Comments
on the draft Hungarian Partnership Agreement on EU Funds
from an environmental perspective

1. Introduction

The comments set out below are in line with the provisions of the Regulation of the European Parliament and of The Council laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund Plus, the Cohesion Fund, and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and financial rules for those and for the Asylum and Migration Fund, the Internal Security Fund and the Border Management and Visa Instrument (hereinafter referred to as CPR).

In August 2021 we made comments on the basis of the draft Partnership Agreement on EU Funds (hereinafter: PA) dated on 12th May 2021, published on the website of the Hungarian government. As of October 8, 2021, a new version of the Partnership Agreement was published on the social consultation website. The filename of the new draft indicates the date of September 30, but the text still includes July 2021. With the amendments, the previous 52-page draft has been expanded to 77 pages.

2. General remarks

The draft PA describes most of the main challenges faced by Hungary but generally fails to meaningfully respond to the country-specific issues highlighted in the recommendations. It mainly contains the Hungarian government’s plans, relations with other EU funds and the description of the support structure, which remains largely unchanged. At the same time the draft lacks to prescribe specific eligibility conditions and special minimum requirements, which could make the processes related to the Funds more transparent and more effective.

We also consider it very relevant that the objectives and programs chosen by the PA are too general, more specification and detailed analysis would be needed. The overly general nature of the text makes it impossible to judge whether the requirements of the CPR are met under the draft PA. There is not even one case where a concrete numerical figure would demonstrate what targets would be achieved in a given period of time. Generally, we consider it indispensable to include concrete and ambitious targets to the policy objectives (see p. 4 of this paper).

The draft PA is permeated by the economic policy thinking (see for example on page 56) that development should be ensured by forcing and implementing investments as soon as possible, and by financing them from public funds. This idea is often criticized and considered dangerous by non-governmental organizations, renowned economists and even the President of the Hungarian National Bank, as it means mainly greenfield investments whose economic, environmental and social sustainability is questionable and which cause serious natural loss. These also cause demand for raw materials, leading to further environmental destruction. The forced investments will only improve

3 https://www.budapestherald.hu/national/2021/02/02/according-to-gyorgy-matolcsy-romania-has-been-more-successful-than-hungary-in-the-last-10-years/
economic performance in the short term but will be more damaging in the longer term. In the case of several objectives (e.g., tourism, increasing the employment capacity of companies), we believe that financing should be provided primarily from private sources instead of the Funds. This was also noted by the comments of European Commission concerning the Partnership Agreement for the 2014-2020 period (point 1 (5), or 2 (15))

The draft PA aims to spend 50% of all resources on the four Hungarian NUTS2 regions which are among the poorest 20 regions in the EU. However, the practical implementation of this commitment is not sufficiently clarified in the draft. It would also be important to rule out the well-known phenomenon of de facto linking resources in these poorer regions to implementing companies in other regions.

3. Shortcomings of the draft PA – in more detail

3.1 Point 1.1 of the draft PA: The vision of Hungary
In terms of environmental, nature and climate protection, the vision contains a short sentence: “Greening the economy, transport and energy production will reduce greenhouse gas emissions, resulting in improved environmental quality.”
In our view, reducing greenhouse gas emissions alone will not improve the environment, it does not even stop it from deteriorating further. On the other hand, greening would be needed not only in these three sectors, but in all areas of life. Thirdly, we believe that more social, economic and attitudinal structural change than greening would be needed to avoid a climate catastrophe and to use natural resources sustainably.
There are also conflicting goals in this chapter, such as expanding transport links for environmentally harmful transport modes vs greening transport, as further traffic-attracting investments undermine emission reduction targets. Therefore, in its current form, the vision defines partly contradictory, mutually exclusive directions.

3.2 Chapter 1.2 Justification for the choice of policy objectives
Table 1. The table contains contradictory findings, such as the need for expressway construction or the need to increase the immersion depth of the Danube in the face of the deteriorating state of our natural areas.
The Balaton area has been designated as a priority development area, which is similarly worrying. In practice, this already means that partly the EU and Hungarian tax-payers would finance investments that are environmentally and economically unsustainable, far exceeding the tolerance of the area, often with enormous natural devastation. The short-term profit of these investments will go to private actors, while the burden of the necessary public services, environmental damage and, in the longer term, facilities that prove unsustainable will fall on the community. Moreover, the water-management and transport system of the region, as well as the ecological balance of Lake Balaton can no longer serve new large-scale development and more intensive tourism. Experts and scientists working on issues concerning lake Balaton and its surroundings have long been saying that the ongoing investments are also threatening an ecological disaster, so further significant investments would violate the environmental and nature protection goals of the EU and Hungary. Instead of further supporting the already developed region, the resources should be spent on making the lagging areas more liveable and catching up.
In many places, it would be also advisable to update the statistical data used to compile the situation picture, as they are already obsolete and in several cases, there are new ones (e.g. in the case of digitization).

---

3.3. The draft PA states the following at Point 2.1.1 (Policy Objective 1: Smart Europe): “The competitiveness of the Hungarian economy can be improved by increasing electrification and automation and moving towards higher value-added products.” We consider this to be only partially true. The draft recognizes and states that economic restructuring is needed to improve competitiveness but if this will continue to focus on strengthening large-scale industrial investments, improving integration into international value chains and automation, then it might lead to further degradation of the natural environment and cause additional environmental impact. In the context of economic restructuring, we would prefer to develop local small-scale production, the production of high-quality, traditional handmade and organic products, as well as the promotion of high intellectual value-added services.

3.4. The draft PA does not fully comply with Article 6 (1) of the CPR which states the following: “3. Member States shall provide information on the support for environment and climate objectives using a methodology based on types of intervention for each of the Funds. That methodology shall consist of assigning a specific weighting to the support provided at a level which reflects the extent to which such support makes a contribution to environmental objectives and to climate objectives. In the case of the ERDF, the ESF+ and the Cohesion Fund weightings shall be attached to dimensions and codes for the types of intervention established in Annex I.”

3.5. The description of Policy Objective 2: A greener, low-carbon and resilient Europe (point 2.1.2 of the draft PA) is incomplete. In all cases, the draft aims for some kind of infrastructure development, which may increase the deterioration of the environment due to its demand for raw materials and energy. In addition, the part on energy does not focus sufficiently on improving energy efficiency and energy-saving renovation of buildings. The section on air quality lacks steps to reduce emissions from residential heating and focuses too much on new infrastructure elements. It puts the main blame for air pollution on “coal-fired stoves” while it does not mention that the coal used is of the worst quality, lignite, and its sale for residential heating could and should have been banned years ago. It also fails to mention that the air pollution which is most dangerous to human health results from the widespread burning of waste in households, and it is first of all the lack of sufficient action by the government that makes it possible to continue these illegal activities.

We also consider a shortcoming that there is not a single mention in the draft about the possibilities of wind energy in Hungary. It would be worth clarifying whether we would also support this source, and if not, it would be necessary to work out a justification for this.

Concerning transport, the PA puts emphasis on the electrification of transport which, albeit necessary, will not ensure in itself the greening of transport. On the contrary, the situation will continue to deteriorate: for example, each year more than a hundred thousand old second-hand cars are imported to Hungary while less than one thousand electric cars (BEV) are sold.

3.6. Concerning Policy Objective 3: A more connected Europe (point 2.1.3), the aim of further development of the “convenient road facilities” runs counter to green objectives and to “the polluter pays” principle, as it encourages the proliferation of individual motorized passenger traffic and transport. The stated goals do not include however the reconstruction of the existing road network, but the development of the highway network is emphasized, which is completely unnecessary from the point of view of transport, but causes the fragmentation of natural areas and indirectly the increase of air and noise pollution. Similarly, the development of ports on rivers may cause loss of biodiversity and may violate the aims of the environmental acquis, especially the Water Framework Directive.

---

5 Air pollution may be much more hazardous than follows from official monitoring data. https://www.levego.hu/en/campaigns/waste-campaign/
3.7 Concerning Policy Objective 5: A Europe closer to its citizens (point 2.1.5).
There are several expected outcomes related to tourism developments in this chapter. In our view the focus should be on preserving and renovating our existing cultural heritage, rather than creating new tourist attractions, facilities, since our built heritage is in a terrible and rapidly deteriorating condition across the country.

3.8 Chapter 2.1.6. Fair Transition
The affected regions in need of development are characterized by poor housing conditions and poor energy performance. For this reason, there would be a great need for large-scale, deep energy renovations and, in cases where this is no longer possible, for the construction of modern and energy-efficient social rental housing. This would mean a large-scale programme of building modern, energy-efficient housing that could be used on a social basis, free of charge or for low rent by people living in housing deprivation in less developed regions. In spite of the above, energy renovations are only included in the draft PA as a supplement, and the rental housing program is not included at all.

3.9. List of programs planned under the Funds covered by the Partnership Agreement, with an ex-ante financial allocation from each Fund and the related national contribution by category of region Table 9/A.
According to the draft PA, a very small part of the resources will go to the "more developed" regions, such as to the capital of Hungary, Budapest. The draft itself correctly acknowledges that some public services in the capital are underfunded and underdeveloped, therefore serious improvement would be needed. Nevertheless, the draft allocated very little EU funding to more developed regions, practically to the capital. This disproportion may lead to forced, less sustainable investments in some rural regions, while important and efficient developments will be lagging behind in the capital where one-fifth of the total population lives and where 25-30% of the population work or study every day, due to a lack of resources in areas outside of Budapest. It is not clear from the draft that the resources allocated to the capital are so low because the EU cohesion rules do not allow more or it is the result of another decision. If this is due to the rules, and if possible, we recommend that the government request derogation from these rules with reference to the special proportions of the Hungarian settlement structure formed for historical reasons.

3.10. There are several shortcomings related to the thematic enabling conditions set forth by Annex IV of the CPR. The non-compliance with these conditions also violates Article 15 of the CPR. The key would be to make progress in the following areas in order to establish compliance with the thematic enabling conditions:

- Annex IV., point 2.1 of the CPR requires a “Strategic policy framework to support energy efficiency renovation of residential and non-residential buildings”. Although the government recently adopted the Governmental Decision (no. 1343/2021. (VI. 2.) on the adoption of the national long term renovation strategy to support the renovation of the national stock of residential and non-residential buildings, neither the Act on the 2022 State Budget, nor any other legislation reflects the aims set forth in the strategy. Just to the contrary, the Hungarian government provides huge support for the construction and renovation of buildings without any meaningful requirements for energy efficiency. (It has been generally characteristic for Hungary that the Parliament, the government, and local governments adopt excellent strategies which are never implemented; even worse, the concrete measures and investments

---

• Annex IV, point 2.2 of the CPR requires the following: “The integrated national energy and climate plan is notified to the Commission, in accordance with Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 2018/1999 and consistent with the long-term greenhouse gas emission reduction objectives under the Paris Agreement, which includes: 1. All elements required by the template set out in Annex I to Regulation (EU) 2018/1999. 2. An outline of envisaged financial resources and mechanisms for measures promoting low-carbon energy.” According to the Commission’s assessment even the current National Energy and Climate Plan (NECP) of Hungary “shows a very low level of ambition”. Among others, a meaningful „outline of envisaged financial resources and mechanisms for measures promoting low-carbon energy” is missing. Moreover, with the new EU target of 55% emission reduction, the NECP must be completely revised. In our opinion, the PA cannot be signed before the adoption of a revised NECP which fully aligned with the new EU target and contains, among others, concrete annual deadlines and a detailed description of financial instruments.

• Annex IV, point 2.3 of the CPR requires “Effective promotion of the use of renewable energy across sectors and across the Union”. Hungary will certainly have serious difficulties in complying with this requirement, namely, to increase the share of renewables in the heating and cooling sector by 1 percentage point per year up to 2030. According to the current tendencies and forecasts (see the below figures) the share will be decreasing. Therefore, new measures and roadmap are necessary to meet with this enabling condition before signing the PA.

![Share of renewables in the heating and cooling sector](source: National Energy and Climate Plan)

• Annex IV, point 2.5 of the CPR requires “Updated planning for required investments in water and wastewater sector”. The PA does not include detailed measures for ameliorating the quality of the surface and groundwater bodies, instead it emphasises irrigation development projects. In our view, the PA should focus on Nature-Based Water Retention Measures to improve water retention in Hungary in general – which is essential as the country is facing longer periods of droughts, and more frequent and more extreme rain and flooding events –, and not artificial and unsustainable solutions like irrigation. Furthermore, the PA does not

---

address one of the biggest problems of water management in Hungary: the canalisation system that quickly drains excess water from the country instead of retaining it.

- Annex IV, point 2.7 of the CPR requires “Prioritised action framework for the necessary conservation measures involving Union co-financing.” The PA does not include any details regarding better management of protected areas, or on the role that prioritised action frameworks (PAF) may play in this (apart from its specific connection to an ongoing integrated LIFE project). The PAF has an integral role in identifying priority measures and estimating financing needs for nature conservation. We are also concerned that the development directions planned in the funding period will undermine the fulfilment of nature conservation objectives and cause further deterioration by the end of the period.

- Annex IV, point 3 of the CPR requires “Developing and enhancing sustainable, climate resilient, intelligent and intermodal national, regional and local mobility…” The current transport system of Hungary is far from being sustainable and climate resilient. The external costs of road transport (according to the Integrated Transport Operational Programme) equal to 6% of the GDP. As long as these external costs are not internalised, transport cannot become sustainable and climate resilient.10 The PA envisages the construction of new roads, including new motorway sections; this would contradict “the polluter/user pays” principle, more road traffic would be generated, natural areas would be damaged, there would be less resources for railways and public transport, and more sustainable transport modes would have to face even greater harmful competition For these reasons, the draft PA is non-compliant with this enabling condition.

4. Proposals to decrease the environmental impacts of the future projects

The following amendments should be made in the draft PA in order to fully comply with the objectives of the CPR, particularly the objective to reach “a greener, low-carbon transitioning towards a net zero carbon economy and resilient Europe by promoting clean and fair energy transition, green and blue investment, the circular economy, climate change mitigation and adaptation, risk prevention and management, and sustainable urban mobility” (Article 5 1 (b));

4.1. The PA should ensure that the energy efficiency and the reduction of greenhouse gases are important criteria in the selection of every project. Effective steps should be taken in the PA to establish a monitoring system with the help of which the measures should be followed up.

4.2. It is also necessary to apply “the polluter pays” principle and prescribe steps to ensure this11. In line with this principle the PA should ensure that an external cost analysis is carried out before every decision of the funding of concrete projects over 1 million EUR financial contribution.

4.3. The PA should explicitly prescribe the improvement of the application of the preventive action principle as well as the precautionary principle, in particular by the following measures12,13:

---

10 The internalisation of transport external costs, if done properly, would be advantageous not only for the environment but also for the economy and would reduce social inequalities:
Proposal for the Internalisation of the External Costs of Road Transport in Hungary,
Car tolls must be implemented urgently – with appropriate compensation,
11 Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), Para 2, Article 191.,
https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A12012E%2FTXT
12 TFEU, Para 2, Article 191.
13 _Liability for Environmental Damage in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA): Implementation of
• Taking effective steps towards the stricter official practice in environmental licensing procedures.
• Restoring the permit requirement for minor environmental use activities.
• Improving the legal framework of the environmental liability system.

4.4. The text of the PA should include an article that the EU Green public procurement rules must be complied with in projects financed by the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF).

4.5. The PA should also include an explicit prescription to ensure that the compliance with the relevant environmental acquis regulation shall be maintained throughout the financial period (including project selection criteria, which ensure the dissolving of current infringements and the avoiding of future infringements). The above also makes it necessary to carry out a general revision of the national legislation.

4.6. The PA should include a provision that Hungary shall significantly increase the efficiency of the work of environmental authorities, in particular by the following measures:
• Restoring the autonomous environmental authorities.
• Significantly increasing the human and financial resources of the environmental authorities.
• Providing the necessary training for governmental and local staff in charge of environmental issues. There shall be an effective training strategy developed (training sessions, online training, etc.), with quantitative indicators, where possible. Moreover, appropriate technical assistance (e.g., guidelines, guidance documents, external experts) shall be provided to all the authorities applying EIA/SEA Directives.
• Introducing stricter sanctions in frequent or serious environmental non-compliance cases. The deterrent effect of the current administrative fines shall be assessed, and the economic benefits of non-compliance should be eliminated.

4.7. The PA should include the introduction of the following condition: In order to ensure the full compliance with the sustainable development principle any project funding decision exceeding 10 million EUR shall be proceeded by obtaining the prior opinion of the National Council for Sustainable Development on the sustainability of the project.

4.8. The PA should explicitly prescribe that managing authorities shall ensure the mandatory application of BAT as well as the compliance with the BAT conclusions for every project funded by at least 10 million EUR.

4.9. The PA should envisage the setting up of the legal framework to ensure that the government conduct preliminary environmental assessments before any significant changes in the public finance (state budget, taxation system). Ex-post impact assessments (similarly to those set forth by the Act CXXX of 2010 on law-making) shall also be properly conducted following the changes in public finance.

---

15 TFEU, Article 11.
17 TFEU, Article 11.
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4.10. In order to fully comply with Article 8 of the CPR, the PA should envisage the improvement of the current regime and fully ensure that the public (including relevant NGOs) is given early and effective opportunities to participate in the preparation and modification of the programmes as well as in every relevant decision-making procedure concerning the ESI Funds. In the framework of the above, Hungary shall fully ensure

- timely disclosure of and easy access to relevant information;
- sufficient time for the partners to analyse and comment on preparatory documents and draft programmes;
- available channels through which partners may ask questions, may provide contributions, and will be informed of the way in which their proposals have been taken into consideration;
- the dissemination of the outcome of the consultation.

4.11. The text of the PA should guarantee the significant improvement of the transparency and efficiency of the monitoring committees. In the framework of the above the Hungarian Government shall ensure that every monitoring committee has a two-thirds majority of members independent from the government. Otherwise, the PA will violate Article 8 of the CPR.

4.12. According to Article 8 of the CPR, the PA should ensure that relevant stakeholders take part in the preparation of the progress reports on the implementation of the PA, in particular concerning the assessment of the role of partners in the implementation of the PA and the overview of the opinions given by the partners during the consultation, including, where appropriate, the description of the way in which the opinions of partners have been taken into account. This provision should be included in the PA.

4.13. According to Article 8 and 12 of the CPR, the text of the PA should ensure that the partners, within the framework of the monitoring committees and their working groups may assess the performance of the programme, including the conclusions of the performance review, and they may take part in the preparation of the annual implementation reports on the programmes.

4.14. The PA should envisage a system which monitors the need of support for the strengthening of the institutional and/or financial capacity of partners. Where such support is needed, the Hungarian Government shall provide the necessary resources in order to enable the partners to effectively practice their participation rights (e.g., in the framework of the Technical Assistance).

4.15. The PA should ensure that Hungary breaks down all barriers to disclosure procedures for environmental information as soon as possible, in particular, the unjustified confidentiality of certain relevant data and the unfounded application of unreasonable costs in connection with data requests.

4.16. The PA should envisage the establishment of the framework of a system which improves the

---


19 Code of Conduct, Article 11
20 Code of Conduct, Article 14
21 Code of Conduct, Article 15
22 Code of Conduct, Article 17
knowledge of the extent and value of ecosystem services, habitat and soil maps within and outside protected areas. This system shall also continue to share (online) sectoral data and shall improve the accessibility and communication of information to the public\textsuperscript{24}.

4.17. The PA should address the risk of increased flooding and resulting vulnerability of (urban) infrastructure, the water supply and sanitation systems through improved engineering, water management practices, and establishing early warning systems.

4.19. The PA should ensure that Hungary shall amend the relevant legislation in order to provide the public concerned (including environmental NGOs) access to a review procedure before a court of law to challenge the programmes on environmental grounds\textsuperscript{25}.

4.20. The PA should ensure that Hungary shall not take any legislative or other action that leads to a reduction in the current level of environmental protection\textsuperscript{26}. Hungary shall also ensure that national environmental policies and regulations are not reducing the current level of EU environmental protection regulations and standards. The text of the PA should also ensure that the relevant Hungarian regulation and any new pieces of law shall be assessed from this aspect and regulation shall continue to contribute to environmental and health protection, and shall not worsen pollution or lead to loss of biodiversity. The above principle of non-regression should be applied to substantive, procedural as well as organisational rules.

In line with point (11) of the CPR, biodiversity should be mainstreamed in other policies with adequate funding towards reaching the set EU-level biodiversity objectives, while considering existing overlaps between climate and biodiversity goals. The draft PA does not explicitly link climate and biodiversity objectives and planned activities, apart from stating the aim to harmonise these areas under the KEHOP Plus (Environmental and Energy Operational Programme Plus) funding framework.

Hungarian environmental civil society organisations have made more detailed concrete proposals for the PA.\textsuperscript{27} In our opinion, these proposals should be included as an Annex to the Partnership Agreement.

4.21. The PA should provide safeguards and actively build on the principle of partnership with a multi-level governance approach, in accordance with point (14) of the CPR. The active involvement of regional, local, urban, and other authorities, civil society, economic and social partners should be ensured, following the European code of conduct on partnership.

Budapest, 16 December 2021

\textsuperscript{24} Access to information Directive, Article 7
\textsuperscript{25} Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, Article 9, \url{https://unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/pp/documents/cep43e.pdf}
\textsuperscript{26} The Fundamental Law of Hungary, Article XXI. Para (1). \url{https://njt.hu/translation/TheFundamentalLawofHungary_20201223_FIN.pdf}
Decision of the Hungarian Constitutional Court No. 17/2018. \url{http://public.mkab.hu/dev/dontesek.nsf/0/e8abcc671cb1b77e7c12581fc005e21b5/FILE/17_2018%20AB%20hat%20C3%A1rozat.pdf}

\textsuperscript{27} Proposals for the Hungarian Partnership Agreement on the European structural and investment funds 2021-2027 and the National Recovery and Resilience Plan for contributing to a climate-neutral EU (by Clean Air Action Group and CEEWeb for Biodiversity), \url{http://levego.hu/sites/default/files/Hungarian%20Partnership%20Agreement%20proposal%20Climate%202021apr21.pdf}
This publication has been produced by Clean Air Action Group (Levegő Munkacsoport, www.levego.hu) in cooperation with CEEweb for Biodiversity (www.ceeweb.org) in the framework of the project “Towards climate-neutral EU: efficient allocation of EU funds” (https://www.ceeweb.org/eufunds/).

The project Towards climate-neutral EU: efficient allocation of EU funds” is part of the European Climate Initiative (EUKI). EUKI is a project financing instrument by the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU). The EUKI competition for project ideas is implemented by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH. It is the overarching goal of the EUKI to foster climate cooperation within the European Union (EU) in order to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions.
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