



PLANNING AND ENGAGEMENT ARENAS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY LANDSCAPES

PEARLS

Marie Skłodowska - Curie Actions (MSCA)
Research and Innovation Staff Exchange (RISE)
H2020-MSCA-RISE-2017 – 778039 - PEARLS

Document Title	Interviews
Version	1.0
Status	Version submitted to EC
Work Package	WP2
Deliverable Type	Scientific Deliverable
Contractual Date of Delivery	28 February 2023
Actual Date of Delivery	23 May 2023
Responsible Unit	USE
Contributors	USE; ENERCOUTIM; UNITN; HABITECHT; ETHICS FOR GROWTH; CONSORTIS; BGU
Keyword List	Research Report; Best Practices; Environmental Impact Assessment; Public Participation
Dissemination level	Public

Document change record

Version	Date	Status	Author (Unit)	Description
0.1	2023-01-20	Draft	USE	Deliverable Structure
0.2	2023-04-24	Draft	USE	First Complete Draft without conclusions
0.3	2023-04-27	Draft	BGU	First Complete Draft
0.4	2023-22-10	Draft	USE	Review and Comments Deliverable Index Draft
1.0	2023-05-23	Final Version	USE-BGU	Web site available

Abstract:

This deliverable contains the result of the research carried on the comparative analysis of environmental impact assessment procedures in Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece, and Israel. A common questionnaire has been used to interview national and regional policy makers and technicians from private and public sector in these countries. Its main goal has been to obtain direct information about the public participation system in renewable energies implementation through this procedure. This information will allow deep into the assessment and effectiveness of the incentive mechanism for public participation in RE projects in close connection with WP3. The result of the research goes ahead in task 3 of WP2 to include natural and cultural aspects in EIA and to propose a return mechanism for policy makers.

INDEX

I.	Introduction.....	3
II.	RE Policy: National legal frameworks	4
1.	Environmental Impact Assessment	5
2.	Changes in the European Energy Transition Framework	7
III.	Methodological Procedure	9
IV.	Results	11
1.	Participant information process: socio-demographic details.....	12
2.	Energy Transition Process.....	13
3.	Renewable Energy Actors and Renewable Energy Projects	14
4.	Environmental Impact Assessment for Renewable Energy Projects	15
V.	Conclusions.....	22
VI.	Annex.....	23
VIII.	PEARLS Consortium	41

I. Introduction

This deliverable contains the result of the research carried on the comparative analysis of environmental impact assessment (EIA) procedures in Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece, and Israel. Its main goal has been to obtain direct information about the public participation system in renewable energies implementation through this procedure. A common questionnaire has been used to interview national and regional policy makers and technicians from private and public sector in these countries. Based on the WP2 research reports presented in D.2.1, a common methodology has been constructed to design a questionnaire that would question about different aspects regarding the procedure of EIA to know how public participation is taking place along land-use planning procedures related to the energy transition. The deliverable introduces the EIA rules in the European Union including the last changes due to the war in Ukraine and the quest after energy independence. The situation in Israel is also presented due to its own regulatory frame of EIA. The methodological procedure and the questionnaire structure are included to facilitate the results analysis interpretation. By the end, the script for an in-depth interview to be conducted with some of the relevant respondents to the questionnaires is introduced.

II. RE Policy: National legal frameworks

D.2.1 and D.6.5 provide references to identify RE national case studies as specific issues in policies and practices for further research and task in WP2. WP 2 analyses the sustainable implementation of policies and practices on renewable energy landscapes. It aims to facilitate a better understanding of legal frameworks and daily practice in the implementation of renewable energy landscapes. Legal frameworks included in WP2 are energy policy, land use planning and landscape practice regulations. These topics are addressed through the four countries' legal frameworks for developing and implementing RE including, i) national contexts in legislation to promote RE and their landscapes and the main figures for outcomes; ii) spatial differences between the chosen case studies in each country; and iii) spotlights to obtain first-hand information about the implementation procedure and EIA on the landscape that result from renewable energy installations.

The situation of RE about topics such as legal framework of RE policy and RE landscape planning tools are conditioned by territorial, economic, and administrative circumstances in each country. PEARLS participant countries are rich in renewable energy resources, mainly for the development of solar and wind energy, while hydropower has been present as a pioneering renewable energy. This is not the case in Israel, where the scarcity of rivers hindered the development of this energy source. In the Azores Islands, Portugal, there are also resources for geo-thermal energy production. From these bases, the penetration of RE has been possible thanks to the impulse of international agreements in the fight against global climate change and global warming, mainly the Kyoto Protocol and more directly the Paris Agreements in 2016. The regulations introduced by the European Union have made it possible to develop frameworks for action in each country, with the establishment of objectives, action plans and monitoring of results with which to demonstrate the scope of these to the European institutions. At the same time, they have favoured the development of a strong business sector, especially in the Iberian Peninsula. Although Israel is following its own roadmap, partly because of its geo-political situation, partly because several large beds of natural gas were discovered in Israel's economic Waters, the Israeli government had set a national target for reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 and optimising energy consumption in the economy. The tools put in place to achieve these objectives have consisted of the formulation of plans, the adaptation of laws and the formulation of new ones, while the development of RE in land-use planning and spatial planning has begun to be incorporated. Israel is a pioneering case because already in 1970, the Planning and Building Law directed all new residential buildings up to 9 floors to install thermal solar panels for domestic water heating.

Portugal, Italy, Greece, and Israel have centralised administrative structures for the promotion of RE, with implementation formulas that start directly from the top down to the territories where these installations are implemented. This is also the case in Spain, although decisions are taken by the autonomous governments. The consequence is a lack on the dialectical relationship between the local and centralized level of planning. General criteria use to disregards local specificities and depreciates the local self-government. So then, public opposition, mainly based on landscape concerns, is increasingly apparent, especially of residents, NGOs and others. The locality factor should be enhanced while the role of citizens and local actors should be strengthened. A key event for the RE promoting comes from the new concept of Energy

Community introduced by European Union Legislation. Its aim is to boost the potential from individual to local communities to develop investment projects as both producers and consumers at the same time. In addition to the consequences for the development of RE, the new figure of prosumers introduces a more direct relationship between the legal framework and the achievement of results in renewable generation.

1. Environmental Impact Assessment

Agenda 21 resulting from Rio de Janeiro Conference -1992- or the Aarhus Convention of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe -1998- show the importance of access to information, public participation, and justice into environmental concerns. The convention granted public participation rights into environmental plans and programmes elaboration also establishing some dispositions. These dispositions could be pertaining to access to legal procedures resulted of violation of information and public participation rights into authorization for activities. Following the Agenda, European Directive 2014/52/EU about Environmental Impact Studies reaffirms the requirement of evaluation of effects into environment of public or private projects. This regulatory framework sets the authorization of projects with important effects into environment, which should be given after the corresponding EIA. This last one must be based in the provided information by the developer and completed by the authorities and interested public. Also, this legal framework expresses the duty of encourage public participation that includes such associations as groups or organizations like NGOs working in environmental protection. Through this participative process of the public, they seek to appreciate the importance of social aspects in decision-making stage of projects. This is done by the expression of opinions and concerns. It is remarkable to say they must be considered by the competent authorities. On the other hand, this process contributes both directly to improve the citizen awareness of environmental issues as the public support of adopted decisions.

The modes of information and consultation to interested public are established and determined by EU Member States since they started. An environmental impact evaluation of projects is compulsory when their realization implies significant effects. In any case the decision can be taken for each or by adopting some generic criteria. Public participation can in practice happen in two principal moments,

- i) as part of the decision-making process about placement and infrastructures – e.g., dimensions and implementation of wind turbines, power substations, grid power lines-, or
- ii) during negotiations whose objective are to set measures to mitigate impacts and distribute the corresponding compensations and benefits once the installation has been finished.

These procedures occur in most of the RE installations which are obliged to develop the public exposition phase. On these cases, the framework for a three-way dialogue is established between the Administration, the development company, and the population, while it is true that each actor plays a different role in each country. Cultural aspects will emphasise the Administration role against others. In the case of Southern European countries, it is common that the main role is played by the Administration or the development company, but rarely, this leadership on the public exposition phase, is performed by the population. In the case of Israel, the situation is effectively very close to this, with scarce presence of citizens' opinion in the

development of renewable energy plants facilities. Its modest numbers due to the specific energy backgrounds are normally argued as the main cause of this proceeding, although some examples of the scientific literature invite to think differently. In fact, when it is not like that, the common is that the population opinion is not considered by the developers in some precise experiences in the context of EU.

The main environmental impact evaluation legislation in Portugal is Decreto-Lei Nº 151-B/2013, which was altered and republished by Decreto-lei Nº 152-B/2017. The latter transposes Directive 2014/52/EU. Numerous regulations are in place and today all energy projects with capacities equal or over 50MW are subjected to the process. The process includes the public consultation phase. All public consultations are posted in an online portal and citizens can read a characterisation of the project and voice their possible concerns. Also, in some cases of more controversial projects, such as large dams, public presentations are made by the promoters to inform and have a dialogue with the public.

In Spain participation related to RE is limited to consultations within environmental impact studies. The first legal regulation was established in 1986 by the Royal-Legislative Decree 1302/1986, 28 June, about EIA and remained in force by the Law 21/2013, 9 December. For plans and programs, a Strategic Environmental Assessment -SEA- has been mandatory, while an EIA has been required for projects. In the case of SEA, a public information stage takes place when the procedure is started, and the corresponding promoter determines the scope and content of his plan or program. The initial version of the document is used for information to the consultation process to affect Public Administrations and people takes place (45 business days as minimum). In relation with EIA, the submitted project is presented to public information for a minimum of 30 business days. Any change related to content, length and meaning of the project can be done within the mentioned terms. All obtained information is addressed to the promoter and when adding modifications occur into project, is mandatory to start a new information and consultation process.

Although the first integrated legislation for EIA appeared in Greece in 1986 (Law No 1654/86), the implementation of the EIA context for the first time was in 1990 (Joint Ministerial Decision (JMD) 69269/19990 enacting Law 1650). Main step of the Greek Legal Framework is Law No 4014/2011 (Law 4014/2011 («*Environmental licensing for projects and activities, regulation of arbitrary constructions by reference to the creation of environmental balance and other competence provisions of the Ministry of Environment*»)). All projects and activities for which environmental licensing is required have been classified into two categories and in 12 groups common to all categories. In addition, the time needed for the completion of the evaluation processes, the required studies as well as the issue of the relative transactions has been notably long, e.g., for category A1 the time needed for environmental licensing could exceed 20 months and reach up to 42 months. At the same time, the environmental licensing process involve a variety of competent authorities and it also lack standardization, practices, and valuable guidelines, as well as electronic databases and information systems.


The Israeli governmental decision to establish the Environment Authority in the 1970s already included a section on environmental impact assessments based on the American system (NEPA). The first regulation was set in 1982 and final legislation was approved in 2003 as part of the

Planning and Building Act. Its goal, conditions and scope are similar to those of the EU directive. Public participation in the EIA procedure itself, however, is not obligatory, and the public can only object to plans at a later stage as part of the land-use planning approval process. Final and approved EIA reports must be, according to the law, published to the public.

Among it's a short history, EIA procedures are totally consolidated in EU's member states and in Israel as essential tools for preservation and protection. Any initiative as a plan, program, or project that may cause environmental affections must be done according to the established rules before its adoption, approval, or authorization. Besides, in EU countries public participation is one of the key factors in the environmental assessment procedures. It grants action into the procedure of interested people and public by their input of opinions in consultation and public information processes. And to grant an effective participation and a wide diffusion, these procedures must be done electronically and/or by public announcements so public administrations must adopt the required measures to ensure an e-access.

2. Changes in the European Energy Transition Framework

With its ratification of the Paris Agreement in 2016, the European Union contributed to the target of containing the increase in the average global temperature. The 'Winter Package' ('Clean Energy for all Europeans', COM (2016) 860 final) sought to enable and update compliance with the main binding targets for 2030. Two years later, the European Commission updated its long-term strategic vision to achieve a prosperous, modern, competitive, and climate-neutral economy by 2050 through the Communication 'A clean planet for all' COM (2018) 773 final.



European Union: Main binding targets for 2030

This framework has considered two additional conditions: i) the COVID pandemic, with the administration paralysed, and ii) the Ukrainian War, which brought with it some further geopolitical variables. Subsequently, a variety of Commission working documents have clearly established the new energy transition scenario in the EU:

Russia's invasion of Ukraine made deploying renewable energy as soon as possible one of the EU's strategic priorities as it will reduce our dependence on (mostly imported) fossil fuels and will help make energy affordable again.

Specifically, these include the 'Guidance to Member States on good practices to speed up permit-granting procedures for renewable energy projects' that accompanies the document titled 'Recommendation of the Commission on speeding up permit-granting procedures for renewable energy projects and facilitating power purchase agreements' of 18th May 2022 (European Commission, 2022). As a result, the European Commission has identified barriers related to the processing of permits and other administrative procedures as the main limitation to the rapid deployment of RE as they slow down projects, increase uncertainty and costs and put off investors, and thus put 'at risk the achievement of the EU decarbonisation targets and the proposed RE target for 2039' (European Commission, 2022). The roadmap of the European Green Deal reaffirms the appropriateness of the energy transition to end energy dependence by

2027. The REPowerEU initiative will apply to save energy, produce clean energy and diversifying our energy supplies reinforcing renewable sources and technologies.

The EIA of projects has been the only channel for assessing the repercussions for the territory and landscape. This was made evident by the response of the promoters, the absence of territorial planning for this type of project, and the lack of thresholds that would allow their management. And this is despite the above-mentioned difficulties such as a limited and sometimes questionable public information process, the large number of files disclosed for information purposes and the complexity of access and analysis by interested agents. The new 'approach' of tenders for access and connection in line with the 'Winter Package' proposals advocated placing the public at the centre of the energy transition and, therefore, intended to correct this shortcoming by integrating social impact assessment processes from the beginning of the project. This is an urgent requirement due to the proliferation of renewable projects and their possible concentration in locations where the best resources are found. For this, citizens must directly perceive the benefits of renewable energy deployment, which requires the social perspective to be included in the proposed set of measures with a proactive role for citizens in the energy transition.

However, the course of geopolitical events has curtailed this road map. The war in Ukraine and the geopolitical consequences for energy supply have prompted several regulatory changes to 'speed up renewable energy projects to accelerate decarbonisation and reduce energy dependence'. This has seriously inhibited EIAs with the adoption of urgent measures that include shorter timer limits for procedures to determine environmental conditions for renewable energy projects and compliance with a series of requirements. In COM (2022) 108 and Recommendation (EU) 2022/822, the European Commission documents have marked out a clear roadmap. Actions are currently aimed at expediting the 'deployment of renewables and self-consumption' by simplifying administrative procedures and searching for a 'balance between the need for environmental protection and accelerating the deployment of these projects. Council Regulation (EU) 2022/2577 of December 22nd, 2022, designed to contribute to mitigating the effects of the current energy crisis, transparently transfers the reasons for accelerating the deployment of RE in European territory. This Regulation introduces a key issue for understanding the European administration's impetus in this new phase: the favourable presumption that renewable energy projects are activities of great public interest for relevant environmental legislation as exemptions from certain assessment obligations laid down in environmental legislation can be introduced. The principle of energy solidarity is essential in this new approach. Any increase in the deployment of renewable energy in any one Member State should also benefit others by encouraging 'renewable electricity' to flow across borders to where it is most needed and ensuring that its 'low cost' production is exported to Member States where electricity production is more expensive.

The outcome is pivotal not only due to the climate emergency, energy dependency and geopolitical crisis but to the urgent need to resolve projects based on the consumption of large surface areas for the installation of renewable energy plants, whatever the assessment of their environmental impact. Furthermore, this situation has come about precisely when the need has become clear to respond to public demands to be involved in the energy transition to take their opinion into account.

III. Methodological Procedure

The methodological procedure is based on a structured questionnaire for key decision makers in five countries. Its aim is to provide information about public participation system in RE implementation through EIA procedure, to articulate similarities and point out significant differences. Working at the same time on this procedure in Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece, and Israel means using a common questionnaire to interview national and regional policy makers and technicians from private and public sector, while accounting for differences that pertain both to terminology and the actual phase of transition. This information will allow deep into the assessment and effectiveness of the incentive mechanism for public participation in RE projects.

The procedure of carrying out this work has been divided in four stages. The first stage consisted of the elaboration of a common questionnaire. For this purpose, the existing regulation of EIA tool in the five countries was considered as a criterion. By the same time, the selection of policy makers and technicians was done on the five countries following the criteria of a minimum of two questionnaires and maximum of ten ones per each, participants in the research were chosen based on their active role in decision-making processes related to RE siting. The third stage has been on the dissemination of the questioner that was based on a personal approach to each of the participants. The analysis of answers and results tabulation have been the final stage. Results will be a first approach to EIA tool in each country to provide information for further WP2 research tasks.

The questionnaire is structured in five blocks (see Figure 1). In each block a set of questions were included with the aim of finding the relationship between participants and their degree of knowledge and expectations on EIA related to RE projects for the energy transition process. In block 1, respondents were asked on socio-demographic details including their gender; age; education level; employment and area of expertise. In block 2, more precise information was asked about their views on the future of the energy transition process within the context of resilience, recovery, and twin transition. Using different scale criteria, the participants were asked to select their ideas and values about RE sources, types, and models like centralised and distributed energy models. In blocks 3 and 4, the participants were asked about multiple-choice questions with sought to identify their role as RE actors on specific RE projects. The aim for those has been to share their personal experiences and values about the participatory process that will enable a comparison of the five countries. To conclude, in blocks 5 and 6 an extended set of options were offer to them to depth in the EIA for RE projects.

The complete questionnaire is included in the Annex.

Block 1	SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
Block 2	ENERGY TRANSITION PROCESS. PERSONAL OPINIONS WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF RESILIENCY AND RECOVERY AND TWIN TRANSITION
Block 3	RENEWABLE ENERGY ACTORS
Block 4	RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS
Block 5	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION PROJECTS
Block 6	TERRITORIAL/REGIONAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AS A TOOL WITH AN INTEGRATED APPROACH

Figure 1: Interview Blocks

The definition of the questionnaire has followed an interactive and iterative building process between the WP2 secondees team. The questionnaire was administered into national languages, so it has been translated from English -as working communication tool- into Portuguese, Spanish, Italian, Greek and Hebrew. To ensure maximum territorial coverage, trying to reduce bias as much as possible in the sample, and following subsidiary research process, the questionnaire was sent to national and regional policy makers and technicians from private and public sector in the five countries by local secondees. We selected the participants carefully based on their active role in decision-making/policymaking process related to RE siting. After approaching personally to key-stakeholders, we used the snow-ball technique to identify further potential participants. Ultimately, the final sample attempt to capture the national diversities and stive to have a gender balance. The questionnaire was distributed between December 2022 and February 2023. After Steering Committee Meeting in Trento (January 2023) and the new amendment to incorporate Ethics 4 Growth to PEARLS consortium, the deadline was extended until the 10 of March 2023 and additional questionnaires came from Italy. The survey has been done using hybrid methods for collecting information such as e-mail, google tool and was also filled-in during in person meeting with stakeholders.

Finally, the analysis of the responses and interpretation of the results has been made by the University of Seville WP2 co-leader in Spain with the support of Ben-Gurion University of the Negev from Israel as co-lead of the WP. They were analysed using descriptive statistics, based on the number of times of the options was ticked (in the multiple-choice questions) or according to the number of respondents who selected each option in relation to the total. In the case of a small sample of survey respondents, descriptive statistics can be used to provide a summary of the responses and to identify any trends or patterns in the data. This can be particularly useful when analysing data from a small sample size as it allowed us to draw insights and conclusions from a limited dataset. The analysis of the questionnaires was carried out with the aim of obtaining a general overview, but national analysis is also provided when observing respondents' perception does not infringe the right to privacy. Consent forms and data protection forms were signed by each survey participant.

IV. Results

The initial sample size was 25 respondents. After the interview process, the definitive sample size was 21 respondents (n=21). Figure 2 shows the number of questionnaires completed in each of the five countries and the number of correct survey responses. The highest number of questionnaires came from Greece (7 questionnaires), Italy (4 questionnaires) and Spain (5 questionnaires), followed by Israel (3 questionnaires) and Portugal (2 questionnaires).

COUNTRY	GENDER	POSITION	ORGANISATION
PORTUGAL	Male	Senior Technical Staff	Municipal Public Agency
	Male	Senior Technical Staff	Regional Public Agency
SPAIN	Male	Secretary General of the Energy Service	Territorial Delegation of Economy, Finance, European Funds and Industrial Policy and Energy
	Male	Head of the Natural Environment Management Service	Sustainability Regional Delegation, MA y EC. Blue in Cadiz
	Female	Programme Director	General Sub-directorate of Environmental Assessment (MITECO)
	Male	Environment Department Manager	SAITEC (consultant, specialists in wind power)
	Male	General Director	Territorial and Environmental Analysis S.L.
ITALY	Male	Head of the Office	Urban Planning Service, Municipality of Trento
	Male	Project Manager	Habitech
	Male	Director of Foundation	Foundation Riusciamo
	Female	Engineer	Vice-Major
GREECE	Male	One of Hyperion Energy Community co-founding members	Electra Energy
	Male	Member of the Management Board (Cooperative Member)	Attica Energy Community
	Male	Government Employee (civil servant)/Researcher	Ministry of Rural Development and Food/Private Sector
	Male	Consultant of Mayor	Municipality of Komotini
	Male	Researcher	Centre for Renewable Energy Sources and Saving, Division for Energy Policy and Planning
	Female	Climate & Energy Campaigner	Greenpeace Greece
	Female	Researcher	Division Energy, School of Mechanical Engineering, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
ISRAEL	Female	Ecologist	Ministry of Environment, Southern District
	Female	Examiner of Plans	Special Planning Committee for Renewable Energy, Southern District
	Male	Senior Manager	

Figure 2: Stakeholders table

Data extracted from questionnaires are included in the Annexes. Questions and multi-choice answers are included as well as the final tabulation of the open questions. In the following pages after the data analysis results are presented.

1. Participant information process: socio-demographic details

The proportion of female and male respondents in the sample was 28,57% and 71,43%, respectively. With the age groups of 41-50 (42,86% respondents) and 31-40 (28,57%) being more representative, reflecting the age structure of national and regional policy makers and technicians from private and public sector in each country. Regarding educational level most participants reach to Master's degree (52,38%), followed by PhD grade and postdoctoral (19,05% and 9,52%) respectively. Employees respondents belongs mainly to public sector (58,33%) with civil servants as main category ticked (45,83%). To end, areas of expertise cover a wide spectrum including Life, Earth, Agricultural, Technological and Economic Sciences. Most participants belong to technological sciences as Civil Environment and Energy Engineers. Urban planning is another category also mentioned together with Biology from Earth Sciences. Then, the profile of a common respondent is a man bellow 50 years old, graduated on Engineering, and working on public sector as civil servant.

Spatially women were predominant in Israel (67%) followed by Greece (29%), Italy (25%) and Spain (20%), but not in Portugal where the sample was only composed by two men. The youngest participants are from Israel and Spain, where 50% are bellow 40 years old. A half of the Israeli participants have reached Doctoral and Post-doctoral degrees, followed by Greece, and on the opposite of Portugal were none. Although the predominance of public sector in the sample, respondents from private sector were also present in Spain, Italy and Greece as consultants, researchers, and cooperative members.




Figure 3: Participants gender by country

2. Energy Transition Process

Questions in block number two asked about the personal opinions within the context of resiliency and recovery and twin transition process by people sampled. First able, the respondents were asked about the most technologically energy sources replacing fossil fuels in the global context. 76,19% of the respondents have ticked that sun will be, followed by wind (57,14%). Although other sources were also included in this multi-choice question, like hydrogen or even unexplored resources. Its means that the most common/extended RE have been extrapolated for respondents to energy provision in the future. If the RE desirable type would be distributed energy (61,90%) or both, distributed and centralised energy (38,10%), solar energy source has been selected. No one ticked centralised energy. The factors prioritised by chosen centralized or distributed energy have focus on a set of ten options. By order, options ranked by most important to less important are shown in Figure 4. Factor number one was indicated by “others”, mainly refer to natural environment and biodiversity preservation, followed by profit. Other options related to practical concerns, such as profits and human-made spaces, energy demand, location characteristics and installation costs. Although all factors were ranked, those ones related to public opinion, landscape quality, heritage protection and landscape quality were not prioritized. So, distributed energy model activates installation benefits instead of perception concerns.




Figure 4: Prioritized factors of energy transition process

The energy transition process has been also analyzed by respondents like energy consumers. Those who use RE at home use photovoltaic panels, mainly in Spain, Greece, and Italy. Wind energy is relevant in Portugal and Greece. This is because self-consumption is the RE type used by the half of respondents, together with those who use centralized and distributed energy. Self-consumption is key as RE type in Spain, being also important in Italy and Greece where

photovoltaic is more relevant. On the contrary, Portugal is the place for centralised energy from wind. For those who weren't using distributed energy, the questionnaire has asked why. Main reasons ticked has been related to the lack of specialized companies and not enough offer form energy communities or cooperatives. It seems to indicate that once the distributed energy pathway overcomes present barriers, it will be the most widespread pathway in domestic consumption. Just mention the case of Israel, in which self-consumption is rare and, most of roof-top PV energy is being sold and fed into to the grid (in addition to the overall low RE production capacity).

Next, the survey asks about those who use centralised energy at home and about energy distribution networks. Energy certifications are an important option among domestic consumers, with most Italian households using them. Regarding the energy distribution networks, the interviewees declared to be informed about the distribution and transmission operating companies. But not so much in relation to improvement initiatives despite the high awareness of their importance in the energy transition.

3. Renewable Energy Actors and Renewable Energy Projects

Most of respondents have demonstrated previous working experience in RE sector, 19 of the 21 participants. Almost a half have declared more than 10 years of experience, being Spain and Portugal where senior workers are more presented. Their main experience is in solar projects. Photovoltaic is the most extended one (63,16%), up than wind energy (21,05%). Photovoltaic projects are the only experience of those respondents from Israel, while in the rest of the cases, although relevant, they share prominence with wind energy, especially in Portugal and Greece. To end, a few respondents declared some knowledge in thermal energy, both thermo-solar and geo-thermal (15,79%), represented by Portugal and Italy. No experience in biomass, hydropower or green hydrogen have been found. Regarding where these projects were located, the common place are more common open areas, mainly rural. 52,63% of respondents declare that their first project experience was in the countryside (31,58) and farmland (21,05%). But 42,1% of respondents declare in urban areas and cities as first working renewable project experience. First experience in protected natural sites is also present, but not relevant (10,53%), from Spain and Greece. These figures confirm that previous workers experience RE projects path is marked by photovoltaic installations in rural areas, followed by urban ones (Figure 5).




Figure 5: Main locations of RE projects

RE projects previous experience/knowledge block included three multichoice questions, asking about which groups of people have been involved along respondents' renewable projects experience and from whom came the responsibility for kickstarting those. The third question interviewed about missing people in this kickstarting projects process.

When question was the groups of people involved in those projects all options were ticked, from NGOs, citizen associations, residents and owners to inventors, developers, company clusters and technicians from public administrations. But most interviewed people answered that public officials (78,95%), developers (47,37%) and residents (36,82%) have been the most common ones taking part in first/main renewable project. Other categories like NGOs, middle-management and researchers or inventors were mentioned in Greece, Israel and Italy respectively. The responsibility for kickstarting installation process came from/concerned developers (30%), the main group in Spain. Other pioneers also mentioned were power companies and clusters of companies, private owner, energy cooperatives, research projects and association with unusual/symbolic presence/representation. Lastly, all participants indicated the importance of opening the process of planning and siting renewable energy installations to a broad spectrum of participants. For question in block four number three, all answers were ticked. Strong consensuses belong to citizen associations and researchers (73,64%), but NGOs and owners (26,32%) followed by public officials (21,05%) were also an outstanding choice.

4. Environmental Impact Assessment for Renewable Energy Projects

Public consultation process is not mandatory in all study cases. Since countries like Israel does not have this stage in the EIA process, respondents from Israel were not asked to refer to the related questions. The total sample size of 21 respondents ($n = 21$) has been reduced in these two final blocks to 14. However, in block 4, the participation remained very high, answering the questions up to 20 of the 21 participants.

To evaluate EIA dimension, a question about ten main profiles of people taking part in this process was asked. Main profiles ticked have been developers and public officials, followed by residents. Citizens were also participants under the umbrella of organizations like citizen associations and NGOs. More than 50% of interviewers aggregated choosing those profiles. Other ones were also declared as participants in EIA procedure, like researchers, company clusters, owners, and inventors (see Figure 6). Although their relevance is less than the first ones, it is important to notice their participation. Within main profiles of people taking part in this process by countries, it was remarkable the option of public officials, which has chosen by all of them at least once. Residents and developers are other options ticked in four of the five countries. The category “other” was the option answered for more countries; specifying that municipality (Portugal), public administration and local authority (Greece) must be the responsible. However, in Spain these answers focused on “developer” as responsible for kickstarting the process. The questionnaire also interviewed about groups of people missing from RE projects. Residents (42,10%) and Citizen Associations (36,82%) have obtained the highest position in the ranking (see figure 7).




Figure 6: Potential responsible for kick-starting the project




Figure 7: Responsible for kick-starting the project according to the countries

Followed questions in this block asked about main arguments argued by the participants along the public consultation process (see Figure 8). Landscape impact has been the most relevant issue, together with requesting additional information and environmental damage complaint. More categories were ticked such as biodiversity loss; land use change; noise and/or flashes pollution; project location; rejection of RE installations (power plants and grids) and human health damages. The difference between the general issues and the answers for countries about main arguments was minimal because landscape impact, information request and environmental damage have been the most relevant issues also. However, other possible response options were not selected, whether they were related to resource consumption or degradation, i.e., soils and water; possible impacts on the natural or cultural environment; and the reversibility of the RE installation process.




Figure 8: Public's participation main argument

On a second step, same question was asked twice, choosing second main argument. Environmental damage and biodiversity loss were the main options ticked again, followed by landscape impact and human health damage. New arguments choose were project location and additional infrastructure needed to be built. The participation of civil society and NGOs in the consultation process introduce their concerns about the effects of these installations. The respondents' answers follow the wake of citizen protests RE installations, disseminated through the press and social networks. It shows how the sensitivity/valuation of the landscape, and the natural environment is stronger when they are threatened/transformed.

When the professionals involved were questioned about the fair arguments along the EIA procedure, there was a consensus about information request; landscape impact; additional infrastructures to RE installations; and environmental damage (see figure 9). Other arguments also important were biodiversity loss; land use changes; and noise/air pollution.




Figure 9: Most relevant fair arguments along EIA procedure

In this case, countries answers were relevant, because they had important participation. Spain stands out above the rest, whose respondents have selected one of the arguments at least twice, even one respondent selected all.

Once more, answers strengthen the need of clear information along the procedure, as well as the general concern about RE installations over landscape and natural environment. None of the fair arguments were rejected, indicating a higher degree of awareness among professionals about lesser-known effects of RE installations. Mentioning the effects of the installations on soil fertility or water consumption on the one hand, and their presence in areas of cultural value and the possible effects on heritage elements on the other, they show some concern that goes beyond what is known. The professionals who participated confirm that these arguments were fully (46%) or partially (31%) debated even though there is no obligation to do so. This would justify that they are not always addressed. Only 25% of the responses confirm that they were considered and 33% were partially considered; and 33% rejected by the installation. Concluding that the public consultation process did not lead to an improvement of the project.

Finally, Block 6 makes deeper into the EIA tool. There is a consensus about the importance of RE installations on the local economy (Figure 9). The main argument of the respondents in favor of renewable energy plants is the benefits for the local economy. They indicated that the RE installations attract new business opportunities, create jobs, and generate new forms of employment. Other advantages mentioned were the creation of small and medium-sized enterprises, the arrival of new consumers and new professionals (Figure 10). Yet, facilities also bring negative consequences (Figure 11). These include the decline of agricultural activity, together with changes in land use and the loss of fertile land. Other negative reasons go to economy, such as hindrance to preexisting local business and prices rises.




Figure 10: Positive effects for local economies




Figure 11: Negative effects for local economies

V. Conclusions

This Deliverable 2.2 set out to provide an exploratory sustained contribution on the comparative analysis of environmental impact assessment (EIA) procedures in Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece, and Israel. The empirical analysis has shown that there are many similarities in the stakeholders' perceptions about the energy transition overall as well as in the details of it that are pertaining to RE planning and installation. Most of the respondents to the questionnaire believe that the energy transition toward renewable energies would mainly be based on wind and solar resources and on distributed installations. In choosing between distributed and centralized energy production models, participants indicated that energy demand patterns coupled with the physical values of the potential sites, should be the leading factors to consider. Despite growing public objection to distributed energy facilities (documented in the media and academic research), our respondents did not think that landscape quality and heritage qualities are central to the decision between the two modes of production.

The goal of this study was to characterise the role of the public in RE planning processes. While a wide range of actors are involved in such processes in all 5 countries, it is clear from the responses, that distributed RE did not bring about, yet, a revolution in the way energy is planned, produced and distributed, and that the government (local, regional and national) is still the main actor in promoting and making decisions regarding RE installations. Similarly, developers, usually even large energy companies, are still the main initiators and promoters of projects, a fact which may indicate that most of the projects our respondents were involved in, are not community-led. It is, however, worth mentioning that some of the respondents were involved in projects in which residents or energy cooperatives took a leading role in promoting the RE installation, a tendency which can be expected to increase according to the EU policy, as reviewed in the beginning of this report.

The capacity of residents, environmental NGOs and the general public to influence RE planning processes is perceived as low in all studied countries, as its statutory status remains vague. Residents and citizens associations are largely viewed by our respondents as missing from the consultation stages of EIA procedure. Across all studied countries, public concerns were found to be very similar; the public is often demanding to receive more information about the planning projects, and is mostly worried over adverse environmental, landscape and health impacts. The answers strengthen the claim that there is a need of clearer information exchange along RE planning procedures. Despite regulatory gaps in the ability of the public to actively participate in RE planning processes, most of the respondents indicated that public concerns are taken seriously, sometimes even leading to the cancellation of the plan, but in other times indicating that the consultation did not improve the main pitfalls of the plan.

The presence of large RE installations in open spaces, occupying agricultural land and affecting rural landscapes, is the basic rationale for participatory EIA. Their positive effects on the local economy call for extending this instrument, by incorporating the assessment of the RE installations' territorial impact as well. Having confirmed the significant impact of these installations on the landscape, participants in our study go further by affirming their capacity to transform pre-existing landscapes and give rise to new landscapes. The quality of the renewable energy landscapes may contribute to disseminating new energy behaviors and promoting energy saving, while at the same time they can reinforce the sense of community.

VI. Annex

ON-LINE INTERVIEW _ WP2

ADDRESSED TO NATIONAL-REGIONAL POLICY MAKERS AND TECHNICIANS

TOPIC: TERRITORIAL/REGIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT TOOL

1. INTERVIEWER INFORMATION

1.1 Gender

- 1.1.1: Male
- 1.1.2: Female
- 1.1.3: Other

1.2 Age

- 1.2.1: 21-30
- 1.2.2: 31-40
- 1.2.3: 41-50
- 1.2.4: 51-60
- 1.2.5: + 60

1.3 Highest Level of Education

- 1.3.1: Bachelor's degree
- 1.3.2: Master's degree
- 1.3.3: Doctoral degree
- 1.3.4: Post-doctoral degree

1.4 Current employment

- 1.4.1: Private Sector
 - 1.4.1.1: Consultant
 - 1.4.1.2: Cooperative Member
 - 1.4.1.3: Manager (i.e., Senior, General, etc.) (please indicate) _____
 - 1.4.1.4: Researcher
 - 1.4.1.5: Other, including self-employed (please indicate) _____
- 1.4.2: Public Sector
 - 1.4.2.1: Government Employee (civil servant)
 - 1.4.2.2: Policy Maker
 - 1.4.2.3: Researcher
- 1.4.3: Not working
 - 1.4.3.1: Unemployed
 - 1.4.3.2: Retired

1.5 Area of expertise (please indicate) _____

2. ENERGY TRANSITION PROCESS. PERSONAL OPINIONS WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF RESILIENCY AND RECOVERY AND TWIN TRANSITION

2.1 Which of the following energy sources do you consider the most technologically feasible of replacing fossil fuels in the global context?

- 2.1.1: Wind
- 2.1.2: Sun
- 2.1.3: Water
- 2.1.4: Hydrogen
- 2.1.5: Biomass/Biogas
- 2.1.6: Geo-thermal
- 2.1.7: Untapped/Unexplored resources

2.2 Which of these renewable energy types is most useful for replacing fossil fuels?

- 2.2.1: Centralised energy
- 2.2.2: Distributed energy
- 2.2.3: Both models (please explain why) _____

2.3 What factors should be prioritised in the choice of one of the two models? Please rank from 1 (most important) to 10 (less important)

- 2.3.1: Energy demand
- 2.3.2: Residents' opinions

- 2.3.3: Installation costs
- 2.3.4: Profit
- 2.3.5: Human-made spaces
- 2.3.6: Natural environment
- 2.3.7: Landscape quality
- 2.3.8: Elements of heritage
- 2.3.9: Location characteristics
- 2.3.10: Others (please indicate) _____
- 2.4 Do you consume any renewable energy at home? (Please leave blank if answer is 'no')
- 2.4.1: On-shore wind
- 2.4.2: Off-shore wind
- 2.4.3: Photovoltaics
- 2.4.4: Thermo-solar
- 2.4.5: Hydropower
- 2.4.6: Geo-thermal
- 2.4.7: Green hydrogen
- 2.5 If the answer is yes, which type of renewable energy do you use? (Please leave blank if answer is 'no')
- 2.5.1: Self-consumption
- 2.5.2: Centralised energy
- 2.5.3: Distributed energy
- 2.6 If you use Distributed energy, do you belong to an (please leave blank if answer is 'no')
- 2.6.1: Energy cooperative
- 2.6.2: Energy community
- 2.6.3: Other (please describe) _____
- 2.7 If the answer to 2.6 is no, please tick the reason why you do not use Distributed energy (please leave blank if you use Distributed energy)
- 2.7.1: Lack of subsidies
- 2.7.2: Installation costs
- 2.7.3: Lack of time
- 2.7.4: Not enough offer from energy communities or cooperatives
- 2.7.5: Not information access
- 2.7.6: Lack of specialised companies/entities
- 2.7.7: Other reasons (please indicate) _____
- 2.8 If you use Centralised energy, have you applied for renewable energy certification? (Please leave blank if you do not use Centralised energy)
- 2.8.1: Yes
- 2.8.2: No
- 2.8.3: Not available
- 2.8.4: I am still considering doing so
- 2.8.5: Other reasons (please indicate) _____
- 2.9 Do you know well the distribution and transmission system operators in your area?
- 2.9.1: Yes
- 2.9.2: No
- 2.9.3: Not available
- 2.9.4: Other reasons (please indicate) _____
- 2.10 Do you informed of any initiatives to improve power grids in your municipality/region?
- 2.10.1: Yes
- 2.10.2: No
- 2.10.3: Other reasons (please indicate) _____
- 2.11 Do you aware that power grids are important for energy transition and facilitation of Centralised generation?
- 2.11.1: Yes
- 2.11.2: No
- 2.11.3: Other reasons (please indicate) _____

3. RENEWABLE ENERGY ACTORS

- 3.1 How many years have you been working in renewable energy?

- 3.1.1: 1-2
- 3.1.2: 3-6
- 3.1.3: 7-10
- 3.1.4: 10+
- 3.2 What was the first renewable energy project in which you were involved?
 - 3.2.1: On-shore wind
 - 3.2.2: Off-shore wind
 - 3.2.3: Photovoltaic
 - 3.2.4: Thermo-solar
 - 3.2.5: Biomass/Biogas
 - 3.2.6: Hydropower
 - 3.2.7: Geo-thermal
 - 3.2.8: Green hydrogen
 - 3.2.9: Other (please indicate) _____
- 3.3 Where was it located?
 - 3.3.1: Village
 - 3.3.2: City
 - 3.3.3: Urban area
 - 3.3.4: Heritage value building
 - 3.3.5: Farmland
 - 3.3.6: Countryside
 - 3.3.7: Non-protected natural area
 - 3.3.8: Protected natural area
 - 3.3.9: Other (please specify) _____

4.RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS

- 4.1 Please, tick the groups of people who were involved in your first/main renewable project
 - 4.1.1: Public officials
 - 4.1.2: NGOs
 - 4.1.3: Middle-management
 - 4.1.4: Researchers
 - 4.1.5: Residents
 - 4.1.6: Developers
 - 4.1.7: Inventors
 - 4.1.8: Owners
 - 4.1.9: Citizen Associations
 - 4.1.10: Company cluster
 - 4.1.11: Other (please indicate) _____
- 4.2 Who was responsible for kickstarting the process?
 - 4.2.1: Power company
 - 4.2.2: Civil Engineering company
 - 4.2.3: Developer
 - 4.2.4: Investment Fund
 - 4.2.5: Company cluster
 - 4.2.6: Private owner
 - 4.2.7: Energy cooperative
 - 4.2.8: Research project
 - 4.2.9: NGO
 - 4.2.10: Association
 - 4.2.11: Energy community
 - 4.2.12: Other (please indicate) _____
- 4.3 In your opinion, which groups of people have been missing from any renewable energy projects who should have been included?
 - 4.3.1: Public officials
 - 4.3.2: NGOs
 - 4.3.3: Middle-management
 - 4.3.4: Researchers

- 4.3.5: Residents
- 4.3.6: Developers
- 4.3.7: Inventors
- 4.3.8: Owners
- 4.3.9: Citizen Associations
- 4.3.10: Company cluster
- 4.3.11: Other (please indicate) _____

5. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION PROJECTS

5.1 Who participated in the public consultation process? (Please leave blank if there have been no public consultation processes)

- 5.1.1: Public officials
- 5.1.2: NGOs
- 5.1.3: Middle-management
- 5.1.4: Researchers
- 5.1.5: Residents
- 5.1.6: Developers
- 5.1.7: Inventors
- 5.1.8: Owners
- 5.1.9: Citizen Associations
- 5.1.10: Company cluster
- 5.1.11: Other (please mention) _____

5.2 What was the public's main argument related to renewable energies installations in the consultation process?

- 5.2.1: Information request
- 5.2.2: Environmental damage
- 5.2.3: Human health damage
- 5.2.4: Biodiversity loss
- 5.2.5: Impact on landscape
- 5.2.6: Loss of soil quality
- 5.2.7: Water consumption
- 5.2.8: Land use change
- 5.2.9: Noise and/or flashes pollution
- 5.2.10: Non-reversible process
- 5.2.11: Cultural heritage
- 5.2.12: Project location
- 5.2.13: Rejection of renewable energy installation (power plants)
- 5.2.14: Rejection of renewable energy installation (grids)
- 5.2.15: Duration of the installation
- 5.2.16: Need for additional infrastructures to be built
- 5.2.17: Opposition to renewable energies
- 5.2.18: Other (please indicate) _____

5.3 What was their second most important argument for attending?

- 5.3.1: Information request
- 5.3.2: Environmental damage
- 5.3.3: Human health damage
- 5.3.4: Biodiversity loss
- 5.3.5: Impact on landscape
- 5.3.6: Loss of soil quality
- 5.3.7: Water consumption
- 5.3.8: Land use change
- 5.3.9: Noise and/or flashes pollution
- 5.3.10: Non-reversible process
- 5.3.11: Cultural heritage
- 5.3.12: Project location
- 5.3.13: Rejection of renewable energy installation (power plants)
- 5.3.14: Rejection of renewable energy installation (grids)

- 5.3.15: Duration of the installation
- 5.3.16: Need for additional infrastructures to be built
- 5.3.17: Opposition to renewable energies
- 5.3.18: Other (please indicate) _____
- 5.4 In your professional judgement, were these fair arguments?
- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 5.4.1: Information request | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.2: Environmental damage | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.3: Human health damage | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.4: Biodiversity loss | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.5: Impact on landscape | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.6: Loss of soil quality | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.7: Water consumption | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.8: Land use change | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.9: Noise and/or flashes pollution | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.10: Non-reversible process | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.11: Cultural heritage | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.12: Project location | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.13: Rejection renewable energy installation (pow plants) | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.14: Rejection renewable energy installation (grids) | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.15: Duration of the installation | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.16: Need for additional infrastructures to be built | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.17: Opposition to renewable energies | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5.4.18: Other (please indicate) | Yes _____ No _____ |
- 5.5 Were they debated?
- 5.5.1: Yes
- 5.5.2: No
- 5.5.3: Partially
- 5.5.4: Don't know
- 5.5.5: Don't remember
- 5.6 If not, why not?
- 5.6.1: Out of time
- 5.6.2: No relevant arguments
- 5.6.3: No scientific evidence
- 5.6.4: Not well argued
- 5.6.5: Not obligation to deal with
- 5.6.6: Unrepresentative of signatories
- 5.6.7: Other (please indicate) _____
- 5.7 Did the project change after the public consultation?
- 5.7.1: Yes
- 5.7.2: No
- 5.7.3: Partially
- 5.7.4: Don't know
- 5.7.5: Don't remember
- 5.8 Did the final project improve thanks to the public consultation?
- 5.8.1: Yes
- 5.8.2: No
- 5.8.3: Partially
- 5.8.4: Don't know
- 5.8.5: Don't remember
- 5.9: To conclude, please specify one of the best practices where the role of public sector has been efficient accelerating and facilitating the project installation (include a link if it is available) _____

6.TERRITORIAL/REGIONAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AS A TOOL WITH AN INTEGRATED APPROACH

- 6.1 Do you consider that renewable energy projects affect the local economy?

- 6.1.1: Yes
- 6.1.2: No
- 6.1.3: Don't know
- 6.2 If so, could the effect be positive for any of the following?
 - 6.2.1: Jobs
 - 6.2.2: New jobs/professions
 - 6.2.3: New small or medium enterprises
 - 6.2.4: More professional labour force
 - 6.2.5: New customers for local markets
 - 6.2.6: New business opportunities
 - 6.2.7: Don't know
- 6.3 If so, could the effect be negative for any of the following?
 - 6.3.1: Land use change
 - 6.3.2: Loss of fertile land
 - 6.3.3: Agriculture activity decline
 - 6.3.4: Hindrance to pre-existing local economic activities
 - 6.3.5: Prices rises
 - 6.3.6: Other reasons (please indicate) _____
- 6.4. Do you consider that renewable energy installations affect the landscape?
 - 6.4.1: Yes
 - 6.4.2: No
 - 6.4.3: Don't know
- 6.5. Do you consider that renewable energy installations are promoting new landscapes as renewable energy landscapes?
 - 6.5.1: Yes
 - 6.5.2: No
 - 6.5.3: Don't know
- 6.6. If the answer to 6.5 is yes, how do you value the renewable energy landscapes?
 - 6.6.1: Reinforce the sense of community
 - 6.6.2: Promote energy saving
 - 6.6.3: Disseminate new energy behaviour
 - 6.6.4: Prevent need for domestic installations
 - 6.6.5: Cause biodiversity loss
 - 6.6.6: Cause cultural landscape changes
 - 6.6.7: Cause heritage loss
 - 6.6.8: Cause breakdown in place attachment and local identity
 - 6.6.9: Other (please indicate) _____

INTERVIEW _ TABLES

BLOCK 1

1. INTERVIEWER INFORMATION		
100% answers received: 100% correct answers		
QUESTIONS	ANSWERS	
1.1	1.1.1	1.1.2
	71.43%	28.57%

1. INTERVIEWER INFORMATION					
100% answers received: 100% correct answers					
QUESTIONS	ANSWERS				
1.2	1.2.1	1.2.2	1.2.3	1.2.4	1.2.5
	14.28%	28.57%	42.86%	9.52%	4.76%

1. INTERVIEWER INFORMATION				
100% answers received: 100% correct answers				
QUESTIONS	ANSWERS			
1.3	1.3.1	1.3.2	1.3.3	1.3.4
	19.05%	52.38%	19.05%	9.52%

1. INTERVIEWER INFORMATION										
100% answers received: 100% correct answers										
QUESTIONS	ANSWERS									
1.4	1.4.1					1.4.2			1.4.3	
	1.4.1.1	1.4.1.2	1.4.1.3	1.4.1.4	1.4.1.5	1.4.2.1	1.4.2.2	1.4.2.3	1.4.3.1	1.4.3.2
	9.52%	9.52%	0,00%	9.52%	9.52%	42.86%	9.52%	4.76%	0,00%	4.76%

1. INTERVIEWER INFORMATION						
100% answers received: 100% correct answers						
QUESTIONS	ANSWERS					
1.5	Life Sciences	Earth Sciences	Agriculture Sciences	Technological Sciences	Economic Sciences	No area specified
	14.28%	4.76%	4.76%	66.67%	4.76%	4.76%

BLOCK 2

2. ENERGY TRANSITION PROCESS							
QUESTIONS	ANSWERS						
2.1	Answers received: 21 / Correct answers: 21						
	2.1.1	2.1.2	2.1.3	2.1.4	2.1.5	2.1.6	2.1.7
	57.14% (12/21)	76.19% (16/21)	19.05% (4/21)	14.29% (3/21)	14.29% (3/21)	14.29% (3/21)	9.52% (2/21)
2.2	Answers received: 21 / Correct answers: 21						
	2.2.1	2.2.2	2.2.3				
	0% (0/21)	61.90% (13/21)	38.10% (8/21)				
2.3	Answers received: 20 / Correct answers: 16						
	2/5/4/9/7/1/6/8/3/10 (GENERAL RANKING)						
2.4	Answers received: 14 / Correct answers: 10						
	2.4.1	2.4.2	2.4.3	2.4.4	2.4.5	2.4.6	2.4.7
	30.00% (3/10)	10.00% (1/10)	90.00% (9/10)	60.00% (6/10)	40.00% (4/10)	0% (0/10)	0% (0/10)
2.5	Answers received: 14 / Correct answers: 10						
	2.5.1	2.5.2	2.5.3				
	50.00% (5/10)	40.00% (4/10)	30.00% (3/10)				
2.6	Answers received: 3 / Correct answers: 3						
	2.6.1	2.6.2	2.6.3				
	0% (0/3)	66.67%(2/3)	33.33% (1/3)				
2.7	Answers received: 11 / Correct answers: 11						
	2.7.1	2.7.2	2.7.3	2.7.4	2.7.5	2.7.6	2.7.7
	9.10% (1/11)	18.18% (2/11)	0% (0/11)	27.27% (3/11)	9.10% (1/11)	27.27% (3/11)	36.36% (4/11)
2.8	Answers received: 9 / Correct answers: 9						
	2.8.1	2.8.2	2.8.3	2.8.4	2.8.5		
	11.11% (1/9)	11.11% (1/9)	11.11% (1/9)	0% (0/9)	0% (0/9)		
2.9	Answers received: 18 / Correct answers: 18						
	2.9.1	2.9.2	2.9.3	2.9.4			
	72.22% (13/18)	27.78% (5/18)	0% (0/18)	0% (0/18)			
2.10	Answers received: 20 / Correct answers: 20						
	2.10.1	2.10.2	2.10.3				
	50.00% (10/20)	50.00% (10/20)	0% (0/20)				
2.11	Answers received: 19 / Correct answers: 19						
	2.11.1	2.11.2	2.11.3				
	94.74% (18/19)	5.26% (1/19)	0% (0/19)				

BLOCK 3

3. RENEWABLE ENERGY ACTORS									
QUESTIONS	ANSWERS								
3.1	Answers received: 19 / Correct answers: 19								
	3.1.1	3.1.2	3.1.3	3.1.4					
	31.58% (6/19)	21.05% (4/19)	10.53% (2/19)	36.82% (7/19)					
3.2	Answers received: 19 / Correct answers: 19								
	3.2.1	3.2.2	3.2.3	3.2.4	3.2.5	3.2.6	3.2.7	3.2.8	3.2.9
	21.05% (4/19)	5.26% (1/19)	63.16% (12/19)	10.53% (2/19)	0% (0/19)	0% (0/19)	5.26% (1/19)	0% (0/19)	0% (0/19)
3.3	Answers received: 19 / Correct answers: 19								
	3.3.1	3.3.2	3.3.3	3.3.4	3.3.5	3.3.6	3.3.7	3.3.8	3.3.9
	0% (0/19)	21.05% (4/19)	21.05% (4/19)	0% (0/19)	21.05% (4/19)	31.58% (6/19)	0% (0/19)	10.53% (2/19)	0% (0/19)

BLOCK 4

4. RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS												
QUESTIONS	ANSWERS											
4.1	Answers received: 19 / Correct answers: 19											
	4.1.1	4.1.2	4.1.3	4.1.4	4.1.5	4.1.6	4.1.7	4.1.8	4.1.9	4.1.10	4.1.11	
	78.95% (15/19)	10.53% (2/19)	10.53% (2/19)	5.26% (1/19)	36.82% (7/19)	47.37% (9/19)	5.26% (1/19)	10.53% (2/19)	10.53% (2/19)	5.26% (1/19)	5.26% (1/19)	
4.2	Answers received: 20 / Correct answers: 20											
	4.2.1	4.2.2	4.2.3	4.2.4	4.2.5	4.2.6	4.2.7	4.2.8	4.2.9	4.2.10	4.2.11	4.2.12
	10.00% (2/20)	0% (0/20)	30.00% (6/20)	0% (0/20)	10.00% (2/20)	10.00% (2/20)	5.00% (1/20)	10.00% (2/20)	5.00% (1/20)	0% (0/20)	5.00% (1/20)	25.00% (5/20)
4.3	Answers received: 19 / Correct answers: 19											
	4.3.1	4.3.2	4.3.3	4.3.4	4.3.5	4.3.6	4.3.7	4.3.8	4.3.9	4.3.10	4.3.11	
	21.05% (4/19)	26.32% (5/19)	10.53% (2/19)	36.82% (7/19)	21.05% (8/19)	5.26% (1/19)	10.53% (2/19)	26.32% (5/19)	36.82% (7/19)	10.53% (2/19)	0% (0/19)	

BLOCK 5

5. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS																		
QUESTIONS	ANSWERS																	
5.1	Answers received: 14 / Correct answers: 14																	
	5.1.1	5.1.2	5.1.3	5.1.4	5.1.5	5.1.6	5.1.7	5.1.8	5.1.9	5.1.10	5.1.11							
	57.14% (8/14)	42.86% (6/14)	0% (0/14)	42.86% (6/14)	50.00% (7/14)	64.29% (9/14)	7.14% (1/14)	14.28% (2/14)	50.00% (7/14)	14.28% (2/14)	21.43% (3/14)							
5.2	Answers received: 13 / Correct answers: 13																	
	5.2.1	5.2.2	5.2.3	5.2.4	5.2.5	5.2.6	5.2.7	5.2.8	5.2.9	5.2.10	5.2.11	5.2.12	5.2.13	5.2.14	5.2.15	5.2.16	5.2.17	5.2.18
	30.77% (4/13)	30.77% (4/13)	7.69% (1/13)	7.69% (1/13)	38.46% (5/13)	0% (0/13)	0% (0/13)	7.69% (1/13)	7.69% (1/13)	0% (0/13)	0% (0/13)	7.69% (1/13)	7.69% (1/13)	7.69% (1/13)	0% (0/13)	0% (0/13)	7.69% (1/13)	7.69% (1/13)
5.3	Answers received: 12 / Correct answers: 12																	
	5.3.1	5.3.2	5.3.3	5.3.4	5.3.5	5.3.6	5.3.7	5.3.8	5.3.9	5.3.10	5.3.11	5.3.12	5.3.13	5.3.14	5.3.15	5.3.16	5.3.17	5.3.18
	0% (0/12)	25.00% (3/12)	8.33% (1/12)	25.00% (3/12)	16.67% (2/12)	0% (0/12)	0% (0/12)	0% (0/12)	0% (0/12)	0% (0/12)	8.33% (1/12)	0% (0/12)	0% (0/12)	0% (0/12)	8.33% (1/12)	0% (0/12)	0% (0/12)	16.67% (2/12)
5.4	Answers received: 13 / Correct answers: 13																	
	5.4.1	5.4.2	5.4.3	5.4.4	5.4.5	5.4.6	5.4.7	5.4.8	5.4.9	5.4.10	5.4.11	5.4.12	5.4.13	5.4.14	5.4.15	5.4.16	5.4.17	5.4.18
	100% (13/13)	69.23% (9/13)	46.15% (6/13)	69.23% (9/13)	92.31% (12/13)	46.15% (6/13)	46.15% (6/13)	69.23% (9/13)	53.85% (7/13)	15.38% (2/13)	69.23% (9/13)	76.92% (10/13)	38.46% (5/13)	38.46% (5/13)	38.46% (5/13)	76.92% (10/13)	23.08% (3/13)	15.38% (2/13)
5.5	Answers received: 13 / Correct answers: 13																	
	5.5.1	5.5.2	5.5.3	5.5.4	5.5.5													
	46.15% (6/13)	15.38% (2/13)	30.77% (4/13)	7.69% (1/13)	0% (0/13)													
5.6	Answers received: 2 / Correct answers: 2																	
	5.6.1	5.6.2	5.6.3	5.6.4	5.6.5	5.6.6	5.6.7											
	0% (0/2)	0% (0/2)	0% (0/2)	0% (0/2)	100% (2/2)	0% (0/2)	0% (0/2)											
5.7	Answers received: 12 / Correct answers: 12																	
	5.7.1	5.7.2	5.7.3	5.7.4	5.7.5													
	25.00% (3/12)	33.33% (4/12)	33.33% (4/12)	8.33% (1/12)	0% (0/12)													
5.8	Answers received: 11 / Correct answers: 11																	
	5.8.1	5.8.2	5.8.3	5.8.4	5.8.5													
	36.36% (4/11)	36.36% (4/11)	18.18% (2/11)	9.09% (1/11)	0% (0/11)													
5.9	Answers received: 0 / Correct answers: 0																	

BLOCK 6

6. TERRITORIAL/REGIONAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT									
QUESTIONS	ANSWERS								
6.1	Answers received: 21 / Correct answers: 21								
	6.1.1	6.1.2	6.1.3						
	100% (21/21)	0% (0/21)	0% (0/21)						
6.2	Answers received: 21 / Correct answers: 21								
	6.2.1	6.2.2	6.2.3	6.2.4	6.2.5	6.2.6	6.2.7		
	15.69% (8/21)	23.53% (12/21)	10.76% (6/21)	7.84% (4/21)	10.76% (6/21)	29.42% (15/21)	0% (0/21)		
6.3	Answers received: 19 / Correct answers: 19								
	6.3.1	6.3.2	6.3.3	6.3.4	6.3.5	6.3.6			
	47.37% (9/19)	36.84% (7/19)	47.37% (9/19)	21.05% (4/19)	21.05% (4/19)	10.53% (2/19)			
6.4	Answers received: 21 / Correct answers: 21								
	6.4.1	6.4.2	6.4.3						
	80.95% (17/21)	7.84% (4/21)	0% (0/21)						
6.5	Answers received: 21 / Correct answers: 21								
	6.5.1	6.5.2	6.5.3						
	76.19% (16/21)	14.29% (3/21)	9.52% (2/21)						
6.6	Answers received: 18 / Correct answers: 18								
	6.6.1	6.6.2	6.6.3	6.6.4	6.6.5	6.6.6	6.6.7	6.6.8	6.6.9
	22.22% (4/18)	33.33% (6/18)	50.00% (9/18)	0% (0/18)	22.22% (4/18)	33.33% (6/18)	5.55% (1/18)	16.67% (3/18)	11.11% (2/18)

INTERVIEW_TABLES_PER_COUNTRIES

BLOCK 1

Question 1.1		
100% answers received: 100% correct answers		
COUNTRY	ANSWERS	
	1.1.1	1.1.2
PORTUGAL	100.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	80.00%	20.00%
ITALY	75.00%	25.00%
GREECE	71.00%	29.00%
ISRAEL	33.00%	67.00%

Question 1.2					
100% answers received: 100% correct answers					
COUNTRY	ANSWERS				
	1.2.1	1.2.2	1.2.3	1.2.4	1.2.5
PORTUGAL	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	0.00%	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	0.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%
GREECE	28.57%	14.28%	28.57%	28.57%	0.00%
ISRAEL	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 1.3				
100% answers received: 100% correct answers				
COUNTRY	ANSWERS			
	1.3.1	1.3.2	1.3.3	1.3.4
PORTUGAL	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	0.00%	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%
ITALY	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	28.57%	28.57%	28.57%	14.28%
ISRAEL	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%

Question 1.4										
100% answers received: 100% correct answers										
COUNTRY	ANSWERS									
	1.4.1					1.4.2			1.4.3	
	1.4.1.1	1.4.1.2	1.4.1.3	1.4.1.4	1.4.1.5	1.4.2.1	1.4.2.2	1.4.2.3	1.4.3.1	1.4.3.2
PORTUGAL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 1.5						
100% answers received: 100% correct answers						
COUNTRY	ANSWERS					
	Life Sciences	Earth Sciences	Agriculture Sciences	Technological Sciences	Economic Sciences	No area specified
PORTUGAL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%
SPAIN	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	14.28%	0.00%	14.28%	57.14%	14.28%	0.00%
ISRAEL	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%

BLOCK 2

Question 2.1							
Answers received: 21 / Correct answers: 21							
COUNTRY	ANSWERS						
	2.1.1	2.1.2	2.1.3	2.1.4	2.1.5	2.1.6	2.1.7
PORTUGAL	25.00%	25.00%	12.50%	12.50%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%
SPAIN	33.33%	44.44%	11.11%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%
GREECE	40.00%	26.67%	13.33%	0.00%	6.67%	6.67%	6.67%
ISRAEL	14.28%	42.86%	0.00%	14.28%	14.28%	0.00%	14.28%

Question 2.2			
Answers received: 21 / Correct answers: 21			
COUNTRY	ANSWERS		
	2.2.1	2.2.2	2.2.3
PORTUGAL	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%
SPAIN	0.00%	40.00%	60.00%
ITALY	0.00%	75.00%	25.00%
GREECE	0.00%	71.43%	28.57%
ISRAEL	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%

Question 2.4							
Answers received: 14 / Correct answers: 10							
COUNTRY	ANSWERS						
	2.4.1	2.4.2	2.4.3	2.4.4	2.4.5	2.4.6	2.4.7
PORTUGAL	25.00%	12.50%	25.00%	12.50%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	40.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	12.50%	0.00%	50.00%	25.00%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 2.3										
Answers received: 20 / Correct answers: 16										
COUNTRY	ANSWERS (RANKING)									
	2.3.1	2.3.2	2.3.3	2.3.4	2.3.5	2.3.6	2.3.7	2.3.8	2.3.9	2.3.10
TOTAL	2º	5º	4º	9º	7º	1º	6º	8º	3º	10º

Question 2.5			
Answers received: 14 / Correct answers: 10			
COUNTRY	ANSWERS		
	2.5.1	2.5.2	2.5.3
PORTUGAL	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	50.00%	25.00%	25.00%
GREECE	40.00%	20.00%	40.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 2.6			
Answers received: 3 / Correct answers: 3			
COUNTRY	ANSWERS		
	2.6.1	2.6.2	2.6.3
PORTUGAL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
GREECE	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 2.7							
Answers received: 11 / Correct answers: 11							
COUNTRY	ANSWERS						
	2.7.1	2.7.2	2.7.3	2.7.4	2.7.5	2.7.6	2.7.7
PORTUGAL	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%
ITALY	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%
GREECE	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 2.8					
Answers received: 9 / Correct answers: 4					
COUNTRY	ANSWERS				
	2.8.1	2.8.2	2.8.3	2.8.4	2.8.5
PORTUGAL	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 2.9				
Answers received: 18 / Correct answers: 18				
COUNTRY	ANSWERS			
	2.9.1	2.9.2	2.9.3	2.9.4
PORTUGAL	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	85.71%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 2.10			
Answers received: 20 / Correct answers: 20			
COUNTRY	ANSWERS		
	2.10.1	2.10.2	2.10.3
PORTUGAL	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%
ITALY	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%
GREECE	42.86%	57.14%	0.00%
ISRAEL	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 2.11			
Answers received: 19 / Correct answers: 19			
COUNTRY	ANSWERS		
	2.11.1	2.11.2	2.11.3
PORTUGAL	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	20.00%	80.00%	0.00%
ITALY	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%

BLOCK 3

Question 3.1				
Answers received: 19 / Correct answers: 19				
COUNTRY	ANSWERS			
	3.1.1	3.1.2	3.1.3	3.1.4
PORTUGAL	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%
SPAIN	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	60.00%
ITALY	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%
GREECE	42.86%	28.57%	14.28%	14.28%
ISRAEL	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 3.2									
Answers received: 19 / Correct answers: 19									
COUNTRY	ANSWERS								
	3.2.1	3.2.2	3.2.3	3.2.4	3.2.5	3.2.6	3.2.7	3.2.8	3.2.9
PORTUGAL	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	40.00%	40.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	28.57%	0.00%	57.14%	14.28%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 3.3									
Answers received: 19 / Correct answers: 19									
COUNTRY	ANSWERS								
	3.3.1	3.3.2	3.3.3	3.3.4	3.3.5	3.3.6	3.3.7	3.3.8	3.3.9
PORTUGAL	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	40.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%
ITALY	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

BLOCK 4

Question 4.1											
Answers received: 19 / Correct answers: 19											
COUNTRY	ANSWERS										
	4.1.1	4.1.2	4.1.3	4.1.4	4.1.5	4.1.6	4.1.7	4.1.8	4.1.9	4.1.10	4.1.11
PORTUGAL	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%
SPAIN	55.55%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	44.44%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	30.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	20.00%	10.00%	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	0.00%
GREECE	33.33%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%	0.00%	8.33%
ISRAEL	12.50%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	12.50%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 4.2												
Answers received: 20 / Correct answers: 20												
COUNTRY	ANSWERS											
	4.2.1	4.2.2	4.2.3	4.2.4	4.2.5	4.2.6	4.2.7	4.2.8	4.2.9	4.2.10	4.2.11	4.2.12
PORTUGAL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
SPAIN	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%
GREECE	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%	12.50%	25.00%	0.00%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%	12.50%	12.50%
ISRAEL	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%

Question 4.3											
Answers received: 19 / Correct answers: 19											
COUNTRY	ANSWERS										
	4.3.1	4.3.2	4.3.3	4.3.4	4.3.5	4.3.6	4.3.7	4.3.8	4.3.9	4.3.10	4.3.11
PORTUGAL	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	0.00%	14.28%	0.00%	35.71%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	14.28%	21.43%	7.14%	0.00%
ITALY	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%
GREECE	28.57%	7.14%	7.14%	0.00%	21.43%	0.00%	7.14%	14.28%	14.28%	0.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	12.50%	12.50%	12.50%	37.50%	12.50%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

BLOCK 5

Question 5.2																		
Answers received: 13 / Correct answers: 13																		
COUNTRY	ANSWERS																	
	5.2.1	5.2.2	5.2.3	5.2.4	5.2.5	5.2.6	5.2.7	5.2.8	5.2.9	5.2.10	5.2.11	5.2.12	5.2.13	5.2.14	5.2.15	5.2.16	5.2.17	5.2.18
PORTUGAL	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	22.22%	22.22%	0.00%	11.11%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	12.50%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%

Question 5.3																		
Answers received: 12 / Correct answers: 12																		
COUNTRY	ANSWERS																	
	5.3.1	5.3.2	5.3.3	5.3.4	5.3.5	5.3.6	5.3.7	5.3.8	5.3.9	5.3.10	5.3.11	5.3.12	5.3.13	5.3.14	5.3.15	5.3.16	5.3.17	5.3.18
PORTUGAL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%

Question 5.4																		
Answers received: 13 / Correct answers: 13																		
COUNTRY	ANSWERS																	
	5.4.1	5.4.2	5.4.3	5.4.4	5.4.5	5.4.6	5.4.7	5.4.8	5.4.9	5.4.10	5.4.11	5.4.12	5.4.13	5.4.14	5.4.15	5.4.16	5.4.17	5.4.18
PORTUGAL	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%	7.69%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%	7.69%	7.69%	7.69%	7.69%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	7.14%	7.14%	5.71%	7.14%	7.14%	5.71%	4.29%	7.14%	4.29%	2.86%	5.71%	7.14%	4.29%	5.71%	4.29%	7.14%	4.29%	2.86%
ITALY	10.34%	10.34%	6.90%	6.90%	10.34%	6.90%	6.90%	6.90%	3.45%	0.00%	10.34%	10.34%	3.45%	0.00%	0.00%	6.90%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	22.22%	5.55%	5.55%	5.55%	16.66%	0.00%	0.00%	5.55%	11.11%	0.00%	5.55%	5.55%	0.00%	0.00%	5.55%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 5.1											
Answers received: 14 / Correct answers: 14											
COUNTRY	ANSWERS										
	5.1.1	5.1.2	5.1.3	5.1.4	5.1.5	5.1.6	5.1.7	5.1.8	5.1.9	5.1.10	5.1.11
PORTUGAL	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%	12.50%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%	12.50%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%
SPAIN	17.39%	17.39%	0.00%	8.70%	17.39%	17.39%	0.00%	4.35%	13.04%	4.35%	0.00%
ITALY	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	12.50%	25.00%	12.50%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	11.11%	11.11%	0.00%	22.22%	11.11%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%

Question 5.5					
Answers received: 13 / Correct answers: 13					
COUNTRY	ANSWERS				
	5.5.1	5.5.2	5.5.3	5.5.4	5.5.5
PORTUGAL	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	40.00%	0.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 5.7					
Answers received: 12 / Correct answers: 12					
COUNTRY	ANSWERS				
	5.7.1	5.7.2	5.7.3	5.7.4	5.7.5
PORTUGAL	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	60.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 5.6							
Answers received: 2 / Correct answers: 2							
COUNTRY	ANSWERS						
	5.6.1	5.6.2	5.6.3	5.6.4	5.6.5	5.6.6	5.6.7
PORTUGAL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 5.8					
Answers received: 11 / Correct answers: 11					
COUNTRY	ANSWERS				
	5.8.1	5.8.2	5.8.3	5.8.4	5.8.5
PORTUGAL	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	40.00%	20.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

BLOCK 6

Question 6.1			
Answers received: 21 / Correct answers: 21			
COUNTRY	ANSWERS		
	6.1.1	6.1.2	6.1.3
PORTUGAL	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 6.2							
Answers received: 21 / Correct answers: 21							
COUNTRY	ANSWERS						
	6.2.1	6.2.2	6.2.3	6.2.4	6.2.5	6.2.6	6.2.7
PORTUGAL	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	21.43%	21.43%	7.14%	14.28%	14.28%	21.43%	0.00%
ITALY	15.38%	23.08%	23.08%	7.69%	7.69%	15.38%	0.00%
GREECE	16.67%	22.22%	5.55%	11.11%	16.67%	27.78%	0.00%
ISRAEL	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%

Question 6.3						
Answers received: 19 / Correct answers: 19						
COUNTRY	ANSWERS					
	6.3.1	6.3.2	6.3.3	6.3.4	6.3.5	6.3.6
PORTUGAL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%
SPAIN	15.38%	15.38%	30.77%	23.08%	15.38%	0.00%
ITALY	28.57%	28.57%	14.28%	0.00%	14.28%	14.28%
GREECE	25.00%	16.67%	41.66%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%


Question 6.4			
Answers received: 21 / Correct answers: 21			
COUNTRY	ANSWERS		
	6.4.1	6.4.2	6.4.3
PORTUGAL	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%
GREECE	57.14%	42.86%	0.00%
ISRAEL	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Question 6.5			
Answers received: 21 / Correct answers: 21			
COUNTRY	ANSWERS		
	6.5.1	6.5.2	6.5.3
PORTUGAL	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ITALY	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%
GREECE	57.14%	28.57%	14.28%
ISRAEL	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%

Question 6.6									
Answers received: 18 / Correct answers: 18									
COUNTRY	ANSWERS								
	6.6.1	6.6.2	6.6.3	6.6.4	6.6.5	6.6.6	6.6.7	6.6.8	6.6.9
PORTUGAL	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SPAIN	7.69%	7.69%	23.08%	0.00%	15.38%	23.08%	0.00%	15.38%	7.69%
ITALY	20.00%	40.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GREECE	16.67%	33.33%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ISRAEL	11.11%	11.11%	22.22%	0.00%	11.11%	11.11%	11.11%	11.11%	11.11%

VIII. PEARLS Consortium

1		USE C/ S Fernando 4, Sevilla 41004 Spain	Contact: María-José Prados
2		UHU Dr. Cantero Cuadrado, 6 Huelva, España	Contact: M ^a Ángeles Barral
3		UPO Ctra. de Utrera, 1, 41013 Sevilla	Contact: Ricardo Iglesias
4		ICSUL Avda Prof Anibal de Bettencourt 9, Lisboa 1600 189, Portugal	Contact: Ana Delicado
5		UNITN Via Calepina 14, Trento 38122, Italy	Contact: Rossano Albatici
6		AUTH University Campus Administration Bureau, Thessaloniki 54124 Greece	Contact: Eva Loukogeorgaki
7		Ben-Gurion University of the Negev P.O.B. 653 Beer-Sheva 8410501 Israel	Contact: Na'ama Teschner
8		CLANER C/ Pierre Laffitte nº6 Edificio CITTIC TECNOLÓGICO DE AN, Málaga 29590 Spain	Contact: Carlos Rojo Jiménez
9		Territoria C/ Cruz Roja nº10 piso 1 pta b Sevilla 41008 Spain	Contact: Michela Ghislanzoni
10		COOPERNICO Praca Duque de Terceira 24 4 Andar 24 Lisboa 1200 161 Portugal	Contact: Ana Rita Antunes
11		ENERCOUTIM Centro de Artes e Ofícios, Rua Das Tinas 1 esq, Alcoutim 8970 064, Portugal	Contact: Marc Rehtel
12		HABITECH Piazza della Manifattura, 1, Rovereto TN 38068, Italy	Contact: Marcello Curci
13		E4G Viale Scala Greca 406/B - 96100 Siracusa	Contact: Giuseppe Macca
14		GSH Gkonosati 88A, Metamorfosi, Athina 14452 Greece	Contact: Vasiliki Charalampopoulou

15		CONS Leof. Georgikis Scholis 27, Pilea 570 01, Grecia	Contact: Ahí Mantouza
16		CONS Geo Phoenix Centre 27 Georgikis Scholis Avenue	Contact: Georgios Tsakoumis
17		SP Interface 8 Nave Matz St, Rehovot 7624416 Israel	Contact: Daniel Madar