



# THE USE OF SURVEY DATA IN THE AUDIT ECOLOGY PREMIUM

WGEA-meeting

October 8, 2014

- 
1. Audit Ecology Premium
  2. Why a survey?
  3. Conducting the survey
  4. Results
  5. Lessons learned



# 1. Audit Ecology premium

- The ecology premium = a financial grant for certain ecological investments made by enterprises in Flanders
- Objective = encourage enterprises to green or to make their production process more sustainable
- Policy measure within the framework of the European climate and energy policy and within the EU Energy 2020 strategy (20-20-20 targets)
- Scope of the audit: audit of the framework (policy objectives, budgetary and legal framework), the policy implementation and evaluation



## 2. Why a survey?

- Policy implementation (research question 2)
- Stimulating effect; additionality
  - without the grant the green investment would not have been done in the same manner
  - European General block exemption Regulation
  - Legal conditions in Flemish regulation
- Suspicion of non-additionality
- Step towards 'real' performance audit



### 3. Conducting the survey

- Definition of the population and sampling
  - 2405 enterprises : sample of 350
  - Response rate?
  - 2007-2010; 2010-2012
  - Solar panels
  - Administrative load (red tape) for enterprises

→ NO SAMPLE, 1 CALL (229)



### 3. Conducting the survey

- In practice
  - Test phase
  - E-mail with follow up by phone
  - Intro by administration
  - Labour time



### 3. Conducting the survey

- Questions
  - Stimulating effect (2 closed questions)
    - Favourably ranked
    - Unfavourably ranked (control group)
    - Possible answers
      - Yes
      - Yes, but ...
      - No
  - Other questions: 4 open and 1 closed

## 4. Results

- Response rate: 42 %

	Summoned	Answered
Favourably ranked	64	29 (45%)
Unfavourably ranked	165	67 (41%)



Answers	Small enterprise	Medium enterprise	Large enterprise	Total
The same investment	1 (2%)	9 (50%)	2 (50%)	<b>12 (17%)</b>
The same investment, but later	2 (4%)	9 (50%)	0	<b>11 (15%)</b>
An investment with an (environmental) less performant technology	1 (2%)	0	1 (25%)	2 (3%)
An investment on a smaller scale	9 (18%)	0	0	9 (12,5%)
No comparable investment	31 (62%)	0	0	31 (43%)
No decision yet regarding an investment	6 (12%)	0	1 (25%)	7 (10%)



Enterprises that obtained a favourable decision where asked if they **would have done the same investment without subsidy.**

→ **32 % would have done so**

Answers	Small enterprise	Medium enterprise	Large enterprise	Total
The same investment	45 (58%)	15 (94%)	5 (19%)	<b>65 (55%)</b>
The same investment, but later	0	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	<b>2 (2%)</b>
An investment with an (environmental) less performant technology	1 (1%)	0	3 (12%)	4 (3%)
An investment on a smaller scale	0	0	4 (15%)	4 (3%)
No comparable investment	31 (40%)	0	13 (50%)	44 (37%)
No decision yet regarding an investment	0	0	0	0



Enterprises that obtained a negative decision where **asked if they had actually** done the investment without subsidy.

→ **57 % actually did**



## 5. Conclusions – lessons learned

- *Useful results: stimulating effect is not guaranteed*
- *Performance auditing*
- *Visibility*
- *Questions*
- *Follow up – response rate*
- *Scientific results – governmental auditing*