

Norwegian Renewable Energy Policy

Why has Norway chosen
another approach than most
European countries?

Elin Lerum Boasson

Senior researcher, CICERO,

Associate Professor, Political Science, Univ. of Oslo



Strategic Challenges
in International Climate
and Energy Policy

www.cicep.uio.no

Lecture, Energy Transition Workshop, Berlin 18.09.2015

Content

- Contrasting renewable energy policy character in
 - EU and key EU countries
 - Norway
- Explaining the Norwegian renewable electricity outcome by assessing policy shaping forces in Norway
 - Organizational field
 - Political steering
 - European Environment
- Conclusions



Renewables policy designs

Policy criteria	Technology criteria	Economic criteria
State steering		
Indirect	1) Technology standards RES-REQUIREMENTS IN BUILDING CODES: To a certain extent Germany	2) Market Instruments NORWEGIAN RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY: Green certificate scheme
Direct	3) Governmental Industry Development RENEWABLE ENERGY POLICY IN KEY EUROPEAN COUNTRIES: Feed-in in Denmark, Germany, UK, France and more	4) Cost-minimizing state aid NORWEGIAN RENEWABLE HEATING POLICY: Enova State Aid Scheme



- The strength and effectiveness of all measures may vary

EU renewables policy: David beats Goliath



Research questions Norwegian RES

1. To what extent and how did the Norwegian organizational field of stationary energy influence the *Norwegian renewables electricity outcome*?
2. To what extent and how did the Norwegian political field have independent influence?
3. To what extent and how did the EU and the European Environment play into the Norwegian national processes?



National organizational field

- Actors
 - Ministries, agencies, regulators, industry, business associations, environmental organizations
- Concentration of structural resources
 - Authority distribution
 - Information distribution
- Conflicting institutional logics
 - Market
 - Minimizing societal costs
 - Technology development

Climate policy logics

Type of logic	Market	Minimizing societal costs	Technology development
Logic components			
Objective	Maximizing corporate profits.	Minimizing societal costs.	Enhancing technical development
Role of commercial organizations	Engaging in strategic competition aimed at maximizing profits.	Engaging in all endeavours that yield profits.	Inventing, developing and refining promising technologies.
Appropriate solutions	Market-based support schemes that favour the most profitable low-carbon solutions.	Raising the price of technologies with neg. effects. Support to projects requiring the lowest level of state aid.	Fostering a broad spectrum of technologies by introducing various technology specific measures.
Governmental measures	Market measures (e.g. ETS and green certificate scheme).	ETS. CO2 tax. Cost-efficient financial incentives.	Gov. industry development, Tec. standards (e.g. Feed In).

Organizational field mechanisms

Structural pattern	Concentrated	Distributed
Institutional pattern		
One dominant professional logic	1) Segmentation Strong policy impact	2) Collaboration Intermediate mechanism
Several professional logics	3) Turf Battle Intermediate mechanism	4) Pluralism Weak policy impact

National political fields

- Actors
 - Parliament, government, political parties
- Concentration of structural resources
 - Authority distribution
 - Information distribution
- Two political logics
 - Political competition
 - Garbage can

Two political logics

	Political competition	Garbage Can
Political preferences will reflect...	simplified lines of conflict and the action of other political actors	former actions and adjacent developments at specific moments in time
Decision-making is an opportunity for...	Political victory	Symbolic action
Stability of political positions	High	Low
Climate-policy decisions will reflect the positions of ...	the majority	actors with additional time and energy

Four political field mechanisms

Structural pattern	Concentrated	Distributed
Institutional pattern		
Political Competition	1) Politicizing Intermediate mechanism	2) Legislature Governing Strong policy impact
Garbage Can	3) Ministerial Governing Intermediate mechanism	4) Random Decision-Makin Weak policy impact

European influence

Structural pattern Institutional pattern	Structural power gathered in Brussels	Structural powers dispersed across Europe
<p>One Dominant Model/Policy Approach</p>	<p>1) EU Governs Example: EU Emissions Trading System 2013 – 2020</p> <p><i>National factors have little importance</i></p>	<p>2) Natural harmonization Example: Diffusion of Feed-in support schemes in Europe</p> <p><i>National factors are important</i></p>
<p>Different Models/Policy Approach</p>	<p>3) Unpredictable EU Governing Example: Environmental State Aid Guidelines</p> <p><i>National factors are important</i></p>	<p>4) Let a thousand flowers bloom Example: Energy Policy for Buildings</p> <p><i>National factors are important</i></p>

Norwegian conclusions

- Organizational field of energy
 - Turf battle: clash of logics
- The political sphere
 - 2000 – 2005: Ministerial governing
 - 2005 – 2010: Politicizing
- The European environment
 - Natural harmonization+unpredictable EU governing
 - Entrepreneurship: Statkraft+ministry officials
- Conclusion: the lines of conflict was shaped by the field, politicians slow to react but eventually important, creative interpretation of EU steering.

Thank you!



Strategic Challenges
in International Climate
and Energy Policy

www.cicep.uio.no