

## In depth description of the 5 good practices selected dealing with regulatory reliefs, incentives or other simplification measures

PARTNER **CZECH REPUBLIC**

**Good practice selected:** Funding programme of the Ministry of Environment, and the Ministry of Industry and Trade

<b>N. assigned in the mapping phase</b>	1
<b>Promoting institution(s)</b>	state
<b>Type of measure</b>	Credit access and Funding support
<b>Background</b>	<i>Funding is one of “the easiest” way to support the EMAS program. This funding solves just the initial cost, but not the future cost. The problem is, that it is not sustainable and there always be the time limitation of this RR.</i>
<b>Detailed description of the measure</b>	<i>Companies could receive 50 % subsidy to cover EMAS or ISO 14001 implementation cost. The program was in effect in the beginning of millenium (approx. 2000 - 2006). The fund was focused on the private sector.</i>

<b>Legislative reference</b>	Funding programme of the Ministry of Environment, and the Ministry of Industry and Trade
<b>Level of Application (regional, national, etc.)</b>	national
<b>Score obtained in the first level assessment</b>	10
<b>Score obtained in the second level assessment</b>	8,47
<b>Final Score</b>	18,47

### Legal feasibility - 2

#### Description

*The regulatory relief requires a medium legislative effort to be adopted. It is a stronger relief, which operates funding, and the management of those kinds of instruments take a lot of authorizing procedures, but there is a quite a probability to success. One point down is because there has to be a big political will to negotiate high amount of money for this program.*

### Economic feasibility - 2

<b>Description</b>	<i>The economic and technical feasibility required to adopt the regulatory relief is closely connected to the legal feasibility. If it is possible to ensure a legal feasibility, there are usually no problems to conform to these other aspects.</i>
<b>Technical feasibility - 2</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<i>The RR does not require high technical effort to be adopted.</i>
<b>Achieved results – 3</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<i>The regulatory relief is very welcome by the EMAS registered organizations and in the past it has contributed a lot to increase the numbers of EMAS, and its potential to spread EMAS in the future is high.</i>
<b>Environmental benefit - 3</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<i>Environmental benefit potential is very high.</i>

**Good practice selected:** Reduction of financial guarantees

<b>N. assigned in the mapping phase</b>	3
<b>Promoting institution(s)</b>	state
<b>Type of measure</b>	Reduction of financial guarantees
<b>Background</b>	<i>This is the adoption of the EU legislation, but in practise is not so effective or motivating to convince companies to get EMAS.</i>
<b>Detailed description of the measure</b>	<i>Operators with EMAS or ISO 14001 are exempt from the obligation to provide financial security for potential environmental damage.</i>
<b>Legislative reference</b>	Act No. 167/2008 on Prevention of Environmental Damage – Implementation of Directive 2004/35/CE on environmental liability with regard to the prevention and remedying of environmental damage § 14 - Financial security of preventive and corrective measures
<b>Level of Application (regional, national, etc.)</b>	national
<b>Score obtained in the first level assessment</b>	8
<b>Score obtained in the second level assessment</b>	7,35

<b>Final Score</b>	15,35
<b>Legal feasibility - 3</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<i>The regulatory relief is set such as non-financial support, it means it is well feasible. When the origin of the RR is EU, it also makes it more open and feasible for EU member states.</i>
<b>Economic feasibility - 3</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<i>The RR does not require high cost to be adopted.</i>
<b>Technical feasibility - 3</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<i>The RR does not require high technical effort to be adopted.</i>
<b>Achieved results - 1</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<i>The regulatory relief did not contribute to spread EMAS, EMAS organizations do not know and use it.</i>

### Environmental benefit - 3

<b>Description</b>	<i>Environmental benefit potential is very high.</i>
--------------------	--

*Environmental benefit potential is very high.*

**Good practice selected:** Fast-track permits/simplification in the application

<b>N. assigned in the mapping phase</b>	2
<b>Promoting institution(s)</b>	state
<b>Type of measure</b>	Fast-track permits/simplification in the application
<b>Background</b>	<i>This is the adoption of the EU legislation, but in practise is not so effective or motivating to convince companies to get EMAS.</i>
<b>Detailed description of the measure</b>	<i>Reports and documents provided for ISO14001 and EMAS certification can be attached to the application for Integrated Environmental Permit, to fulfill BAT 1. However, they are considered as additional documents only. §20b - Companies with EMAS have fewer controls of Czech Environmental Inspectorate</i>
<b>Legislative reference</b>	Act No. 76/2002 on Integrated Prevention (Regulation No 288/2013) – Implementation of the Directive 96/61/CE on the integrated prevention and reduction of pollution (IPPC Directive). § 4 - Content of the application § 20b - Inspection
<b>Level of Application (regional, national, etc.)</b>	national

<b>Score obtained in the first level assessment</b>	9
<b>Score obtained in the second level assessment</b>	6,12
<b>Final Score</b>	15,12

### Legal feasibility - 3

#### **Description**

*The regulatory relief is set such as non-financial support, it means it is well feasible. When the origin of the reg. is EU, it also makes it more open and feasible for EU member states.*

### Economic feasibility - 3

#### **Description**

*The RR does not require high cost to be adopted.*

### Technical feasibility - 3

#### **Description**

*The RR does not require high technical effort to be adopted.*



### Achieved results - 1

#### Description

*The regulatory relief did not contribute to spread EMAS, EMAS organizations do not know and use it.*

### Environmental benefit - 3

#### Description

*Environmental benefit potential is high.*

**Good practice selected:** Green public procurement

<b>N. assigned in the mapping phase</b>	4
<b>Promoting institution(s)</b>	state
<b>Type of measure</b>	Green public procurement
<b>Background</b>	<i>The EMAS (EMS) is mentioned just in a part, where the price of the procurement is bigger than 140 000 EUR, or 5 421 546 EUR (Construction work), it means in case of smaller procurements, EMAS (EMS) is not taken into account.</i>
<b>Detailed description of the measure</b>	<i>Contractor can require EMAS or ISO 14001 to be implemented as a proof of a tenderer's technical qualification.</i>
<b>Legislative reference</b>	Act No. 134/2016 on Public Procurement § 80 - Quality and environmental management standards
<b>Level of Application (regional, national, etc.)</b>	national
<b>Score obtained in the first level assessment</b>	7
<b>Score obtained in the second level assessment</b>	7,65
<b>Final Score</b>	14,65

## Legal feasibility - 2

### Description

*The regulatory relief requires a medium legislative effort to be adopted. It is a stronger relief and the management of those kinds of instruments takes a lot of authorizing procedures, but there is a quite a probability to success. In case of GPP, each country has its own system and there may be a problem with the formulation of EMAS, to not discriminate the other EMS.*

## Economic feasibility – 3

### Description

*There is no need to extra costs or time savings.*

## Technical feasibility - 2

### Description

*Technical feasibility – two points - because other states may have another system of the public procurement.*

## Achieved results - 2

<b>Description</b>	<i>This RR does not have a significant effect to spread EMAS, but it makes an administration easier for registered organizations.</i>
<b>Environmental benefit - 3</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<i>Environmental benefit potential is very high.</i>

**Good practice selected:** Funding of MoE - the environmentally responsible behaviour

<b>N. assigned in the mapping phase</b>	5
<b>Promoting institution(s)</b>	state
<b>Type of measure</b>	Credit access and Funding support.
<b>Background</b>	<i>This is the only one RR, which supports the SMEs. The objective of the sub-area is to support the environmentally responsible behaviour of companies and other entities (eg cities) by supporting the EMS certification. The instrument is not valid yet, but we hope it will be successful.</i>
<b>Detailed description of the measure</b>	<i>Funding for projects supporting voluntary instruments implementation and EMS certification including EMAS as well as projects for raising awareness, enlightenment and education. This RR is for SMEs and the public organizations.</i>
<b>Legislative reference</b>	National Programme Environment funding scheme Priority area No. 6 Environmental prevention, Chapter 3 Voluntary instruments
<b>Level of Application (regional, national, etc.)</b>	national
<b>Score obtained in the first level assessment</b>	6

<b>Score obtained in the second level assessment</b>	6,35
<b>Final Score</b>	12,35

### **Legal feasibility - 2**

#### **Description**

*The regulatory relief requires a medium legislative effort to be adopted. It is a stronger relief, which operates funding, and the management of those kinds of instruments takes a lot of authorizing procedures, which depends on the priorities and the political will of the Ministry.*

### **Economic feasibility - 2**

#### **Description**

*The RR does not require high cost to be adopted.*

### **Technical feasibility - 3**

#### **Description**

*The RR does not require high technical effort to be adopted.*

### **Achieved results – 2**

<b>Description</b>	<i>This RR does not have a significant effect to spread EMAS, because this RR is not valid yet.</i>
<b>Environmental benefit - 2</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<i>Environmental benefit potential is expected to be medium.</i>