

Good practice in climate & energy governance

A methodology for the selection and collection of
good practice examples in EU Member States

LIFE Plan Up

Published: November 2018

By Energy Cities with input from Carbon Market Watch.

Author: David Donnerer

Contributors: Agnese Ruggiero, Francisco Goncalves

To cite this study

LIFE Plan Up (2019) Good practice in climate and energy governance: A methodology for the selection and collection of good practice examples in EU Member States.

Further Information

David Donnerer

Policy & Communication Officer

Energy Cities

david.donnerer@energy-cities.eu

Tel: +33 (0)3 81 65 36 80

Renewable Energy House 63-65 rue d'Arlon | BE-1040 | Brussels | Belgium

www.energy-cities.eu | [@energycities](https://twitter.com/energycities)

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 Good practice in climate and energy governance: A methodology for the selection and collection of good practice examples in EU Member States is financed by the European Commission through the LIFE + programme and by the European Climate Foundation.

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.



➤ Introduction

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 LIFE PlanUp project is to strengthen the climate and energy governance processes in these countries by increasing involvement of local and regional authorities (LRAs) and civil society organisations (CSOs) in the development and implementation of their NECPs.

Action C7 aims to facilitate a multi-layer governance framework in the design and delivery of the NECPs in the 5 target countries, by improving the coordination and cooperation between LRAs/CSOs and national policymakers. Furthermore, national policymakers in these countries will be provided with good practices in climate and energy governance from other EU Member States. Thereby, these national policymakers can learn from practical examples on how to best include LRAs and CSOs in order to increase public acceptance and support for their NECPs. Moreover, these good practices can provide venues for them to adjust and adapt them to their own national specificities, or also serve as a reference for establishing new inclusive climate and energy governance policies. The good practice examples will also be made available to national policymakers in all EU Member States, so they can contribute to the promotion and development of a common understanding of inclusive climate and energy governance and effective public participation in decision-making across the EU.

It is therefore critical to design a robust and thorough methodology that enables the selection of high-quality good practices in climate and energy governance. This document will outline the steps taken in the conception of this methodology, followed by a description of its main features. Finally, the methodology will be transposed into a template that allows for a standardized collection of good practices in climate and energy governance.

➤ Methodology conception

This section describes the process followed to devise the methodology for selecting and collecting good practices in climate and energy governance in EU Member States.

The main approach taken was the conduction of desk research, which included the compilation of previously used methodologies in other EU projects relevant for the scope of LIFE PlanUp. After researching among Horizon 2020 and LIFE projects, it was ascertained that the good practice methodology of the Horizon 2020 [PUBLENEF](#) project (ongoing), as well as the [LIFE Maximiser](#) (completed) project's tool to assess EU Member States' low-carbon development strategies, can provide useful indicators and criteria for the design of the project's good

practice governance methodology. Furthermore, the indicators and criteria applied in a study authored in May 2018 by Andreas Ruedinger for the French think tank IDDRI, which assesses the climate governance framework of the 2015 French Energy Transition Law, were also deemed relevant and useful for the LIFE PlanUp methodology. The reasoning for choosing elements from these 3 sources will be explained below.

The Horizon 2020 PUBLENEF project assists EU Member States in implementing effective and efficient sustainable energy policies and seeks to empower them to make use of good practices implemented in other Member States at the national, regional or local level. PUBLENEF used a detailed questionnaire to identify good practices and ascertain the underlying factors that have driven their successful policy implementation. While most of the indicators used by PUBLENEF in its questionnaire were targeted towards selecting good practices in energy efficiency, in particular those relevant to the EU Energy Efficiency Directive (EED), some of them are also suitable in the climate and energy governance sphere – such as questions on stakeholder involvement, replicability or governance structure. Therefore, we will build upon these elements in developing our methodology.

The LIFE Maximiser project analyzed EU Member States' 2050 low-carbon development strategies (LCDS). For this purpose, LIFE Maximiser developed a [complex technical tool](#) to assess and score the quality (in terms of substance, credibility and process) and status of 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 analyzed. In its entirety, the LIFE Maximiser tool is therefore the most relevant instrument to feed into PlanUp's participatory assessment of the NECPs of the five focus countries under Action C4. Nevertheless, the analysis of the LIFE Maximiser tool showed that some its criteria and indicators can also serve as crucial basis for the LIFE PlanUp methodology to select and collect good practices in governance. Hence, the project will build in particular upon criteria and indicators relating to action, political commitment, institutional collaboration, transparency and stakeholder engagement in the conception of its good practice governance methodology.

The 2018 IDDRI study by researcher Andreas Ruedinger on the climate governance framework of the 2015 French energy transition law uses a detailed assessment matrix, is based on previous analytical guiding work undertaken by IDDRI and Ecologic and is structured around the two following dimensions: robustness of the institutional design of a climate governance framework, and effectiveness of this framework in driving and implementing the structural transformations required for a low-carbon transition. The matrix used by Ruedinger has similar, but slightly different evaluation criteria and indicators than the LIFE Maximiser project. Consequently, it can also play a key role in informing the LIFE PlanUp methodology. Our project will therefore build in particular upon Ruedinger's criteria and indicators relating to legal bindingness, adaptability, policy impact, implementation stringency and quality of long-term objectives in its own methodology.

The 2018 IDDRI study by researcher Andreas Ruedinger on the climate governance framework of the 2015 French energy transition law uses a detailed assessment matrix, is based on previous analytical guiding work undertaken by IDDRI and Ecologic and is structured around the two following dimensions: robustness of the institutional design of a climate governance framework, and effectiveness of this framework in driving and implementing the structural transformations required for a low-carbon transition. The matrix used by Ruedinger has similar, but slightly different evaluation criteria and indicators than the LIFE Maximiser project. Consequently, it can also play a key role in informing the LIFE PlanUp methodology. Our project will therefore build in particular upon Ruedinger's criteria and indicators relating to legal bindingness, adaptability, policy impact, implementation stringency and quality of long-term objectives in its own methodology.

Finally, at each step of the development of this methodology, the LIFE PlanUp project partners were consulted, and their feedback and guidance were included in the final product.

➤ Main features of the methodology

In order for a measure in climate and energy governance to be considered as a suitable good practice for LIFE PlanUp, we have first established the following selection criteria:

Criteria	Description
Political commitment (Maximiser 2017, p.24; Ruedinger 2018, p. 25-26)	The level of ownership within the public authority in charge, support from across political spectrum for implementation and ability to survive political change
Institutional collaboration (Maximiser 2017, p.23-24, 26)	The degree of cooperation between different governance levels (multi-level governance) and within the public authority in charge of the process (e.g. ministries)
Governance structure (Maximiser 2017, p.24; PUBLENEF 2016, p. 11, Ruedinger 2018, p.25-26)	The existence of a governance structure, its status (permanent or temporary body) and its legal bindingness

Stakeholder engagement & involvement (Maximiser 2017, p. 26-27; PUBLENEF 2016, p.13)	Degree to which stakeholders, in particular LRAs and CSOs, are able to participate, and to which extent their views are actively sought out and reflected in the process
Action (Maximiser 2017, p.22; PUBLENEF 2016, p.11-12)	To which extent resources were available, actions clearly defined and responsibilities allocated in the measure
Transparency (Maximiser 2017, p.25-26)	Degree to which documentation, including on the process, is available to public
Adaptability (Ruedinger 2018, p.25-26)	Degree to which the measure includes procedures for strategic revision and is able to adjust to changes and challenges (endogenous and exogenous)
Replicability (PUBLENEF 2016, p.12)	The extent to which replication is possible, and at which level (national/regional/local)
Effectiveness (Maximiser 2017, p.21-23; Ruedinger 2018, p.25-26)	The degree of ambition and policy detail, as well as the robustness of the monitoring and evaluation process to evaluate progress

These 9 criteria are underpinned by a total of 24 indicators. In addition, a scaling system was introduced to measure and evaluate the indicators:

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Description
Political commitment (Maximiser 2017, p.24; Ruedinger 2018, p.25-26)	Level of ownership within the public authority in charge	Is the measure backed by high-level political bodies and figures?	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully
	Level of support across political boundaries	Is the measure supported across the political spectrum?	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully
	Ability to survive political change	Can the measure survive political change?	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Description
Institutional collaboration (Maximiser 2017, p.23-24; 26)	Multi-level governance	Are responsibilities shared vertically among different governance levels (local – regional – national) in the measure?	0 = no 1 = yes, some sharing with small role for LRAs 2 = yes, significant sharing with key role for LRAs
	Cooperation within public authority	Are responsibilities divided among different entities in the public authority in charge? (e.g. different ministries)	0 = no 1 = yes, some division 2 = yes, broad division

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Description
Governance structure (Maximiser 2017, p.24; PUBLENEF 2016, p. 11; Ruedinger 2018, p.25-26)	Existence of governance structure	Is there a dedicated institutional body or arrangement in the measure?	0 = no 1 = yes, working group e.g. or similar 2 = yes, new body created for delivery
	Status of governance structure	What is the status of the dedicated body or arrangement in the measure?	Skip if previous indicator = 0 1 = temporary body created for delivery 2 = permanent body created for delivery
	Legal bindingness	To which extent is the body or arrangement legally binding?	0 = non-binding 1 = somewhat legally binding 2 = fully legally binding

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Description
Stakeholder engagement & involvement (Maximiser 2017, p. 26-27; PUBLENEF 2016, p.13)	Method	How are stakeholders, in particular LRAs & CSOs, consulted in process?	0 = no form of consultation 1 = only public consultation 2 = several forms of consultation
	Status of governance structure	What is the status of the dedicated body or arrangement in the measure?	Skip if previous indicator = 0 1 = temporary body created for delivery 2 = permanent body created for delivery
	Legal bindingness	To which extent is the body or arrangement legally binding?	0 = non-binding 1 = somewhat legally binding 2 = fully legally binding

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Description
Action (Maximiser 2017, p.22; PUBLENEF 2016, p.11-12)	Resources available	Are there enough resources – human, financial, etc. – available in the measure?	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully
	Clear definition of the actions	Are the actions clearly defined in the measure?	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully
	Clear division of responsibilities	Are responsibilities clearly allocated in the measure?	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Description
Transparency (Maximiser 2017, p.25-26)	Documentation available	Is documentation on the measure available to the public?	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully
	Information on process available	Is information on the process of measure available to public?	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Description
Adaptability (Ruedinger 2018, p.25-26)	Strategic revision	Does the governance measure include procedures for strategic revision?	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully
	Capacity to adjust to changes and challenges	Is the measure capable of adjusting to changes and challenges? (endogenous and exogenous)	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Description
Replicability (PUBLENEF 2016, p.12)	Feasibility	To which extent is replication of measure possible?	0 = not possible 1 = low extent 2 = medium extent 3 = high extent
	Governance level	At how many levels can the measure be replicated?	0 = no level of governance 1 = only one level of governance 2 = multiple levels of governance

Criterion	Indicator	Indicator description	Description
Effectiveness (Maximiser 2017, p. 21-23; Ruedinger 2018, p.25-26)	Ambition	Does the governance measure have ambitious and coherent targets?	0 = no 1 = yes, some extent 2 = yes, fully
	Level of policy detail	Does the measure provide detailed and feasible policy orientations and mechanisms to ensure the achievement of the targets?	0 = no 1 = yes, some extent 2 = yes, fully
	Monitoring & evaluation	Does the governance measure include regular reporting processes, aiming at evaluating policy progress?	0 = no 1 = yes, some 2 = yes, clearly outlined and regular

While the criteria and corresponding indicators follow a single scaling system, it was decided by the consortium to provide different weights for different criteria. Some of the criteria outlined here relate explicitly to the coordination and cooperation between LRAs/CSOs and national policymakers, which is key in the development and implementation of the NECPs. Therefore, a good performance in particular in these criteria should be graded higher in the overall assessment of a climate and energy governance measure as a good practice. The below table shows the different weights applied to the 9 criteria:

Criteria	Points
Political commitment	10
Institutional collaboration	15
Governance structure	15
Stakeholder engagement & involvement	20
Action	7,5
Transparency	7,5
Adaptability	7,5
Replicability	7,5
Effectiveness	10
Total	100

For a measure to be considered as a good practice in climate and energy governance, it is therefore critical that it especially fulfils the criteria of stakeholder engagement & involvement, institutional collaboration as well as governance structure, as all these combined make up half of the points that can be credited.

Finally, the project partners decided that a measure should achieve at least a score of 65 points, in order to be selected as a good practice in climate and energy governance.

➤ Template for good practices in climate & energy governance

Based on the methodology described beforehand, a template is created to enable the standardized selection and collection of good practices in climate and energy governance in EU Member States. The template is designed in order to allow for a multifaceted gathering of good practices, not only through the means of desk research and literature review, but also through (phone or face-to-face) interviews with relevant target audiences (LRAs, CSOs, EU Member States officials such as staff from permanent representations, etc.).

General Information	
Title of good practice	xxx
Country	xxx
Governance level & organization / institution in charge	National – Regional – Local Name of organization / institution in charge
Starting year	xxx
Status	Ongoing / Completed
National framework	Short description of national context and climate and energy objectives
Summary of good practice	Ca. 100 words, with rationale & objectives
Pictures	2-3 pictures illustrating the good practice
Political commitment	
Level of ownership within the public authority in charge: Is the measure backed by high-level political bodies and figures?	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully Tick corresponding score & explain answer

<p>Level of support across political boundaries: Is the measure supported across the political spectrum?</p>	<p>0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully Tick corresponding score & explain answer</p>
<p>Ability to survive political change: Can the measure survive political change?</p>	<p>0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully Tick corresponding score & explain answer</p>

Institutional collaboration

<p>Multi-level governance: Are responsibilities shared vertically among different governance levels (local – regional – national) in the measure?</p>	<p>0 = no 1 = yes, some sharing with small role for LRAs 2 = yes, significant sharing with key role for LRAs Tick corresponding score & explain answer</p>
<p>Cooperation within public authority: Are responsibilities divided among different entities in the public authority in charge? (e.g. different ministries)</p>	<p>0 = no 1 = yes, some division 2 = yes, broad division Tick corresponding score & explain answer</p>

Governance structure

<p>Existence of governance structure: Is there a dedicated institutional body or arrangement in the measure?</p>	<p>0 = no 1 = yes, working group e.g. or similar 2 = yes, new body created for delivery Tick corresponding score & explain answer</p> <p>If available, attach organizational chart of the governance structure</p>
<p>Status of governance structure: What is the status of the dedicated body or arrangement in the measure?</p>	<p>Skip if previous indicator = 0 1 = temporary body created for delivery 2 = permanent body created for delivery Tick corresponding score & explain answer</p>
<p>Legal bindingness: To which extent is the body or arrangement legally binding?</p>	<p>0 = non-binding 1 = somewhat legally binding 2 = fully legally binding Tick corresponding score & explain answer</p>

Stakeholder engagement & involvement

Method: How are stakeholders, in particular LRAs & CSOs, consulted in process?	0 = no form of consultation 1 = only public consultation 2 = several forms of consultation Tick corresponding score & explain answer
Frequency: How frequent are stakeholders, in particular LRAs & CSOs, engaged with by the public authority in charge of the measure?	0 = never 1 = rarely 2 = sometimes 3 = often Tick corresponding score & explain answer
Depth: Which stakeholder group could participate?	0 = no groups 1 = only one group 2 = several groups 3 = all groups Tick corresponding score & explain answer
Input reflected in the process: Were views from the stakeholders, in particular LRAs & CSOs, reflected during process?	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully Tick corresponding score & explain answer

Action

Resources available: Are there enough resources – human, financial, etc. – available in the measure?	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully Tick corresponding score & explain answer
Clear definition of the actions: Are the actions clearly defined in the measure?	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully Tick corresponding score & explain answer
Clear division of responsibilities: Are responsibilities clearly allocated in the measure?	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully Tick corresponding score & explain answer

Transparency

Documentation available: Is documentation on the measure available to the public?	0 = no 1 = yes, some extent 2 = yes, fully Tick corresponding score & explain answer
--	---

Information on process available: Is information on the process of measure available to public?	0 = no 1 = yes, some extent 2 = yes, fully Tick corresponding score & explain answer
--	---

Adaptability

Strategic revision: Does the governance measure include procedures for strategic revision?	0 = no 1 = yes, some extent 2 = yes, fully Tick corresponding score & explain answer
---	---

Capacity to adjust to changes and challenges: Is the measure capable of adjusting to changes and challenges? (endogenous and exogenous)	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully Tick corresponding score & explain answer
--	--

Replicability

Feasibility: To which extent is replication of measure possible?	0 = not possible 1 = low extent 2 = medium extent 3 = high extent Tick corresponding score & explain answer
---	---

Governance level: At how many levels can the measure be replicated?	0 = no level of governance 1 = only one level of governance 2 = multiple levels of governance Tick corresponding score & explain answer
--	--

Effectiveness

Ambition: Does the governance measure have ambitious and coherent targets?	0 = no 1 = yes, some extent 2 = yes, fully Tick corresponding score & explain answer
---	---

Level of policy detail: Does the measure provide detailed and feasible policy orientations and mechanisms to ensure the achievement of the targets?	0 = no 1 = yes, to some extent 2 = yes, fully Tick corresponding score & explain answer
--	--

Monitoring & evaluation: Does the governance measure include regular reporting processes, aiming at evaluating policy progress?	0 = no 1 = yes, some 2 = yes, clearly outlined and regular Tick corresponding score & explain answer
--	---

References

LIFE Maximiser project, Submission of a Final Tool Concept for the Assessment of Low-Carbon Development Strategies, July 2016, accessed at: <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/57050297356fb0e173a11732/t/5b3107a96d2a73fc7b-baaa28/1529939892483/final+tool+concept+Maximiser+formatted.pdf>

PUBLENEF project, Compilation of good practices case study reports, September 2016, accessed at: http://publnef-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/PUBLENEF_WP2_D2-1-_FINAL-REPORT.pdf

Ruedinger, Andreas, Best practices and challenges for effective climate governance frameworks: A case study on the French experience, IDDRI study, May 2018, accessed at: <https://www.iddri.org/sites/default/files/PDF/Publications/Catalogue%20Iddri/Etude/201805-IddriStudy0318-ClimateGovernanceFrance-EN.pdf>



Join the conversation ➤

www.planup.eu