



Fit to succeed?

An assessment of the Hungarian draft energy and climate plan

Table of contents



please consider the environment before printing

Executive summary / 1

An assessment of the Hungarian draft national energy and climate plan / 3

Scope, ambition and credibility / 4

In-depth sectoral analysis / 6

Transport / 6

Buildings / 8

Agriculture / 9

Public participation and transparency / 10

Co-benefits / 12

Overall score and conclusions / 13

Annexes / 15

Assessment criteria / 16

LIFE PlanUp project description / 23

Executive summary

As part of the European Union's 2030 climate and energy package, EU member states are required to develop energy and climate strategies to plan and to report on their 2030 climate and energy objectives.

The LIFE PlanUp project (for more information, see Annex II), analyses the draft national energy and climate plans (NECPs) from five countries - Romania, Poland, Hungary, Italy and Spain.

Divided into four sections, this briefing assesses the draft plan of Hungary. An overall score is provided at the end of the assessment (for more information, see Annex 1 on assessment criteria).

The first section covers the scope of the plan and the ambition and plausibility of its overall objectives.

Hungary published its draft national energy and climate plan (NECP) in February 2019, thus missing the legal deadline. The plan fails to address key issues such as phasing out fossil fuel subsidies and reducing energy poverty, and to put forward measures to ensure that the rights of prosumers and those of renewable energy communities are protected, in accordance with the Clean Energy Package.

Hungarian greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are expected to decrease by at least 40% by 2030 compared to 1990. However, the country's emissions are already 35% lower than the 1990 level, meaning that the drop over the next decade is expected to be small. In terms of goals, the government plans to strictly adhere to the 7% target required by the Climate Action Regulation (also known as the Effort Sharing Regulation), although there would be a need and potential go way beyond that.

The draft plan foresees a 20% and 8-10% increase in the use of renewable energy sources and energy efficiency improvement, respectively, by 2030. These are the bare minimum decided on at the EU level, and will hardly contribute to the common climate targets of the EU.

The second chapter provides an in-depth analysis of the transport, buildings and agricultural sectors with regard to the proposed objectives and policy measures.

There is no specific decarbonisation target for transport in the Hungarian draft NECP. In the scenarios presented, the planned energy consumption of, and the GHG emissions from transport will be growing, neglecting the emission reduction potential of climate mitigation policies.

The draft NECP has very little information on reducing emissions from buildings. The long-term energy efficiency roadmap, expected to be developed in the course of 2019, will be crucial in order to enable energy modernisation of buildings.

Instead of proposing measures to rein in emissions from agriculture, the Hungarian government argues that the expected 18% increase in agricultural emissions is acceptable, considering the emission reductions by other sectors towards meeting the Climate Action regulation overall goal of reducing emissions by 30% by 2030.

The third chapter looks at how the Hungarian NECP was developed, and whether the process was transparent and inclusive. While more involvement of stakeholders is expected in the course of 2019, for the draft NECP, the government only asked for input from a selected group of stakeholders, giving them a very limited time frame to react.

Finally, an important part of an NECP is the impact assessment of planned policies with regard to co-benefits such as job creation, air quality improvement and reduction of energy poverty, but the Hungarian plan fails to address any of these issues.

Overall, the Hungarian draft NECP lacks key information and scores low in all criteria used in this assessment. It is of paramount importance that when developing the final plan, the Hungarian government strengthens its commitment to the 2030 climate objectives, and involves all stakeholders in a transparent process.

An assessment of the Hungarian draft national energy and climate plan



Scope, ambition and credibility

The Hungarian draft NECP, published in February 2019, fails to address key issues such as phasing out fossil fuel subsidies. It doesn't include measures to ensure that the rights of prosumers' and those of renewable energy communities are protected, in accordance with the Clean Energy Package.

At the time of writing, the Hungarian government is developing a new National Energy Strategy (NES), due to be published later in the year, which will address many items that are relevant to the NECP.

Greenhouse gas emission target

According to the draft NECP, Hungarian greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions will decrease by at least 40% by 2030 compared to 1990. However, the country's emissions are already 35% lower than in 1990, mostly because of the collapse of the heavy industry at the beginning of the 1990s. 6,4 MtCO₂ of the total 8,2 MtCO₂ reduction is expected to come from closing down the lignite and bio-mass-fired Mátra power plant. Under the Climate Action Regulation, Hungary is expected to cut its emissions from the CAR (i.e. those not covered under the EU Emissions Trading System) sectors by 7% by 2030 compared to 2005. However, national emissions have been on the rise since 2015, partly due to increasing pollution from the industrial, agricultural, and first of all transport sectors.

Renewable energy

In its draft plan, Hungary sticks to the minimum target of reaching a 20 % share of renewable energy sources in primary energy consumption by 2030, which is rather modest.

In particular, the plan expects Hungary to continue to rely heavily on solid biomass for residential heating.

The government plans to develop a system integration of renewable sources, as well as household and industrial-scale energy storage technologies, and to support the development of energy-efficient technologies, digitalisation and promotion of smart metering. However, a more detailed explanation on how this measure would be implemented and financed is missing.

Energy efficiency

As for the renewable energy deployment, the Hungarian government plans to adhere to the minimum EU level target of improving energy efficiency by 8-10% by 2030, therefore hardly contributing to the common climate targets of the EU.

Despite deploying energy efficiency programs since 2014, Hungary will probably not meet its 2020 energy efficiency target. One of the reasons for this is probably the government's policy to keep utility costs artificially low in the residential sector. The low energy prices and lack of a stable investment environment do not encourage investments in energy efficiency.

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Scope	Consistency with Energy Union governance regulation	Does the plan follow the mandatory template as outlined in the Governance Regulation? ¹	2/4 = to some extent
	Sectors/policies coverage	Does the plan include policies covering all required sectors?	2/4 = to a small extent
	Deadline	Has the plan been published on time/respecting deadline?	1/4 = considerable delay

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Ambition/plausibility	Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions	Does the plan include an economy-wide GHG emissions reduction target for 2030?	1/4 = to a small extent
	Consistency among targets	Does the plan utilise consistent and harmonised GHG emission targets and related baselines?	3/4 = to a moderate extent
	Renewable energy	Does the plan include a national 2030 renewable energy target? ²	1/4 = to a small extent
	Energy efficiency	Does the plan include a national 2030 energy efficiency target?	0/4 = not at all
	Alignment with 2050 decarbonisation objective	Is there a clear commitment to the Paris Agreement's objectives?	0/4 = not at all

¹ <http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/PE-55-2018-INIT/en/pdf>

² <https://www.ecofys.com/en/publications/national-benchmarks-for-a-more-ambitious-eu-2030-res-target/>

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Consistency and credibility	Adaptation plan	Has an adaptation plan been devised? Is it reflected in the NECP? ³	1/4 = unclear adaptation strategy
	Use of loopholes	Does the plan include use of loopholes in achieving GHG emission targets? ⁴	1/4 = yes, large use
	Policy projections Impact assessment	Does the plan use a strong and effective model used for the impact assessment of planned policies and measures?	0/4 = not at all

In-depth analysis of sectors

Transport

The Hungarian NECP does not include any specific target for decarbonising the transport sector. It builds mainly on electric mobility, although no clear financial support for this is specified. The transport sector should contribute to climate change mitigation goals in accordance with the overall Hungarian target, i.e. at least 7% emission reduction compared to 2005. On the contrary, the plan foresees 15.66 million tCO₂e emissions from transport by 2030 that means more than a 50% rise compared to 2005.

Furthermore, the Hungarian government plans to make infrastructure investments that will increase passenger and freight transport, leading to additional emissions and energy use.

The draft plan includes a target for the use of renewables in transport of 15% (the EU only mandates a binding 7% for advanced fuels) with a rough breakdown of the sources of energy, as seen in the table below.

Transport energy generated from renewable energy sources in the breakdown of fuels (Mtoe)
Source: Hungarian National Energy and Climate Plan

Mtoe	2015	2023	2025	2027
Traditional biofuel	0.188	0.426	0.439	0.57
Electricity - from renewable energy	0.025	0.125	0.75	0.215
Biogas	0	0.003	0.005	0.007
Hydrogen - from renewable energy	0	0	0.001	0.003

There is a slight increase in the use of traditional biofuels, which is not in line with the EU's Renewable Energy Directive (REDII) that requires that traditional biofuels be frozen at 2020 levels and

3 Art. 19 Governance Regulation: <http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/PE-55-2018-INIT/en/pdf>
4 <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018R0842&from=EN>

should never be higher than 7%. At the same time, there is no mention of advanced biofuels, which according to the REDII, must make up for at least a 3.5% share of the mix for transport.

Furthermore, there is no clarity about the source of biomass, which should not be based on first-generation feedstocks. If 'traditional biofuels' also include advanced fuels, it should be clarified in the plan.

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Sectoral policy: Transport	Alignment/plausibility with 2030 goals	Are transport policies included in the plan plausible to reach 2030 national climate goals? ⁵	1 /4 = to a small extent
	Inclusion of long-term strategy	Do plans include transport policies beyond 2030?	0/4= not at all
	Consistency with EU legislation	Are transport policies consistent and in line with EU legislation? ⁶⁷⁸⁹	1/4 = to a small extent
	Infrastructure	Are proposed infrastructure investments aligned with the long-term climate goals?	1/4 = to a small extent
	Policies beyond or additional to EU requirements	Does the plan include policies that are additional or go beyond EU requirements?	2 /4 = to some extent

Recommendations

- Include a transport specific GHG emission reduction objective, to be able to track the emission reductions in such a polluting sector.
- Increase the share of electric vehicles to be in line with the EU target.
- Include measures and policies to address emissions from heavy-duty transport. At the bare minimum, the plan should include what is mandated by the EU in the CO2 standards for these vehicles, but other measures should be considered such as modal shift.
- Implement road charging schemes.
- Include provisions for big emitters in the transport sector such as aviation and shipping, which are largely ignored in the current NECP.

5 https://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/effort/proposal_en
6 https://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:609fc0d1-04ee-11e8-b8f5-01aa75ed71a1.0001.02/DOC_1&format=PDF
7 https://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:3eb9ae57-faa6-11e6-8a35-01aa75ed71a1.0007.02/DOC_1&format=PDF
8 https://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/vehicles/directive_en
9 https://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/cpt_en

Buildings

Hungary is currently developing a long-term energy efficiency roadmap relating to the country's building stock.

The draft NECP mentions ESCO (Energy Services Company)¹⁰, but it is doubtful whether the building sector can be attractive enough for this type of for-profit companies.

Although energy modernisation of buildings has the greatest emission reduction potential by volume, the payback time is long and the cost to be covered by residents is prohibitively high. Better regulation and targeted support would be necessary to harness this savings potential.

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Sectoral policy: Buildings	Alignment/plausibility with 2030 goals	Are buildings policies included in the plan plausible to reach 2030 national climate goals?	0/4 = not at all
	Inclusion of long-term strategy	Do plans include buildings policies beyond 2030?	0/4 = not at all
	Consistency with EU legislation	Are buildings policies consistent and in line with EU legislation? ^{11 12 13}	2/4 = to some extent
	Infrastructure	Are proposed infrastructure investments aligned with the long-term climate goals? ^{14 15}	0/4 = not at all
	Policies beyond or additional to EU requirements	Does the plan include policies that are additional or go beyond EU requirements?	0/4 = not at all

Recommendations

- Develop a long-term energy efficiency roadmap enabling energy modernisation of buildings.
- Implement tariff schemes that incentivise energy efficiency, and adopt specific measures for vulnerable consumers.

¹⁰ An ESCO is a company that offers energy services which may include implementing energy-efficiency projects (and also renewable energy projects) and in many cases on a turn-key basis (<https://e3p.jrc.ec.europa.eu/communities/energy-service-companies>)

¹¹ <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018L0844&from=EN>

¹² <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52016PC0761&from=EN>

¹³ [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52016PC0767R\(01\)&from=EN](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52016PC0767R(01)&from=EN)

¹⁴ <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32012L0027&from=EN>

¹⁵ <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018L0844&from=EN>

Agriculture

The draft NECP does not include any measures to address GHG emissions from agriculture.

The government's reasoning is that, given the reduction targets in other sectors, it is actually possible to allow the agricultural emissions to increase, while still reaching the 30% reduction target for the non-ETS sectors. Indeed, Hungary expects that its agricultural GHG emissions will increase by 18% by 2030.

Seeing that more than half of methane and a large majority of NO₂ emissions stem from agriculture, it is irresponsible to allow the sector's GHG emissions to keep growing unabated. Using other sectors' climate efforts as a pretext to allowing agricultural emissions to grow will only make the inevitable long-term adjustment of the sector more difficult.

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Sectoral policy: Agriculture	Alignment with 2030 goals	Are agricultural policies included in the plan plausible to achieve 2030 climate goals? ¹⁶	0/4 = not at all
	Inclusion of long-term strategy	Do plans include agricultural policies beyond 2030?	0/4 = not at all
	Consistency with EU legislation	Are agricultural policies consistent and in line with EU legislation? ¹⁷	0/4 = not at all
	Infrastructure	Are proposed infrastructure investments aligned with the long-term climate goals?	0/4 = not at all
	Policies beyond or additional to EU requirements	Does the plan include policies that are additional or go beyond EU requirements?	0/4 = not at all

¹⁶ https://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/effort/proposal_en

¹⁷ <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018R0841&from=EN>

Recommendations

- Acknowledge the sector's significant potential to contribute towards reaching the CAR targets, and outline policies, measures and available funding sources in the energy and climate plan in order to reduce agricultural emissions.
- Ensure that:
 - agricultural mitigation measures cover all sources of emissions from the sector
all measures are environmentally proofed (air - water - biodiversity)
 - specific budget is allocated for each measure and the number of farmers expected to enroll is put forward.

Transparency and public participation

Prior to the elaboration of the draft NECP, the Hungarian government sent out a questionnaire on the plan only to a selected group of stakeholders, including some NGOs, such as the Clean Air Action Group. Municipalities or associations of municipalities are not explicitly mentioned among the stakeholders contacted. The stakeholders contacted by the Ministry could send their reply to the questionnaire and their proposals in writing. The questionnaire included questions on the specific sectors and the general ambition of the plan, but not on the governance aspects of the NECP (e.g. multi-level dialogue). The process lasted one month according to the information provided in Hungary's draft NECP, and reached 134 stakeholders in total.

More involvement of stakeholders is expected in the course of 2019, when a more advanced version of the NECP is ready. The draft plan does not mention a specific public consultation open for all citizens, nor does it foresee elaborate plans for a multilevel dialogue.

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Transparency	Public participation	Does the plan include early and effective opportunities for public participation? ¹⁶	2/4 = no, public consultation but too short time
	Publication	Is the draft plan publicly available? ¹⁷	1/4 = yes, but for a limited period of time

¹⁶ Art. 10 Governance Regulation: <http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/PE-55-2018-INIT/en/pdf>
¹⁷ Art. 3.4, 9.4 Governance Regulation: <http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/PE-55-2018-INIT/en/pdf>

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Transparency	Multilevel dialogue	Does the plan cater for a multilevel dialogue where local authorities, NGOs, business, investors and the general public can actively engage and discuss the climate and energy policy scenarios, and review progress? ¹⁸	0/4 = no provision for dialogue

Recommendations

- Organise a public consultation to enable citizens and other stakeholders to contribute to the NECP, following the European Commission recommendations in June.
- Publish a summary of stakeholder contributions to the first and second questionnaire process, describing how they were included/not included in the NECP.
- Make the timeline for the remaining NECP process publicly available, so that citizens and stakeholders can receive early and effective information on how they can contribute to the NECP process.
- Organise regional gatherings to discuss the NECP with local and regional authorities (LRAs), civil society organisations (CSOs) and other stakeholders in the second half of 2019.
- Make use of existing local energy and climate initiatives, such as the Covenant of Mayors, to gather the potential contribution of LRAs to the NECP. National associations of LRAs, such as Klimabarat, the association of County Councils and others, as well as the Covenant of Mayors initiative, can be used to reach out to LRAs.
- Establish a multi-level energy and climate dialogue for the finalisation of the NECP, making use of existing formats like working groups, taskforce or other consultative bodies that involve all stakeholders; provide the dialogue with an administrative structure to ensure its duration and its involvement in regularly following up on the NECP implementation from 2020 onwards.

Co-benefits

Air quality, energy poverty and job creation

While phasing out lignite as a source of energy for residential heating would be absolutely necessary in order to improve air quality, the draft plan does not include a coal phase-out date. On the other hand, the government's goal to improve the technical condition of residential solid firing equipment is a step in the right direction.

The draft plan does not set any energy poverty objectives, as energy costs of Hungarian consumers are considered among the lowest in Europe.

As for jobs, there is no mention in the draft plan about job creation in low-carbon industries.

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Co-benefits	Air quality	Do proposed policies improve air quality?	3/4 = moderate improvement
	Energy poverty	Do proposed policies reduce energy poverty?	0/4 = no effect predicted
	Job creation	Does the plan include investments in low-carbon industries, thus promoting job creation in these industries?	0/4 = no effect predicted

Recommendations

- Acknowledge the job-creating potential of a shift towards a low-carbon economy.
- Foresee energy poverty measures for low-income households.

Overall score and conclusions



please consider the environment before printing

Criteria	Weight	HU points
Scope	5	6/12
Ambition	20	5/20
Consistency and credibility	20	2/12
Transport policies	10	2/20
Buildings policies	10	2/20
Agriculture policies	10	0/20
Transparency	20	2/12
Co-benefits	5	3/12

Total score: 17%

The Hungarian draft NECP scores very low in all the most important criteria.

The ambition of its climate and energy objectives and the transparency of the NECP development require major improvement. Higher ambition in terms of targets would set Hungary on the right path to significantly reducing its emissions and contributing to the fulfilment of the Paris Agreement objectives.

A more transparent process where all relevant stakeholders and the general public are consulted on the country's climate objectives, together with well-planned policies would ensure greater support and commitment from all parties involved.

With regard to sectoral objectives and policy measures, the draft plan needs review and improvement, especially on the buildings and agricultural sectors.

Energy consumption and GHG emissions of transport in Hungary are growing, as the government neglects the emission reduction potential of climate mitigation policies, such as the shift of freight from trucks to (electric) trains and implementation of road charging.

The draft plan lacks a long-term energy efficiency roadmap for the buildings sector, which should be developed in the finalisation of the plan to enable the energy modernisation of buildings which will help unlock the sector's emission reduction potential.

The plan should also acknowledge the contribution of the agricultural sector to reaching the goals of the Climate Action Regulation by outlining policies, measures and available funding sources to reduce its emissions.

The Hungarian draft NECP should be completed and properly finalised. It is of paramount importance that, when developing the final plan, Hungary increases its commitment to the 2030 climate objectives, and involves all stakeholders in a more transparent process.

Annexes



Assessment criteria

Methodology

To develop the used set of criteria, we conducted desk research and looked mainly at two examples: the criteria used in the LIFE Maximiser Project and the criteria developed by Climate Action Network (CAN) Europe.

The LIFE Maximiser project analysed EU Member States' 2050 low-carbon development strategies (LCDS). For this purpose, LIFE Maximiser developed a complex technical tool²⁰ to assess and score the quality (in terms of substance, credibility and process) and status of the EU Members' LCDS. The tool was broken down into 10 criteria, and based on these criteria, further into 48 indicators and sub-indicators. The overall approach used by LIFE Maximiser was normative, meaning that their tool was designed with the primary purpose to measure what elements should be included in the LCDS they analysed. Of the 10 criteria, the most relevant for our work were: ambition, scope, integration, public transparency and process transparency.

The guidelines developed by CAN Europe (part 1²¹ and part 2²²) are intended to serve as a tool to empower civil society organisations across Europe to engage actively and effectively in the process of the development of the NECPs; to demand ambitious targets and policies from their governments; to check on the accuracy and coherence of governmental proposals; and to hold them accountable for what they have committed to do. They are meant to provide an understanding of the plans and how they work. The guidelines are composed of five pillars, one per topic analysed. Each pillar is underpinned by a set of criteria and indicators. For our work, we looked at all the pillars and selected the relevant criteria and indicators.

Additionally, we developed sector-specific indicators to analyse sectoral policies that are the focus of our project. Each sector - agriculture, buildings and transport - was given a set of indicators that explore the ambition level of sectoral policies, their alignment with EU legislation and the level of their infrastructure investment.

User manual

The result of this methodology was a set of eight criteria, underpinned by a total of 38 indicators. In addition, a scaling system was introduced to measure and evaluate the indicators.

The participatory assessments shall be conducted on the basis of the eight criteria listed below.

20 <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/57050297356fb0e173a11732/t/5b3107a96d2a73fc7bbaaa28/1529939892483/final+tool+concept+Maximiser+formatted.pdf>

21 <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1A4qGHLX2ThnlwlrnkHjJHRZTdh0jghV6PxUjqxDzI0/edit>

22 <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1tLOHUF1T0gYWPMU7SeBpybw1AvPwH3L-TLGPmbozDnA/edit#heading=h.2nusc19>

These criteria should be used to provide a general indication of the strengths and weaknesses of the specific NECP section on a scale from 0 to 4. The score should be properly justified in a dedicated paragraph.

These criteria, and related indicators, rely exclusively on existing data provided within the NECPs. Lack of data or sections in the NECPs should be highlighted but not compensated for. The lack of details and data shall instead be translated into concrete policy asks to be submitted to Member States in public consultations.

When impact assessment of policies and measures is missing in the NECP, the following national projections may be used to explain the point assigned to each indicator: Climate and Energy country profiles.

Assessment criteria template

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Scope	Consistency with Energy Union governance regulation	Does the plan follow the mandatory template as outlined in the Governance Regulation?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent
	Sectors/policies coverage	Does the plan include policies covering all required sectors?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent
	Deadline	Has the plan been published on time/respecting deadline?	0 = no publication 1 = considerable delay 2 = no, reasonable delay 3 = yes, some delay 4 = yes, no delay

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Ambition/plausibility	Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions	Does the plan include an economy-wide GHG emissions reduction target for 2030?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent
	Consistency among targets	Does the plan utilise consistent and harmonised GHG emission targets and related baselines?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Ambition/ plausibility	Renewable energy	Does the plan include a national 2030 renewable energy target?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent
	Energy efficiency	Does the plan include a national 2030 energy efficiency target?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent
	Alignment with 2050 decarbonisation objective	Is there a clear commitment to the Paris Agreement's objectives?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Sectoral policy: Transport	Alignment/plausibility with 2030 goals	Are transport policies included in the plan plausible to reach 2030 national climate goals?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent
	Inclusion of long-term strategy	Do plans include transport policies beyond 2030?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent
	Consistency with EU legislation	Are transport policies consistent and in line with EU legislation?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent
	Infrastructure	Are proposed infrastructure investments aligned with the long-term climate goals?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Sectoral policy: Transport	Policies beyond or additional to EU requirements	Does the plan include policies that are additional or go beyond EU requirements?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Sectoral policy: Buildings	Alignment/plausibility with 2030 goals	Are buildings policies included in the plan plausible to reach 2030 national climate goals?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent
	Inclusion of long-term strategy	Do plans include buildings policies beyond 2030?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent
	Consistency with EU legislation	Are buildings policies consistent and in line with EU legislation?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent
	Infrastructure	Are proposed infrastructure investments aligned with the long-term climate goals?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent
	Policies beyond or additional to EU requirements	Does the plan include policies that are additional or go beyond EU requirements?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Sectoral policy: Agriculture	Alignment/plausibility with 2030 goals	Are agricultural policies included in the plan plausible to reach 2030 national climate goals?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Sectoral policy: Agriculture	Inclusion of long-term strategy	Do plans include agricultural policies beyond 2030?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent
	Consistency with EU legislation	Are agricultural policies consistent and in line with EU legislation?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent
	Infrastructure	Are proposed infrastructure investments aligned with the long-term climate goals?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent
	Policies beyond or additional to EU requirements	Does the plan include policies that are additional or go beyond EU requirements?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = to a great extent

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Transparency	Public participation	Does the plan include early and effective opportunities for public participation?	0 = no opportunities/form of consultation 1 = no only limited and not public 2 = no, public consultation but too short time 3 = yes, several opportunities 4 = yes, several opportunities and ample time to participate
	Publication	Is the draft plan publicly available?	0 = no 1 = yes, 6 or more months delay 2 = yes, 2-3 months delay 3 = yes 4 = yes, plus summary in English

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Transparency	Multilevel dialogue	Does the plan cater for a multilevel dialogue where local authorities, NGOs, business, investors and the general public can actively engage and discuss the climate and energy policy scenarios, and review progress?	0 = no provision for dialogue 1 = very limited effort 2 = only limited to very few stakeholders 3 = yes, some effort in including multiple stakeholders and gather input 4 = yes, effective dialogue and high engagement

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Consistency and credibility	Adaptation plan	Has an adaptation plan been devised? Is it reflected in the NECP?	0 = no 1 = no, unclear adaptation strategy 2 = yes, but not clearly reflected in the plan 3 = yes, but limited 4 = yes, fully developed and integrated
	Use of loopholes	Does the plan include use of loopholes in achieving GHG emission targets?	0 = yes, full use/no alternative sought 1 = yes, large use 2 = yes, most opportunities used 3 = yes, but limited 4 = no loopholes used
	Policy projections Impact assessment	Does the plan use a strong and effective model used for the impact assessment of planned policies and measures?	0 = not at all 1 = to a small extent 2 = to some extent 3 = to a moderate extent 4 = yes, very strong and detailed model used

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Co-benefits	Air quality	Do proposed policies improve air quality?	0 = no effect 1 = minimal effect 2 = small improvement 3 = moderate improvement 4 = great improvement

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Score
Co-benefits	Energy poverty	Do proposed policies reduce energy poverty?	0 = no effect 1 = minimal effect 2 = small improvement 3 = moderate improvement 4 = great improvement
	Job creation	Does the plan include investments in low-carbon industries, thus promoting job creation in these industries?	0 = no investment 1 = almost insignificant increase 2 = small increase 3 = moderate increase 4 = great investment and substantial job growth

The table below summarises the weight that each criterion has on the overall score of the NECP.

Given the difference in importance of the criteria in our analysis, a weight system helps us quantify this difference and ensure that it is reflected in the overall score of the NECP. For example, while the consistency between the NECP document and template provided in the Governance regulation is important, the plausibility of the policies listed, the ambition level in targets set for each sector and the dialogue with multiple stakeholders in the development of the NECP are much more relevant and important to the objective of this exercise, and therefore should be given more prominence in the overall assessment.

Hence, a good performance in particular in these criteria should be graded higher in the overall assessment of climate and energy policies.

The final score of the assessment will be expressed as a percentage and will equal to the sum of the weighted points.

Criteria	Weight	Points
Scope	5	12
Ambition	20	20
Consistency and credibility	20	12
Transport policies	10	20
Buildings policies	10	20
Agriculture policies	10	20
Transparency	20	12
Co-benefits	5	12

A NECP should obtain at least 65% to be considered a good plan.

LIFE PlanUp project description

LIFE PlanUp supports the shift to a low-carbon and resilient economy through the development and implementation of effective and ambitious national 2030 energy and climate plans (NECPs) in Hungary, Poland, Romania, Spain and Italy. A key objective of the PlanUp project is to strengthen the climate and energy governance processes in these countries by increasing the involvement of local and regional authorities (LRAs) and civil society organisations (CSOs) in the development and implementation of the NECPs.

Aiming to support the five target countries in strengthening their national NECPs and to engage in their development, a core action of the PlanUp project is the participatory assessment of draft and final NECPs. In order to conduct meaningful and consistent analyses for all five Member States, we developed a set of assessment criteria that will guide the assessments and ensure their comparability.

LIFE PlanUp

Published: May 2019

Analysis by Clean Air Action Group and Carbon Market Watch, with input from Earth Hungary, WWF Hungary, Energiaklub, Greenpeace Hungary, Transport and Environment, Energy Cities and European Environmental Bureau.

Expert group: Agnese Ruggiero, Elisa Martellucci, Kaisa Amaral, András Lukács, Zoltán Lontay, Márton Vargha, Judit Szegő, Alexa Botár, Ádám Harnat, Orsolya Fülöp, András Perger, Cristina Mestre, Stephan Piskol, Roland Joebstl, Berenice Dupeux and David Donnerer.

To cite this study: LIFE PlanUp (2019) Fit to succeed? An assessment of the Hungarian draft energy and climate plan

Acknowledgement

The Life PlanUp project has received funding from the LIFE programme of the European Union. The project acknowledges also the generous support of the European Climate Foundation.

Legal notice

This publication, C4.1 Participatory assessment of draft NECPs, is financed by the European Commission through the LIFE+ programme, the European Climate Foundation and the European Climate Initiative (EUKI).

It is the overarching goal of the LIFE + programme to act as a catalyst for changes in policy development and implementation by providing and disseminating solutions and best practices to achieve environmental and climate goals, and by promoting innovative environmental and climate change technologies.

The information and views set out in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Commission.

Further Information

Agnese Ruggiero

Policy Officer

Carbon Market Watch

agnese.ruggiero@carbonmarketwatch.org

Rue d'Albanie 117, B-1060 Brussels, Belgium, Belgium | Tel: +32 2 335 36 66

www.carbonmarketwatch.org | [@carbonmrktwatch](https://twitter.com/carbonmrktwatch) | fb: Carbon Market Watch



Join the conversation ➤ www.planup.eu