

Environmental Technology Verification (ETV)

20/02/2008 - 28/03/2008

371 responses

0. PARTICIPATION

| Country | | |
|----------------------|----|---------|
| DE - Germany | 63 | (17%) |
| NL - The Netherlands | 44 | (11.9%) |
| CZ - Czech Republic | 30 | (8.1%) |
| PL - Poland | 22 | (5.9%) |
| UK - United Kingdom | 21 | (5.7%) |
| DA - Denmark | 20 | (5.4%) |
| IT - Italy | 16 | (4.3%) |
| BE - Belgium | 14 | (3.8%) |
| ES - Spain | 13 | (3.5%) |
| RO - Romania | 13 | (3.5%) |
| FI - Finland | 12 | (3.2%) |
| PT - Portugal | 12 | (3.2%) |
| HU - Hungary | 11 | (3%) |
| AT - Austria | 10 | (2.7%) |
| NO - Norway | 10 | (2.7%) |
| BG - Bulgaria | 9 | (2.4%) |
| IE - Ireland | 9 | (2.4%) |
| EL - Greece | 8 | (2.2%) |
| EE - Estonia | 6 | (1.6%) |
| FR - France | 6 | (1.6%) |
| LT - Lithuania | 6 | (1.6%) |
| SV - Sweden | 6 | (1.6%) |
| SI - Slovenia | 3 | (0.8%) |
| LU - Luxembourg | 2 | (0.5%) |
| LV - Latvia | 2 | (0.5%) |
| CY - Cyprus | 1 | (0.3%) |
| SK - Slovak Republic | 1 | (0.3%) |
| IS - Island | 1 | (0.3%) |
| MT - Malta | 0 | (0%) |

| Number of employees in your company | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|---------|
| 0 | 22 | (5.9%) |
| 1-9 | 82 | (22.1%) |
| 10-49 | 86 | (23.2%) |
| 50-249 | 65 | (17.5%) |
| 250-499 | 40 | (10.8%) |
| 500 + | 76 | (20.5%) |

| Indicate your main sector of activity | | |
|--|----|---------|
| C - Mining/Quarrying | 4 | (1.1%) |
| D - Manufacturing | 98 | (26.4%) |
| E - Electricity, gas and water supply | 13 | (3.5%) |
| F - Construction | 28 | (7.5%) |
| G - Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles, motorcycles and personal and household goods | 55 | (14.8%) |
| H - Hotels, restaurants and bars | 10 | (2.7%) |
| I - Transport, storage and communication | 41 | (11.1%) |
| J - Financial intermediation | 32 | (8.6%) |
| K - Real estate, renting and business activities | 52 | (14%) |
| N - Health and social work | 7 | (1.9%) |
| O - Other community, social and personal service activities | 31 | (8.4%) |

| Apart from your country, in how many countries of the European Union do you regularly sell products and services? | | |
|---|-----|---------|
| none | 116 | (31.3%) |
| 1 | 35 | (9.4%) |
| 2-3 | 67 | (18.1%) |
| 4-5 | 25 | (6.7%) |
| more than 5 | 101 | (27.2%) |

| 0) Are you interested in filling out the questionnaire? | | |
|---|-----|---------|
| Yes | 331 | (89.2%) |
| No | 40 | (10.8%) |

I. Introduction

| 1) Is your company interested in purchasing environmentally friendly goods and/or services (including processes, know-how and organisation)? | | |
|--|-----|---------|
| Yes | 290 | (87.6%) |
| No | 19 | (5.7%) |
| Don't know | 22 | (6.6%) |

| 2) When purchasing environmentally friendly products, services or processes, are you sure that the claims on their performance are correct? | | |
|---|-----|---------|
| Yes | 32 | (11%) |
| No but one can ask for evidence backing the claims | 165 | (56.9%) |
| No and there are no means to check that the claims are correct | 75 | (25.9%) |
| Don't know | 18 | (6.2%) |

| 3) What would you trust the most to provide reliable information on the performance of environmentally friendly products, services or processes? | | |
|--|-----|---------|
| Vendor's claims | 13 | (4.5%) |
| Verification by a qualified third party | 131 | (45.2%) |
| Official certification or label | 133 | (45.9%) |
| Don't know | 13 | (4.5%) |

II. Environmental Technology Verification (ETV)

4) Do you think there is a need to promote and organise the third party verification of technology performance?

| | | |
|-----|-----|---------|
| Yes | 266 | (80.4%) |
| No | 65 | (19.6%) |

4 a) Is it:

| | | |
|-------------------|-----|---------|
| a slight need | 48 | (18%) |
| a clear need | 136 | (51.1%) |
| an important need | 75 | (28.2%) |
| Don't know | 7 | (2.6%) |

5) What should in your view be the three main objectives of a technology verification system? Please rank those three from the most important (1) to the least important (3).

Accelerate the market penetration of environmental technologies

| | | |
|---|----|---------|
| 1 | 56 | (21.1%) |
| 2 | 44 | (16.5%) |
| 3 | 50 | (18.8%) |

Help small and medium-sized enterprises to prove the performance of their

| | | |
|---|----|---------|
| 1 | 32 | (12%) |
| 2 | 52 | (19.5%) |
| 3 | 37 | (13.9%) |

Help start-ups in environmental technologies to convince their financial partners (bank, investors)

| | | |
|---|----|---------|
| 1 | 30 | (11.3%) |
| 2 | 40 | (15%) |
| 3 | 37 | (13.9%) |

Help technology vendors to obtain the necessary authorisation to place their technologies on the market

| | | |
|---|----|---------|
| 1 | 15 | (5.6%) |
| 2 | 60 | (22.6%) |
| 3 | 36 | (13.5%) |

Help technology purchasers (public or private) to base their purchase decision on reliable information

| | | |
|---|-----|---------|
| 1 | 120 | (45.1%) |
| 2 | 45 | (16.9%) |
| 3 | 41 | (15.4%) |

| Other | | |
|-------|---|--------|
| 1 | 4 | (1.5%) |
| 2 | 5 | (1.9%) |
| 3 | 6 | (2.3%) |

| Don't know | | |
|------------|---|--------|
| 1 | 1 | (0.4%) |
| 2 | 1 | (0.4%) |
| 3 | 6 | (2.3%) |

| 6) For what type of technologies should ETV be developed in priority? (Select all) | | |
|--|-----|---------|
| New technologies just entering into the market | 124 | (46.6%) |
| All technologies should be accepted irrespectively of their stage of development | 112 | (42.1%) |
| Mature technologies largely available on the market | 79 | (29.7%) |
| Pilot technologies not yet ready for the market | 53 | (19.9%) |
| Don't know | 5 | (1.9%) |

7) The following table includes technology areas which are considered for the initial phase of the EU ETV scheme. Please indicate your opinion about the relevance of these technology areas.

| Monitoring techniques | | |
|-----------------------|-----|---------|
| Very relevant | 100 | (37.6%) |
| A little relevant | 118 | (44.4%) |
| Not relevant | 27 | (10.2%) |
| Don't know | 21 | (7.9%) |

| Waste water treatment | | |
|-----------------------|-----|---------|
| Very relevant | 170 | (63.9%) |
| A little relevant | 79 | (29.7%) |
| Not relevant | 12 | (4.5%) |
| Don't know | 5 | (1.9%) |

| Renewable and energy efficiency | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|---------|
| Very relevant | 198 | (74.4%) |
| A little relevant | 62 | (23.3%) |
| Not relevant | 3 | (1.1%) |
| Don't know | 3 | (1.1%) |

| Air pollution abatement | | |
|-------------------------|-----|---------|
| Very relevant | 182 | (68.4%) |
| A little relevant | 71 | (26.7%) |
| Not relevant | 10 | (3.8%) |
| Don't know | 3 | (1.1%) |

| Clean technologies (like recycling) | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|---------|
| Very relevant | 151 | (56.8%) |
| A little relevant | 109 | (41%) |
| Not relevant | 4 | (1.5%) |
| Don't know | 2 | (0.8%) |

| Other | | |
|-------------------|----|--------|
| Very relevant | 11 | (4.1%) |
| A little relevant | 7 | (2.6%) |
| Not relevant | 2 | (0.8%) |
| Don't know | 20 | (7.5%) |

III. Outline of an EU ETV Scheme

| 8) What should be the main rationale of an EU ETV scheme? | | |
|---|----|---------|
| Verification based on agreed legal requirements (certification) | 76 | (28.6%) |
| Verification of performance claims presented by vendors | 71 | (26.7%) |
| Verification of performance based on standard protocols | 65 | (24.4%) |
| Verification of performance based on user requirements | 47 | (17.7%) |
| Other | 4 | (1.5%) |
| Don't know | 3 | (1.1%) |

| 9) Who should lead the organisation of an EU ETV? | | |
|--|-----|---------|
| It should be organised by EU institutions | 121 | (45.5%) |
| It should be organised by the private sector itself in a coordinated way | 56 | (21.1%) |
| It should be organised by one (a group of) business service(s) having the necessary capacity | 41 | (15.4%) |
| It should be organised by governments at national level | 37 | (13.9%) |
| Don't know | 11 | (4.1%) |

| 10) In your area of activities, would a voluntary scheme based on the verification of performance claims, using test data provided by the technology developer and additional tests if needed, be: | | |
|--|-----|---------|
| Very appropriate | 50 | (18.8%) |
| Appropriate | 125 | (47%) |
| Not appropriate | 37 | (13.9%) |
| Does not apply | 35 | (13.2%) |
| Don't know | 19 | (7.1%) |

| 11) Do you think the ETV scheme should provide other services than verification | | |
|---|-----|---------|
| Yes | 135 | (50.8%) |
| No | 131 | (49.2%) |

| 11a) Which services would you consider useful? (Select all that apply) | | |
|---|-----|---------|
| Benchmarking of different technologies for users | 100 | (74.1%) |
| Pre-verification for pilot technologies | 73 | (54.1%) |
| Support to the marketing of new technologies information of a possible sources of funding | 63 | (46.7%) |
| Networking (like with capital investors, researchers, companies) | 58 | (43%) |
| Other | 6 | (4.4%) |
| Don't know | 2 | (1.5%) |

IV. Consideration of costs

12) The funding provided by the applicants to the system (technology developers or vendors) would cover the cost of verifying their application (estimated €5000 to €20000) and the cost of additional tests if needed (estimated €10000 to €70000). In your view, is this cost:

| | | |
|--|-----|---------|
| Impossible to meet for small technology developers without external support | 155 | (58.3%) |
| Possible to meet if justified by the added-value of the scheme | 52 | (19.5%) |
| Coherent with cost currently met for testing, verification or certification activities | 24 | (9%) |
| No opinion | 22 | (8.3%) |
| Don't know | 13 | (4.9%) |

13) In your area of activity, what cost would seem to you reasonable to cover both tests and verification of data:

| | | |
|------------------------------|-----|---------|
| Below €20.000 | 123 | (46.2%) |
| Between €20.000 and €50.000 | 27 | (10.2%) |
| Between €50.000 and €100.000 | 8 | (3%) |
| More than €100.000 | 3 | (1.1%) |
| Does not apply | 66 | (24.8%) |
| Don't know | 39 | (14.7%) |

14) In order to reduce the cost for technology vendors to a minimum, what other sources of funding would you consider appropriate? (Select all that apply)

| | | |
|---|-----|---------|
| Public administrations | 119 | (44.7%) |
| Public technology centres, laboratories or universities | 110 | (41.4%) |
| Industry federations | 90 | (33.8%) |
| Technology users | 84 | (31.6%) |
| Investors | 79 | (29.7%) |
| Private sponsors (big companies, banks, etc) | 77 | (28.9%) |
| Chambers of commerce | 55 | (20.7%) |
| Don't know | 22 | (8.3%) |

15) Who should cover the fixed costs of the system (system administration and communication, test protocols)? (Select all that apply)

| | | |
|---|-----|---------|
| The EU budget | 171 | (64.3%) |
| The applicants to the system (technology developer or vendor) | 86 | (32.3%) |
| The budget of national governments | 77 | (28.9%) |
| Other public budgets | 30 | (11.3%) |
| Other private sources of funding | 22 | (8.3%) |
| Don't know | 11 | (4.1%) |

16) Please indicate how important are the following aspects of an EU ETV system

| Credibility and scientific soundness | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|---------|
| Very important | 210 | (78.9%) |
| Important | 53 | (19.9%) |
| Not important | 2 | (0.8%) |
| Don't know | 1 | (0.4%) |

| Rapidity of verification process | | |
|----------------------------------|-----|---------|
| Very important | 95 | (35.7%) |
| Important | 151 | (56.8%) |
| Not important | 19 | (7.1%) |
| Don't know | 1 | (0.4%) |

| Low cost for applicants | | |
|-------------------------|-----|---------|
| Very important | 115 | (43.2%) |
| Important | 131 | (49.2%) |
| Not important | 18 | (6.8%) |
| Don't know | 2 | (0.8%) |

| Recognition of verification results in Europe | | |
|---|-----|---------|
| Very important | 170 | (63.9%) |
| Important | 88 | (33.1%) |
| Not important | 7 | (2.6%) |
| Don't know | 1 | (0.4%) |

| International recognition of verification results | | |
|---|-----|---------|
| Very important | 106 | (39.8%) |
| Important | 126 | (47.4%) |
| Not important | 31 | (11.7%) |
| Don't know | 3 | (1.1%) |

| Accessibility for SMEs (language, cost, proximity of contact points) | | |
|--|-----|---------|
| Very important | 132 | (49.6%) |
| Important | 112 | (42.1%) |
| Not important | 15 | (5.6%) |
| Don't know | 7 | (2.6%) |

| Attractiveness for investors and other financial partners | | |
|---|-----|---------|
| Very important | 54 | (20.3%) |
| Important | 145 | (54.5%) |
| Not important | 55 | (20.7%) |
| Don't know | 12 | (4.5%) |

| Support to technology users/public and private purchasers | | |
|---|-----|---------|
| Very important | 68 | (25.6%) |
| Important | 151 | (56.8%) |
| Not important | 42 | (15.8%) |
| Don't know | 5 | (1.9%) |

| Confidentiality of technology details or test data | | |
|--|-----|---------|
| Very important | 100 | (37.6%) |
| Important | 93 | (35%) |
| Not important | 64 | (24.1%) |
| Don't know | 9 | (3.4%) |

| Public availability of verification report | | |
|--|-----|---------|
| Very important | 98 | (36.8%) |
| Important | 117 | (44%) |
| Not important | 46 | (17.3%) |
| Don't know | 5 | (1.9%) |

| Focus on technologies addressing the main environmental issues | | |
|--|-----|---------|
| Important | 123 | (46.2%) |
| Very important | 123 | (46.2%) |
| Not important | 18 | (6.8%) |
| Don't know | 2 | (0.8%) |

| Focus on technology areas where many innovations occur | | |
|--|-----|---------|
| Very important | 64 | (24.1%) |
| Important | 147 | (55.3%) |
| Not important | 45 | (16.9%) |
| Don't know | 10 | (3.8%) |