# This Excel File relates to the Bruegel Blueprint Series Report "Energy: Choices for Europe" (Röller, Delgado and Friederiszick, 2007).

It contains the complete dataset, used for the computation of the Energy Policy Index (EPI).

For a complete description of the methodology adopted, please refer to Annex I of the Bruegel Report.

#### **INDEX**

CRITERIUM	SHEET NAME	SHEET DESCRIPTION AND LINK
	C_Meth	Competitiveness: Methodology
COMPETITIVENESS	C_Data	Competitiveness: Data
	C_Index	Competitiveness: Index
	SoS Meth	Security of Supply: Methodology
SECURITY OF SUPPLY	SoS Data	Security of Supply: Data
	SoS_Index	Security of Supply: Index
ENN/ID ON MENTAL	ES Meth	Environmental Sustainability: Methodology
ENVIRONMENTAL	ES_Data	Environmental Sustainability: Data
SUSTAINABILITY	ES_Index	Environmental Sustainability: Index
	3 MAIN INDICES	Final Indices: Efficiency, Security of Supply, Environmental sustainability

			Weights by theme	Weights by theme (b <sub>j</sub> )	Weights by subtheme (sb <sub>j</sub> )	Question weights (c <sub>k</sub> )			
			(b <sub>j</sub> )					Coding of data	
st CRITERIUM	COMPETITIVENESS	1/2							
	ELECTRICITY		1/2	1/4					
	Vertical integration				1/2				
	What is the degree of vertical separation						Ownership separation	Legal/Accounting separation	n Integrated
	between the transmission and generation segments of the electricity industry?					1/2	6	3	0
	What is the degree of vertical separation						Ownership separation	Legal/Accounting separation	n Integrated
	between the distribution segment and the other segments of the electricity industry?					1/2	6	3	0
	Horizontal market structure				1/2				
	How many companies with market						More than 5	Between 3 and 5	Less than 3
	share over 5% in generation?					1/2	6	3	0
	How many companies with market share over 5% in supply?					1/2	6	3	0
	GAS		1/2	1/4					
	Vertical integration				1/2				
	What is the degree of vertical separation						Ownership separation	Legal/Accounting separation	n Integrated
	between the transportation and import/production segments of the electricity industry?					1/2	6	3	0
	What is the degree of vertical separation						Ownership separation	Legal/Accounting separation	n Integrated
	between the distribution segment and the other segments of the electricity industry?					1/2	6	3	0
	Horizontal market structure				1/2				
	How many companies with market						More than 5	Between 3 and 5	Less than 3
	share over 5% in production/import?					1/2	6	3	0
	How many companies with market								
	share over 5% in supply?					1/2	6	3	0
	INTRA-EU TRADE	1/2		1/2					
	What is the share (e) of electricity trade over total electricity generation		1		1		Scaled on a 0-6 range, where 0 intra-EU trade and 6 indicates vaccording to the following formula:	vide openness,	6*((e <sub>i</sub> -min e)/max e)

		<b>Austria</b> AT	<b>Belgium</b> BE	<b>Cyprus</b> CY	<b>Czech Republic</b> CZ	<b>Denmark</b> DK	<b>Estonia</b> EE	<b>Finland</b> Fl	France FR	<b>Germany</b> DE	<b>Greece</b> GR	<b>Hungary</b> HU	Ireland IE	•	<b>Latvia</b> LV	<b>Lithuania</b> LT	<b>Luxembourg</b> LU	<b>Malta</b> MT	<b>Netherlands</b> NL	<b>Poland</b> PL	Portugal PT	Slovak Republic SK	<b>Slovenia</b> Sl	<b>Spain</b> ES	<b>Sweden</b> SE	United Kingdor
	Year	,			<u> </u>									•									•		-	
The state of the s																										
Electricity																										
Vertical integration What is the degree of vertical separation																										
petween the transmission and generation	2006	Ownership	Ownership	Ownership	yes and ownership	: yes and ownersh	ip: Ownership	yes: state overlap	ves: state overlap	Ownership	yes: state overlap	yes: state overlap	yes: state overlap	ves and ownership	Ownership	ves: state overlap	Ownership	NΙΛ	ves and ownership	yes: state overlap	yes and ownership	yes: state overlap	yes: state overlap	yes and ownership	ves: state overlan	ves and owner
egments of the electricity industry?	2000	separation	separation	separation	state overlap	state overlap	separation	yes. state overlap	yes. state overlap		yes. state overlap	yes. state overlap	yes. state overlap	yes and ownership	separation	yes. state overlap	separation	INA	yes and ownersing	yes. state overlap	yes and ownership	yes. state overlap	yes. state overlap	yes and ownersing	yes. state overlap	yes and owner.
segments of the electricity industry:		Separation	3c paration	Separation	state overlap	state overlap	separation			separation					Separation		Separation									
What is the degree of vertical separation	2005	Integrated	Ownership	Integrated	Legal/Accounting	Ownership	Ownership	Integrated	Integrated	Legal/Accounting	g Integrated	Integrated	Integrated	Ownership	Integrated	Integrated	Legal/Accounting	Integrated	Ownership	Integrated	Ownership	Integrated	Integrated	Ownership	Ownership	Ownership
between the distribution segment and the			separation		separation	separation	separation			separation				separation			separation		separation		separation			separation	separation	separation
other segments of the electricity industry?																										
Horizontal market structure																										
How many companies with market share																										
over 5% in generation?	2004	5	2	NA	1	10	1	10	1	5	1	7	2	5	1	3	1	NA	4	7	3	1	3	3	10	8
How many companies with market share																										
over 5% in supply?	2004	5	5	1	3	NA	1	5	1	4	1	7	3	6	1	3	4	1	3	6	2	1	6	5	3	6
Gas																										
Vertical integration																										
What is the degree of vertical separation																										
petween the transportation and																										
mport/production segments of the gas		Ownership	Ownership							Ownership		Ownership	Ownership	Ownership			Ownership			Ownership		Ownership				
ndustry?	2006	separation	separation	NA	yes and ownership	yes and ownersh	nip Integrated	Integrated	yes: state overlap	separation	NA	separation	separation	separation	Integrated	Integrated	separation	NA	yes and ownership	separation	NA	separation	Integrated	yes and ownership	yes and ownership	yes and owner
What is the degree of vertical separation																										
between the distribution segment and the		Ownership	Ownership		Ownership	Ownership				Legal/Accounting	]			Ownership			Legal/Accounting		Ownership							
other segments of the gas industry?	2006	separation	separation	NA	separation	separation	Integrated	Integrated	Integrated	separation	NA	Integrated	Integrated	separation	Integrated	Integrated	separation	NA	separation	Integrated	NA	Integrated	Integrated	Integrated	Integrated	yes and owner
Horizontal market structure																										
How many companies with market share																										
over 5% in production/import?	2004	2	2	NA	NA	2	1	NA	2	5	NA	2	5	3	1	4	1	NA	1	1	NA	1	1	4	1	7
How many companies with market share																										
over 5% in supply?	2004	4	5	NA	7	3	1	NA	2	1	NA	7	3	5	1	2	4	NA	3	7	NA	1	6	5	1	6
NTRA-EU TRADE																										
What is the share of electricity trade																										
imports plus exports) over total electricity																										
generation	2004	47,10%	24,90%	0,00%	41,80%	49,90%	24,10%	21,50%	13,10%	16,10%	11,60%	40,30%	6,20%	15,60%	81,90%	71,90%	233,00%	0,00%	26,40%	12,90%	23,80%	63,20%	87,80%	6,90%	22,00%	3,10%

#### COMPETITIVENESS: Index

COUNTRY	ISO	Electricity	Gas	Average (EI + Gas)	Intra-EU trade	Competitiveness Index
Austria	AT	3,75	3,75	3,8	2,8	3,3
Belgium	BE	3,75	3,75	3,8	4,3	
Cyprus	CY	5,00	NA	5,0	6,0	5,5
Czech Republic	CZ	3,38	2,25	2,8	3,1	3,0
Denmark	DK	1,50	3,00	2,3	2,6	2,4
Estonia	EE	4,50	6,00	5,3	4,4	
Finland	FI	3,00	6,00	4,5	4,5	
France	FR	5,25	5,25	5,3	5,1	5,2
Germany	DE	3,00	3,75	3,4	4,9	
Greece	GR	5,25	NA	5,3	5,2	
Hungary	HU	2,25	3,75	3,0	3,2	3,1
Ireland	IE	4,50	3,75	4,1	5,6	
Italy	IT	1,50	3,00	2,3	4,9	3,6
Latvia	LV	5,25	6,00	5,6	1,1	3,4
Lithuania	LT	3,75	5,25	4,5	0,4	2,5
Luxembourg	LU	4,13	4,13	4,1	0,0	2,1
Malta	MT	6,00	NA	6,0	6,0	6,0
Netherlands	NL	2,25	3,00	2,6	4,2	3,4
Poland	PL	1,50	3,75	2,6	5,1	3,9
Portugal	PT	3,00	NA	3,0	4,4	3,7
Slovak Republic	SK	5,25	5,25	5,3	1,7	3,5
Slovenia	SI	3,00	4,50	3,8	0,0	
Spain	ES	2,25	3,00	2,6	5,5	
Sweden	SE	2,25	3,75	3,0	4,5	3,7
United Kingdom	UK	0,75	0,00	0,4	5,8	

# **SECURITY OF SUPPLY: Methodology**

		Weights by theme (b <sub>j</sub> )	Weights by subtheme (sb <sub>j</sub> )			Codin	g of data			
2nd CRITERIUM	SECURITY OF SUPPLY									
	ENERGY DEPENDENCE	1/2								
	Share of energy net imports on gross energy consumption		1	<15%	Between 15.01% and 30%	Between 30.01% and 45%	Between 45.01% and 60%	Between 60.01% and 75%	Between 75.01% and 90%	Above 90%
	energy consumption			6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	ADEQUACY MARGIN	1/2								
				< - 0.101	Between -0.10 and 0	Between 0.001 and 0.10	Between 0.101 and 0.15	Between 0.151 and 0.20	Between 0.201 and 0.25	Above 0.25
	System adequacy (a): Reliably available capacity over expected peak demand, 2006		1/3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
	System adequacy (a): Reliably available capacity over expected peak demand, 2010		1/3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
	System adequacy (a): Reliably available capacity over expected peak demand, 2015		1/3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6

SECURITY OF SUPPLY: Data																										
		<b>Austria</b> AT	<b>Belgium</b> BE	<b>Cyprus</b> CY	<b>Czech Republ</b> CZ	ic <b>Denmark</b> DK	Estonia EE	<b>Finland</b> Fl	<b>France</b> FR	<b>Germany</b> DE	<b>Greece</b> GR	<b>Hungary</b> HU	Ireland ⊫	<b>Italy</b> П	<b>Latvia</b> LV	<b>Lithuania</b> LT	<b>Luxembourg</b> LU	<b>Malta</b> MT	<b>Netherlands</b> NL	<b>Poland</b> PL	<b>Portugal</b> PT	<b>Slovak Republic</b> SK	<b>Slovenia</b> Sl	<b>Spain</b> ES	<b>Sweden</b> SE	<b>United Kingdom</b> UK
ENERGY DEPENDENCE																										
Share of energy net imports on gross energy consumption	2005	82,6	80,7	105,5	37,6	-58,8	33,9	69,3	54,5	65,1	70,8	65,3	90,2	86,8	94	63,1	99	NA	38,9	18,4	99,4	67,8	55,9	85,1	45	13
ADEQUACY MARGIN System adequacy (a): Reliably available			·	·	·	·		·					·	·	·		·	·		·					·	
capacity over expected peak demand, 2006	2006	38,6%	1,6%	NA	21,5%	2,2%	19,7%	2,2%	13,3%	10,8%	14,3%	2,8%	3,0%	13,1%	19,7%	19,7%	37,6%	NA	7,6%	27,5%	18,6%	20,7%	-39,9%	20,5%	2,2%	3,9%
System adequacy (a): Reliably available capacity over expected peak demand, 2010	2010	36,7%	-5,6%	NA	16,0%	8,9%	20,0%	8,9%	9,2%	10,5%	16,1%	1,8%	-1,4%	15,1%	20,0%	20,0%	48,6%	NA	3,8%	35,8%	18,1%	-10,8%	-2,0%	15,1%	8,9%	3,7%
System adequacy (a): Reliably available capacity over expected peak demand, 2015	2015	30,1%	-16,1%	NA	11,5%	4,3%	-5,5%	4,3%	3,8%	5,2%	18,8%	8,0%	-18,6%	7,7%	-5,5%	-5,5%	43,8%	NA	-2,2%	29,0%	2,2%	-30,0%	-9,2%	5,1%	4,3%	-0,8%

### SECURITY OF SUPPLY: Index

				Aded	quacy Margins	2006-2015	
		<b>Energy Dependence</b>	AM 2006	AM 2010	AM 2015	Adequacy Margin Average	Security of Supply Index
Austria	AT	1,30	6	6	6	6,00	5,06
Belgium	BE	1,41	2	1	0	1,00	1,08
Cyprus	CY	0,00	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,00
Czech Republic	CZ	3,86	5	4	3	4,00	3,97
Denmark	DK	6,00	3	3	2	2,67	3,33
Estonia	EE	4,07	4	4	1	3,00	3,21
Finland	FI	2,06	2	2	2	2,00	2,01
France	FR	2,90	3	2	2	2,33	2,45
Germany	DE	2,30	3	3	2	2,67	2,59
Greece	GR	1,97	3	4	4	3,67	3,33
Hungary	HU	2,29	2	2	2	2,00	2,06
Ireland	IE	0,87	1	1	0	0,67	0,71
Italy	IT	1,06	3	4	2	3,00	2,61
Latvia	LV	0,65	2	2	2	2,00	1,73
Lithuania	LT	2,41	2	2	2	2,00	2,08
Luxembourg	LU	0,37	6	6	6	6,00	4,87
Malta	MT	0,00	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,00
Netherlands	NL	3,79	2	2	1	1,67	2,09
Poland	PL	4,95	6	6	6	6,00	5,79
Portugal	PT	0,35	4	4	2	3,33	2,74
Slovak Republic	SK	2,14	5	0	0	1,67	1,76
Slovenia	SI	2,82	1	1	1	1,00	1,36
Spain	ES	1,16	5	4	2	3,67	3,17
Sweden	SE	3,44	2	2	2	2,00	2,29
United Kingdom	UK	5,26	2	2	1	1,67	2,39

## ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY: Methodology

		Weights by theme (b <sub>j</sub> )	Weights by subtheme (sb <sub>j</sub> )			Coding	of data			
3rd CRITERIUM	ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY									
	Renewables	1/3								
	Weight of renewables plus hydro in energy mix		1	>23%	Between 17% and 22.99%	and 16.99%	Between 9% and 11.99	Between 6% and 8.99%	Between 3% and 5.99%	Below 3%
	IIIA			0	1	2	3	4	5	6
	CO2 emissions	1/3								
	CO2 emissions: Kg CO2 over 2000 US\$ PPP GDP	.,,		Below 0.29	Between 0.3 and 0.39	Between 0.4 and 0.49	Between 0.5 and 0.59	Between 0.6 and 0.69	Between 0.7 and 0.81	Above 0.81
			1/2	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Evolution of CO2 emissions: Percentage reduction in greenhouse gas emissions		1/2	Above 52%	Between 42% and 51%	Between 32% and 41%	Between 22% and 31%	Between 12% and 21%	Between 1% and 11%	No reduction
	with respect to GDP at PPP values, from 1995 to 2004		1/2	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Planned Measures and Progress Towards Target	1/3								
	Existing policies and measures		1/8		yes			no		
			1/0		0			6		
	Additional policies and measures		1/8		yes 0			no 6		
	Use of Kyoto mechanisms				yes			no		
			1/8		0			6		
	Net removal of carbon sinks		1/0		yes			no		
			1/8		0			6		
	Kyoto Target projected to be reached		1/2		yes			no		
			1/2		0			6		

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY: Data	
	ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY: Data

		Austria	Belgium	Cyprus	Czech Republic	n Donmark	Estonia	Finland	Franco	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Luxembourg	Malta	Netherlands	Poland	Portugal	Slovak Republi	c Slovenia	Snain	Sweden	United Ki
	Year	AT	BE	<b>Cyprus</b> CY	CZ CZ	DK	EE	FI	<b>France</b> FR	DE	GR	HU HU	E	<b>Italy</b> ∏	LV	LT	LU	MT	NL NL	PL	PT	SK	SI	<b>Spain</b> ES	SE	UK
vables																										
t of renew ables plus hydro in energy mix																										
	2004	21,5	2,3	7,4	3,5	14,4	11,4	24,1	6,2	4,3	5,3	3,8	2,2	8,0	37,3	9,1	1,6	0,0	2,9	5,2	15,0	4,2	11,5	6,3	27,0	
nissions																										
issions: Kg CO2 over 2000 US\$ PPP GDP	2004																									
		0,31	0,4	0,4	0,71	0,32	0,92	0,47	0,23	0,39	0,44	0,39	0,31	0,31	0,29	0,31	0,47	0,36	0,4	0,66	0,33	0,54	0,41	0,34	0,2	
of CO2 omiccione: Parcontago reduction in																										
of CO2 emissions: Percentage reduction in se gas emissions with respect to GDP at PPP	1995-2004																									
om 1995 to 2004		6,0	20,0	8,0	22,0	25,0	44,0	18,0	18,0	18,0	14,0	31,0	42,0	4,0	50,0	62,0	16,0	-8,0	24,0	37,0	6,0	33,0	23,0	3,0	26,0	
Measures and Progress Towards Target				·			·	·		·	·	·			·	·	·					·	·	·	<u>.</u>	·
policies and measures																										
	2006	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
policies and measures	2006	yes	ves	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	no	no	
oto mechanisms	2000	yes	yes	110	yes	110	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	110	yes	yes	110	110	110	yes	110	yes	yes	yes	110	110	
	2006	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	
al of carbon sinks	2000																									
	2006	yes	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	
rget projected to be reached																										

### ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY: Index

					Planned Measures		
COUNTRY	ISO	Renewables	CO2 emissions	CO2 emission change	and Progress	Kyoto target	Environmental Sustainability Index
					Towards Target		
Austria	AT	1	1	5	0	(	
Belgium	BE	6	2		1,5	(	4,3
Cyprus	CY	4	. 2	5	6	3	
Czech Republic	CZ	5	5	3	1,5	(	
Denmark	DK	2	1	3	1,5	(	2,6
Estonia	EE	3	6	1	3	(	2,7
Finland	FI	0	2		1,5	(	
France	FR	4	0	2	1,5	(	2,3
Germany	DE	5	1	4	3	(	3,0
Greece	GR	5			3		3,2
Hungary	HU	5	1	3	3	(	2,8
Ireland	IE	6	1	1	1,5	6	3,6
Italy	IT	4	1	5	0	6	- <b>)</b> -
Latvia	LV	0	0	1	3		,
Lithuania	LT	3		C	4,5	(	,
Luxembourg	LU	6	2		3	(	
Malta	MT	6	1	6	6	3	4,7
Netherlands	NL	6		3			2,8 3,4 6 2,7
Poland	PL	5	4	. 2	4,5	(	3,4
Portugal	PT	2		5	0	6	2,7
Slovak Republic	SK	5			2	(	3,0
Slovenia	SI	3	2	3	· ·		2,1
Spain	ES	4	1	5	1,5	(	
Sweden	SE	0	0	3	3	(	
United Kingdom	UK	6	1	3	1,5	(	2,9

### **3 MAIN INDICES**

COUNTRY	ISO	Competitiveness	Security of Supply	<b>Environmental Sustainability</b>
Austria	AT	3,3		
Belgium	BE	4,0		
Cyprus	CY	5,5	6,0	4,0
Czech Republic	CZ	3,0		
Denmark	DK	2,4	4,4	
Estonia	EE	4,8	4,5	
Finland	FI	4,5	5,1	1,3
France	FR	5,2		
Germany	DE	4,1	4,6	
Greece	GR	5,2	3,8	3,2
Hungary	HU	3,1	5,1	
Ireland	IE	4,9		
Italy	IT	3,6	4,5	3,3
Latvia	LV	3,4	5,2	0,7
Lithuania	LT	2,5	4,9	1,9
Luxembourg	LU	2,1	1,2	3,5
Malta	MT	6,0	6,0	
Netherlands	NL	3,4	4,8	2,8
Poland	PL	3,9	1,6	
Portugal	PT	3,7	4,5	
Slovak Republic	SK	3,5	4,7	
Slovenia	SI	1,9	5,4	
Spain	ES	4,1	4,2	3,6
Sweden	SE	3,7	4,9	
United Kingdom	UK	3,1	4,8	2,9