least 10% share of renewable energy in final consumption of energy in transport by 2020.

Indicative Target set by the RES electricity European Directive from 2001 is a 5.1% share of renewable electricity on gross electricity consumption by 2010. Actual share in 2010 was about 9.5%.

Indicative Target set by the European Biofuels Directive from 2003 is for biofuels consumption of 5.75% of petrol and diesel use for transport in 2010. Actual share of biofuels use as motor fuels in Estonia in 2010 was 0.2%.

The “Long-term national development plan for the fuel and energy sector until 2015” adopted through a decision by parliament on 15 December 2004 set following targets:

- a target for biofuels of 2% by 2006 and 5.75% by 2011, calculated on the basis of energy value.
- share of renewable sources 12% of gross national energy consumption by 2010. This target has already been achieved due to a high share of wood and wood waste for heat production
- share of renewable electricity 5.1% of gross national electricity consumption by 2010 and 8% by 2015 .

The strongest incentive for the development of renewable energy production in Estonia has been a purchase obligation and feed-in tariffs for electricity produced from renewable sources and from efficient co-generation, which were introduced in 2001. In May 2007 a scheme for subsidizing renewable sources and cogeneration was changed and tariffs were increased significantly. According to the scheme producers had two options: either to sell electricity at a fixed purchase obligation price or receive a subsidy and sell electricity at a market price. According to the system established in 2007 the subsidies for production from renewable sources were paid only in cases where the production equipment capacity was below 100 MW. In July 2009 the amendments to the electricity Market Act removed the capacity limitation. As a result of this, Narva Power Plants also received the subsidy, when they used wood chips in addition to oil shale fuel in electricity production. The amendment had a substantial effect on the subsidy payments, raising the total subsidy amount in 2009 to €25.9 million. €4.7 million of this, or 18%, was paid to

Narva Power Plants. In 2010 the respective figures were €45 million, or 26%.

Subsidy-related issues were further amended in February 2010. The most significant change in the system of subsidies payable to producers was the abandoning of the purchase obligation. At the same time the circle of undertakings eligible for subsidies was enlarged. With effect from 27 February 2010 producers have the right to receive subsidies in the following cases and amounts:

beginning from 1 July 2010 for electricity produced from renewable sources, excluding biomass, 5.37 €cent/kWh;

beginning from 1 July 2010 for the electricity, if it is produced from biomass in a cogeneration process, 5.4 €cent/kWh. If the electricity is produced from biomass in a condensing process then it is not subject to the subsidy. In this case it is a new stipulation that is intended for the limitation of inefficient use of renewable resources;

for electricity produced in an efficient cogeneration process from waste as defined in the Waste Act, from peat or from the pyrolysis gas of oil shale processing 3.2 €cent/kWh;

for electricity produced in an efficient cogeneration process using production equipment with a capacity not exceeding 10 MW, 3.2 €cent/kWh;

for the utilization of installed net capacity of production equipment using oil shale, if the production equipment started operation within the period 1 January 2013 to 1 January 2016, depending on the CO<sub>2</sub> quota price, 1.4-1.6 €cent/kWh.

Furthermore, the quantity of electricity produced from wind energy in Estonia and eligible for subsidy was increased from the earlier 400 GWh to the limit quantity of 600 MWh in a calendar year.

Increased tariffs have led to rapid growth in the installation of new RES capacity and the use of wood for co-generation in oil-shale power plants. The 2010 national target for the RES share of final electricity consumption, 5.1%, has been achieved and exceeded – the RES electricity share was 9.7%<sup>13</sup> in 2010. In 2011, renewable electricity made up 13% of total domestic consumption of electricity. Of the total contribution of RES electricity, 32% was produced from wind, 2% from hydro and 66% from biomass. In first half of 2012, RES electricity made up 20.4% of domestic electricity consumption.

Since 2010, the government has tripled support to housing cooperatives both by increasing credit guarantees and contributing direct investment grants for the renovation of houses for energy efficiency gains as well as allocating a big portion of revenues from sales of the CO<sub>2</sub> quotas (AAUs) via the Kyoto Emission Trade and national Green Investment Scheme for renovation of public sector buildings. Estonia has been successful in selling a surplus of Assigned Amount Units (AAUs) for saved CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to Japan, Liechtenstein, Spain and Austria, and revenues from sales have been used for investment support to private and public buildings, improvement and expan-

13 Elering AS varustuskindluse aruanne 2011 - [http://elering.ee/public/Infokeskus/Aruanded/Elering\\_Varustuskindluse\\_aruanne\\_2011.pdf](http://elering.ee/public/Infokeskus/Aruanded/Elering_Varustuskindluse_aruanne_2011.pdf)

sion of public transport and for the establishment of national infrastructure supporting electro-mobility. If support schemes remain as high in coming years, one may expect a relatively high rise in energy efficiency figures in the housing sector.

The use of fiscal instruments to increase resource and energy use efficiency in Estonia has been steadily strengthened in Estonia since June 2005, when the government adopted a National Strategy for Ecological Tax Reform. Since then, fees for environmental use (emission fees, fees for water use and water effluents, waste generation and landfill fees and natural resources extraction fees) were doubled and increased annually by an average of 20%. A tax on electricity produced from fossil fuels was also introduced in 2006. In the second phase of the Ecological Tax Reform, in 2010, further increases were introduced by doubling tariffs for major environmental emissions and resources, with annual tariffs rising at a fixed rate of 20% until 2015. Part of the second phase of ETR also consisted of rises in fuel and electricity taxes (to fill in revenue shortfalls after the 2009 economic crisis) and the elimination of excise tax reductions for use of fossil fuels for non-road vehicles and machinery in forestry, construction and mining sectors. Such exemptions still exist for agriculture and fisheries, but are planned to be removed in the near future and replaced with direct subsidies to the mentioned sectors. ETR was weakened by a decision in 2006 to exempt electricity producers from paying CO<sub>2</sub> emission fees as electricity excise was established.

Implementation of the EU Emissions Trade Directive covers CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from installations such as power stations, combustion plants, oil refineries and iron and steel works, as well as factories making cement, glass, lime, bricks, ceramics, pulp, paper and board. Altogether, 45 major installations were included in the scheme in 2005-2007 with total emissions of 56,859,003 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents and 47 installations with total emissions of 13,301,720 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents were allocated to the installations for the period 2008-2012. The Estonian National allocation plan was approved by the EU Commission as a compromise between Estonia's initial proposal and the Commission's proposed caps after rejection of national proposals by the Commission and European Court decision in favour of Estonia. During the period 2005-2008 the national allocation to the ETS installations amounted on average to 76.5% of national total annual CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Despite the fact that implementation of the ETS Directive and cap-and-trade system encouraged investments into energy and fuel efficiency in many industrial installations as well as fuel switches and increased use of renewable fuels for heat and electricity production, the expected sharp reduction in GHG emissions did not occur, since the first trading period allocation was too generous to the installations and the sale of excess allowances yielded extraordinary revenues for enterprises. In addition, the free allocation of allowances in both trading periods in Estonia did not generate significant reductions in GHG emissions at national level, because the reduction in power production capacities in the closed Baltic Energy market (the closure of Ighalina NPP second reactor in 2009) increased demand and doubled exports of Estonian oil shale electricity, and consequently increased CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from oil shale power plants.

From the National report to the EU Commission (2011), there can be highlighted other policy measures implemented in Estonia for the support of wider use of renewable energy as follows:

- investment support for wider use of sources of renewable energy in energy generation;
- investment support for bioenergy generation;
- investment support for adding value to forestry products;
- investment support for electricity producers who use wind as a source of energy;
- training sessions on regional energy planning to improve the administrative capacity of municipalities and their agencies with respect to coordination of energy efficiency activities;
- a thematic spatial planning for 4 counties related to wind energy development;
- devising legal bases for developing off-shore wind farms;
- electrical mobility programme in Estonia: Introduction of electric cars and their charging infrastructure as well as the introduction of electricity from renewable sources in the transport sector.

Comparing used mitigation measures by their scope and impact, major environmental NGOs and RES producers have prioritised the selected ten best mitigation measures according to their impact as follows:

No.	Name of the measure	Type	Achieved or expected result	Time and trends of application
1	Feed-in tariff and purchase obligation for electricity from renewable sources and fuels	Fiscal	RES share in domestic electricity consumption has increased 10 times - from 0.1% (2006) to 13% (2011), in real production from 128 GWh to 1181 GWh.	Started in 2001, sharp increase in tariffs from 2007, tariffs planned to be reduced from 01.01.2013 for new power producers, but increase expected to be continued +30% capacities increase per annum, as many wind projects underway.
2	Government subsidies for support of renovation of buildings in public sector and housing cooperatives aiming to increase energy efficiency	Fiscal	Average dwelling's heat energy consumption of buildings has fallen by 2% per year, slowing overall increase of energy end use (electricity consumption is expected to grow 2.4% per year). Overall existing renovations currently cover only 1.9% of building stock, whereas renovation rates need to be over 2 percent per annum to achieve retrofits by 2050.	Started in 1998, subsidy volumes declined in mid-2000s and sharply increased in 2010 due to the allocation of revenues from AAU sales.
3	Government subsidies through the Environmental Investment Centre for support of investments for the reconstruction of boiler houses, district heating networks and the construction of RES (wind, biomass, biogas) generation capacities.	Fiscal	Installed RES capacities increased 60-fold, from 2.4 MW (2003) to 132 MW (2010) incl. 5.1 MW biogas CHP, 7 MW biomass CHP and 25 MW wind generators installed by 2012 using EIC subsidies. Expected annual production 80 GWh.	2007-2013 (EU Structural Funds allocation). Support level continues until 2013, further support volume unknown.
4	Government subsidies for energy efficiency renovation and installation of small RES applications (heat pumps, wind, solar heat and PV) for single-family houses.	Fiscal	Installation of range of applications initiates wider acceptance of small RES use by households. Expected savings of 0.5% from total final energy consumption	Started 2012, further application depends on revenues from AAU sales.

5	Ecological tax reform.	Fiscal	Electricity excise and continuous emission fees increase lead to decrease in energy and resource intensity of GDP by 0.5 % per annum.	Started in 2006 by doubling emission and resource use fees and introducing electricity excise duty; II phase of ETR with doubling tariffs and reducing exemptions from fuel excise from 2010.
6	Adoption of stricter energy efficiency standards for design of buildings, U-values since 30.08.2012 in small private houses 160 kWh/(m <sup>2</sup> ); multi-storey dwellings 150 kWh/(m <sup>2</sup> ); offices 160 kWh/(m <sup>2</sup> ); industrial buildings 210 kWh/(m <sup>2</sup> ); public buildings 200 kWh/(m <sup>2</sup> ); schools 160 kWh/(m <sup>2</sup> ); nurseries 190 kWh/(m <sup>2</sup> ); hospitals 380 kWh/(m <sup>2</sup> ).	Regulative	New buildings are 70% more energy efficient than average. Annual energy savings about 2% of total heat energy.	2007, transposition and implementation of reformulated EPBD directive expected to generate further savings from 2013.
7	Establishment of regulations for use of sea bottom for construction of offshore installations.	Regulative	Creation of opportunity for seeking permits /consents for erection of offshore wind farms. 3 wind farm projects under preparation with expected installed capacity of 1490 MW.	2009, offshore wind farm installation expected to take place in 2013-2020.
8	Preparation of thematic spatial planning for development of wind energy in 4 counties in Western Estonia <sup>1</sup> .	Spatial Planning	Creating opportunity for speeding up permitting of construction of wind capacities in 4 counties, area covered by planning may allow up to 1300 MW of wind capacity. Increased acceptance of wind energy installation.	2012-2013 thematic plans adopted by County Governors. Other counties may follow approach from 2013 onwards.
9	Investment support to upgrade public transport infrastructure: purchase new efficient buses (120 for rural lines) and renting to operators, purchase of new diesel trains (10) and of new trams (16).	Technical, Fiscal	Reduction of total fossil vehicle fuel use by 0.5%, shift from private car use to use of public transport. Stop annual decline of 2% in public transport share of transported passengers.	Started in 2011-2012 (project finalised 2013). Continuation of measure unknown, depends on AAU transfer over 2012 and sales success.
10	National electromobility programme: construction of national network of charging stations, purchase of 500 electric vehicles (mostly used by municipal social workers) and subsidy for purchase of (500 x €18000) electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles for private use.	Technical, Fiscal	Reduction of fossil motor fuel use by 3000 t per year. Creation of increased fuel savings in the future by increased no. of electric vehicles.	05.2011 - 2012

It must be noted that quantitative and qualitative assessment of achieved or expected GHG reduction for individual policy measures is highly uncertain as no comprehensive evaluation has been conducted in Estonia for specific measures, and because most measures have been implemented simultaneously, so the exact impact of individual measures compared to other policy measures or other driving forces, such as changes in demand, impact of global financial and economic crisis etc., could not be eliminated while assessing the causes of trends in GHG emissions.

Tallinn, August 2012.



FINLAND

## Ten best mitigation measures in Finnish climate and energy policy

*Compiled by Meri Pukarinen (Finland)*

### Introduction

This paper identifies the ten most effective mitigation measures in Finnish climate and energy policy as part of a project to compile the best mitigation measures in the Baltic-Nordic region. This sub-project was undertaken by Meri Pukarinen, with Reinhold Pape at AirClim being the project manager. Three Finnish NGO experts ranked the mitigation measures.

This paper first introduces the general policy landscape and emission trends in Finland. Policy measures are then looked at from the following points of view: measures to meet the renewables target set by the EU, measures to meet the energy efficiency target set by the EU, measures to meet the emission reduction target imposed by the EU on the transport sector, and measures at the sub-national level to cut greenhouse gas emissions. A policy measure on the pre-implementation stage is discussed as its expected impact on GHG emissions is large. Finally, the measures are ranked. The appendix lists the NGO experts who ranked the measures.

### Trends in Finnish emissions

Finnish emissions vary significantly year-on-year, depending on the availability of hydropower in the Nordic countries as well as the severity of the winter and subsequent use of energy for heating. The overall trend is that of growing emissions throughout the 1990s and the 2000s, before the economic downturn of the recent years bent emissions downwards. The downward trend in emissions during the recession is, however, not likely to be sustained when the economy starts growing again unless new climate policy measures are introduced. The split in Finnish emissions between sectors and trends in emissions are as follows<sup>14</sup>:

<sup>14</sup> Finland's Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 12. See [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin\\_nc5.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin_nc5.pdf)

**Table 1.1**

Greenhouse gas emissions (+) and removals (–) by sector, 1990, 1995 and 1997–2007  
(million tonnes CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)


Sector	1990	1995	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Energy	54.6	56.3	60.3	57.2	56.6	54.6	59.9	62.5	70.0	65.9	54.3	65.6	63.6
Industrial processes <sup>1</sup>	4.9	4.5	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	5.2	5.4	5.3	5.3	5.7
F-gases <sup>2</sup>	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.9	0.8	0.9
Use of solvents and other products	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Agriculture	7.1	6.3	6.2	6.1	5.9	6.0	5.9	5.8	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.5
Waste	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.3	3.2	3.0	2.8	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>70.9</b>	<b>71.2</b>	<b>75.7</b>	<b>72.1</b>	<b>71.5</b>	<b>69.5</b>	<b>74.7</b>	<b>76.8</b>	<b>84.5</b>	<b>80.5</b>	<b>68.7</b>	<b>79.9</b>	<b>78.3</b>
Land use, land-use change and forestry <sup>3</sup>	-17.8	-16.6	-19.7	-16.6	-18.5	-18.4	-21.5	-22.5	-22.5	-23.3	-28.3	-32.2	-25.3

1 Excluding F-gases

2 F-gases refer to fluorinated greenhouse gases (HFC compounds, PFC compounds and SF<sub>6</sub>)

3 A negative figure denotes a net sink, which means that in this sector more greenhouse gases are absorbed from the atmosphere than are released into it.

*Greenhouse gas emissions in Finland in have developed in the following way in relation to the Kyoto target level for 2008–2012<sup>15</sup>:*



<sup>1</sup> CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent describes the warming effect of various gases in relation to CO<sub>2</sub>, e.g. 1 t of N<sub>2</sub>O is equivalent to 310 t of CO<sub>2</sub>

<sup>2</sup> Finland's base year under the Kyoto Protocol is 1990, except for the so-called F-gases (HFC, PFC and SF<sub>6</sub>) 1995. Finland's Kyoto target for 2008–2012 is estimated and fixed based on the reviewed base year inventory in the initial inventory submission under the Protocol

## Implementation of EU policy forms the basis of national policy

The requirements set by the EU guide Finnish climate and energy policy. Finland's emission reduction obligation under the Climate and Energy Package for sectors not covered by the EU ETS is 16 per cent by 2020, compared to 2005 levels. The package also requires Finland to increase its energy efficiency, as well as the share of biofuels in gasoline and diesel to 10 per cent by 2020. The use of renewable energy sources is to grow to 38 per cent of final energy consumption by 2020.<sup>16</sup>

In the traded sector, Finland argues it avoids double regulation and thereby relies on the EU-ETS to cut emissions union-wide, wherever it is most cost-efficient. As the EU-ETS currently suffers from historically low permit prices, which do not encourage investments in low-carbon technologies, this position is quite contestable. However, the Renewables Directive as well as the Energy Efficiency Directive affect the traded sector, and Finland has executed and planned measures to meet the targets set in the directives. By and large, however, Finnish decision-makers tend to focus on the emissions in the non-traded sector as they lie within the national jurisdiction.

### Overarching policy framework: climate and energy strategies

Finnish climate and energy policy is planned through so-called Climate and Energy Strategies<sup>17</sup>. These strategies have been prepared once in every government's term of office since 2001. In 2008, the Government approved the new Long-term Climate and Energy Strategy, with detailed proposals for climate and energy policy measures up to 2020, and suggestions up to 2050. The 'with measures' (WM) scenario in the most recent strategy, approved by the parliament, includes the implemented and adopted policies and measures with which the emission limitation target under the Kyoto Protocol will be achieved. The 'with additional measures' (WAM) scenario aims at meeting the objectives of the EU Climate and Energy Package. As a result of the domestic targets and measures, Finland's greenhouse gas emissions are forecast to decline by an estimated 23 per cent by 2020 compared to a situation without the new measures.<sup>18</sup> The VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland has, however, estimated that with the current policies and measures Finland will not reach the emission reduction target of 16% in the non-traded sectors by 2020, set by the EU. Emission reductions enabled by the current policies and measures will amount to a mere 7% emission reduction by 2020<sup>19</sup>.

When estimating the mitigation potential of different measures in the government's scenarios, a challenge arises: the emission reduction effect has not always been stated. This is explained to be due to there not being a "without

16 Finland's Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 14. See [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin\\_nc5.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin_nc5.pdf)

17 National Climate and Energy Strategy. See <http://www.tem.fi/index.phtml?l=en&s=2542>

18 Finland's Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 15. See [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin\\_nc5.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin_nc5.pdf)

19 Arvio ei-päästökaupparektorin päästövähennyskeinoista ja kustannuksista Suomessa. See <http://www.vtt.fi/news/2012/20120111paastovahennystavoitteet.jsp> (in Finnish)

measures” scenario. The point of view chosen as regards impact assessment is described as follows:

*“The WM [with measures] scenario does not state how probable or acceptable the final result will be. Neither does it assess the probability of the basic variables, such as economic growth or the trend in fuel prices on the world market. The scenario describes one vision that is internally consistent and is based on calculations with pre-defined starting points. From a greenhouse gas emissions point of view, the scenario represents a development path that shows the magnitude of new appropriate additional measures needed to reach the emissions targets”<sup>20</sup>.*

**Table 4.5**

Major policies and measures affecting greenhouse gas emissions in the energy sector in the 'with measures' (WM) scenario, 2007–2020

Policy	Objective	Type of instrument	Status	Estimated mitigation impact		
				2010	2015	2020
EU ETS	To reduce emissions, renewables	Economic	Implemented	na	na	na
Nuclear power	Supply of electricity	Regulatory, economic	Under construction, in use in 2013	0	About 8 Tg	About 8 Tg
Energy taxation	Energy saving, renewables	Fiscal	Implemented	na	na	na
Voluntary agreement scheme	Energy saving	Agreements	Implemented	4 Tg	na	na
Subsidies	Renewables, energy saving, R&D	Fiscal	Implemented	na	na	na
Regulatory measures	Energy efficiency, buildings	Regulatory	Implemented	na	na	na

na = Not available

*Source of the table: Finland’s Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 109. Please note the Olkiluoto 3 nuclear power plant, assumed to feed electricity to the grid in 2013 in the table above, is currently estimated to be in operation in 2016 – seven years behind schedule <sup>21</sup>.*

Where impact assessments are provided, estimated reductions in emissions are not specified per policy measure but shown in aggregate for different sectors<sup>22</sup>. This prevents us from actually estimating the impact of a specific policy measure.

20 Finland’s Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 138. See [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin\\_nc5.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin_nc5.pdf)

21 Finland’s Olkiluoto 3 reactor seen delayed to 2016. See <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/11/teollisuudenvoima-olkiluoto-idUSL5N0BBEZ520130211>

22 Finland’s Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 149. See [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin\\_nc5.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin_nc5.pdf)

**Table 1.5**

Effect of policies and measures on longer term trends: The estimated emissions in the WM and WAM scenarios in 2020 (million tonnes CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Sectors	2005	2006	2007	2020	
				WM	WAM
Transport	13.4	13.6	14.0	14.2	11.4
Space heating	3.1	3.0	3.1	2.6	1.2
Agriculture	5.6	5.6	5.5	5.7	5.1
F-gases	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.6	0.3
Waste management	2.4	2.5	2.4	1.8	1.7
Machinery	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.5
Other sources, of which:	7.7	7.2	7.5	8.4	7.5
• Non-ETS industry CO <sub>2</sub>	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.1
• Combustion, N <sub>2</sub> O	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.0
• Hydrogen production, CO <sub>2</sub>	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.8	0.8
<b>Non-ETS total</b>	<b>35.7</b>	<b>35.3</b>	<b>36.0</b>	<b>36.0</b>	<b>29.7</b>
<b>Emissions in the ETS sector</b>	<b>33.1</b>	<b>44.6</b>	<b>42.5</b>	<b>52.6</b>	<b>38.8</b>
<b>Total emissions</b>	<b>68.8</b>	<b>79.9</b>	<b>78.5</b>	<b>88.6</b>	<b>68.5</b>

Source of the table: Finland's Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 18<sup>23</sup>

The vague impact analysis of policies to cut greenhouse gas emissions has been criticized by the National Audit Office of Finland.<sup>24</sup> This has, however, neither resulted in an enhanced impact assessment analysis of the measures in the 2008 Climate and Energy Strategy nor guided the updating of the strategy which is currently in process. This represents a particular challenge to effective climate policy.

## Measures to meet the renewables target

The proportion of renewable energy in final consumption was 28.5 per cent in 2005<sup>25</sup>. In 2010, the proportion had risen to 33.1 per cent<sup>26</sup>. One of the NGO experts having ranked these measures highlights that this rise is, however, due to the good availability of hydropower on the Nordic market rather than active policy to increase the share of renewables in the energy mix. The relatively high share of renewables is due to the forest industry using their own process residues for energy. Finland aims to increase the proportion of renewable energy in final energy consumption to 38 per cent by 2020. This target is to be achieved by reducing energy consumption and increasing the use of renewables. Wood-based fuels, wind power and heat pumps will contribute most to the target.

23 "Machinery" refers to machines equipped with an internal combustion engine and used in, for example, agriculture or construction. Finland's Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 121

24 Valtionalouden tarkastusvirasto. See [http://www.e-julkaisu.fi/vtv/ilmastonmuutoksen\\_hillinta/pdf/ilmastonmuutoksen\\_hillinta\\_208.pdf](http://www.e-julkaisu.fi/vtv/ilmastonmuutoksen_hillinta/pdf/ilmastonmuutoksen_hillinta_208.pdf) (in Finnish)

25 Finland's Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 113. See [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin\\_nc5.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin_nc5.pdf)

26 European Commission. See [http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/reports/2011\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/reports/2011_en.htm)

## Measure 1: Feed-in tariff for wind power, biogas and wood-based fuels from plants

In September 2009 the working group set up by the Ministry of Employment and the Economy to consider the structure and size of renewable energy feed-in tariffs submitted its final report for a feed-in tariff for wind power and electricity generated from biogas. The working group suggested that a market-based guaranteed price be introduced for wind power in Finland. The guaranteed price for wind power would be introduced in early 2010 for a period of 12 years. At the initial stage, the guaranteed price for wind power determined by the authorities would be EUR 83.5/MWh. The difference between the market price of electricity and the guaranteed price would be paid to wind power producers as a feed-in tariff. For example, at a EUR 50/MWh market price, the premium guaranteed by the feed-in tariff would be EUR 33.5/MWh. The tariff levels are set to be somewhat higher in the initial stage of the scheme in order to facilitate the rapid launch of investments.<sup>27</sup> For a maximum period of three years, until the end of 2015, the guaranteed price is EUR 105.3/MWh.<sup>28</sup>

The feed-in tariff is expected to further the construction of wind power in line with the Long-term Climate and Energy Strategy, the objective of which is to increase the production of wind power to 6 TWh by the year 2020<sup>29</sup>. The current production level is approximately 0.5 TWh<sup>30</sup>: meeting the 6 TWh goal would mean 12 times more electricity from wind than today. In comparison to e.g. Denmark or Sweden, this goal is still modest. In terms of capacity, meeting the 6 TWh goal means about a 2500 MW capacity and 800 wind turbines. Upping wind energy production in alignment with this goal would mean investments adding up to EUR 4 billion, which in 2020 would mean employment for 25 000 people in Finland. In addition, EUR 300 million would be saved in avoided costs of imported fuel<sup>31</sup>.

In addition to the feed-in tariff, a heating premium can be paid to plants using biogas and wood-based fuels if the heat they produce is also fed into the grid. The premium for biogas plants is EUR 50/MWh and EUR 20/MWh for plants using wood-based fuels<sup>32</sup>.

The experts having ranked the mitigation measures in this paper noted that the benefits of the feed-in tariff include the “anti lock-in” effect in fossil fuels, positive impact on the market balance of different energy options by altering the economic playing field and the direct emission reduction impact. The cons of the measure include a serious disjoint with the emissions trading

27 Finland's Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 114. See [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin\\_nc5.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin_nc5.pdf)

28 Energiamarkkinavirasto. See <http://www.emvi.fi/files/Sy%C3%B6tt%C3%B6tariffin%20m%C3%A4%C3%A4r%C3%A4tyminen%202013-01-16%20FI.pdf> (in Finnish)

29 Finland's Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 114. See [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin\\_nc5.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin_nc5.pdf)

30 Finnish Energy Industries. <http://energia.fi/en/statistics-and-publications>

31 Tuulivoimaa edistämään. See [http://www.tem.fi/files/32699/Tuulivoimaa\\_edistamaan\\_A4\\_lop.pdf](http://www.tem.fi/files/32699/Tuulivoimaa_edistamaan_A4_lop.pdf) (in Finnish)

32 Syöttötariffin määräytyminen. See <http://www.emvi.fi/files/Sy%C3%B6tt%C3%B6tariffin%20m%C3%A4%C3%A4r%C3%A4tyminen%202013-01-16%20FI.pdf> (in Finnish)

scheme: emission reductions enabled by renewables should be counted out of the permits allocation on the traded sector. In the current situation incoherent regulation results in the problem of “hot air” with too many permits on the market, lowering the permit price and disincentivising investments in low-carbon technologies. Another disjoint prevails in policy planning: policy-makers are incapable of analysing the whole chain of steps energy producers have to go through – and the many obstacles along the chain – before they can actually feed energy into the grid. This results in a jigsaw of suboptimal policies or only a part of the necessary policy measures being utilised. In addition to this, the capacity limit set for biogas plants enjoying the feed-in tariff should be lower in order for the scheme to actually encourage the utilisation of biogas. In spite of the critique, the overall ranking of this measure is high, as the feed-in tariff is one of the few serious national attempts to further the development of renewables.

### **Measure 2: Removing bureaucratic hurdles in wind energy development**

In spite of the feed-in tariff, wind energy development has not taken off as hoped and planned. This is due to a host of issues, ranging from local acceptability to flight security, impacts on radar used by the military to noise, impacts on birds to the applicable distance of the turbines from roads, and most of all bureaucratic hurdles. The permission processes are lengthy and tiresome. The government has now addressed these issues through a special report<sup>33</sup>, published in early 2012, also making suggestions to overcome them. The suggested improvements to remove the barriers identified have been taken forward and wind energy development can be expected to finally take off.

This underlines the importance of coherent policy planning: feed-in tariffs alone will not suffice unless the whole policy environment is favourable.

The experts noted that the benefit of removing bureaucratic obstacles in wind energy development lies in enabling the feed-in tariff to be effective. On the flip side, lightening regulation as regards the complaint procedure in wind energy development may be problematic from the point of view of natural values. This is a common point of view in NGOs focusing on traditional nature conservation, which another expert found contestable. It can be argued that streamlining permit procedures does not automatically mean overlooking natural values, and it would in effect enhance citizen participation in planning processes. Current processes are unclear and difficult to follow, and they encourage opposition more than genuine participation. However, it remains to be seen whether all the obstacles to wind energy development will be removed in an optimal manner or whether perverse incentives still prevail. One of the experts stated that those barriers that are rather mechanical in nature are easy to remove but the politically touchier obstacles, namely the wind turbines’ impacts on radar used by the military, are unlikely to be deconstructed. Due to these concerns, the measure was ranked in the middle.

---

33 Tuulivoimaa edistämään. See [http://www.tem.fi/files/32699/Tuulivoimaa\\_edistamaan\\_A4\\_lop.pdf](http://www.tem.fi/files/32699/Tuulivoimaa_edistamaan_A4_lop.pdf) (in Finnish)

### Measure 3: allowances to households replacing oil and direct electric heating with renewables

In 2012, the state reserved EUR 10 million to support households replacing heating systems based on oil or direct electric heating with renewables<sup>34</sup>. These allowances are applicable for all kinds of households as long as the buildings in question are used throughout the year. The allowances encourage investing in borehole heat pump systems, air-to-water heat pump systems, systems using pellets or other wood-based energy sources, building storage facilities for systems using pellets or other wood-based energy sources and building a combined heating system, using either heat pumps or wood-based energy sources and some other form of extra heating or a combination of heat pumps and wood-based energy sources.

Municipalities are responsible for the allocation of the allowances. Residents must apply for the allowance and, once their application has been approved, the Housing Finance and Development Centre of Finland (ARA)<sup>35</sup> provides the municipalities with the funds. 25% of the overall costs can be reimbursed. The aim is to influence the behaviour of building users, owners and individual consumers by making investment in renewables more attractive.

The experts were sceptical regarding the effectiveness of these allowances. The scepticism arises from the fact that, from a cost-effectiveness point of view, it would make sense to reduce GHG emissions relating to energy in the traded sector, as the marginal cost is many times higher in the non-traded sector<sup>36</sup>. The energy sector is, however, almost untouchable in Finland due to its traditional political significance. This results in the allowances being a patchy initiative, not looking at the big emission sources in the energy sector. Rather than supporting the shift away from oil on a small scale, one should look at the value chain of oil as a whole and identify the biggest emission sources. In addition to these political economy obstacles, the reimbursement for investments in houses utilising direct electricity is too low at 25%. Furthermore, these allowances should not be paid one-off but be continuous in the state budget. As allowances are allocated to certain years and demand fluctuates, the supply side suffers: installers are very busy towards the end of the budget year, but wait for orders for the rest of time. According to one of the experts, the message from the industry is quite clear: allowances should either be continuous or not exist at all. Due to the direct emission reduction impact being small, cost-efficiency being low and the impact on the economic playing field and business opportunities remaining limited, this measure was ranked low.

---

34 Kuntien myöntämät korjaus- ja energia-avustukset. See <http://www.ara.fi/download.asp?contentid=25336&lan=fi> (in Finnish)

35 Kuntien myöntämät korjaus- ja energia-avustukset. See [http://www.ara.fi/fi-FI/Rahoitus/Avustukset/Kuntien\\_myontamat\\_korjaus\\_ja\\_energiaavustukset](http://www.ara.fi/fi-FI/Rahoitus/Avustukset/Kuntien_myontamat_korjaus_ja_energiaavustukset) (in Finnish)

36 Ilmastopaneeli. See [http://www.ilmastopaneeli.fi/uploads/selvitykset\\_lausunnot/Yhteenvetoraportti-Energiaj%C3%A4rjestelm%C3%A4%20ja%20p%C3%A4%C3%A4st%C3%B6v%C3%A4hennystoimet%2029-1-2013.pdf](http://www.ilmastopaneeli.fi/uploads/selvitykset_lausunnot/Yhteenvetoraportti-Energiaj%C3%A4rjestelm%C3%A4%20ja%20p%C3%A4%C3%A4st%C3%B6v%C3%A4hennystoimet%2029-1-2013.pdf) p.11 (in Finnish)

## Energy efficiency measures

As part of the EU, Finland has to participate in meeting the indicative target of 20% improvements in energy efficiency by 2020. The main measures to this end consist of energy efficiency agreements and improving energy efficiency in buildings. Energy savings through Energy Performance Contracting (EPC) also contribute.

### Measure 4: energy efficiency agreements

Finland has favoured voluntary agreements with the industry as regards furthering energy efficiency. Since the 1990s, Finland has employed a voluntary energy efficiency agreement scheme for companies and municipalities. Voluntary measures include energy conservation agreements, energy audits and sector or measure-specific programmes. The scheme covers around 85 per cent of all industrial energy use and over 50 per cent of the building stock of the service sector. New energy efficiency agreements for industries, municipalities and the oil sector are mainly the responsibility of the Ministry of Employment and the Economy and have been signed for the period 2008–2016. They follow the energy conservation agreements that were in force in 1997–2007. Additional energy efficiency agreements are currently in force for goods transport, logistics and public transport. These agreements fall under the responsibility of the Ministry of Transport and Communications. The housing sector has an energy conservation agreement scheme, which is overseen by the Ministry of the Environment<sup>37</sup>.

Total savings from measures under energy efficiency agreements within the industry, energy, municipal, property and building sectors at the end of 2010 are estimated to be about 9 TWh per year. The cumulative CO<sub>2</sub> reductions under the energy efficiency agreements are estimated to be about 3.4 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> per year by the end of 2007, based on a marginal emissions rate of 700 kg CO<sub>2</sub>/MWh. By the end of 2010 the emissions reduction will exceed 4 million CO<sub>2</sub> tonnes per year<sup>38</sup>. On the other hand, tax refunds for energy-intensive industries can be argued to disincentivise improvements in energy efficiency. These refunds amount to around EUR 9 million annually<sup>39</sup>.

The experts were sceptical towards voluntary agreements. Low additionality was the main concern: in a regulated environment, what is the added value of voluntary agreements, and what exactly is the reference scenario against which impacts can be estimated? If energy efficiency improvements make economic sense, they will happen anyway and voluntary agreements bring little added value. In addition to this, the validation of the effectiveness of such schemes differs between countries, which makes comparison difficult. On the positive side, voluntary agreements can be a good complimentary measure if an otherwise comprehensive energy efficiency policy package exists, and

37 Finland's Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 112. See [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin\\_nc5.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin_nc5.pdf)

38 Finland's Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 112-113. See [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin\\_nc5.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin_nc5.pdf)

39 Finland's Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 129. See [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin\\_nc5.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin_nc5.pdf)

if the details of such agreement schemes are well tailored. However, a major concern with voluntary measures, visible in environmental policy more generally, is the dynamic of industries actually dodging regulation through voluntary agreements. In the Finnish context, the concern is valid as industries oppose legally binding energy efficiency improvements by default. Low additionality and a very limited direct emission reduction impact cause these agreements to rank lowest.

### Measure 5: energy efficiency standards for new buildings

In 2010, the government tightened the energy efficiency standards for new buildings by 30% compared to the previous level. Standards were amended again in 2011 when an upper limit for the energy use of buildings was set. This limit takes into account the type of the building as well as the source of the energy used in the building<sup>40</sup>. The tightened standards regulate the upper limits for the energy used in the buildings in the following manner (a non-exhaustive set of examples)<sup>41</sup>:

Building type	kWh/m <sup>2</sup> per year
Detached houses less than 120 m <sup>2</sup> in size	204
Townhouses	150
Apartment houses	130
Office buildings	170
Hotels etc.	240

When counting the “e figure”, stating the overall energy consumption of the building, different fuels used for the heating of the building are allocated different factors by which the actual energy consumption must be multiplied. For direct electricity heating, the factor is 1.7; for district heating 0.7; for district cooling 0.4; for renewable fuels 0.5; and for fossil fuels 1<sup>42</sup>.

The tightened standards have not sunk in without opposition as the building industry opposes ambitious energy efficiency standards. This is due to quality concerns as the know-how does not follow the speedy tightening of regulation<sup>43</sup>.

The experts estimated these standards to make good sense – it would be irrational not to tighten the standards and lock-in high energy consumption for decades. Furthermore, the Finnish building stock is young compared to many European countries, which makes tightening the standards for new buildings a meaningful measure: the potential in existing buildings is not quite as large as elsewhere in Europe. One of the experts said it is very embarrassing for

40 Rakennuksen energia- ja ekotehokkuus. See <http://www.ymparisto.fi/default.asp?node=20644&lan=fi> (in Finnish)

41 Asetus rakennusten energiatehokkuudesta. See [http://www.finlex.fi/data/normit/37188-D3-2012\\_Suomi.pdf](http://www.finlex.fi/data/normit/37188-D3-2012_Suomi.pdf) (in Finnish)

42 Ibid.

43 Energiatehokkuus suututtaa rakentajia. See [http://yle.fi/uutiset/energiatehokkuus\\_suututtaa\\_rakentajia\\_-\\_maailmanparannus\\_mennyt\\_terveyden\\_edelle/6501528](http://yle.fi/uutiset/energiatehokkuus_suututtaa_rakentajia_-_maailmanparannus_mennyt_terveyden_edelle/6501528) (in Finnish)

the building industry not to keep up with tightening standards: perhaps the state could support the sector with funds for further education if need be. The “anti lock-in” effect, potential to create low-carbon business opportunities and large direct emission reduction impact especially over time resulted in a high ranking for the tightened standards.

### **Measure 6: energy efficiency measures in old buildings**

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the use of energy in buildings are mainly covered by the emissions trading sector. District heating is the source for about half of the space heating in Finland. The majority of district heating production – as with electricity produced in CHP plants – falls within the sphere of the emissions trading sector. Much of the rest of Finland’s electricity production is also covered by the emission trading sector. Therefore, the category of direct CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from energy use in buildings in Finland only comprises emissions from domestic heating using light fuel oil and to a very small extent natural gas, which is typical of much of the country’s detached housing stock. These CO<sub>2</sub> emissions amount to about 3 million tonnes annually. The non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from energy use in buildings are much smaller, approximately 0.2 million tonnes CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent annually. Most of these emissions are CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from wood combustion. The Directive on the energy performance of buildings aims at reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by improving the energy efficiency of buildings. The directive was implemented in Finland by a new regulation which came into force at the beginning of 2008. New Finnish legislation on the energy efficiency of buildings includes <sup>44</sup>:

- Act on energy certification of buildings and Ministry of the Environment Decree on Energy Certification of Buildings. The energy certification enables comparison and bettering of the energy efficiency of buildings through the provision of energy use information when selling or renting them. The certificate includes information not only on the current energy efficiency of the building but also recommendations to enhance it. The certification is undertaken by professionals. The certification system aims to raise awareness of the energy use of residential buildings as they are responsible for 27% of the energy use of all buildings. All in all, buildings use up to 40% of all energy used in Finland <sup>45</sup>.
- Act on energy efficiency inspections of cooling equipment used in air conditioning systems in buildings. This act requires that the energy efficiency of cooling equipment used in air conditioning systems in buildings is inspected once every ten years. This does not apply to district cooling systems. The inspection must examine the overall condition of the cooling equipment along with its efficiency, and a certificate must be given to the owner of the building. This certificate ought to include recommendations to improve the energy efficiency of the equipment<sup>46</sup>.

---

44 Finland’s Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 115. See [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin\\_nc5.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin_nc5.pdf)

45 Laki rakennuksen energiatodistuksesta 22.1.2013: Usein kysytyt kysymyksiä & vastauksia. See <http://www.ymparisto.fi/download.asp?contentid=141230&lan=fi> (in Finnish)

46 Laki rakennuksen ilmastointijärjestelmän kylmälaitteiden energiatehokkuuden tarkastamisesta. See <http://www.ymparisto.fi/download.asp?contentid=66032> (in Finnish)

From a regulatory point of view, one of the experts stated that it makes sense to regulate when people make some of their biggest decision – like buying a house or a car. At these moments, a window opens up for people to think about their behaviour and consumption in the long term. This is why the idea of the energy certificate deserves credit, but, on the other hand, regulation should have a clear effect on the price of the house, depending on energy consumption over time. The provision of information is seldom enough to steer decision making. Another expert echoed this view, stating that a better understanding of the steering of behaviour is needed. Setting the building tax in alignment with the energy consumption of the building would actually create an economic incentive to improve energy efficiency. What matters for people buying a house is its location especially in terms of services and price: raising awareness does not thus create much of an incentive. However, due to the potential “anti lock-in” effect in big consumption rates of often fossil energy over time, as well as the direct emission reduction impact, these measures avoid scoring at the very bottom.

### **Measure 7: energy savings through Energy Performance Contracting (EPC)**

ESCO services – better known as Energy Performance Contracting (EPC) outside of Finland – mean investments to save energy in client companies, enabled by an external energy expert (Energy Service Company). These companies commit to ensuring energy efficiency goals in the client company are met. The costs, including the initial energy efficiency investment, are paid back by the client company’s reduced fuel costs over time. ESCO services are used in industry, the public sector and the private service sector, and specific projects include e.g. heat recovery systems, renewal of lighting, optimising pump systems in industry and heat recovery from flue gas <sup>47</sup>.

Energy Performance Contracting was started in the 1980s in the US, Canada and France, and it has spread around the world during the past decade <sup>48</sup>.

The emission reduction potential of ESCO projects in Finland was estimated in a Climtech project report. The report found the emission reduction potential in industry to be 0.3–0.4 Mt CO<sub>2</sub> <sup>49</sup>.

Although the idea of the ESCO concept is good, the actual impact in reducing emissions is not applauded. Additionality and validation remain concerns, similar to the case with voluntary energy efficiency agreements. Furthermore, one of the experts stated that ESCO suffers from either its being marginal or creating risks for the core processes of industries. The biggest energy savings do lie within the core processes, where quality concerns and worries of production stoppages create barriers to enhancing energy efficiency. A risk insurance of some sort would therefore be needed in order for energy efficiency improvements to take off. These notions explain why this measure scores a low ranking.

---

47 ESCO-palvelu. See <http://www.motiva.fi/toimialueet/energiakatselmustoiminta/esco-palvelu> (in Finnish)

48 ESCO maailmalla. See [http://www.motiva.fi/toimialueet/energiakatselmustoiminta/esco-palvelu/esco-palvelu\\_kaytannossa/esco\\_maailmalla](http://www.motiva.fi/toimialueet/energiakatselmustoiminta/esco-palvelu/esco-palvelu_kaytannossa/esco_maailmalla) (in Finnish)

49 Climtech-ohjelma. Loppuraportti. See <http://www.motiva.fi/files/825/CO2esco.pdf> (in Finnish)

## Reducing emissions from transport

The single most important measure having reduced emissions from transport is the differentiation of taxation according to vehicle-specific emissions.

Measure 8: differentiation of car and vehicle taxation according to vehicle-specific emissions

The aim is that by 2020 specific emissions of new cars sold in Finland would be close to the EU objective (95 g/km; the current level is at around 163.5 g/km) and the rate of vehicle fleet renewal would be around 7 per cent a year. The goal with regard to the entire vehicle fleet is that by 2020 the average carbon dioxide emissions would be 137.9 g/km at most (currently around 180.1g/km). This means that the specific emissions of the Finnish vehicle fleet would be reduced by a third<sup>50</sup>. The emission reduction potential is estimated to be 2.1–2.3 million tons per year and with a cost of about 0.5 M€ per year<sup>51</sup>. As regards the costs of reducing emissions from cars, more efficient cars arguably save money in both production and use.

According to data from the year 2012, the target seems to be met with regard to new cars. The average CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of new cars have dropped by 24% between 2007 and 2012. However, as regards the entire vehicle fleet, the target seems not to be met as the renewal rate is worse than expected: the aim was to sell 150 000 new cars per year but in 2011 only some 130 000 were sold<sup>52</sup>.

According to expert estimations, the emission reduction impact from new cars was 68 000 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> in 2011<sup>53</sup>.

Altering behaviour through economic incentives was seen as an effective measure by the experts. Pros of the measure include additionality to EU regulation, setting a good example that is replicable in many other countries, good overall design of the measure and the impact on the market balance of different mobility options. An expert noted that similar measures should be used in e.g. enhancing energy efficiency in buildings. One benefit of taxes, all in all, is their psychological effect: the tax need not be large but it being a tax already steers behaviour at least in the Finnish context. Unfortunately, however, the emission reduction impact on the entire fleet is limited although emissions have dropped as regards new cars. In addition to this, other policy measures should support the positive impacts created by taxation. Due to the positive impacts, the measure ranks in the top three.

## Sub-national measures

Although the state has moved rather slowly in climate policy, a group of municipalities have initiated ambitious emission reduction schemes in an internationally unique project.

50 Finland's Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 118. See [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin\\_nc5.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin_nc5.pdf)

51 Liikenne- ja viestintäministeriön hallinnonalan ilmastopoliittinen ohjelma 2009–2020. Seuranta 2012. See [http://www.lvm.fi/c/document\\_library/get\\_file?folderId=1986562&name=DLFE-18457.pdf&title=Julkaisu%202012](http://www.lvm.fi/c/document_library/get_file?folderId=1986562&name=DLFE-18457.pdf&title=Julkaisu%202012) p. 8 (in Finnish)

52 Ibid. p. 10

53 Ibid. p. 11

### Measure 9: carbon-neutral municipalities as forerunners

In 2008, five Finnish municipalities launched a climate project, carbon-neutral municipalities, that is unique not only in Finland but internationally too. Their objective is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by more than required by the EU targets and more quickly than has been agreed: these municipalities have committed to an 80 per cent emission reduction by 2030 from the level of 2007<sup>54</sup>.

The project aimed to create tools and procedures to enable Finnish municipalities to mitigate climate change and promote the adoption of climate-friendly technologies. Suitable solutions were sought through close cooperation between researchers, the public sector and businesses. The aim was that successful tools and practices could also be applied elsewhere in Finland and abroad. The municipalities were to define short-term goals and plan required measures together with experts. Consequently, achieving concrete results within just a few years was envisaged. The project aims at greenhouse gas emission reductions both in the near future (2–5 years) and in the longer term (6–20 years). The ultimate goal is a carbon-neutral municipality.<sup>55</sup>

Since the beginning of the project, the number of municipalities involved has grown to 10<sup>56</sup>. The municipality most praised is Uusikaupunki, aiming for a 30 per cent reduction compared to the 2007 emissions level by 2012<sup>57</sup>. One of the project's most significant private sector measures comes in the shape of the Yara fertiliser plant's investment in catalyst technology. This will cut the factory's greenhouse gas emissions by approximately 90 per cent. Another remarkable initiative is the closed circulation energy solution devised by Sybimar Oy. This facilitates the utilisation of nutrients, water and carbon dioxide in energy and food production<sup>58</sup>.

The activities undertaken in carbon-neutral municipalities vary from enhancing energy efficiency to installing renewable power capacity. The newest examples range from switching from oil to borehole heating in 18 households in the Mynämäki municipality, having reduced emissions by 28 000 kg CO<sub>2</sub>e/a<sup>59</sup>; a beneficial "green loan" enabled by a local bank for households switching from oil heating to renewables in the Padasjoki municipality<sup>60</sup>; testing a new technology in biogas production, multiplying the energy

54 HINKU-municipalities. See <http://www.ymparisto.fi/default.asp?contentid=392091&lan=en&clan=en>

55 Finland's Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change p. 100. See [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin\\_nc5.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/fin_nc5.pdf)

56 HINKU-kunnat. See <http://www.ymparisto.fi/default.asp?node=26610&lan=FI> (in Finnish)

57 Proven by experience in five municipalities: carbon-neutral municipality not a utopian idea. See <http://www.ymparisto.fi/default.asp?contentid=367135&lan=en&clan=en>

58 Ibid.

59 Lämpökeskus öljylämmityksestä maalämpöön. See <https://www.wp5.ymparisto.fi/hinku/Kohteet/Tiedot.aspx?Id=206> (in Finnish)

60 "Viherlaina". See <https://www.wp5.ymparisto.fi/hinku/Kohteet/Tiedot.aspx?Id=205> (in Finnish)

output manyfold compared to conventional technologies in the Salo municipality<sup>61</sup>; to creating energy efficiency standards for public procurement in the Parikkala municipality, setting minimum criteria for energy efficiency for e.g. IT and other office equipment, logistics, building projects and heat and electricity procurement.<sup>62</sup>

According to the project manager, Mr. Jyri Seppälä at the Finnish Environment Institute, the main drivers for success are rather simple. The single most important reason for the initiative taking off is the commitment from the highest possible level – mayors. Without their enthusiasm, results would not be as encouraging as they now are. New ways of cooperation within and between municipalities are another driver for success: the sectoral approach in policy implementation often leads to suboptimal and uncoordinated action, and breaking such a way of working has opened up new possibilities in reducing emissions and creating positive impacts for the local economies. The role of the media in showcasing success stories has also been an important factor<sup>63</sup>.

For a comprehensive list of activities in carbon-neutral municipalities (in Finnish), see <https://www.wp5.ymparisto.fi/hinku/Aloitukset.aspx>.

Expert evaluations differed regarding the carbon-neutral municipalities initiative. On the one hand, the success stories were seen as important and the initiative as such was praised. In many municipalities replicable examples matter, as the time and resources available for analysing possibilities to reduce emissions are very limited. The initiative shows drastic emission reductions are possible and that businesses benefit from reducing emissions. On the other hand, the initiative does not cover a single major city. In addition, the link from local to national level is missing: how could the lessons learnt in municipalities inform national policy-making? Although the pros range from setting a good example to the initiative being replicable and having produced useful and open data, the low coverage and disjoint to wider policy learning lowers the ranking.

## Measures in preparation

The lack of systematic impact assessment of Finnish climate policies is a central concern in terms of the effectiveness of policies and measures (see section ‘Overarching policy framework: climate and energy strategies’). A remedy to this is currently under preparation.

### Measure 10: climate law enhancing the effectiveness of policy measures

The government has agreed to prepare a climate law which implements the long-term emission reduction target of at least 80% less emissions in 2050

---

61 Biokaasun tuotanto uudella tekniikalla. See <https://www.wp5.ymparisto.fi/hinku/Kohteet/Tiedot.aspx?Id=203> (in Finnish)

62 Kunnan hankintaohjeistuksen päivitys energiatehokkuuden osalta. See <https://www.wp5.ymparisto.fi/hinku/Kohteet/Tiedot.aspx?Id=189> (in Finnish)

63 Pers. comm.

than in 1990<sup>64</sup>. The law is currently under preparation in the Ministry of Environment<sup>65</sup>. The law would make sure emission reductions happen on an annual basis, and the process for planning, implementing and following up on the effectiveness of the policy measures chosen would be legally binding. So-called carbon budgets would include the maximum amount of GHG emissions different sectors may emit within the tentative four-year carbon budget period, and the path towards the 2050 emission reduction target would be split into such carbon budgets. This would improve the predictability and coherence of climate and energy policy<sup>66</sup>. This measure is inspired by the Climate Act passed in 2008 in the UK<sup>67</sup>.

As the impact assessments of policies so far have been vague and, as a result, emissions have not started to decline, the overarching climate law can significantly improve the effectiveness of climate policy measures, implementing the targets set in the carbon budgets. In short, the climate law would make sure the emission reduction targets agreed on are met through the most effective policy measures and the policy landscape is coherent.

The experts applauded the Climate Law establishing an overarching scheme to plan, implement and monitor emission reductions. This was seen as the basis of effectiveness. However, due to political horse trading, the law as currently planned would not up the level of ambition for GHG cuts, and the traded sector is outside the law's coverage. Moreover, as the emission reduction targets are not raised by the law, the impact could either be zero on paper or massive in practice, depending on whether we assume that emission reduction targets already agreed on could be met with other measures. So far this has clearly not been the case. As regards the level of emission cuts within the climate law, the devil lies in the detail. Depending on the final architecture and wording of the law, the law could include a mechanism to evaluate the adequacy of current emission reduction targets. This would create a framework in which upping the emission reduction targets could be discussed – for now, such a framework does not exist on the political fora.

Although some problematic limitations do exist, the law scores points due to its overarching nature in preventing carbon lock-in, direct emission reduction impact, setting a good example, being replicable and additional, and bringing with it good data availability and monitoring as regards the development of emissions.

---

64 Ilmastolaki valmistellaan vielä tämän hallituskauden aikana. See <http://www.ymparisto.fi/default.asp?contentid=428736&lan=FI> (in Finnish)

65 Ibid.

66 Ilmastopaneeli. [http://www.ilmastopaneeli.fi/uploads/selvitykset\\_lausunnot/Abstact\\_Assessment%20of%20the%20Need%20and%20Opinions%20for%20Climate%20Act.pdf](http://www.ilmastopaneeli.fi/uploads/selvitykset_lausunnot/Abstact_Assessment%20of%20the%20Need%20and%20Opinions%20for%20Climate%20Act.pdf)

67 Climate Change Act 2008. See <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2008/27/contents>; for early lessons learnt see The UK Climate Change Act 2008 – Lessons for national climate laws. <http://www.clientearth.org/reports/climate-and-energy-lessons-from-the-climate-change-act.pdf>

## Mitigation measures ranked

Measure	Type	Direct impact	Criteria	Ranking
Feed-in tariff for wind, biogas and wood-based fuels in plants	Subsidy	Wind capacity to increase to 6 TWh by the year 2020	Direct emission reduction impact; altering the economic playing field; anti-lock-in effect in fossils; steering behaviour	1
Tightening of energy efficiency standards for new buildings	Regulatory	30% less energy use in new buildings since 2010	Direct emission reduction impact; anti-lock-in effect in fossils, creating business opportunities for clean tech	2
Differentiation of car and vehicle taxation according to vehicle-specific emissions	Taxation	Average CO <sub>2</sub> emissions of new cars have dropped by 24% between 2007 and 2012; emission reduction impact from new cars was 68 000 tons of CO <sub>2</sub> in 2011	Direct emission reduction impact; good example; replicable; additional, steering behaviour	3
Climate Law	Regulatory	Creating a coherent emission reduction path and ensuring emission reduction targets are met	Overarching nature; direct emission reduction impact; good example; replicable; additional; good data availability and monitoring	4
Removing bureaucratic hurdles in wind energy development	Regulatory	Enable feed-in tariff to kick in	Steering behaviour; direct emission reduction impact; creating business opportunities for clean tech	5
Carbon-neutral municipalities	Voluntary cooperation	Ten municipalities have committed to an 80 per cent emission reduction by 2030 from the level of 2007	Direct emission reduction impact; good example; replicable; additional; good data availability and monitoring; anti-lock-in effect; creating business opportunities for clean tech	6
Energy efficiency measures in old buildings	Regulatory	n.a.	Anti-lock-in effect in fossils; direct emission reduction impact; steering behaviour	7
Allowances to households replacing oil and direct electric heating with renewables	Allowance	Renewable heating sources become more cost-competitive	Altering the economic playing field; direct emission reduction impact; impact to the market balance of different energy options; steering behaviour	8
Energy savings through Energy Performance Contracting (EPC)	Voluntary business model	Emission reduction potential in industry 0.3-0.4 Mt CO <sub>2</sub>	Direct emission reduction impact; additionality, direct emission reduction impact, creating business opportunities	9
Voluntary energy efficiency agreements with industry and municipalities	Voluntary agreement	Total savings at the end of 2010 are estimated to be about 9 TWh per year. The cumulative CO <sub>2</sub> reductions are estimated to exceed 4 million CO <sub>2</sub> tonnes per year by 2010	Additionality; direct emission reduction impact; steering behaviour, creating business opportunities for clean tech	10

## List of references

Finland's Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. 2009. Ministry of the Environment and Statistics Finland, Helsinki. 280 p. [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/nat/fin\\_nc5.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/nat/fin_nc5.pdf)

Greenhouse gas inventory. Statistics Finland. [http://www.stat.fi/tup/khkinv/index\\_en.html](http://www.stat.fi/tup/khkinv/index_en.html)

Cited on March 9 2013.

National Climate and Energy Strategy. Ministry for Employment and the Economy. <http://www.tem.fi/index.phtml?l=en&s=2542>  
Cited on March 9 2013.

Lindroos, Hast, Ekholm ja Savolainen. 2012. Arvio ei-päästökauppasektorin päästövähennyskeinoista ja kustannuksista Suomessa. VTT tiedotteita 2605. <http://www.vtt.fi/news/2012/20120111paastovahennystavoitteet.jsp>

Reuters. 2013. UPDATE 3-Finland's Olkiluoto 3 reactor seen delayed to 2016. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/11/teollisuudenvoima-olki-luoto-idUSL5N0BBEZ520130211>  
Cited on March 13 2013.

Valtiontalouden tarkastusvirasto. 2011. Tuloksellisuustarkastuskertomus 235/2011. Ilmastonmuutoksen hillintä. Ilmasto- ja energiastrategian valmistelu ja toimeenpano.

[http://www.e-julkaisu.fi/vtv/ilmastonmuutoksen\\_hillinta/pdf/ilmastonmuutoksen\\_hillinta\\_208.pdf](http://www.e-julkaisu.fi/vtv/ilmastonmuutoksen_hillinta/pdf/ilmastonmuutoksen_hillinta_208.pdf)

European Commission. 2011. Renewable energy. Progress reports. [http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/reports/2011\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/reports/2011_en.htm)

Cited on March 9 2013.

Energiamarkkinavirasto. 2013. Syöttötariffin määräytyminen. Tuuli-, biokaasu- ja puupolttoainvoimalat. <http://www.emvi.fi/files/Sy%C3%B6tt%C3%B6tariffin%20m%C3%A4%C3%A4r%C3%A4ytyminen%202013-01-16%20FI.pdf>

Finnish Energy Industries. Statistics and publications. <http://energia.fi/en/statistics-and-publications>

Cited on March 9 2013.

Tarasti. 2013. Tuulivoimaa edistämään. [http://www.tem.fi/files/32699/Tuulivoimaa\\_edistamaan\\_A4\\_lop.pdf](http://www.tem.fi/files/32699/Tuulivoimaa_edistamaan_A4_lop.pdf)

Syöttötariffin määräytyminen. 2013.

<http://www.emvi.fi/files/Sy%C3%B6tt%C3%B6tariffin%20m%C3%A4%C3%A4r%C3%A4ytyminen%202013-01-16%20FI.pdf>

Asumisen rahoitus- ja kehittämiskeskus. 2013. Kuntien myöntämät energia-avustukset.

<http://www.ara.fi/download.asp?contentid=25336&lan=fi>

Cited on March 9 2013.

Asumisen rahoitus- ja kehittämiskeskus. 2013. Kuntien myöntämät energia-avustukset.

[http://www.ara.fi/fi-FI/Rahoitus/Avustukset/Kuntien\\_myontamat\\_korjaus\\_ja\\_energiaavustukset](http://www.ara.fi/fi-FI/Rahoitus/Avustukset/Kuntien_myontamat_korjaus_ja_energiaavustukset)

Cited on March 13 2013.

Ilmastopaneeli. 2013. Energiajärjestelmä ja päästövähennystoimet. Yhteen-  
vetoraportti.

[http://www.ilmastopaneeli.fi/uploads/selvitykset\\_lausunnot/Yhteenvetoraportti-Energiaj%C3%A4rjestelm%C3%A4%20ja%20p%C3%A4%C3%A4st%C3%B6v%C3%A4hennystoimet%2029-1-2013.pdf](http://www.ilmastopaneeli.fi/uploads/selvitykset_lausunnot/Yhteenvetoraportti-Energiaj%C3%A4rjestelm%C3%A4%20ja%20p%C3%A4%C3%A4st%C3%B6v%C3%A4hennystoimet%2029-1-2013.pdf)

Ympäristöministeriö. Rakennuksen energia- ja ekotehokkuus.

<http://www.ymparisto.fi/default.asp?node=20644&clan=fi>

Cited on March 9 2013.

Ympäristöministeriö. Asetus rakennusten energiatehokkuudesta 2/11.

[http://www.finlex.fi/data/normit/37188-D3-2012\\_Suomi.pdf](http://www.finlex.fi/data/normit/37188-D3-2012_Suomi.pdf)

Yle Uutiset. Energiatehokkuus suututtaa rakentajia - "maailmanparannus mennyt terveyden edelle". [http://yle.fi/uutiset/energiatehokkuus-suututtaa\\_rakentajia\\_-\\_maailmanparannus\\_mennyt\\_terveyden\\_edelle/6501528](http://yle.fi/uutiset/energiatehokkuus-suututtaa_rakentajia_-_maailmanparannus_mennyt_terveyden_edelle/6501528)

Cited on March 9 2013.

Ympäristöministeriö. 2013. Laki rakennuksen energiatodistuksesta 22.1.2013: Usein kysytyjä kysymyksiä & vastauksia.

<http://www.ymparisto.fi/download.asp?contentid=141230&clan=fi>

Cited on March 9 2013.

Ympäristöministeriö. 2007. Laki rakennuksen ilmastointijärjestelmän kylmälaitteiden energiatehokkuuden tarkastamisesta.

<http://www.ymparisto.fi/download.asp?contentid=66032>

Cited on March 9 2013.

Motiva. ESCO-palvelu. <http://www.motiva.fi/toimialueet/energiakatselmus-toiminta/esco-palvelu>

Cited on March 9 2013.

Motiva. ESCO maailmalla. [http://www.motiva.fi/toimialueet/energiakatselmustoiminta/esco-palvelu/esco-palvelu\\_kaytannossa/esco\\_maailmalla](http://www.motiva.fi/toimialueet/energiakatselmustoiminta/esco-palvelu/esco-palvelu_kaytannossa/esco_maailmalla)

Cited on March 9 2013.

Motiva. 2002. Climtech-ohjelma. Loppuraportti. CO<sub>2</sub>ESCO - Energiapalveluyritysten (ESCO) toiminta ilmastonmuutoksen rajoittamisen näkökulmasta.

[http://www.motiva.fi/files/825/CO<sub>2</sub>esco.pdf](http://www.motiva.fi/files/825/CO2esco.pdf)

Liikenne- ja viestintäministeriö. 2012. Liikenne- ja viestintäministeriön hallinnonalan ilmastopoliittinen ohjelma 2009–2020. Seuranta 2012.

[http://www.lvm.fi/c/document\\_library/get\\_file?folderId=1986562&name=DLFE-18457.pdf&title=Julkaisu%2023-2012](http://www.lvm.fi/c/document_library/get_file?folderId=1986562&name=DLFE-18457.pdf&title=Julkaisu%2023-2012)

Ministry of Environment. HINKU municipalities.

<http://www.ymparisto.fi/default.asp?contentid=392091&clan=en&clan=en>

Cited on March 9 2013.

Ympäristöministeriö. HINKU-kunnat.

<http://www.ymparisto.fi/default.asp?node=26610&clan=FI>

Cited on March 9 2013.

Finnish Environment Institute. Proven by experience in five municipalities: carbon-neutral municipality not a utopian idea.

<http://www.ymparisto.fi/default.asp?contentid=367135&clan=en&clan=en>

Cited on March 9 2013.

Suomen ympäristökeskus. 2011. Hinkumappi. Lämpökeskus öljylämmityksestä maalämpöön. <https://www5.ymparisto.fi/hinku/Kohteet/Tiedot.aspx?Id=206>

Cited on March 13 2013.

Suomen ympäristökeskus. 2011. Hinkumappi. "Viherlaina".

<https://www5.ymparisto.fi/hinku/Kohteet/Tiedot.aspx?Id=205>

Cited on March 13 2013.

Suomen ympäristökeskus. 2011. Hinkumappi. Biokaasun tuotanto uudella tekniikalla.

<https://www5.ymparisto.fi/hinku/Kohteet/Tiedot.aspx?Id=203>

Cited on March 13 2013.

Suomen ympäristökeskus. 2011. Hinkumappi. Kunnan hankintaohjeistuksen päivitys energiatehokkuuden osalta.

<https://www5.ymparisto.fi/hinku/Kohteet/Tiedot.aspx?Id=189>

Cited on March 13 2013.

Personal communication with Mr. Jyri Seppälä. March 12 2013.

Ympäristöministeriö. Ilmastolaki valmistellaan vielä tämän hallituskauden aikana.

<http://www.ymparisto.fi/default.asp?contentid=428736&lan=FI>

Cited on March 9 2013.

Ilmastopaneeli. 2012. Abstract: Assessment of the need and options for a climate act.

[http://www.ilmastopaneeli.fi/uploads/selvitykset\\_lausunnot/Abstact\\_Assessment%20of%20the%20Need%20and%20Opinions%20for%20Climate%20Act.pdf](http://www.ilmastopaneeli.fi/uploads/selvitykset_lausunnot/Abstact_Assessment%20of%20the%20Need%20and%20Opinions%20for%20Climate%20Act.pdf)

The National Archives. Climate Change Act 2008.

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2008/27/contents>

Cited on March 9 2013.

ClientEarth. 2009. The UK Climate Change Act 2008 – Lessons for national climate laws.

<http://www.clientearth.org/reports/climate-and-energy-lessons-from-the-climate-change-act.pdf>

## **Appendix 1. NGO experts having ranked the measures**

Ms. Karoliina Auvinen, Senior Lead, Ecoefficiency , SITRA (The Finnish Innovation Fund) <http://www.sitra.fi/en>

Ms. Hanna Hakko, Environmental Policy Officer, Finnish Association for Nature Conservation <http://www.sll.fi/site-actions/english>

Ms. Kaisa-Reeta Koskinen, Energy Campaigner, Greenpeace Nordic <http://www.greenpeace.org/finland/en/>



ISLAND

## The 10 best Mitigation Measures in Iceland

Compiled by Arni Finnsson

Iceland Nature Conservation Association (INCA)

In an Action Plan presented by the Minister for the Environment in November 2010, Iceland lists 10 key actions in order to reduce net emissions of greenhouse gases in Iceland. The Action Plan is only available in Icelandic.<sup>68</sup> The Action Plan, however, is based on Iceland's 5th National Communication from early 2010<sup>69</sup>, published in late 2011.

Iceland's climate ambition can be read in a submission sent to the UNFCCC Secretariat, dated 8 February 2010, which says

... the Icelandic government adopted in 2009 the goal of reducing net greenhouse gas emissions by 15% in 2020, compared to 1990, with the understanding that the rules governing the Kyoto Protocol would continue to apply after 2012. In Copenhagen Iceland announced that it was ready, in a joint effort with the European Union, to cut emissions up to 30% by from 1990 levels in 2020, as part of a global ambitious agreement. The 30% reduction target would be achieved jointly by Iceland and the Member States of the European Union, with Iceland adhering fully to the Energy and Climate Package. ...<sup>70</sup>

For 2020 this meant a 30% reduction in a joint effort with the European Union. Even though the European ambition level would remain at 20%, Iceland would only have to reduce its emissions by 15% net, that is including sequestration.

### Special status?

Iceland being a small economy – tiny really – has made for some difficulties or challenges, which may be radically different from other Annex I countries. Iceland has presented this as blessing in the sense that almost all stationary energy is produced by renewable energy, although Icelandic NGOs would argue that large hydro and geothermal energy may not be so renewable.<sup>71</sup>

Between 1990 and 2008 greenhouse gas emissions increased by 43% in Iceland, from 3443 tonnes to 4881 tons. This includes energy-intensive industries like aluminium smelters and ferrosilicon plants.<sup>72</sup> If sequestration due to afforestation and revegetation is accounted for, the 2008 figure would be 4510, an increase of 32%.

In 2008 emissions per capita were 15.6 tonnes as compared to 13.4 tonnes in 1990.

68 <http://www.umhverfisraduneyti.is/frettir/nr/1711>

69 [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/isl\\_nc5\\_resubmit.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/isl_nc5_resubmit.pdf)

70 [http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/cop\\_15/copenhagen\\_accord/application/pdf/icelandcphaccord\\_app1.pdf](http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/cop_15/copenhagen_accord/application/pdf/icelandcphaccord_app1.pdf)

71 Eventually reservoirs will be filled with glacier mud and some geologists argue that geothermal power plants will only last for decades.

72 <http://www.umhverfisraduneyti.is/frettir/nr/1711>

In 2008, the Icelandic government still expected a significant increase in emissions from energy intensive industries, from about 1800 Gg of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents to 2900 equivalents, an increase by 62%. Whereas the increase in emissions during the first commitment period would be covered by Decision 14/CP.7 (see below), an increase by 46% compared to 1990 (8000 Gg during the first commitment period).

Total greenhouse gas emissions in Iceland increased by 32% in the period 1990 to 2007. Emissions per capita increased by 6% in the same period, but emissions per GDP (1990–2006) decreased by 23%.<sup>73</sup>

Iceland has been reluctant to provide more recent figures on emissions per capita.

**These 10 key actions are:**

1. Implementing a trade system with emission allowances.
2. Carbon tax
3. Changes in tax system and levies on cars and fuel
4. Cars in public ownership (state and municipalities) shall be fuel efficient and eco friendly
5. Strengthen public transportation and increase the number of trails for bikers and pedestrians to provide more options for sustainable transportation
6. Utilizing biofuels for fishing vessels
7. Fuel fish meal factories with electricity
8. Increase in afforestation and revegetation projects
9. Wetland reclamation
10. Provide more support for research and innovation with regard to climate issues.

**Implementing a trade system with emission allowances (ETS)**

Under the European Economic Area Agreement (EEA) Iceland is part of the ETS system and this looks like one of the most promising mitigation actions. Domestic flight is already a part of the ETS and so will the aluminium and ferrosilicon industry from 1 January 2013.

**14/CP.7**

During the first period under the Kyoto Protocol, Iceland has enjoyed an exemption for its aluminium industry, in accordance with decision 14/CP.7

Under decision 14/CP.7 Iceland can exclude emissions from large projects. In 2003, this accounted for 0.45 Mt of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents, coming exclusively from industrial process emissions. The emissions qualify for exclusion under 14/CP.7 when “the proportional impact of single projects are over 5% of total carbon dioxide emissions of a country in 1990”. Projects exceeding this threshold shall be reported separately and carbon

---

73 [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/isl\\_nc5\\_resubmit.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/isl_nc5_resubmit.pdf)

dioxide emissions from them not included in national totals to the extent that they would cause the party to exceed its assigned amount.<sup>74</sup>

The projects presently covered by Decision 14/CP.7 – aluminium plants and one ferrosilicon plant – will be part of the EU-ETS in 2013.

In an answer to the EU Commission, during a screening process for the negotiations on Iceland's accession to the EU:

98. Is Iceland planning on continuing with decision 14/CP.7 (single project exemption)?

Iceland's answer is:

The present government would prefer to discontinue Decision 14/CP.7 on the effect of single projects in small economies, as it creates a dual system of accounting for emissions and is complex in its implementation.

In order to avoid this risk, Iceland asked to join the EU Climate Policy, which was granted in December 2009. Hence, Iceland will take on the same obligations as the EU under any new treaty agreed by the Kyoto Protocol and the UNFCCC.

However, Iceland continues:

It must be considered, however, that a simple discontinuation of the Decision in 2012 would leave those projects presently covered under its provisions without adequate backing with regard to their emissions – both in relation to the UNFCCC and domestic law – if no account is taken to those emissions in other aspects of a post-2012 climate regime. Iceland is therefore keeping open the possibility of extending Decision 14/CP.7 and its provisions for the next commitment period, and has submitted a proposal in that regard in the climate negotiations. That proposal will be withdrawn if other solutions are found with regard to the emissions presently covered under Dec. 14/CP.7.

What this will mean, it is difficult to say, but Iceland Nature Conservation Association strongly criticized the government for pursuing a special status for Iceland, granting the aluminium industry the status of a free ride, which compared to 1990 amounted to a 46% increase in emissions. However, we have welcomed Iceland's accession to the EU Climate Policy, which on its own, could be considered as a climate action by Iceland, providing the government with both a more rigorous and more systematic approach. Approximately 40% of Iceland's emissions will be included in the EU ETS system.

## **Carbon tax**

Last year, 2012, as a part of government policy to improve state finances, which have been poor since the economic collapse in October 2008, the government set a carbon tax on motor vehicles. It is too early to say how this will affect emissions, but the economic collapse of 2008, causing a depreciation of the Icelandic krona, made gas and oil a lot more expensive and to the degree the market for new cars has recovered since then, there is a clear trend

---

74 Greenhouse gas emission trends and projections in Europe 2007 – Country profile

towards buying smaller and a more fuel-efficient cars.

Although carbon tax may be seen as a budgetary measure, the government points out that the tax charged is additional to those levies already put on diesel and gas (petrol). The tax is based on the amount of carbon per litre of fuel. Hence the levy is higher on diesel than gas.

... the carbon tax covers liquid fossil fuels for vehicles and ships. The tax is based on the carbon content of the fuel. The taxation of the fuel carbon corresponds to half the price for CO<sub>2</sub> allowances in the EU emission trading system. The non-ferrous metal industry will fall under the EU emission trading system from 2013. Benchmarking, gradual lowering of the cap and trading of allowances under the EU-ETS are designed to encourage a shift toward cleaner technologies and lower emissions of greenhouse gases.<sup>75</sup>

Therefore the carbon tax is an environmental tax. The value of the tax was initially 50% of the price of CO<sub>2</sub> allowances, but on 1 January 2011 it was raised to 75%. As of 1 January the taxation for all types of fuels except gasoline has been 100% of the EU price for CO<sub>2</sub> allowances. Due to enormous price increases the government has decided to keep the tax for gasoline at 75% of the EU price for emission allowances.<sup>76</sup>

The price of fuel is however cheaper in Iceland than most other Nordic Countries<sup>77</sup> and given the long distances in rural areas plus the urban sprawl in the capital area, the government has chosen a very lenient approach on carbon tax.

The Action Plan admits that Icelanders own the largest car fleet per capita and four-wheel drive vehicles are often one of two cars per household.

The old system favoured gas guzzlers. In fact, in 2000 the government reduced taxes on cars with engines with a bigger displacement than 2 litres. The new system taxes cars in accordance with emissions in grams of CO<sub>2</sub>/km. This has helped to increase sales of smaller cars, while bigger cars like Mercedes and Volvo are now sold with more fuel-efficient engines.

Part of the Action Plan to reduce emissions from private cars is education. However, no major education campaigns have been launched by the government or local authorities. The opposition depicts these measures as new taxes, putting greater burdens on the taxpayer and, in a sense, the climate threat is not seen as great enough to enable the government to call on the public to drive less and turn to more fuel-efficient cars.

It will take time for the public to change values. Whatever people may feel, snow in Reykjavik will not hamper traffic more than a few days a year. Even less so as the climate gets warmer. The best educator, perhaps, is to raise taxes and levies on carbon, but even that will take time as it will take some 10 years to renew the car fleet.

The new system promises a fleet of smaller cars in 10 years, but by compari-

75 [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/isl\\_nc5\\_resubmit.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/isl_nc5_resubmit.pdf)

76 [http://www.umhverfisraduneyti.is/media/PDF\\_skrar/Adgerdir-i-loftslagsmalum-skyrsla.pdf](http://www.umhverfisraduneyti.is/media/PDF_skrar/Adgerdir-i-loftslagsmalum-skyrsla.pdf)

77 See <http://www.fuel-prices-europe.info/>, dated 3 April 2013.

son, diesel and gas cost more in Denmark, Norway and Sweden, measured in ISK. However, the purchasing power may be greater in these countries than it is in Iceland.

Mostly thanks to the 50% devaluation of the krona in October 2008, with subsequent price hikes for gasoline and diesel, fuel consumption dropped significantly due to less driving, from 3.048 billion km in 2008 to 2.097.5 billion km in 2012.<sup>78</sup>

### **Cars in public ownership (state and municipalities) must be fuel-efficient and eco-friendly**

This is probably not having much effect, as yet, because neither the government nor the municipalities have been able to renew their car fleet. However, this is a good signal to the public, if implemented properly. However, there are no specific targets except that 'eco-friendly' cars would emit less than 120g CO<sub>2</sub> per km. In case of four-wheel drive vehicles, those would be diesel rather than gasoline.

### **Strengthen the net of pathways for pedestrians, roads for bikers as well as public transport as an alternative for transportation**

This mostly applies to the Reykjavik area and it certainly is a tall order. Reykjavik and neighbouring communities were planned and built as American cities, allowing for urban sprawl. Although the City Council and other authorities are now calling for more density, this will take decades. Therefore, public transportation is less developed than in most European cities.

In recent years, both the government and the Reykjavik City Council have promoted biking as a means of transportation, and the infrastructure for bikers has been improved. But it is still nowhere near the standard of the Danish or Swedish system, where there are specific traffic lights for bikers. Biking, also, is a long-distance effort for those who live in the suburbs.

### **Utilizing biofuels for fishing vessels**

This alternative, which was listed in the action plan in 2010, is no longer as promising as it was described by those who promoted it. It has turned out to be much more expensive than anticipated. Other measures intended to increase the fuel efficiency of fishing vessels include designing lighter fishing gear such as bottom trawls. Due to the cost of running factory trawlers, the industry has the alternative of landing the fish for freezing on land where clean energy can be used.

### **Fuel fish meal factories with electricity**

This measure has been in the works for more than a decade. The delay can probably be explained by Iceland wanting to time such measures when they count, i.e. during the first commitment period of the KP.

The problem is that fish meal factories only need energy for a limited time

---

<sup>78</sup> See <http://www.fuel-prices-europe.info/>, dated 3 April 2013.

each year, energy which cannot be provided by hydropower or geothermal power stations as they need continuous demand for their production.

By 1 January 2013, the fish meal factories will become part of the ETS system. Hence this approach is no longer relevant for mitigating efforts by the Icelandic government.

## **Sequestration - More afforestation and soil conservation**

Iceland has long promoted afforestation and land reclamation as a key part of its climate policy. Hence, Iceland talks of net emissions. That is, emissions – minus sequestration through land reclamation and afforestation.

## **Wetland reclamation**

*In Iceland's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change it says:*

Related to agriculture is the issue of emissions from drained wetlands. Research indicates that drained wetlands are a significant source of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. These emissions can be attributed largely to human influence, from the draining of wetlands undertaken almost entirely before 1990. Some of the land is currently used for crop cultivation or animal grazing, but the rest is of marginal use. The discovery of this apparently significant emission source indicates that the reclamation of wetlands can help stop the emission of CO<sub>2</sub>, and even in some cases sequester carbon in vegetation and soil. Increased reclamation of wetlands is listed as a priority measure for the mitigation of climate change in the 2007 climate change strategy, regardless of whether it can result in credits in the Kyoto Protocol GHG accounting or not.<sup>79</sup>

In a “Background paper produced by Iceland for AWG-KP 6, part I meeting in Accra, August 2008” it says:

### **Mitigation potential**

The technical mitigation potential for drained and damaged wetlands, including peatlands, would appear to be sizable on a global scale, perhaps equivalent of up to 10% of global emissions, counting emissions from wooded peatlands. Feasible mitigation by wetland restoration would be smaller, taking into account that much of degraded wetlands are used for food production, habitation and other use, that would render it difficult to restore them. Most countries would have a much lower mitigation potential than Iceland, which has a relatively large surface area compared to its population.

Iceland's proposal on reclamation of wetlands was adopted at COP7 in Durban,<sup>80</sup> as a method of mitigation rather than sequestration, and this could be a gold mine for Iceland. Back in the 50s, 60s, 70s, 80s and well into the 1990s, the Icelandic government subsidized farmers to dry their lands by digging thousands of kilometres of ditches, , in order to provide more land for

79 [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/isl\\_nc5\\_resubmit.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/isl_nc5_resubmit.pdf) See page 54.

80 Decision 2/CMP.7 Land use, land-use change and forestry, <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2011/cmp7/eng/10a01.pdf>

hayfields or grazing. Yet, these grazing areas or hayfields serve little purpose today as farms have been abandoned en masse.

Filling the ditches again will be even cheaper than digging them, it will provide jobs and it will account for a good share of Iceland's mitigation efforts. It will probably start during the 2nd Kyoto Protocol commitment period. How much carbon can be mitigated by reclaiming wetlands seems unclear, but Icelandic scientists at the Agricultural University of Iceland, which have conducted research on this, believe there is a great potential.

## **10. Provide more support for research and innovation with regard to climate issues.**

In Iceland, research on wetland reclamation and sequestration by soil conservation, revegetation and afforestation receive by far the most attention. Whereas wetland reclamation is a relatively new phenomenon, soil conservation, revegetation and afforestation have enjoyed government support for the last century. Iceland's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change states:

In Iceland the human impact on ecosystems is strong. The entire island was estimated to be about 65% covered with vegetation at the time of settlement in the year 874. Today, Iceland is only about 25% vegetated. This reduction in vegetative cover is the result of a combination of harsh climate and intensive land and resource utilization by a farming and agrarian society over 11 centuries. Estimates vary as to the percentage of the island originally covered with forest and woodlands at settlement, but a range of 25 to 30% is plausible.

This is true, but farmers are still allowed to put their livestock to pasture on poorly vegetated areas. The purpose of soil conservation and revegetation is blurred by different agenda set by scientists, official farmers' interests.

As for mitigation of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, research is much more limited and does not enjoy a century-old tradition. The fishing industry has made some attempts to investigate biofuels, but apparently without research. The most promising research regards technology to optimize vessel fuel consumption. In 2008, an Icelandic company, Marorka<sup>81</sup> was awarded the Nordic Council Nature and Environment Prize for having developed IT tools which can significantly reduce energy consumption and emissions in shipping.

### **Interconnector**

During the last two years, Landsvirkjun, the National Power Company, has brought up plans for an interconnector to Scotland in cooperation with the British National Grid. That is, Landsvirkjun would sell energy to Scotland via an interconnector which would be laid and funded by another company. The cable would be able to carry some 1000 MW, but as well as export, Iceland could import energy, if need be.

Apparently this is a project in which the British authorities have a great

---

81 See: <http://www.marorka.com/about-us/>

interest in order to be able to meet their 2020 target. The energy would be provided by hydropower plants, geothermal power plants and wind energy, which is a novelty in Iceland.

Wind energy in Iceland looks very promising in the sense that wind turbines on land would produce as much energy as offshore wind turbines in the North Sea. Recently, the Icelandic Met Office published a feasibility study on harnessing wind energy in Iceland and it looks promising. Landsvirkjun has installed two wind turbines from Germany for testing.

Currently, an exploratory committee, involving the industry, MPs and NGOs (Arni Finnsson), consumer organizations, etc. is studying the feasibility of exporting energy via an interconnector. A report is due in May and will likely recommend further studies. Landsvirkjun, however, has asked for a grace period until 2014, claiming that decisions are not due until then, at the earliest.

Given the interest from the British, who would like to complement offshore wind energy off Scotland with energy from Iceland, this project must have some economic merits. How much carbon it will save, though, is unclear. The number one criterion is whether it will pay off.



LATVIA

## Climate Policy instruments in Latvia

*Compiled by Janis Brizga, Green Liberty, Latvia*

NGOs that participated in the assessment: Green Liberty, Physical Energy Institute, Environmental Protection Club, Latvian Green Movement, Baltic Environmental Forum, Homo Ecos, Latvia's Environmental Management Association.

### Introduction

Latvia signed the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 1992 and ratified it in 1995. Latvia also signed the Kyoto Protocol in 1998 and ratified it in 2002, but nationally climate change is not one of the top political priorities. Like the rest of the former Soviet bloc countries, Latvia over the last 20 years has significantly reduced its CO<sub>2</sub> emissions – almost by 60%. This reduction in GHG emissions has been possible because of the decreasing population – a drop of 16.03% in population between 1990–2010, a drop in economic output, changes in economic structure and rising prices of energy.

The highest CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Latvia are in the energy, transport, agriculture and waste sectors. However CO<sub>2</sub> absorption is ensured by the forestry sector. Over the last 20 years the energy sector in Latvia has undergone significant change. In 1990 it accounted for 19.3, but in 2007 only 8.8 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>. However its share of GHG emissions in Latvia has not changed much and is still around 75%. Fuel composition dramatically changed as well. Comprising 27.7% of energy sources in 1990, heavy oil, shale oil, and coal usage dropped to a mere 3.1% in 2007. Instead, natural gas became the primary source for heating, power plants, and industrial enterprises. Another rising alternative source of energy is fuel wood, climbing from 8.6% in 1990 to 25.2% in 2007.

Nevertheless, there are still many areas for improvement. This is particularly true of the transportation sector, where emissions rose from 3 million tons in 1990 to close to 3.9 million tons in 2007 due to an increase in road transport, explained mostly by the growing number of vehicles and increasing mileage due to economic growth in the country.<sup>82</sup>

According to the Kyoto Protocol, Latvia, like other countries, has an obligation to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 8% by 2012 compared to its 1990 level (25.894 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent). So to fulfill the Kyoto obligations in the time period between 2008 and 2012 Latvia's annual CO<sub>2</sub> emissions should not exceed 23.823 million tons. This is an easy target as in 2000 emissions dropped to only 37% of the 1990 level, and have stayed at the 40% level since then, in part thanks to the economic recession in 2008.

---

82 Latvian Ministry of Environment (2009) "Latvia's national inventory report Submitted under United Nations Convention on Climate Change, Common Reporting Formats (CRF) 1990 – 2007"

However, according to the business as usual scenario, with the existing measures Latvia's GHG emissions by 2020 will increase by 19.6%<sup>83</sup>. The fastest growth in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is foreseen for the manufacturing, energy and agricultural sectors.

A number of abatement opportunities exist that have the potential to deliver emissions reductions in Latvia, and contribute to its climate targets. The level of abatement potential will vary by sector, as will the cost of the measures. Reductions in GHG emissions could be delivered by providing economic incentives, technological improvements, behavioural measures and structural changes. At the same time the possible rebound effects of these measures should be taken into account when designing policy interventions. The following paper gives a brief overview of the climate policy interventions used in Latvia.

## Climate Change Mitigation Policy

The key framework in Latvia through which the requirements of the UN-FCCC, Kyoto Protocol and European Union (EU) climate change legislation are delivered is the Climate Change Mitigation Strategy for 2005–2010. Policy goals at both the national level (e.g. environmental policy guidelines for 2009–2015) and the EU level (e.g. the climate and energy package) go beyond 2010, but it is unclear whether the 2005–2010 programme will continue or be replaced by a similar strategy, Green Growth strategy or other type of policy.

Latvia has taken clear targets for GHG emission limitation and renewable energy deployment from the 2008 EU climate and energy package. As an EU member state, Latvia is bound by EU legislation and has set out some key goals that must be achieved by 2020 within the framework of the 2008 EU climate and energy package, namely that:

- 40% of energy (on a consumption basis) by 2020 should come from renewable resources (in 2009 this figure was 34.3%, in 2010 – 32.5% but in 2011 – 33.1%);
- in 2020 GHG emissions should be reduced by 20-35% of the 1990 level;
- Latvia's national target under the Effort Sharing Decision (ESD) is equivalent to a 17% increase in the greenhouse gas emissions from ESD sectors<sup>84</sup> in 2005, by 2020;
- emissions covered by ETS by 2020 should be 21% below the 2005 level.

Other targets and milestones are mentioned for the energy sector (both for renewable energy production and energy efficiency improvements) and for the transport sector (renewable energy sources should account for 10% of total energy consumption in the transport sector by 2020 – in 2009 the

---

83 Physical Energy Institute, Study „Latvijas Siltumnīcefekta gāzu emisiju un piesaistes prognožu līdz 2020.gadam sagatavošana saskaņā ar Eiropas Parlamenta un Padomes Lēmumu Nr. 280/2400/EK”.

84 Emissions from most sectors not included in the EU Emissions Trading System (EU ETS), such as transport (except aviation), buildings, agriculture and waste.

share was 1.1%, in 2010 – 3.3% but in 2011 – 4.8%)<sup>85</sup>. However longer-term targets are not reported, which makes it difficult to assess whether the actions are modifying longer-term trends in anthropogenic GHG emissions and removals consistent with the objective of the UNFCCC.

A longer-term vision for energy policy developments has been established by the government through the Guidelines for Energy Policy Developments in 2007-2016, that include a firm commitment to promote energy efficiency<sup>86</sup>. For the time being the draft Latvia Energy Strategy 2030 and new Latvia National Development Plan 2014-2020 are under development. Both of them continue the measures relevant for climate policy. At the same time the Renewable Energy Act is being developed, which aims at 40% renewable energy resources in the total energy balance. This has been under discussion for almost two years, in an effort to achieve consensus among all involved stakeholders. Nevertheless, taking into account the latest calculations about the cost of green energy, the Ministry of Economy has postponed adoption of the Act.

Currently, the share of renewable energy is about 33.1% of the total energy balance, while in the electricity sector, green energy currently accounts for 41%, with the target for 2020 being 49.3%.

Significant challenges in implementing the overall climate policy in Latvia are linked to the difficulties in monitoring, evaluating and, where necessary, taking corrective measures to ensure that targets are met; difficulties in ensuring that sustainable feedstocks are available to meet the demands of bioenergy policy; and the difficulty in increasing the share of RES in total final energy consumption at a time when a 55% increase in electricity consumption is forecast.<sup>87</sup>

## Emission trading

### European Union Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS)

Latvia has participated in the EU ETS since 2005. For sectors included in the European Trading Scheme (ETS), there is an EU-wide target of 21% reduction in emissions relative to 2005 levels.

During Phase I (2005–2007) ETS in Latvia covered 99 installations emitting approximately 40 per cent of Latvian CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Installations involved in the first EU ETS period emitted 2.854 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> in 2005 (energy supply installations: 1.922 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>; other combustion installations: 0.179 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>; industrial installations – 0.753 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>) which together make up 26% of the total amount of the country's GHG emissions. However Phase I was more like a learning

85 Republic of Latvia Ministry of Economy 16.10.2012 <http://www.em.gov.lv/em/2nd/?-cat=30170>

86 Klavs, G., Kudrenickis, I. (2012) Energy Efficiency Policies and Measures in Latvia, Institute of Physical Energetics, available at [http://www.odyssee-indicators.org/publications/PDF/latvia\\_nr.pdf](http://www.odyssee-indicators.org/publications/PDF/latvia_nr.pdf)

87 <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2011/idr/lva05.pdf>

stage with over-allocation of quotas and easy profits for some of the companies involved (e.g. in 2006 Latvenergo earned €12.9 million from selling its unused quotas<sup>88</sup>). It also did not ensure significant GHG emission reduction as emissions from installations in 2006 totalled 2,941 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>, – compared to 2,849 million tons in 2007 .

In Phase II (2008-2012) the scheme was extended and from 2012 international aviation was included in the EU ETS as well. In this period the government prioritized emission allocation to industry, reducing the amount of quotas in the energy sector by 20%. A total of 3.428 million quotas were allocated to Latvia by the EU.<sup>89</sup> The biggest share (1.596 million quotas) went to the energy sector, which is 20% less than in the previous period. On the other hand, the amount of emission allowances that has been granted to the industry sector has increased by 6% above the base year level, reaching 1.046 million quotas. In total, there are 90 installations in Latvia that are participating in Phase II of the EU ETS. Two-thirds of these installations are boiler plants. There are also seven cogeneration installations and four thermal centrals. Most of the installations generate thermal energy. The reserve for new plants was 785.8 thousand quotas – the same amount as in the previous period.

Up until 2012, emission allowances are allocated to installations free of charge, which gave little incentive to businesses to decrease their GHG emissions. However, from 2013 until 2020 allowances will have to be purchased at auction. Nevertheless ETS sectors in Latvia cover only one quarter of national GHG emissions. Therefore measures also should be taken in non-ETS sectors, where the business as usual scenario shows that emissions could exceed the 17% increase threshold reached in the EU effort-sharing decision.

### **International Emissions Trading**

Latvia began its participation in the International Emissions Trading regime on 12 April 2006 when it designated 40 million assigned amount units (AAU)(out of the 119,182,230 units initially allocated to Latvia) to be earmarked for potential sale during Kyoto's first commitment period. Latvia and Hungary were the first two East European Countries that established frameworks for "green" AAU trading, meaning that AAU revenues would be used to finance environmental programmes to increase energy efficiency and contribute to GHG mitigation. The selection process of greening projects is usually stipulated in the AAU purchase contract. Latvia has decided to carry out selection with the help of tendering processes.

For the time period from 2008 to 2012 it is estimated that 40 million emission allowances will be traded(including those already sold), which would give revenues of €200 million euro or approximately LVL 141 million.

Since 2008, Latvia has signed several AAU purchase (sale) agreements

---

88 Latvenergo (2006) ANNUAL REPORT 2006, available at [http://www.latvenergo.lv/portal/page/portal/english/annual\\_reports/pdf/LVN\\_EN\\_final\\_sm.pdf](http://www.latvenergo.lv/portal/page/portal/english/annual_reports/pdf/LVN_EN_final_sm.pdf)

89 National Emissions Allowance Allocation Plan 2008–2012, [http://www3.meteo.lv/upload\\_file/SEG\\_REGISTRS/NAP2\\_Latvia\\_EN.pdf](http://www3.meteo.lv/upload_file/SEG_REGISTRS/NAP2_Latvia_EN.pdf)

(AAUPAs) with countries including the Netherlands, Austria, Spain, Japan, and Portugal. These sales have generated over €200 million. The contracts with the Netherlands and Austria were closed in March 2009 (5 million AAUs), the contract with Spain in September 2009 (5 million AAUs), in October 2009 Latvia signed the contracts with Japan and Portugal (total 5.5 million AAUs), a private investor (1.5 million AAUs) and then the second contract with Austria (1.5 million AAUs). The actual AAU price in 2008 and 2009 was two times higher than projected and Latvia was able to sell 50% more AAUs than planned which resulted in €155 million in earnings. The first two trading years proved to be more profitable than expected and Latvia earned €105 million more than initially planned.

Latvia's state budget revenues in 2009 amounted to €5.7 billion (LVL 4 billion). The income from the emission allowance surplus was 2.3% of these revenues (LVL 91.4 million). Although all the collected money goes into the national budget, it does not increase the income directly. The law states that countries must prove that the revenues from emission allowance trading are invested in green technologies. These restrictions are adopted in order to ensure that money is really used for the intended purpose – to mitigate emissions. Latvian AAUs are backed by Green Investment scheme (GIS) projects, thereby guaranteeing that revenues are spent on energy efficiency, green technologies and renewable energy projects.

A Climate Change Financial Instrument (CCFI) was established to manage the funds earned through international emissions trading. This is a government budget programme aiming to “implement activities to improve the energy performance of buildings in both public and private sectors, the development and implementation of technologies that use renewable energy resources, as well as the implementation of integrated solutions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions”<sup>90</sup>. CCFI funds a broad array of greening projects, including, but not limited to, an increase in the energy efficiency of municipal buildings, use of renewable energy sources in the household sector, complex solutions for GHG emission reduction in state and municipal vocational education establishment buildings, technology conversion from fossil to renewable energy sources, complex solutions for GHG emission reduction in municipal buildings and production buildings, public campaigns to raise awareness about the importance of reducing GHG emissions and other projects aimed at GHG emission reduction<sup>91</sup>. Total funds spent in 2011 amounted to LVL 111.7 million:

Increasing energy efficiency in municipal buildings – 25.16 million;

Development of technologies reducing greenhouse gas emissions– 1.74 million;

- Increasing energy performance in higher education establishment buildings – 7.03 million;
- Technology conversion from fossil to renewable energy sources – 7.51 million;

90 [http://www.varam.gov.lv/lat/darbibas\\_veidi/KPFI/merki/](http://www.varam.gov.lv/lat/darbibas_veidi/KPFI/merki/) (official website of The Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development of the Republic of Latvia)

91 [http://www.lvif.gov.lv/?object\\_id=299](http://www.lvif.gov.lv/?object_id=299)

- Complex solutions for greenhouse gas emission reduction in state and municipal vocational education establishment buildings – 11.56 million;
- Complex solutions for greenhouse gas emission reduction in municipal buildings – 16.11 million;
- Complex solutions for greenhouse gas emission reduction in production-buildings – 8.5 million;
- Public awareness with regard to the role and opportunities for greenhouse gas emissions reduction – 0.60 million;
- Renewable energy use in transport sector – 1.81 million;
- Low-energy building – 7.26 million;
- Renewable energy use in the household sector – 11.4 million;
- Use of renewable energy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions – 27.72 million.

Demand for this financing is evidently very high and in most tenders the number of applications by far exceeded the available financing.

## EU Structural Funds

Latvia's National Reform Programme for implementation of "EU 2020" strategy and the National Development Plan for 2007-2013 acknowledge that the development of low-carbon production and services are key to ensuring Latvia's international competitiveness in the long term. In the EU funds programming period 2007-2013, a number of measures have either directly or indirectly supported GHG emission reductions, e.g. over €340 million has been allocated to fund clean energy and efficiency measures.

The operational programme "Infrastructure and Services", with financial support from the Cohesion Fund, promoted the use of renewable resources in the development of cogeneration power plant. The public service providers received 50% funding to build new renewable energy co-generation power plant or for rebuilding an existing boiler plant using renewable energy resources, CHP. Programme financing - EUR 97.817 million (LVL 68.746 million) from the Cohesion Fund - 50%, from private funding - 50%.

Another Investment programme under the same "Infrastructure and Services" operational programme is "Measures for district heating system efficiency". The aim of this programme is to increase efficiency in heating energy generation, which includes reduction of heating lost in transmission and distribution systems as well as to promote the replacement of fossil fuels in energy generation plants with renewable resources. A total of 58 projects have been approved in the first three rounds of allocation, amounting to almost LVL 33 million.

One more investment line under the "Infrastructure and Services" operational programme provides support for "Heat-efficiency improvements in apartment buildings". This is funded through the EU Regional Development Fund (RDF) with total available funding of EUR 43,704 million. Thermal energy savings funded by this fund should be no less than 20% of the normalized total heat consumption, but it is accepted that the heat consumption of the project is 100 kWh per m<sup>2</sup> (for 1-2 storey multi-apartment buildings)

and 120 kWh per m<sup>2</sup> (for 3 storey and higher multi-apartment buildings). Apartment owners can recover 50%-60% of the total eligible costs.

The second EU RDF activity for energy efficiency in buildings is "Heat efficiency improvements in social housing" – EUR 13,233 million. Both activities should ensure 20% energy efficiency improvement.

Financial support for the production of energy from biogas is provided through Rural Development Programme 2007-2013 measure 312(311) "Support for creation and development of micro-enterprises (including diversification into non-agricultural activities)" sub-measure "Production of energy from biomass which is of an agricultural or forestry origin". Its aim is to support holdings which establish production of energy from biomass of agricultural or forestry origin and which provide the produced energy for use predominantly outside the holding. In assessing the effectiveness of the program it has been recognized that it does not fulfill its initial expectations. The aim of the state programme "Biofuel Production and Use in Latvia (2003-2010)" was to ensure that in 2010 biofuels amount to 5.75% of the total fuel market in Latvia, but the actual share of biofuels was only 2.96%, and the majority of biofuels produced in Latvia were exported.

The EU maintains that investment in energy efficiency is important for reducing GHG emissions and other environmental impacts as well as contributing to economic growth and competitiveness – especially in the new EU member states, which are expected to claim the greater part of the support.

Funding is also available for the period 2009-2014 via the "National climate policy" programme through the **European Economic Area Financial Mechanism and Norway Financial Mechanism**. Total allocation according to the Memorandum of Understanding is €10,365 million. The programme aims to support elaboration of national climate policy, data collection for inventories, capacity building, pilot projects and studies.

The Financial Instrument for Environment (LIFE+) was created to support activities which "have European added value, have a leverage or multiplier effect and demonstrative or catalytic character". The Commission proposes to allocate €3.2 billion to the LIFE+ programme (0.8bn on climate and 2.4bn for environment) for 2014-2020. Latvia funded several projects through this programme.

## Taxes

Latvia has nearly always been an opponent of energy taxation, which is why the best opportunities for introducing them – when energy prices were low and the economy was growing at a fast pace – have been missed<sup>92</sup>. The current taxation system supports big energy producers, but there are several examples of fiscal incentives.

---

92 Spruds, A. (ed.) (2010) Latvian energy policy: towards a sustainable and transparent energy sector, Sorosa fonds – Latvija.

## **CO<sub>2</sub> tax**

The Carbon Dioxide Tax (part of the Natural Resource Tax) was introduced in 2006 and it has been gradually increased from LVL 0.10 (EUR 0.14) in 2006 until it will reach LVL 2.0 per ton (EUR 2.82) in 2013. Installations participating in the EU ETS as well as installations which use renewable resources and peat for energy production are exempt from this tax. There are also other exceptions – heat and power production from coal, wood and lignite (brown coal) are also exempt from tax.

The natural resource tax also has to be paid for other types of pollution (PM<sub>10</sub>, CO, ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>), hydrogen sulfide (H<sub>2</sub>S) and other inorganic compounds, SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, volatile organic compounds and other hydrocarbons (C<sub>n</sub>H<sub>m</sub>), heavy metals and vanadium pentoxide emissions) which works in synergy with the climate policy.

## **Other taxes**

**Excise tax** is levied on oil-based products (including natural gas), however, unlike in many other EU member states, it is not levied on fossil fuel used in heating or electricity production. The tax rate varies from LVL 90 per 1000 kg of petroleum gases and other gaseous hydrocarbons to LVL 320 for leaded petrol.

In December, 2008 the parliament (Saeima) abolished the lowered tax rate on locally produced biomass whilst upholding the lowered rate (10%) for natural gas imported from Russia. This measure unquestionably hinders the competitiveness of local renewables and strengthens the position of Russian gas. Only a year later, in December 2009, the amendments to the Excise Duty law were passed. According to the new law, natural gas used as fuel will have an excise duty of LVL 15.6 per 1000 m<sup>3</sup> and natural gas used for heating will have an excise duty of LVL 70 for 1000 m<sup>3</sup>. The new excise duty, in effect, increases the competitiveness of local renewables. However, the process of adopting this legislation was, once again, non-transparent and unpredictable. It left the impression that the reasoning behind the decision was the need to reduce the budget deficit and not the need to act in accordance with the priorities of the energy sector or the need to promote sustainable development of the country's economy.

Latvia aims to increase the proportion of biofuel in transport fuels to 10% by 2020, with a particular focus on vehicles used in agriculture. Latvia provides financial support for biofuel production and promotes the use of biofuel and other renewable fuels in transport by providing reduced rates of excise tax for biofuels used in the transport sector:

- 70 - 85% ethanol fuel produced from agricultural raw materials;
- diesel fuel with at least 30% by volume of biodiesel;
- pure biodiesel is subject to 0% rate;
- petroleum products, which are used as fuel and have at least 5% rapeseed oil or biodiesel admixture.

According to the Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No. 648 from 1 October 2009, petrol and diesel used in transportation should have a mandatory bio-fuel admixture of 5% (not applicable to diesel fuel for use during the winter season).

**Electricity tax** was introduced in 2006. However there are several tax exemptions for:

- electricity derived from (i) renewable energy sources, (ii) hydro, and (iii) in cogeneration units if they meet certain performance criteria
- electricity that is used for (i) the production of electricity, (ii) the production of heat and electricity cogeneration, and (iii) goods and passenger traffic in road and rail transport, (iv) the household.

## **Policy instruments by sector**

### **Transport**

Apart from excise tax there are also other instruments used in Latvia to stimulate GHG emission reductions in transport sectors mostly by promoting use of environmentally friendly vehicles and limiting CO<sub>2</sub> emissions through renewal of the car fleet and increasing the share of environmentally friendly vehicles in the total car fleet.

Transport emissions account for 30% of total GHG emissions and around 25% of energy consumed in Latvia. The main economic instruments are the vehicle registration fee and annual tax, which is differentiated depending on the vehicle's gross weight, engine capacity and maximum engine power.

The annual road tax is comparable to an energy tax, providing it promotes energy efficiency and environment protection goals. However, the reasoning behind the road tax increase, which was recently introduced as part of a state budget consolidation, is old-fashioned and lacking in motivating incentives. The dependency of the tax on the weight of the car is incorrectly explained and does not help to promote reduced fuel consumption. The tax, once again, mainly harms large families and the owners of gas-guzzlers. The best and most fair method would be to link the tax to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and engine size. This way, the tax would serve three purposes: environment protection, social justice and fiscal benefits.

The vehicle first registration tax is differentiated according to vehicle age and engine capacity. As of 1 January 2009, the tax depends on the vehicle CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per kilometre. The tax rate varies from 0.3 to 5 Ls per gram of carbon dioxide emissions.

### **Feed-in tariffs**

Latvia provides support for energy generation from renewable sources through feed-in tariffs for small hydropower plants, wind electricity generation and for cogeneration plants using renewable fuels. However there has been a lot of discussion concerning these tariffs.

Regulation No. 198 of the Cabinet of Ministers (Regulation on Electric Power Production and Pricing Using Renewable Energy Sources), passed on 14 March 2009, gave grounds for political conflict and suspicion that the criteria were deliberately designed to suit certain lobby groups. A couple of months later, amendments to the regulation were passed and the ambiguities were eliminated.

Nevertheless the quota system used in the feed-in tariff scheme does not assist in increasing the share of renewable energy production as considerable numbers of businesses that have been granted the feed-in tariff rights are receiving funds for existing power stations whilst eligible new businesses have no quotas.

Because of the economic recession and budgetary problems the support for the RES is currently frozen for an uncertain period of time.

### **Industrial processes**

In the industry sector, a permitting process under the provisions of the “Law on Pollution” enhances environmental efficiency in production processes, taking into account GHG emission among others. This encourages implementation of the best available techniques, environmentally friendly technologies and cleaner production, including control of fluorinated gases in the manufacturing industry (including steel and mineral production).

### **Agriculture**

In the agriculture sector, the government has not taken any direct actions toward emission reduction, but other policies might indirectly positively affect it, e.g. development of environmentally friendly agriculture, promotion of good agricultural practice and measures to improve manure storage and use agricultural resources more sustainably, through payments to farmers who comply with good agricultural practice and by providing information and guidance on practices that reduce emissions.

### **Forestry**

In the forestry sector, investments are being made to increase forest stand productivity and afforestation, and measures are also in place to increase the productivity of forests, through forest management techniques, and to convert unmanaged agricultural land into forest. As a result of the change in land use structure, in 2007, LULUCF removed 50% more than it did in 1990.

### **Waste**

The National Waste Management Plan 2003–2012 aims to prevent waste production, reduce the amount and risk of waste, support recycling through energy recovery, safe and environmentally friendly storage, and the establishment of new municipal landfill sites.

The government has been promoting recyclables collection facilities, the installation of sorting, processing and disposal equipment in municipal landfills, and collection of biogas emitted from them. It has also created a voluntary program for packaging waste management, which constitutes 20%-30% of municipal waste.

Policies are in place to ensure collection of biogas from household waste landfills and processing of biologically degradable waste as well as to promote recycling, utilize methane collected at landfill sites, utilize biologically degradable waste for composting, restore landfill sites that do not meet current environmental requirements and reduce waste production through best practices.

The government is also promoting RES while at the same time reducing greenhouse gas emissions by applying a suitable waste management process, and providing support for energy production in biogas plants from agricultural waste and for energy production in biogas plants from waste landfills.

### **Communication instruments**

Communication, education and information instruments can promote the development of environmental awareness in society and contribute to climate change mitigation. In Latvia there are several NGOs which carry out various activities to raise public awareness of climate change issues as well as different policy instruments designed for communication.

The Environmental Protection Law (2006) sets out the environmental science, environmental education and sustainable education procedures. As a consequence of the financial crisis, priority is given to implementing environmental issues concerning mainly the air, water, soil, nature and climate.

One of the NGO activities was a climate change and energy campaign, aimed at eco-schools and other primary education institutions. Under this project, teachers as well as students were trained in climate change issues. NGOs provided educational materials and produced a CO<sub>2</sub> calculator for teaching and calculating how consumption is related to CO<sub>2</sub> creation and climate change promotion.

Non-governmental organizations are involved in the development of policies relating to the use of new technologies. For example, the World Wildlife Fund (Latvia Division) is helping members of the public understand their contribution to emissions from transport and household energy. The World Wildlife Fund also promoted the Earth Hour action across the cities and towns of Latvia. Green Liberty helps to communicate to the public how their lifestyles affect climate change and works within the Baltic region to improve cooperation between neighbouring countries. The Baltic Environmental Forum worked on the [BaltClim](#) project to support national adaptation strategies to climate change in the Baltic States. There have also been a number of other NGO initiatives on climate issues.

## Energy efficiency labelling

Latvia has adopted EU regulations on energy efficiency labelling for energy-using products as well as energy efficiency labelling for homes, which came into force in June 2010. Energy certificates are awarded to existing buildings, as well as new projects.

## Local-level initiatives

Some of the local municipalities have developed their own climate initiatives, e.g. ten municipalities in Latvia have adopted the Covenant of Mayors, which aims to improve energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources in their regions. Through their commitment, the covenant signatories aim to meet and exceed the European Union's 20% CO<sub>2</sub> reduction objective by 2020. However, only four municipalities in Latvia (Riga, Jelgava, Tukums and Jekabpils) have adopted sustainable energy action plans. In addition, Salacgriva municipality has developed "Climate change adaptation strategies for Salacgriva municipality", while Riga city has developed a [flood risk management plan](#).

## Research & science

As part of a national research programme entitled "Climate Change Impact on the Waters of Latvia" – KALME (Climate, Adaptation, Equilibrium, Variability, Ecosystem) more than 90 Latvian scientists studied the effects of climate change on Latvia's lakes, rivers and the Baltic Sea and its coast during 2006–2009. The programme resulted in science-based recommendations for adaptation and climate change mitigation. The KALME framework provides information on erosion of the sea coast, which includes the endangered coastal strip. There are also a number of other research projects on climate, e.g., BaltCICA – Climate Change: Impacts, Costs and Adaptation in the Baltic Sea Region; BalticClimate – Baltic Challenges and Changes for local and regional development generated by Climate Change; and BaltClim - Supporting strategies on climate change adaptation in the Baltic States.

Prioritization of the measures by Latvia's NGOs (one being the best):

Measure	Score
EU Structural Funds	1
Local-level initiatives	2
Excise tax	3
Energy efficiency labeling	4
Climate Change Mitigation Policy	5
CO <sub>2</sub> tax	6
Feed-in tariffs	7
European Union Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS)	8
Research & Science	9
Electricity tax	10
International Emissions Trading	11



LITAUEN

## Best GHG mitigation measures in Lithuania

*Compiled by Linas Vainius, Atgaja (Lithuania).*

### General situation:

In 2010, the main greenhouse gas (GHG) in Lithuania was carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), accounting for 64.3 per cent of total GHG emissions expressed in carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub> eq), followed by nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) (19.9 per cent) and methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) (14.9 per cent). Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs) and sulphur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>) collectively accounted for 0.9 per cent of the overall GHG emissions in the country. The energy sector accounted for 59.7 per cent of total GHG emissions, followed by the agriculture sector (24.0 per cent), the industrial processes sector (10.5 per cent), the waste sector (5.4 per cent) and the solvent and other product use sector (0.4 per cent). Total GHG emissions amounted to 21,521.49 Gg CO<sub>2</sub> eq and decreased by 56.9 per cent between the base year and 2010. The main decreases occurred in the early 1990s following the restoration of independence and the transition from a planned economy to a market economy.

The following are the main GHG mitigation measures foreseen by Lithuania and reviewed by Atgaja with comments from NGOs and some experts, plus an additional review of reports and the current status of implementation.

These GHG mitigation measures were taken and evaluated under review of Lithuania's Fifth National Communication under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (2010) and current approved national energy and transport strategies, other policy documents and recent changes in their implementation.

The heating sector presents the best opportunities for large cuts in greenhouse gases, with added other economic and social benefits, among the reviewed climate mitigation measures and tools.

A rough estimation of current energy demand in Lithuania (per year) is as follows:

~20 TWh for heating, both central heating which is dominant in all Lithuanian cities and individual houses in the countryside and suburbs. ~20% of total heating was produced from biomass, using natural gas imported from Russia and to lesser extent imported oil products.

~10 TWh for electricity (of which ~6 TWh imported mostly from Russia and the rest produced mostly

from natural gas (again imported from Russia) and ~12% from renewable energy sources.

~10 TWh for transport.

Development of renewable energy sources, increasing energy efficiency and reduction of GHG are mainly driven by European Union policies and requirements in Lithuania. EU targets for the member states are transferred into national legislation and programmes. But Lithuania is facing specific challenge for the diversification of energy production, decreasing energy

import, increasing security of supply and cutting dependence from Russia as a dominant supplier both of natural gas and electricity. Solution of these challenges can bring both social and economic benefits together with reduction of GHG emissions.

No.	Description of measure	Type	Achieved or expected result	Time and trends of application
1.	Enhancement of the use of RES until 2020	Legislation	<p>Targets for renewable energy development are set in the Lithuanian law on Energy from Renewable Sources approved in 2011:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- wind energy power plant capacity (currently 205 MW of installed capacity, expected 500MW);</li> <li>- biomass CHP plants (currently 80 MW of installed capacity, expected at least 355 MW);</li> <li>- Hydro (currently 128 MW of installed capacity, expected 141 MW);</li> <li>- solar PVC (currently 1 MW of installed capacity, expected 10 MW).</li> </ul>	<p>However, renewable energy associations and experts estimate higher technical and economic potential for renewable energy development with biomass and wind energy as being the main renewable sources in Lithuania. The Lithuanian Renewable Energy Confederation made recent calculations for the potential of renewables in the Lithuanian energy sector, which goes beyond the officially approved targets for the period 2012-2020. Relevant funding from EU structural funds together with rational feed-in tariffs could enforce implementation of such ambitious growth of renewables in Lithuanian energy mix:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- new biomass boilers and cogeneration plants with installed capacity of 630 MWe of total annual electricity production 2.6 TWh, heat production 5.1 TWh; total annual demand of biomass fuel 0.63 million Toe.</li> <li>- Wind turbines with installed capacity of 800 MWe, total electricity production 1.7 TWh;</li> <li>- New biogas power plants 85 MWe with electricity production of 0.6 TWh;</li> <li>- more hydropower plants 14 MWe/0.05 TWh;</li> <li>- solar PVC panels 10 MWe/0.009 TWh.</li> </ul>
2.	Modernisation of multi-apartment buildings. Governmental programme	National programme	<p>There have been plans to cut energy wastage and some GHG emissions through the modernization and renovation of at least 70% of all multi-apartment buildings (24 000 units) in Lithuania. Savings targets for 2010 are 150 GWh, and for 2016: 1 700 GWh. The programme started in 2005 and its completion date is 2020. A new funding mechanism was established with allocations from EU structural funds and an EIB loan since 2008. There were average savings of 61 kWh/1 m<sup>2</sup> per year with the first projects already implemented. With regard to the useful heated area of all renovated multi-apartment buildings, the calculated energy savings total 60 GWh (as of 2010) from renovated houses. According to the forecasts on multi-apartment building renovation, the projection for 2016 amounts to 250 GWh of estimated energy saving.</p>	<p>Despite high ambitions and high expectations, backed up by available financing, still very little progress since 2008. Only 416 multi-apartment buildings' houses renovated since 2008 due to the unattractive financial support scheme. Government approved review of the financial mechanism and expected new kick-start of the programme since 2013. There is huge potential for large energy savings and reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the heating of multi-apartment buildings. E.g. current heat consumption of some of the least efficient multi-apartment houses in Vilnius account for 220-290 kWh/m<sup>2</sup>/per year (average 160–180 kWh/m<sup>2</sup>/per year). Or otherwise average ~25 kWh/m<sup>2</sup> energy consumption for heating (~55.7% of buildings per country) and ~35 kWh/m<sup>2</sup> energy consumption for heating (~22.4% of buildings per country). Such buildings are on the priority lists of municipalities for renovation. Experts highlight that modernization of multi-apartment buildings should be followed by modernization of central heating systems in order to adjust decreased demand for heat.</p>

No.	Description of measure	Type	Achieved or expected result	Time and trends of application
3.	Modernisation of public buildings	Programme	Modernization of public buildings is implemented via different programmes using EU Structural Funds during 2007-13 financial perspective: renovation of administrative buildings, university student halls, general education schools, libraries. Priority is given to buildings constructed before 1992. The conditions of the buildings varied and they had to pass an energy audit followed by the technical reconstruction project prior to the project approval. Savings targets for 2010 year are 30 GWh, and for 2016 – 100 GWh. The programme started in 2007 and its completion year is 2015.	Ongoing implementation with support of EU funds. There are 293 approved projects with implementation deadline of 2015. Planned energy saving of 80 GWh are expected to increase. All renovated buildings must comply with technical norm of D-class for the projects with renovation permissions and/or construction works started before 2014 and C-class with renovation permission and/or construction works started after 2014. Each project is required to achieve at least 30% of energy saving compared to the previous energy consumption.
4.	Promotion of cogeneration	National energy strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cogeneration will make up to 20% of the total energy generation balance in 2010;</li> <li>- The share of CHP plants in the total electricity generation balance should reach 35% by 2025;</li> <li>- At least 75% of district heat shall be generated using CHP by 2020;</li> </ul> There were more than 360 units of biomass boilers with total installed capacity of ~ 710 MW operating in Lithuanian heating networks in 2011. 395 MW of this capacity supplied central heating systems in 2011. The total energy produced and supplied to the central heating systems consisted of 9267.3 thousand MWh in 2009. It reached 9803.5 thousand MWh in 2010. The share of biomass in the fuel make-up was 19.3% in 2009-2010. Still good potential to grow according to the targets in the energy strategy and existing potential capacity.	Little progress achieved up till now. There was small growth in biomass use to 20% (+ 0.7%) in 2011. The government set up a working group to revise implementation of the national energy strategy. New plans are being discussed for promotion of biomass in district heating until 2020: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CHP using biomass currently 80 MW of installed capacity, planned 600 MW;</li> <li>- heating boilers currently 310 MW, planned 525 MW;</li> </ul> Expected increase in renewable energy for district heating no less than 60% from current 20%, mainly from wood-based biomass.
5.	Increase in energy efficiency	National programme	Many ambitious targets for the increase of energy efficiency in various sectors during 2006-2012. Modernization of multi-apartment and public buildings was the most ambitious measure in the programme.	According to some experts the programme itself had high expectations and potential for GHG reduction and many social and economic benefits, but failed to be implemented sufficiently. This programme is legally outdated and needs to be reviewed, new targets set.
6.	LNG import terminal in Klaipeda	Project	Planned in Klaipėda sea port. Aim: to increase security of supply and to decrease dependency on Gasprom, the single Russian supplier of natural gas both for electricity production and central heating. This project is specific to the Lithuanian and regional situation as an interim solution to the transition of the energy sector from fossil fuel to a high share of renewables by 2050. Natural gas is needed to run existing thermal power plants for electricity and central heating systems in major cities, including newly built modern thermal power plant in Elektrenai.	Under implementation, should start operation in 2015. Project could have regional impact on securing supply of LNG in the region and limiting conversion to other fossil fuels (coal, heavy oil fuel, peat, shale oil, etc.). Project can be seen as controversial for GHG reduction, because it competes with possible conversion of Lithuanian central heating sector and partly electricity production to biomass.

No.	Description of measure	Type	Achieved or expected result	Time and trends of application
7.	Integration into the European Energy Systems		Completion of the Lithuanian–Swedish power link <i>NordBalt</i> in 2015. Increased opportunities for offshore wind energy projects in the Baltic Sea. Access to the Kruonis HSPP for balancing of the RES in the grid. There are plans for 400-800 MW of offshore wind energy near the Lithuanian coast. Lithuanian renewable energy experts value Kruonis HPSP for its potential to balance wind energy capacities. Likewise for Visaginas NPP if it is built. Originally Kruonis was built to balance Elektrenai thermal power plant and Ignalina NPP and energy fluctuations in north-west energy grid of former USSR. After 1990 its capacity reduced from the planned 1600 MW to 900 MW (4x225 MW).	Project under implementation.
7.1.	Integration into the European Energy Systems		Start-up of the Lithuanian-Polish power link LitPol Link 1 in 2015 and extension of the link in 2020; also the completion of the extra Lithuania-Poland cross-border power connection (LitPol Link 2) which is required for the future synchronous interconnection with the European Continental Network of the European Network of Transmission System Operators for Electricity (henceforth – ENTSO-E).	Project under implementation. Poland could become a net importer of electricity (after 2015), also of renewable electricity from Baltic States and [nuclear and gas-fired electricity] from Russia (re-exported via Lithuania). If Poland implements its nuclear programme the country might be a net exporter of nuclear electricity. For Lithuania and the Baltic States this is an issue of the general security of supply and integration into European grid.
7.2.	Integration into the European Energy Systems		Synchronous interconnection of the Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian electricity transmission systems with the European Continental Network of ENTSO-E.	
8.	Government subsidies for energy efficiency, renovation and installation of small RES applications (heat-pumps, wind, solar heating and PV) for individual private houses.		There are two separate measures for modernisation (renovation) of small private houses and use of RES applications in such houses. Both are applied to individual private houses built according to the norms approved before 1993. Investments are managed by the Lithuanian Environmental Investment Fund.	Under implementation according to the list of approved projects. Projects in a range of 1000-3000 euro. Certificate confirming reduction of energy consumption by 20% and achievement of C-class energy efficiency are required before final payment for the renovated houses. Combines GHG reduction, environmental and social benefits.
9.	Afforestation of low-erility soils	Programme	Affects mainly CO <sub>2</sub> reduction. One goal is to increase the forest area by 3% by the year 2020. Artificial afforestation should take place over an area of approximately 100-120 thousand ha, or 6-7 thousand ha per year on average. Forests should contain 45% of deciduous and 55% of coniferous trees. In addition self-growing forest expected on 70-90 thousand ha of agricultural land by 2021.	Positive environmental, economic and social effects. Important measure for rural development. EU funds used. Estimate of mitigation impact, by gas in CO <sub>2</sub> eq. Gg -840.



NORWAY

## Best practice policies for climate change mitigation, Norway

Compiled by Thomas Martinsen (Norway)

### Foreword

Over the last 30 years, governments have introduced some policies to decrease emissions, to promote energy efficiency and savings and to develop renewable sources of energy. Environmental NGOs from our region need to come together again and discuss a new, more radical strategy for emission reductions. AirClim believes we need to exchange ideas and experiences on working strategies, scenarios and policies to expand our future efforts.

### Introduction

Norway enacted its initial national climate policy through a government white paper following the Brundtland report “Our common future” in 1987. The basis for policy development has been a combination of bottom-up analysis of measures including an evaluation of cost efficiency and implementation efficiency and top-down macroeconomic studies. Those studies estimate a greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction relative to a projected baseline of future emissions. *The time series of emissions of GHG may thus not reveal the whole story with respect to the influence of policies and measures. If an activity is increasing the baseline emissions will also increase. A measure may thus reduce the specific emissions while the total emissions still increase, e.g., increased oil production offshore. On the other hand, the reduced emission may merely be the result of reduced activity, e.g., closing of an industrial plant for reasons unrelated to energy or environmental policy.* Moreover, the emission reductions are most often not the result of only one policy or measure but rather a combination of measures. This includes research grants to develop technical solutions and non-environmental taxes. Estimating the GHG reduction of a single policy is thus at best uncertain. Moreover, the emission reduction obtained by a measure may vary between years. The emission reduction, when described may be annual or accumulated and is merely intended as an indication. Based on a total evaluation, including GHG emissions development and knowledge of the different policies and potential for replication in the other countries, some measures are selected and described.

### Brief history of emissions of greenhouse gases in Norway

The 2011 national inventory report to the UNFCCC describes Norway’s historic emissions since 1990 as follows:

*The most important sector in Norway with regard to the emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) is the energy sector, accounting for almost 76 per cent of the total Norwegian emissions. The energy sector includes the energy industries (including oil and gas extraction), the transport sector, energy use in manufacturing and constructing, fugitive emissions from fuels and energy combustion in other sectors. Road traffic and offshore gas turbines (electricity generation and pumping of natural gas) are the largest single contributors, while coastal navigation and energy*

*commodities used for the production of raw materials are other major sources.*

*From 1990 to 2009 the increase in the emissions from the energy sector was almost 32 per cent, or more than 9 million tons, mainly due to higher activity in the offshore and transport sectors. Between 1990 and 2009 there have been temporary emission reductions in e.g. 1991 and 2005 and again in 2008 and 2009, when the energy sector emissions decreased by less than 1 per cent from 2008 to 2009.*

*Industrial processes contributed to 13 per cent of the total national emissions of greenhouse gases. Production of metals and chemicals is the main source of process-related industrial emissions of both CO<sub>2</sub> and other greenhouse gases such as N<sub>2</sub>O (fertilizer production) and PFCs (aluminium production). Between 1990 and 2009 emissions from industrial processes experienced an overall decrease by over 50 per cent. This is mainly due to reduced PFC emissions from the production of aluminium and SF<sub>6</sub> from the production of magnesium.*

*Solvent and other product use accounted for only 0.3 per cent of the total emissions of greenhouse gases in Norway. This contribution has been stable since 1990.*

*The agricultural sector contributed in 2009 to about 8 per cent to the total emissions of greenhouse gases. This corresponds to 4.2 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents, which is 1.4 per cent lower than in 2008. This sector has experienced an emission reduction of about 7 per cent over the period 1990–2009. The dominant sources of GHGs are enteric fermentation (CH<sub>4</sub>) from domestic animals and agricultural soils (N<sub>2</sub>O). These sources contributed to about 45 and 44 per cent respectively of the sector's emissions.*

*The waste sector contributed 2 per cent of total Norwegian greenhouse gas emissions in 2009. The emissions of greenhouse gases from the waste sector were relatively stable during the 1990s. From 1998 the emissions declined, and in 2009 they were about 32 per cent lower than in 1990. Waste volumes have increased significantly over the period, but this has been offset by increased recycling and incineration of waste as well as increased burning of methane from landfills.*

*Emissions from transport showed an overall increase of about 29 per cent from 1990 to 2009, while the emissions decreased by more than 2 per cent from 2008 to 2009. The share of transport in the total GHG emissions has increased from 22 per cent in 1990 to almost 28 per cent in 2009. Road transportation accounts for more than 68 per cent of the total mobile emissions, while emissions from navigation and civil aviation account for 15 and 8 per cent respectively. Due to the fact that most railways are electrified in Norway, emissions of GHG from this source are insignificant. Other transportation (off-road vehicles and other machinery and other non-specified) accounts for a bit less than 10 per cent of the emissions from the source transport.*




Figure 2 Relative changes in emission of greenhouse gases compared to 1990 aggregated to the IPCC reporting categories. Source: Statistic Norway/Klif in National Inventory Report 2011

The relative share of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent emissions in 2010 are shown in Figure 2.




Figure 3 Emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents (million ton) in 2010 by source. Source: Statistic Norway/Klif

## Norwegian policies influencing greenhouse gas emissions

The principle of cost effectiveness has a particularly strong hold in Norway and application of this on an international basis has been advocated. A national CO<sub>2</sub> tax and support for the flexible mechanisms under the UN FCCC have thus been a basis for climate policy. Many emitters have, however, had exemption from the CO<sub>2</sub> tax and other measures including voluntary agreements, inclusion in the emission trading system, support for research and development are implemented to correct this. This overview is not intended to be comprehensive and cover all possible direct and indirect measures influencing GHG emissions but rather to give a background for the selected measures described in the next chapter.

A number of policies may influence the emissions of GHG. Some policies are focused on local or regional problems or improving energy efficiency, but the implementation also reduces the emissions of GHG. Examples of such policies are parking restrictions and road use taxes. On the other hand, there are also policies targeted at improving local or regional air quality, which increase emissions of GHG. Use of catalytic cleaning of exhaust gas on gasoline cars increases N<sub>2</sub>O and while diesel cars generally have lower specific CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, particle emissions are higher than for gasoline cars. Technological development is causing both specific CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and particle emissions from gasoline and diesel cars to merge. This is also an example of how technological development may change the order of best practice measures in the future compared to history.

### 1.1 Taxation

Taxation of emissions of pollutants is one of the backbones of Norwegian environmental policy. Norway introduced a CO<sub>2</sub> tax in 1991 and has changed both the level and the basis for the tax several times since then. Introduction of the emission trading regime has partly replaced the CO<sub>2</sub> tax. Today about 50% of national GHG emissions are subject to a CO<sub>2</sub> tax and the share is expected go down following an expansion of the emission trading regime. While industries included in the emission trading regime get the CO<sub>2</sub> tax refunded when buying feedstock from industries not included that have been charged with a CO<sub>2</sub> tax, offshore petroleum production is subject to both a CO<sub>2</sub> tax and an emission allocation in the emission trading scheme. Taxation is also levied on purchases of new cars, the amount of waste deposited, non-recyclable bottles with content for human consumption, emissions of HFK and PFK and electricity supplied to consumers. The level of the CO<sub>2</sub> tax in 2011 is listed in table 1.

<b>Level of CO<sub>2</sub> tax in 2011</b>	
Petroleum production NOK/litre or Sm <sup>3</sup>	0.48
Mineral oil, NOK/litre	0.59
Mineral oil used in national air transportation, NOK/litre	0.69
Mineral oil used in wood processing- and fish flour industry, NOK/litre	0.31
Gasoline, NOK/litre	0.88
Natural gas, NOK/Sm <sup>3</sup>	0.44
LPG, NOK/kg	0.66

It is, however, the total level of taxation that determines the strength of the incentive. The road usage taxes for gasoline and diesel in 2012 were 4.54 NOK/l and 3.56 NOK/l respectively. For heating oil a basic tax at 0.999 NOK/l plus tax on sulphur emissions and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions will determine the total incentive. While the sums of these taxes are larger than the CO<sub>2</sub> tax the difference is less than for automobile fuel.

The threat of direct regulation or taxation is sometimes as effective as the tax itself. This is an important element when negotiating voluntary agreements on GHG emission reduction with the industry.

### **Direct regulation**

Several laws may influence GHG emissions. The pollution prevention law in Norway is designed so that the emitter of a pollutant above a specified limit must apply for an emission permit. The permit is based on an individual evaluation. CO<sub>2</sub> is, after some debate defined as a pollutant. This was important in order to apply the pollution prevention law to demand the installation of carbon capture and storage at gas power plants.

All new buildings and renovation projects requiring a building permit must meet the standards of the current building code. The building code gives energy efficiency requirements for the building. The requirements have been stiffened and the calculation method has moved from only specific insulation requirements to also include performance standards from 2007. It is planned to further strengthen the requirements to achieve passive house standard within the next decade. The building code also includes environmental requirements where the particle emission requirement for wood burning stoves also increases the energy efficiency of the stove. All commercial buildings and housing that is sold must have an energy label. The energy labelling scheme focuses on the amount of delivered energy rather than the standard of the building itself.

The road traffic law regulates emissions from cars. Emission standards for NO<sub>x</sub> are included here.

The national planning law may be applied to reduce the overall need for transport as well facilitating the market for public transport.

## Research, development and deployment

Research, development and deployment support includes several research programmes and the new certificate market for electricity production in Sweden and Norway. The government agency Enova also administers a fund providing investment support for new technologies and energy efficiency measures. While research and development increases the pool of opportunity, deployment is necessary to obtain cost reductions through technology learning and emission reductions.

## Selected best practice measures

A summary of the policies are given in Table 1.

Table 1 List of policies together with classification and criteria. The type of instrument is indicated by a capital letter and the criteria by a roman letter corresponding to the list at the end of the document.

Title of policy	Type	Criteria
CO <sub>2</sub> tax on emissions from oil and gas production	D	I
All new gas-fired power stations must have carbon capture and storage	M	II
Emission quota on N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from fertilizer production	E	I
Automobile purchase tax	D	II
Incentive for increased deployment and use of electric vehicles	J	II
Voluntary agreement with the industry	S	I
Outlawing and taxation of biodegradable waste deposited in landfills	M	I
Stricter requirement for insulation of buildings in the Building Code	L	III
Economic support to replace oil-fired boilers for heating	H	V, VIII
Government grant for public transport to cities implementing measures to reduce automobile use	B	II
Industrial energy efficiency network	I	III, VII
Compulsory evaluation of alternatives to new large road projects	B	II, V, VIII

### CO<sub>2</sub> tax on emissions from oil and gas production (D)

The CO<sub>2</sub> tax when introduced in 1991 had a significant influence on emissions from oil and gas production. A number of measures with a net cost up to the level of the tax were implemented. The emission reductions from elimination of a continuous safety flare and underground deposition of CO<sub>2</sub> extracted from the gas produced at Sleipner are large. The stored CO<sub>2</sub> at Sleipner varies around 800 ktons per year. The elimination of the safety flare is possible because of the development of an ignition device sufficiently fast to assure that any outburst of gas does not pose danger of explosion. Both measures applied new and advanced technology, were important in terms of the image of the industry and offered the potential to export the technology and thus to generate of new business. However, the process of separating the CO<sub>2</sub> from the natural gas at Sleipner is not directly comparable with separation from flue gas because of its high CO<sub>2</sub> content and high pressure.

### **Emission quota on N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from fertilizer production**

Emissions of nitric acid used in the manufacture of fertilizer were subject in the 1990s to an emission permit for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. As the emission trading scheme was developed and discussed it was clear to the industry that N<sub>2</sub>O, which is a powerful greenhouse gas, was to be included. The expectation and later allocation of emission quotas initiated development of cleaning technology. The emission quota is the main policy causing the observed reduction in annual N<sub>2</sub>O emissions of about 4.7 ktons from the year 2000 until today. Given a global warming potential of 310 this equals about 1.5 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent.

### **All new gas-fired power stations must have carbon capture and storage (M)**

The history of introducing gas power plants into the Norwegian energy system has mostly been a struggle of symbols, though important. The government policy requiring carbon capture and storage (CCS) to be fitted from day one of operation has had a preventive effect. This is true despite the fact that exemption from the requirement has been granted to other large facilities using gas for energy generation. The test centre for CCS has not provided results in the time expected and the gas power plant is on standby rather than production because electricity prices are currently too low.

### **Automobile purchase tax (D)**

Norway has always had a substantial car purchase tax. The tax base was initially related to the cost and size of the car. In the last decade there has been a shift towards using specific CO<sub>2</sub> emissions as a parameter. Several revisions have increased the relative weight of the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. This has led to changes in the retail prices of cars in the order of 10 000 – 30 000 NOK. Electric cars have been exempt from the purchase tax altogether. The new plug-in hybrid cars led to considerable discussion over the level of purchase tax. For cars with emissions lower than 50 g/km an additional tax rebate has been introduced to make sure these cars will not experience a price increase.

This has increased the demand for new cars with low specific emissions and reduced the average specific emission of CO<sub>2</sub> from cars in Norway from about 180 g/km in 2006 to 140 g/km in 2010. The specific emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> exhibit a reduction of 22%. Because new cars are generally used more, the total CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction in 2010 compared to 2006 caused by the policy may be up to 25% or 1.4 million tons. The observed reduction in the emission inventory will be less because, for instance, the number of vehicle kilometres has increased. The policy will influence emissions for more than a decade into the future.

A prerequisite for this policy is some sort of purchase tax. Moreover, the reduction would most likely not have taken place without the pressure for technological development from the EU to reduce specific emissions of GHG from cars. This is thus an example of concerted action where demands on the industry are pushing technological development and measures to increase demand in the market are working together.

### **Incentive for increased deployment and use of electric vehicles (J)**

Fully electric cars have been granted the right to drive in the separate bus lane for public transport and thus avoid getting stuck in traffic jams. They are also exempt from purchase tax and highway road toll, have free parking with charging possibilities. These benefits have been highly valued between Oslo and the western suburbs with a large population with two cars per household and a daily traffic jam as well a bus lane in between them. The latter is probably the most important reason for the high per capita share of electric cars in Norway. As of the end of March 2012 there are 6242 electric vehicles in Norway. The average CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for the national car fleet are about 140 g/km and if we assume 10 000 km/year, the reduction in emissions is 9 ktons/year. The number of electric cars in Norway is growing and in September 2012, 5.2% of all cars sold in Norway were electric. It has recently been decided that these benefits will be retained through the next government period (2013 – 2017) unless the number of electric cars increases above 50 000.

While the annual GHG reduction is limited up to now, the niche market created by the policy has been important for development of the technology and thus increasing the future potential emission reduction. It is also an example of how concerted action by various actors, e.g., the ministry of finance, ministry of transportation and local authorities works together to increase the influence of the policy.

### **Voluntary agreement with the industry (S)**

Several agreements were negotiated with different industries. One example with good results is described here. The substantial reductions in emissions of SF<sub>6</sub> in the industry are mostly a result of a voluntary agreement. Its application to electrical equipment has exhibited particularly good results. The SF<sub>6</sub> gas is captured from the electrical equipment when serviced or at the end of its lifetime and recycled. The measure has initiated increased awareness, better registration and control routines. RENAS is a firm chosen by many companies to handle their commitment to recycle the gas. The emission reduction obtained by the measure may be illustrated by the rapid drop from 13 tons in 2005 to a stable level of around 3 tons from 2007 onwards. A reduction of 10 tons of SF<sub>6</sub> is equivalent to about 228 ktons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents. Some of the reduction may be reduced consumption because of the cost to cover collection and recycling or destruction. The accumulated collected amount is 21 tons for the period 2002–2010. Negotiating this type of policy is probably most successful when there is a threat of applying other measures, e.g., direct regulation.

### **Outlawing and taxation of biodegradable waste deposited in landfills (M)**

The deposition of easily degradable organic waste including wastewater has been forbidden since the early 1990s. A deposition fee was also introduced. Deposition of organic biodegradable waste in landfills has been forbidden since 2009. It is, however, a possibility to apply for an exemption and if granted a charge is levied at 447 NOK/ton of waste deposited. The amount of biodegradable waste deposited in landfills is significantly reduced. More-

over, the policy also includes a requirement to extract and burn the methane. Lately many communities have households sort the waste in order to separate the wet organic waste to optimize the methane generation and use it, e.g., for transport. The reduced emission of methane by the policies is not estimated. Annual emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents was reduced from 1.8 million tons in 1990 to 1.2 million tons in 2010. A further indication may be obtained from the amount of reduced emission of methane from old landfills. Methane from abandoned landfills is extracted and burned. The methane may also be used for energy purposes where it may replace fossil fuels and reduce the emissions further. Methane emissions collected in 2010 totalled 19415 tons, equivalent to 408 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>. The accumulated reduction in emissions since extraction of methane from landfills started in 1988 is 72.5 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents.

### **Stricter requirement for insulation of buildings in the Building Code (L)**

Energy-related standards in the building code were first introduced in code of 1949. Requirements for insulation of new buildings and refurbishment where a building permit is required have gradually been tightened. These apply to insulation thickness in all parts of the building shell as well as windows. In 2007 the approach to energy performance of the building increased, more components were subjected energy requirements and the energy performance of the building as a whole with respect to energy demand was included. Moreover, the need for cooling must also be taken into account. With the 2010 revision of the building code one may either apply computer modelling of the energy balance for the building or meet a specific energy requirement or standard for the components, e.g., insulation thickness and specific heat loss values for windows. The specific energy consumption in new individual residential houses has been reduced from more than 400 kWh/m<sup>2</sup> to the new standard (Tek 10) specifying a calculated average of about 100 kWh/m<sup>2</sup> today.

The new building code also prohibits the installation of oil-fired boilers in new buildings and requires part of the demand for heating to be met by other renewable energy forms than electricity.

Electricity is the dominant energy form for heating and nearly all electricity is produced by hydroelectric power. Under the IPCC GHG reporting guidelines there are no emissions. However, a large portion (currently about 60%) of the electricity generated in Norway by hydropower is committed to customers outside Norway through green energy certificates. If an average of the energy mix sold at the Nordic power exchange and certificates of origin is used the emission factor will be above zero. A value of 0.25 kg CO<sub>2</sub>/kWh is suggested for measuring the energy performance of housing. While increased energy efficiency is valuable, the reduction in emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> under Norwegian policy is difficult to estimate and the answer will to a large extent depend on the method chosen.

### **Economic support to replace oil-fired boilers for heating (H)**

The city of Oslo has since 2008 provided direct economic support to resi-

dents willing to replace oil-fired boilers for heating with alternatives using bio-energy, heat pumps, solar thermal energy or connection to the district heating network. The level of support depends on the choice of technology as well as the size of the building in question. The oil storage tank, pumps and other equipment must be removed. This is to make sure it is impossible to convert back to fossil fuel at a later stage. The estimated emission reduction was 9.5 ktons of CO<sub>2</sub> in 2010.

### **Government grant for public transport to cities implementing measures to reduce car use (B)**

The transfer of travel from cars to public transportation and meeting the projected increase in transport needs by public transportation reduces a number of environmental problems. This includes reduced emissions of GHG. Increased service by public transportation facilitates this. It is, however, acknowledged that measures to constrain car use are required. A government grant providing funds for public transport is therefore awarded to those cities implementing measures to constrain private car use over and above the average. Upon receiving the grant a quantified commitment to reduce car traffic and estimates of CO<sub>2</sub> reduction is agreed. Car traffic is monitored by counting the annual number of cars passing the local road toll stations. In the city of Trondheim, where it has been most successful, a 10% reduction in car traffic has been observed. While the target was a 20% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, the results have not been quantified because of uncertainty in the estimates.

### **Industrial energy efficiency network (I)**

A network for industrial energy efficiency was established in Norway in the 1980s. Participating companies receive economic support for selected energy efficiency measures. In return they are committed to report their specific energy consumption to a secretariat that provides feedback on their performance relative to other companies within the same type of industry. Later interactive Internet portals were established where a company may enter its data and get immediate feedback on its performance compared to a benchmark. Moreover, companies that have implemented a system for energy management according to ISO 50001 had about 5% lower specific energy use. The network is operated today by a consulting company under contract with the government agency Enova. The reduced energy consumption may influence several energy forms including fossil fuel. Estimating the reduced emissions of GHG is thus not possible.

### **Compulsory evaluation of alternatives to new large road projects (B)**

A number of policies have been implemented to reduce environmental pollution from transportation. These include urban planning, road taxation, reduced parking availability in cities and improved public transport. The aim of the policies may vary and reducing emissions of GHG is most often only one positive effect. Recently a new law has been implemented in Norway demanding a separate evaluation of alternative ways to meet a need for transportation underlying the proposal for new large road projects. While

the immediate effect may be small it has a long-term potential to shift the mindset of planners. As in energy systems analysis, where demand for energy service is the objective rather than the need for energy carriers, analysis of the transportation sector is forced to focus on the need for transport services. Removing the need for transport through better urban planning may be the preferred solution.

### **Guide to categorization and criteria**

- A. Overall climate and energy policy
  - B. General planning, including urban planning. (e.g. city planning to optimize for public transport and heating with district heating)
  - C. Energy planning
  - D. Energy and CO2 taxes
  - E. Emissions trading
  - F. Operational (running) support for renewable energy: feed-in tariffs, certificates etc. support for biogas used in gas grids, etc.
  - G. Investment support for renewable energy
  - H. Investment support for fuel shift in buildings
  - I. Investment support for energy efficiency
  - J. Support for clean/electric transport
  - K. Support for R&D and demonstration projects for renewable energy, energy efficiency, energy system integration etc.
  - L. Building codes/building regulation
  - M. Requirements, such as mandatory energy efficiency labelling of houses
  - N. Energy efficiency requirements for energy suppliers (used in Denmark. "White certificates" is one form, used for example in the UK and Italy.)
  - O. Promotion of smart grid technology which enables more use of renewables.
  - P. Consumer information activities on energy efficiency and renewable energy
  - Q. Technology procurement for energy efficiency and renewable energy
  - R. Specific support for development and implementation of GHG mitigation in (high-emission) industrial processes
  - S. Voluntary agreement with industry for emission targets
- 
- I. Large GHG cuts
  - II. Future potential for GHG reduction
  - III. Saves significant energy
  - IV. Replicable
  - V. Compatibility with other environmental targets
  - VI. Social welfare
  - VII. Cost-effective
  - VIII. Positive side-effects



SWEDEN

## Climate Policy Instruments in Sweden

*Compiled by Fredrik Lundberg (Sweden)*

Most of the instruments are taken from Sweden's Fifth National Communication on Climate Change<sup>93</sup>. (Entries on Green Consumerism, R&D on heating (Värmeforsk), railway investments, congestion charges, "energy vouchers", and the lightbulb ban have been added.)

### Top 10 instruments, ranked

The following all gave valuable input to the list of instruments, as well as their pros and cons: Stefan Henningsson for WWF Sweden, Martina Krüger for Greenpeace Nordic, Svante Axelsson for the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation and Tomas Käberger, Professor of Industrial Energy Policy at Chalmers Institute of Technology.

Their lines of argument are considerably more complex than what follows from the text below, for which Fredrik Lundberg bears the sole responsibility.

Three things should be noted:

1. The ranking is not a straightforward matter. Obviously some of the instruments have received a high rank because they are evidence-based, others because of their evident potential. The reader is encouraged to see each instrument in its best light!
2. Most reviewers (rankers) pointed out that strong synergies exist between instruments. The (modest) Swedish success story of fairly good economic growth and falling CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is the result of both sticks (such as CO<sub>2</sub> tax) and carrots (such as the climate investment programmes).
3. The "flagship"<sup>94</sup> of EU climate policy is given short shrift. No reviewer ranked it anywhere near the top.

### 1. Energy and carbon dioxide taxes

CO<sub>2</sub> tax introduced 1 Jan 1991.

Initial level: SEK 250/ton, or SEK 334 in 2010 money or €35 (2010). First substantial CO<sub>2</sub> tax in the world.

Initial and extant exemptions. Exemption for electricity production. Exemption for most heavy industry (steel, paper, oil refineries, cement, lime, aluminium). Exemption for peat.

Light industry, including large engineering companies such as Volvo and ABB, was initially levied full tax. In 1993 the "general tax" was increased to SEK 320/ton, though tax for (light) industry was cut 75%.

The industry tax was re-increased to 50 per cent of the "general tax" in 1997.

The "general tax" level was again increased in several stages to its present level of SEK 1100/ton (2012), while the tax for light industry has varied and is now at SEK 330/ton. Heavy industry does not pay energy tax.

93 <http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/108/a/139745>

94 See for example Commissioner Dimas at [www.eu-un.europa.eu/articles/en/article\\_5436\\_en.htm](http://www.eu-un.europa.eu/articles/en/article_5436_en.htm)

Present exemption. Exemption for all industry in the European Emission Trading System, with exception for district heating.

Effects mainly on **heating** of houses, flats, offices and commercial buildings directly and through district heating. Oil and coal have been replaced by biomass in the growing district heating network. In other heating, oil has been replaced by (electric) heat pumps, district heating and wood pellets.

This trend goes back to even before 1991, since it has been Swedish policy since 1974 to reduce oil dependence through a number of taxes and subsidies. This has been reinforced by increasing oil prices over the last 10 years and to some extent by VAT.

For **light industry** it is likely that the same thing has happened to a lesser degree, but statistics are not very good.

**Heavy industry** (process industry) and **electric power production** has not paid the tax.

The transport sector has not been very much influenced by the tax since the energy tax was lowered almost as much as the CO<sub>2</sub> tax was increased.

**Combined heat and power** was initially taxable for the heat but not the power component, which led to some creative accounting. Heat delivered to industries was taxed at the lower rate. Now (2012) the heat component pays 7 per cent or SEK 7.7/ton or less than one extra euro on top of the ETS cost.

It is questionable if this tax can be retained after implementation of proposed amendments of the Energy Tax Directive and Emission Trading Directive.

In theory the tax has also been applied to **vehicle fuels**, but essentially this has been a change not in the tax itself, but in its name, from energy tax till CO<sub>2</sub> tax. For obvious reasons this has not changed behaviour, such as fewer kilometres or smaller cars. But it has had some effect in that it favours ethanol, RME and biogas, though other factors have been of consequence, and more so.

Quantitative effects are hard to discern, since the CO<sub>2</sub> tax works together with an energy tax, which also had the aim and effect of oil phase-out, as well as other instruments such as subsidies for house-owners to change from oil-fired heating to anything else, by VAT on fuels, and by coincidence, i.e. the oil price hike after the year 2000.

Nevertheless the effects were very strong.

Oil for heating in houses, apartments, offices, and shops decreased<sup>95</sup> from 41 TWh in 1990 (before the CO<sub>2</sub> tax) to some 13 TWh by 2011. Despite a considerable growth in living area and office area the total energy use decreased. Biomass increased from 11 to 19 TWh. District heating increased from 31 to 53. Electricity did not change much<sup>96</sup>. This resulted in an emissions decrease from 10.3 to 3.3 Mtons of CO<sub>2</sub> over the period.

---

95 <http://www.energimyndigheten.se/en/Facts-and-figures1/Publications/> Energy in Sweden Excel table 8

96 [www.energimyndigheten.se/Global/Statistik/Energiläget/Kopia%20av%20Energiläget%20i%20siffror%202011.xlsx](http://www.energimyndigheten.se/Global/Statistik/Energiläget/Kopia%20av%20Energiläget%20i%20siffror%202011.xlsx) table 12

Emissions did not shift elsewhere. The growing district heating uses much more biomass, and much less fossil fuel<sup>97</sup> now than it did in 1990, and much less electricity with roughly the same CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

Much of the Swedish GHG cut was achieved in the heating sector, where the CO<sub>2</sub> tax was the most important instrument.

To sum it up, the CO<sub>2</sub> tax has been very powerful, where fully applied, less so where partially or inconsistently applied and not at all where not applied.

## 2. Building regulations

Sweden is far north and has cold winters. This has necessitated a higher average thermal standard than in continental Europe, but better insulation has also led to very high indoor temperatures for at least the last 50 years. Double glazing has been standard for much longer, and triple glazing became very common from the 1970s onwards. Even better windows with infrared reflective coating are now more or less standard.

Much of the heating is electric, but much of the direct resistive electric heating has been replaced by heat pumps, and to lesser extent by district heating.

Building regulation is a potentially very important instrument. In practice, however, Swedish regulation is very weak. Boverket, the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning issues the energy requirements for new buildings. The same requirements are, in principle, also applied to renovated buildings.

The new requirements for new buildings from 2010 are about twice the passive house standard, though there is no good economic argument against applying full passive house requirements in Sweden.

## 3. Congestion charges

Congestion charges were introduced on trial in central Stockholm in 2006, and permanently from 2007. The charge or tax is levied per car passage in or out of the town centre from 6.29 in the morning to 18.29 in the evening. The charge is SEK 10-20 (€1.15-2.3), the latter for rush-hour traffic.

The aim of the charge is to use the road infrastructure in a more efficient manner with revenues used to finance more infrastructure, especially public transport. It was not intended to cut CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, but rather to level out traffic peaks, so as to avoid the choice between gridlock or extremely expensive new roads in the growing Greater Stockholm area.

It produced a 15-18 per cent reduction in traffic peaks. The effect was immediate, and lasting<sup>98</sup>.

The congestion charge in Stockholm was initially quite controversial, but is now generally accepted. From 2013 Gothenburg also has a congestion charge.

---

97 *ibid* table 29

98 [www.transportstyrelsen.se/Vag/Trangselskatt/Fragor--svar/Fragor--svar-for-Goteborg/Fragor-svar-om-trangselskatt-i-goteborg1111/Paverkar-trangselskatt-verkligen-trangselsn-Hur-ar-det-till-exempel-i-Stockholm/](http://www.transportstyrelsen.se/Vag/Trangselskatt/Fragor--svar/Fragor--svar-for-Goteborg/Fragor-svar-om-trangselskatt-i-goteborg1111/Paverkar-trangselskatt-verkligen-trangselsn-Hur-ar-det-till-exempel-i-Stockholm/)

Though, as noted, the congestion charge is not intended to be a climate policy instrument, it could well be used as a general method to reduce traffic (not just time-shift it), and to promote/demote various kinds of vehicles. Stockholm exempted “environmental cars” from the charge up to July 2012. The definition of “environmental car” is a tricky issue, but it was not a problem for the system to implement.<sup>99</sup>

The instrument is not limited to big towns, or towns at all. It can be used to reduce traffic and differentiate vehicles on all roads. If the main object is to reduce other pollutants (especially particles) and to reduce costs for infrastructure, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions can also be cut at a little or negative cost.

Though later than the London congestion charge, the Stockholm zone covers a larger area, in relative and absolute terms. The London zone covers 22 square kilometres of central London, or 1.4% of the Greater London area<sup>100</sup>, whereas the Stockholm zone covers some 34 square kilometres out of the much smaller greater Stockholm area.

An innovation compared to the London experience is that the tax is more differentiated.

#### **4. Climate investment programmes**

The Local Investment Programmes (LIP) 1998-2002 were intended to both reduce unemployment and to improve the environment, with climate mitigation as only one parameter. About half of the projects and project money were dedicated to greenhouse mitigation. The LIPs were funded by the national government after local government applications usually co-financed by local government or private industry.

The LIPs were important in at least two respects.

They did not state preference for any specific technology or method, but left that to the local governments (which are fairly strong and independent in relation to the national government). This innovative “let a hundred flowers bloom” approach actually did produce a broad spectrum of results.

The programme was, for Sweden, well funded. LIP and its follower KLIMP (climate investment program 2003-2012) spent about €500 million with added funding from other sources.

Much of the LIP money went into a fuel shift from fossil fuels to biomass. This is hard to evaluate for the same reasons that CDM projects are hard to evaluate: it is impossible to know if what happened would have happened anyway.

Some projects were however clearly additive. One example is the biogas factory that uses slaughter residue, in Linköping 200 km south of Stockholm. Buses, taxis and many cars in Linköping were converted to biogas. Swedish Biogas<sup>101</sup>, the operator of the biogas plants, owned by the local government,

99 [www.energimyndigheten.se/Global/F%c3%b6retag/Energikartl%c3%a4ggningscheckar/Goda%20exempel/Aroma.pdf](http://www.energimyndigheten.se/Global/F%c3%b6retag/Energikartl%c3%a4ggningscheckar/Goda%20exempel/Aroma.pdf)

100 [www.erg.kcl.ac.uk/Monitoring.aspx?DeptID=Monitoring&CaseStudyID=MonitoringCCS](http://www.erg.kcl.ac.uk/Monitoring.aspx?DeptID=Monitoring&CaseStudyID=MonitoringCCS)

101 <http://www.swedishbiogas.com/>

became a leading developer of biogas projects in Sweden, and to some extent also in other countries. This development work started before LIP, but was reinforced by LIP projects, for example the construction of a public filling station for biogas, conversion of some refuse collection vehicles from diesel to biogas and collection of refuse from school kitchens etc. The positive results from those biogas projects, as well as very positive results from life cycle analyses compared to other fuels, led to an emphasis on biogas in the following KLIMP projects.

Though evaluation is difficult, and may underestimate the long-term effect, the official account<sup>102</sup> says that LIP achieved a GHG reduction of close to one million tons, and KLIMP 0.9 Mton. For KLIMP, the cost per ton of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent was estimated at SEK 100/ton (roughly €10/ton). The electricity consumption reduction, 874 GWh/year was not credited. If the electricity is assumed to be marginal coal or lignite power in surrounding countries, this would add an extra million tons per year. If it is assumed to be natural gas power (or a mix to that effect), it is still worth some 350 000 tons. KLIMP came to end in 2012, but was overlapped by its successor Hållbara Städer (sustainable cities and towns), which began in 2009, and shares some of its features.

## **5. EU ban on incandescent lamps**

The EU-wide ban on incandescent lamps was not Swedish in any sense, but is clearly of importance itself, as an example of the EcoDesign directive and as a general example of what can actually be done. It is added here so it will not be forgotten in the final list of instruments. The ban will cut EU emissions by about 15 Mtons<sup>103</sup>, while also saving money for consumers, as fluorescent bulbs or LEDs reduce electricity costs and last much longer.

## **6. Programme for energy efficiency in industry (PFE)**

The European Union legislated on a minimum tax on electricity with effect from 2005. The Swedish energy-intensive industry had never had to pay such a tax, and was offered a conditional exemption.

The condition was participation in a programme for energy efficiency.(PFE)

Though the tax was very low, about €0.5/MWh, it was very visible, and almost all eligible companies joined the program, with absolutely astonishing results.

During the first five years, the companies had undertaken more than a thousand measures to save electricity. The predicted saving was 0.6 TWh/year.

The actual saving was 1.45 TWh/year for an investment of 708 MSEK – about €5/year per MWh. This means an average payback of 1-2 years.

With a very small carrot in sight, the companies mobilized resources to act in their own interest.

---

102 <http://www.naturvardsverket.se/Documents/publikationer/978-91-620-6357-3.pdf> (in Swedish)

103 [http://ec.europa.eu/energy/lumen/faq/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/energy/lumen/faq/index_en.htm)

Despite the huge success, PFE will be discontinued in 2014, as it is deemed incompatible with present or future EU legislation.

## 7. Railway investments and improved railways

One way to cut emissions is to shift transport of both goods and people from road and air to rail.

The parliamentary Climate Committee of 2008 concluded that investment in a 50 per cent increase of railway goods capacity would cut CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 1 million tonnes<sup>104</sup>.

This line of argument raises a number of questions, such as

1. Is that so – are we moving in that direction?
2. Is more rail freight really cutting emissions if road transport is also increasing?
3. Can past increases in transport be extrapolated into the future indefinitely?
4. If future road transport is fuelled by non-fossil electricity and biomass, does rail transport decrease CO<sub>2</sub> emissions at all?
5. If a large sum of money is available for various purposes such as regional development and emission reductions, is railway investment the most efficient and quickest way to achieve it?
6. Are investments in new infrastructure usually preferable to better maintenance, better trains etc?

The short answer to all these questions is “no, probably not” to all of them. On the other hand, as long as we don’t know for sure that road traffic will be de-fossilized for several decades, the government’s spending allocation between rail and roads is important.

The Social Democratic government 1998-2006 (which was dependent on the Green and Left parties and cooperated with them on budget and other issues) had the ambition to invest twice as much in rail as in road infrastructure. Whether this actually would have happened is hard to tell, given the long time from intention to realization, but the right-centre government made a policy shift to 50/50. In the budget for 2012 there was some increased budget for rail (more maintenance and more new investment), but no way near the 50 per cent increase mentioned above, nor a decisive shift from road to rail.

The conclusion is that railway investment in Sweden is not a climate instrument, though it possibly might have been.

## 8. Electricity certificates

As an alternative to feed-in tariffs for renewable energy, Sweden introduced electricity certificates in 2003. Norway joined the system in 2012. This specifies a quota of new renewable electricity sold to (most) customers. It mandates 25 TWh of new renewable energy by 2020 from year 2002.

Wind power, wave power, biomass and peat CHP, solar power, geothermal power and (some) hydropower all qualify for the quotas.

---

104 <http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/09/96/94/8393cd02.pdf> p399

The principles of the system can be weighed against feed-in tariffs: it can produce large amounts of renewable energy at a low cost. The downside is that it does not promote innovation. And whereas it ensures a long-term subsidy for the 15 first years of operation, through to 2035, with little political interference, the value of that subsidy is not known in advance; it is left to the market.

This, however, also means that if prices drop very much, it gives an indication to the government that the ambition could be raised.

In the first few years almost all new production was from biomass combined heat and power, a technology that was already in widespread use and with little need for innovation. Compared to the feed-in tariff, for example in Germany, it has indeed been cheaper but also produced less innovation. Sweden was several years behind Denmark, Spain, and Germany, and photovoltaics are still insignificant.

However over the last few years, more and more new power is wind power. In 2011 wind power contributed more than 6 TWh or 4 per cent, and it is still growing very fast.

One characteristic of the certificate system is that the prices are up to the market. The prices have fallen from about SEK 350 in 2008 to about 150 per MWh in mid-2012, but, as stated, this has not stopped a high level of investment in wind power. The explanation is probably that wind power development has gathered momentum and that costs are falling, so it is profitable even with a lower subsidy. (After the integration of Norway into the system, and for other reasons, the price has increased again to above SEK 200 in early 2013.)

The practical design of the system has some ugly aspects.

- Peat, which is considered equivalent to fossil fuels by the IPCC, the EU, the IEA etc. is subsidized along with bona fide biomass.
- Heavy industry is exempt from the obligation to buy certificates for their electricity. This is in line with a longstanding Swedish practice of supplying cheap and dirty electricity to the dirtiest industries. As for the paper and pulp industry, they can produce “green” electricity, while using very un-green electricity for their own consumption.
- Hydropower is very heavily exploited in Sweden; any further exploitation comes at a high cost for nature, according to the NGOs, and should therefore be discouraged and, at least, not be subsidized. This aspect may be even more important in Norway, which joined the system in January 2012.

## **9. Technology procurement**

Technology procurement is a method to create a market for energy efficient technology, either to introduce a new technology or to create more markets for an existing technology.

The government (its energy agency) coordinates a group of purchasers and specifies the criteria for a product, both in terms of energy use and whatever criteria the market – as represented by the group of purchasers – prefers: price, warranty, aesthetics, etc.

In an open competition, the best bidder is elected by the group of purchasers, and is awarded an order for a certain quantity of the product.

This approach was first used in 1990 for refrigerators. The requirement was a 50% cut in energy demand, which was met by three competitors<sup>105</sup>. The winner was Electrolux, which had up to that date not offered the market any of its more efficient models. Partly as a result of this procurement exercise, Electrolux (a global appliances company based in Sweden) started to make energy efficiency a selling point, not just for fridges and not just in Sweden, but for all its products and most brands, all over the world. Many of their competitors have followed suit.

Would this have happened anyway? Probably yes, but later, and quite possibly somewhere else. Sweden had at the time a large overcapacity of electricity production, low electricity prices and low awareness of energy efficiency. But it did happen in Sweden first, well before the EU energy labelling of fridges and may well have influenced the label classes (A to G, with A+, A++ and A+++ added later.)

The Energy Agency has initiated many procurement projects. Not all of them have been successes. It is sometimes not so easy to make purchasers as a group take collective responsibility to actually purchase the promised number of products, and to make the winning manufacturer live up to all specifications. A too legalistic approach would scare off many purchasers and many manufacturers, so it has to be based more on a “gentlemen’s agreement”, which sometimes, but not always, is good enough.

Some unsuccessful projects have been too ambitious, too far from the market to really influence it. An electric car procurement initiative in the 1990s, unsurprisingly, did not transform the automobile market.

When technology procurement works, i.e. with the right specification at the right time, it can be very impressive. Two examples:

Heat pumps were introduced in Sweden in the 1970s, but fell into disrepute, because of some substandard manufacturers and many substandard installers. The procurement initiative in 1995 resulted in 30 per cent cheaper and 30 per cent more efficient heat pumps. This kick-started a revival on a very big scale. More than 100 000 heat pumps per year are sold in Sweden alone, and the 1995 winner IVT (a Bosch brand) exports more than 50 per cent. Most down-hole heat pumps have or are replacing oil heating.

A procurement initiative for energy-efficient windows took place in 1990-95, with the target of 45 per cent less heat transmittance than the then average on the market, with stringent requirements for aesthetic aspects such as colour rendition. The specification allowed for a triple-glazed window, as a quadruple-glazed window would be too heavy and expensive.

The winning windows were not an immediate sales success, but the big manufacturers moved much closer to that standard.<sup>106</sup>

---

105 <http://energimyndigheten.se/PageFiles/18077/Uppf%C3%B6ljning%20Kylfrys.pdf>

106 Some of the info here comes from the Energy Agency, [www.energimyndigheten.se](http://www.energimyndigheten.se) report Energimyndighetens teknikupphandlingar ET 2006:08

## 10. Special initiatives for wind and solar power

Support for solar heating and for solar photovoltaics has been patchy and often changed. The contribution of both sources is insignificant.

The support, other than R&D and the Elcertifikat, has been significant for offshore wind, which up until 2009 received extra support of SEK 0.12/kWh (about €12/MWh)<sup>107</sup>.

Sweden was a very important pioneer for offshore wind, and this previous support was instrumental for some projects. Planning work continues, but actual investment decisions more or less ceased after 2009. The wind power industry is so busy onshore that this has mainly gone unnoticed. Some offshore projects have actually proceeded with nothing more than the Elcertifikat subsidy, but it seems the circumstances were unusual.

There are some very big projects on hold, so some renewed extra support might have very big effects. One single project aims to generate 7 TWh of electricity per year, equal to the production of a 1000 MWe nuclear reactor.

### (Other instruments, not ranked)

#### Emissions trading

Sweden is different from most other EU countries in that most electricity production does not emit fossil CO<sub>2</sub> at source. By Phase I 2005-07, about 50 per cent was hydro, 45 per cent nuclear, and a growing share of the remainder was biomass CHP. So by phase I, only a third of Sweden's GHG emissions were covered by the ETS.

Sweden has of course the same prices for ETS as the rest of Europe. But for the two first phases, the National Allocation Plans were of considerable importance.

In the first NAP for 2005-2007 Sweden gave no allocation for new power plants. As few people predicted the actual price development – i.e. a price collapse in 2007 – this probably killed some projects, notably a Vattenfall oil power plant upgraded from reserve to base load. In the 2008-12 NAP, this policy was reversed, so the existing power plants got very few permits, whereas two new fossil gas-fired combined heat and power plants got 100 per cent free allocations.

In combination with the patchy remaining CO<sub>2</sub> tax, the fear of high CO<sub>2</sub> prices stopped all new fossil power and heat projects, but changed very little else.

The overall allocation was very high in both instances, and was substantially cut by the European Commission for Phase II.

For Phase III, Sweden has applied for a large increase in free allocations. A large part goes to heat plants, even those that use biomass. This is, compared to the present situation, a clear disincentive to energy saving. With the low expected CO<sub>2</sub> price there is much less of incentive to move from coal to gas to biomass than with the previous price.

107 [http://www.rgp.se/Fakta/Svensk\\_Vindenergi\\_Lathund.pdf](http://www.rgp.se/Fakta/Svensk_Vindenergi_Lathund.pdf) (in Swedish)

The notion that overlaps or “double instruments” should be avoided<sup>108</sup> is very problematic in the Swedish context (or indeed in any context). The Swedish Energy Administration interprets proposed EU legislation as a prohibition to apply CO<sub>2</sub> tax to district heat plants in the ETS. If this is correct, the ETS rolls back much of what Sweden has achieved over 20 years.

If this happens, the ETS, whatever its merits outside Sweden, has been an instrument for destroying Swedish climate policy, without putting anything positive in its place.

One smaller item on the credit side of the ETS is however that it treats peat as the carbon intensive fuel it is.

### **Environmental Code (environmental quality targets, etc.)**

The 16 environmental targets, of which climate is one, used to be a fairly powerful bureaucratic machine for production of quantitative targets and annual follow up. Though none of the targets were legally binding (other than through EU legislation or other international agreements), this system gave a clear signal when targets were not being met.

The monitoring, and recommended action, was performed by a council of the directors general of the relevant agencies (for the environment, for traffic, for forests etc.) In the Swedish system, the agencies are independent and cannot be ordered around by individual ministers. The ministries are small in staff, with most staff working for the agencies.

The targets were also broken down at regional and municipal level, where indications that things were not moving in the supposed direction sometimes also triggered remedial action.

The system has essentially been dismantled since a right-centre coalition won the election in 2006, and again in 2010. It now produces little more than calls for further investigation

The legal requirements of most importance over the last few years are those resulting from EU legislation on air quality.

This does not directly deal with greenhouse gas emissions, but as it targets NO<sub>x</sub> and particles, it demands action on traffic emissions, which also reduces CO<sub>2</sub> and black carbon, and indirectly also N<sub>2</sub>O.

To improve the air quality of Stockholm, which has had a congestion charge since 2006, it has been suggested by civil servants that the congestion charge should be increased and extended to cover more roads.

Greenhouse gas emissions form part of the permit appraisal procedure. With effect from 2005 it is, however, no longer permitted to issue emission limit values for carbon dioxide

or to limit the use of fossil fuels for installations covered by the EU Emissions Trading Scheme<sup>109</sup>.

---

108 [http://ec.europa.eu/taxation\\_customs/resources/documents/taxation/com\\_2011\\_169\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/com_2011_169_en.pdf)

109 NC5 p 42

## **Planning and Building Act**

This could be an instrument to counter road projects and airstrips that will increase CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and prioritize rail and harbour projects so as to offer lower carbon alternatives.

In practice, this does not happen too often.

It is however an instrument for adaptation to climate change

The Planning and Building Act was amended in 2008 so that buildings are only allowed to be erected at suitable locations, and account has to be taken of the risk of accidents, flooding and erosion in municipal comprehensive plans and detailed development plans<sup>110</sup>.

## **'Energy check' – energy saving for SMEs**

This provides support for energy mapping of small and medium-sized enterprises (mainly light industry), farms and some apartment buildings, and was introduced in 2010. The government (the Energy Agency) pays 50 per cent of the energy analysis cost for hiring an external consultant.

This very modest incentive can produce remarkable results. Aroma, a sweet factory in Stockholm, which produces jelly rats, received SEK 30 000, invested SEK 200 000 and expects to save SEK 500 000/year from a saving of 500 000 kWh.

At Tooltec, an engineering company in Trollhättan, the consultant identified savings (mainly electricity for compressed air and lighting) of 574 000 kWh for an investment cost of SEK 200 000, i.e. a payback time of 3 months.

In several other examples large energy savings were identified with a payback period of around 2 years, still very profitable.

The 'energy check' instrument has not yet been evaluated.

## **Investment support for conversion of heating systems and energy-efficiency measures**

This was a programme that ran in 2005-2010 for converting homes from direct electric heating and oil-fired heating. This spent a large amount of money on what probably would largely have happened anyway, as oil and electricity prices skyrocketed.

An evaluation<sup>111</sup> of the oil conversion component summed it up pretty well in its title "Less oil, better environment, but at what price?" 36 000 houses were converted to heat pumps, biomass or district heating for a subsidy of about €40 million.

Houses, apartments and commercial premises that were converted from direct electric heating, switched mainly to district heating<sup>112</sup>.

---

110 NC5 p 13

111 [http://www.boverket.se/Global/Webbokhandel/Dokument/2008/Mindre\\_olja\\_%20battre\\_miljo.pdf](http://www.boverket.se/Global/Webbokhandel/Dokument/2008/Mindre_olja_%20battre_miljo.pdf)

112 <http://www.boverket.se/Global/Webbokhandel/Dokument/2011/Utv%C3%A4rdering%20av%20st%C3%B6det%20fr%C3%B6r%20konvertering%20fr%C3%A5n%20direktverkande%20elv%C3%A4rme.pdf>

What is instructive about this kind of instrument is that subsidies have a very strong impact on the exact timing of investments. When it is known that a subsidy will take effect next year, the market will be very quiet until then. When the deadline of the phase-out is known, the market goes into frenzy and then nearly drops dead.

What also should be considered is that investment support (of any kind) is much cheaper as part of a Keynesian stimulus during a recession, rather than during a boom. The conversion support failed in that respect, too.

Within this package there was also support for energy-efficient windows, which according to one evaluation<sup>113</sup> was also of little effect at a high cost. This may however have missed the market transformation aspect.

## **Building regulations**

Sweden is in the far north and has cold winters. This has necessitated a higher average thermal standard than in continental Europe, but better insulation has also led to very high indoor temperatures for at least the last 50 years. Double glazing has been standard for much longer, and triple glazing became very common from the 1970s. Even better windows with infrared reflective coatings are now more or less standard.

Much of the heating is electric, but much of the direct resistive electric heating has been replaced by heat pumps, and to lesser extent by district heating.

Building regulation is a potentially very important instrument. In practice, however, Swedish regulation is very weak. Boverket, the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning, issues the energy requirements for new buildings. This is, in principle, also applied to renovated buildings.

The new requirements for new buildings from 2010 are about twice those of the passive house standard, though there is no good economic argument against applying full passive house requirements in Sweden.

## **Research and development funding**

R&D is obviously a very important instrument for cutting GHG emissions, but the early or fundamental research is not relevant for this project.

What is relevant is the pre-commercial development phase for some technologies.

Solar cells are now within reach of grid parity, but needed, and still need, large, diversified and sustained R&D and very large production subsidies to get there – though the potential was understood pretty early.

Swedish R&D in CIGS thin-film cells was one of the factors that led this technology to become the fourth largest photovoltaic production technology after crystalline silicon, amorphous silicon and CdTe. Though the R&D still goes on in Uppsala and is producing record-breaking new cells, the Swedish government missed the opportunity for commercializing CIGS in Sweden.

---

113 <http://www.boverket.se/Global/Webbokhandel/Dokument/2010/Utv%C3%A4rdering%20av%20f%C3%B6nsterbio.pdf>

It was commercialized, but Solibro, the second biggest CIGS producer in the world in 2011, has its factory in Germany.

The sad thing is not that the Swedish taxpayer got the costs while Germany got the benefits. (Germany has other, huge, costs for PV, and well deserves some benefits.) The sad thing is that time was lost in the gap between R&D and large-scale production, maybe a couple of years, which is a very long time in a business with a long-term annual growth of 40 per cent.

Wave power may become the next big thing in renewables, and possibly the Swedish government will be more proactive this time. At least the promising SeaBased technology will be tested on an intermediate scale, 420 converters and an annual 25 GWh. The Energy Agency pays 40 per cent of the investment cost of MSEK 420 (about €45 million). Energy company Fortum is a big partner. It will start operation 2012-2014. It is a big bet, but it is conceivable that wave power will produce significant amounts of energy by 2020.

Other relevant support from the Energy Agency<sup>114</sup> goes to:

- Vehicle biofuel from paper pulp (Kraft) black liquor
- Lignin (solid biomass with high heat value, can replace coal or oil) from black liquor.
- Methane (for vehicle fuel) from woody biomass

Of those, the black liquor projects have been discussed for more than 15 years, though this was initially aimed more at power production than vehicle fuels. It stands a chance of commercialization before 2020 in an industry of great importance, particularly for Sweden, Finland and Norway. Investment cycles in the pulp industry are long, though. Even when it is profitable to use the black liquor for fuel production, rather than just burning it to meet the pulp plant's own needs, it will take decades before most pulp plants will do so.

## Heat Research

Sweden is in the far north, so heating is an important part of the energy supply. Though Sweden has cold winters, or because of it, indoor temperatures are high everywhere even in mid-winter, and the heating share of TPES is not higher than in much warmer countries in Europe.

Sweden has a huge district heating system, largely based on biofuels, especially wood and waste. About 50 TWh of heat<sup>115</sup> is delivered annually to apartments, offices and industry and also to single-family houses. This has almost eliminated smoke from chimneys, and oil-fired boilers, in the inner cities of Sweden.

While the technology to get heat from wood is 500 000 years old, it is rather demanding to do it in a reliable, clean, efficient and inexpensive way. The fuel is relatively cheap, but capital costs are high so equipment must be ensured a long and uneventful life.

114 <http://www.energimyndigheten.se/sv/Press/Nyheter/Stod-till-fullskalig-vagkraftsanlaggning-beviljat-av-EU/>

115 See [www.svenskfjarvarme.se](http://www.svenskfjarvarme.se) and [www.euroheat.org](http://www.euroheat.org)

Some R&D is futuristic and visionary, but some is there to solve very practical boiler problems of soot, corrosion, sintering, mixing, low NOX emissions etc. These problems have to a certain extent been solved at Värmeforsk<sup>116</sup> ('Heat Research'). This entity is funded by the Swedish Energy Agency (less than 50 per cent) together with the district heat producers, the pulp industry and other sectors of industry.

While district heating is best suited to inner cities or big buildings, it is not practical further away. Small-scale wood heating is, or has at least been, an environmental problem. Many home-owners use heat pumps, which (if too many do so) may not be optimal due to power capacity peaks. Increased use of wood pellets or other refined biomass could play a part in the puzzle. The use of pellets increased from about 500 to 2000 ktons<sup>117</sup> from 1997 to 2011. Of that increase, single-family houses increased even more. There is much untapped potential for other kinds of biofuels such as reed canary grass, other types of biofuels such as briquettes, and other demands on fuel and ash handling.

Such issues have been successfully attacked by the Swedish Energy Agency's "Small-Scale Heating Programme" 2008-11, with implications also for small-scale CHP, and with a view for use in tropical countries.

/To be amended/

## **Eco-labelling and Green Electricity**

Only the EU energy labelling scheme is described in the National Communication, though there was a national energy label for some products before the EU. This was organized by Nutek, a predecessor of the Energy Agency, with some innovative elements. Shops in the trial town of Östersund were invited to compete for the largest share of sales of fridges with the lowest energy consumption. There was also a small prize for the shop that had the best display of efficient fridges. The market penetration for efficient fridges went from zero to fairly high, but as the national label was superseded by the EU label, probably also due to bureaucratic infighting, the effort was not replicated on a national scale.

Sweden has, like other countries, a label for agricultural products, though the Swedish KRAV scheme was earlier and better known than in many other countries, and probably had a relatively high market share. KRAV products have a smaller climate footprint, for example in that it does not allow the use of nitrogen fertilizer, which contributes to N<sub>2</sub>O emissions<sup>118</sup>. Also, perhaps more importantly, it established the principle of labelling: if a restaurant wants environmental credibility, it will serve KRAV-labelled food.

The "Good Environmental Choice" ecolabel<sup>119</sup> was also initiated in the late

---

116 <http://www.varmeforsk.se/eng-start> (english)

117 <http://pelletsforbundet.se/web/Leveransstatistik.aspx>

118 [http://www.krav.se/Documents/Engelska%20sidor/Information\\_from%20KRAV\\_focus\\_Climate.pdf](http://www.krav.se/Documents/Engelska%20sidor/Information_from%20KRAV_focus_Climate.pdf)

119 <http://www.naturskyddsforeningen.se/in-english/Ecolabelling/>

1980s by the SNF (Swedish Society for Nature Conservation), occasionally reinforced by boycotts against eco-hostile products. Some early successes in this exercise of “Consumer Power” against products, such as chlorine-bleached coffee filters and some detergents, were never quite repeated. The indirect effects may still be considerable, but are very hard to measure: we do not know what would have happened without them.

“Good Environmental Choice” initially competed with the official Nordic label, Svanen<sup>120</sup> (the Swan), but they ended up collaborating and do not label the same goods and services, and do not compete with the EU label. Svanen is a label for a wide range of products from tyres to houses and office equipment, as well as services such as car washes and hotels, and 400 grocery stores. Good Environmental Choice also ecolabels insurance services and district heating, for example.

Following electricity deregulation in 1996, customers were able to choose any supplier and any specified product. One such product, launched by the SNF, is Good Environmental Choice Electricity, or Green Electricity, which excludes nuclear, fossil and new hydro. It has not been a great success on the consumer market, but companies such as SJ (State Railways), which runs much of the trains in Sweden, purchases only Green Electricity, as do other corporations and agencies. Almost all suppliers offer this product, but they also offer confusingly similar products. The Elcertifikat has also been unhelpful for the market.

To end on a more positive note, there is the unlikely success story of the TCO label<sup>121</sup>. TCO is a white-collar trade union. In the 1990s a lot of office workers complained about computer screens, which then used cathode ray tubes. The TCO formulated criteria for the radiation from the screens, which soon became a world standard! The TCO then formulated not only working environment but also sustainability criteria for various IT products, including energy use. Most major manufacturers (LG, Lenovo, Samsung etc.) apply for the TCO certificate. Again we do not know how the energy consumption and carbon footprint of products would have developed otherwise, but it is encouraging to see that a very small number of individuals that came up with the TCO label can make a difference. The slogan for the TCO label is cocky but has some substance: “Good for you. Good for the Planet.”

### **Green car rebates and other advantages for cars**

A rebate for “green cars” was in effect in 2007–2009. The rebate was SEK 10 000, not a lot compared to the price of a new car, which is 10–50 times as much. This was replaced by an exemption from car tax for the first five years for green cars.

There were also other advantages: free parking in some towns, no congestion charge in Stockholm, and 5 years free of car tax.

Later a super-green car rebate for electric cars was introduced, resulting in very few cars actually sold.

---

120 <http://www.svanen.se/en/Buy-Svanenmarkt/What-is-Svanen/>

121 <http://www.tcodevelopment.com/>

Initially most of the green cars were ethanol cars, with little incentives for fuel saving. Ethanol was pushed by other means, such as a requirement (decided in 2002) for gas stations to supply an alternative fuel, which usually meant ethanol.

The reason for giving priority to green fuel rather than fuel efficiency is of course that Sweden is the homeland of Volvo and the now defunct Saab cars, both very thirsty cars a few years ago. As in other countries, the green fuel policy went down well with the agricultural lobby, as well as with the Green Party (which formed part of the parliamentary majority for the government 1998-2006).

In spite of changing policies, inconsistencies and various definitions of green cars in different parts of Sweden, the combined effect of policies of which green car promotion was a part, was a marked improvement.

In 2008 and for many previous years, Sweden had the least energy-efficient new cars of all EU countries at 180 grams of CO<sub>2</sub>/km. In 2011 Sweden was in the mid-range at 138 grams<sup>122</sup>.

Some of the improved efficiency comes from an increased share of diesel cars, which is of contentious value. The real improvement in climate terms is however still greater, as the relatively large use of renewable fuels in Sweden is not accounted for in the EU statistics. Swedish renewable fuels include diesel from the forest industry relatively benign ethanol and extremely climate-efficient biogas. Sweden was very close to meeting the 2020 requirement for 10 per cent renewable transport fuels<sup>123</sup> as early as 2011. Consumption of diesel and petrol fuels has fallen, in absolute numbers, since about 2007.

Attribution of such complex changes to one single instrument is hardly possible.

One possible conclusion is that the large number of instruments for green cars has had a strong combined effect: the multitude of incentives sends a strong message. Conversely, the public discussion and awareness of car emission performance has been much enhanced.

---

122 [http://www.transportenvironment.org/sites/te/files/publications/2012\\_12\\_TE\\_cars\\_CO2\\_report\\_web\\_final.pdf](http://www.transportenvironment.org/sites/te/files/publications/2012_12_TE_cars_CO2_report_web_final.pdf) p27 and [http://www.trafikverket.se/PageFiles/25435/pm\\_vagtrafikens\\_utslapp\\_20130306.pdf](http://www.trafikverket.se/PageFiles/25435/pm_vagtrafikens_utslapp_20130306.pdf)

123 Transportsektorns energianvändning 2011 Energimyndigheten 2012 p13.



