

› **INDUSTRY LOBBYING FOR TRANSITION POLICY**
STAKEHOLDERS IN THE DUTCH CLIMATE AGREEMENT
DOUWE TRUIJENS (TNO)

› OUTLINE

01. INTRODUCTION

02. THE DUTCH CLIMATE AGREEMENT

03. RESEARCH FINDINGS

04. CONCLUSION

05. DISCUSSION #1

DISCUSSION #2

DISCUSSION #3

› INTRODUCTION

- › Dutch Climate Agreement (2019)
 - › ...is the Dutch decarbonisation programme towards 2030 and 2050
 - › ...is characterised by close stakeholder involvement (“polderen”) – both business and NGOs
 - › ...had as its main objective to achieve an agreement supported by broad range of stakeholders
 - › ...is *not* direct policy
- › The negotiations addressed *how* to achieve the pre-set 49% reduction goal
 1. Cost-effective options with short-term result (<2030)
 2. Pilots for upscaling unprofitable options (2030 & 2050)
 3. Fundamental research, development & innovation (towards 2050)
- › ‘Achievable, affordable, acceptable’

› DUTCH CLIMATE AGREEMENT

TARGET: 49% CO₂-REDUCTION IN 2030



› **CLIMATE AGREEMENT AS A CASE STUDY**

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- › What did stakeholder involvement in the negotiation process look like?
- › What types of interests and arguments were considered, and which not?
- › How did the set-up of the Climate Agreement negotiations impact the outcome?

› RESEARCH METHOD

- › Sector tables Industry and Electricity as cases
- › Qualitative RQ so qualitative research method
- › Desk research & minutes of the meetings
- › 34 stakeholder interviews: companies, umbrellas, NGOs, unions, government officials, chairs of sector tables

GREENPEACE



AkzoNobel



Ministerie van Economische Zaken
en Klimaat



milieudefensie



VNCI



GREEN
CHOICE

nvde

Tennet

FEDEC
energieadviseurs verenigd

› FINDINGS

ASSIGNMENT OR AMBITION?

Different frames of reference for evaluating decision-making process

› Assignment

- › Evaluation frame: has the negotiation process carried out the assignment as formulated by the Minister?

› Ambition

- › Evaluation frame: does the Agreement contribute effectively to achieving broader climate ambitions?

- › This difference is one of the findings from the interviews

- › Stakeholders and public actors used different frames

Reminder

Climate Agreement assignment is to discuss

1. Cost-effective options with short-term result
2. Pilots for upscaling unprofitable options
3. Development & innovation (towards 2050)

49% reduction: 'achievable, affordable, acceptable'

› FINDINGS

PREDETERMINED SCOPE OF THE NEGOTIATIONS

- › Technical options to be discussed
 - › Wind & solar
 - › Green & blue hydrogen
 - › CCS
 - › (Not: nuclear)
 - › (Not: change of products and markets)

- › Themes regarding societal impact and achievability *not* to be discussed
 - › No room for discussing (impact on) labour market
 - › No room for discussing distribution of costs and benefits

- › Discussed options mostly incumbents' cup of tea
 - › Primarily focused on short-term reduction
 - › No room for addressing other options or new topics at the negotiation table

› FINDINGS

DOMINANCE INCUMBENTS IN NEGOTIATIONS (I)

› Dominance in presence

- › Big industries all firmly present (enough resources)
- › NGOs present (in smaller numbers due to resources)
- › SME absent (excluded by set-up)

› Dominance in topics

- › Predetermined topics fit with current industry interests (issue ownership)
- › No additional topics could be addressed at the negotiation tables
- Excluded topic: impact labour market
- Excluded topic: impact and distribution costs (households, but also SME)

› FINDINGS

DOMINANCE INCUMBENTS IN NEGOTIATIONS (II)

- › Position NGOs and unions
 - › No room for addressing 'their' topics
 - › Predominantly topics in which they did not have the upper hand
 - › Important: Climate Agreement did *not* require signatures of all participants – limited clout smaller actors
 - › Some NGOs stepped out – largely symbolic statement

› CONCLUSION

- › Those who followed the assignment perceived the process mostly as (very) successful
- › Those who saw Climate Agreement as opportunity towards climate ambitions, perceived it as limited and unsuccessful
- › To ask the question is to answer it
 - › The outcome of the process highly determined by the set-up (selection of participants and scope of the discussion)
 - › Negotiation process not intended to gather more perspectives
- › Incumbents had strongest position
 - › Numeric presence
 - › Issue ownership of topics within scope
 - › Limited clout of NGOs and SME (and Unions)

› **DISCUSSION**

TAKEAWAYS FOR EVALUATIVE RESEARCH

- › *Scope and technical options pre-given*
- › Much power in agenda-setting phase
- › Looking only at negotiation phase gives incomplete story

- › *Evaluating the process by its assignment gives different view than by its ambition*
- › Role of researcher – which frame to follow?
- › Explicate this frame of reference (also cf. presentation Christine)

› DISCUSSION

INDUSTRY LOBBYING FOR TRANSITION POLICY

- › Outcome of this incumbent-based negotiation process
 - › Transition options that do not hinder existing business cases
 - › Short-term improvements rather than fundamental long-term change
 - › Industry and business incumbents dominant in negotiations
 - › Limited complex and ‘painful’ topics, limited problem ownership
- › *Deciding on fundamental change in good harmony with the affected (vested interests)*
- › Necessary?
- › Feasible?



FIN

TNO innovation
for life