

Case study – target setting in an EU country

Workshop on collecting good practices
on target setting and reporting
Geneva, 8-9 March 2016



Case summary

- * Hungary set targets 2008
- * An intersectorial body was established to coordinate implementation, including target setting
- * Protocol ratification and EU accession overlapped in time
- * Some targets are in line with the EU obligations (drinking water, bathing water, urban waste water and water framework directive)
- * Other targets are outside the scope of EU legislation (enclosed bathing waters, equity and affordability aspects, safe management, water related disease, information to the public, remediation of contaminated sites)

Why is it a good practice?

- * EU obligations provide legal pressure and financial support for achieving the targets
- * Baseline analysis was also a necessity in many areas for the *acquis communautaire*
- * The Protocol helps to phase implementation via defining intermediate targets, targets dates and indicators
- * Many potential target areas are not covered by EU legislation
 - * National priorities were addressed

Overcoming challenges

- * Hungary was early to set targets, when guidance was not available and previous experience was scarce. Indicators were not well defined.
- * In the revision process, more attention will be given to measurable indicators.
- * For the drinking water quality target, implementation started late in spite of the intermediate targets and the availability of the funds due to a reluctance on the local government level. A variety of tools (legislative, infrastructural, financial) was needed to overcome the challenge.
- * Targets without allocated funds were also met:
 - * Water safety planning in drinking water utilities – legislative (obligation in the drinking water regulation)
 - * Pool registry – compiled through the public health network
 - * Information systems – project funds
 - * Remediation of contaminated sites – national programme

Success factors and lessons learned

- * Targets aligned with existing strategies or legal obligations are likely to be met.
- * The Protocol is a good tool for defining actions, intermediate targets and indicators.
- * The Protocol provides a platform for defining national priorities in EU countries which are outside or beyond of the scope of the EU legislation.
- * Tools are available for meeting other targets e.g.
 - * Legislation
 - * Good practice guidance
 - * Data acquisition through existing networks
 - * Project funds
 - * National programmes

How to replicate this practice

- * EU member states can use the Protocol as a tool for phasing and realising existing obligations
- * Use the Protocol as a platform for defining national priorities
- * Set „financially realistic” or politically supported targets in the resource intensive target areas
- * Use other tools to meet targets in areas without earmarked funds.