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Summary

Eco Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS)

Context and theoretical background

Survey: factors influencing Italian public and private organizations to withdraw from EMAS

Survey: possible enabling measures to encourage new registrations

Discussion
Eco-Management and audit scheme (EMAS)

European environmental management system available for any kind of organisation operating in the European Union or in third countries

- Voluntary tool
- Proactive approach
- Legislative compliance
- Continuous improvement of environmental performance
- Relationship with stakeholders
- Integration with ISO 14001

Research context: the growth of non-renewed registrations

**Active registrations 2015**

Europe 4,106  
Germany 1,205  
Spain 1,056  
Italy 1,016  
Austria 287  
Other UE 542**

**Italy: 2010-2015 New reg. vs non-renewals by size***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>No renewal</th>
<th>New reg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** EU Commission, EMAS Helpdesk

*Source: Italian Institute for Environmental Protection and Research*
Research questions

Context
Recent growth of not renewed registrations

• RQ1: Is there a significant difference in the motivations for dropping out of EMAS and the nature of the organizations (PAs and private-owned organizations)?

• RQ2: Is there a significant difference in the measures that would re-encourage organizations to resume EMAS registration and the nature of the organizations (PAs and private-owned organizations)?
EMAS: theoretical background

Barriers and constraints to EMAS implementation
- Cost of implementation
- Higher operational complexity
- Low managerial commitment
- Legislative compliance requirements
- Low market - consumers – supply chain partners recognition
- Preference for ISO 14001
- Lack of regulatory relief and incentives

Critical aspects of the implementation of EMS and EMAS in PA
- Low participation and motivation of employees (Clausen et al., 2002; Iraldo et al., 2005) (Merli et al., 2016)
- High costs of implementation and maintenance (Clausen et al., 2002) (Emilsson and Hjelm, 2002) (Merli et al., 2016)
- Low efficacy in encouraging more sustainable economic activities of territory (Emilsson and Hjelm, 2007)
Methods: Data collection and respondents profile

- **Survey step 1**: Focus groups with Emas registered companies managers and ISPRA support
- **Survey step 2**: questionnaire - Multiple-choice questions - Likert Scale (1 to 6)
- **Target**: Italian EMAS organizations that did not renew EMAS (2010-2015)
- **Population**: 379 organizations - Respondents: 99 (26% response rate)
- 36 PA – 63 Private organizations
- 75% small-sized, 16% medium, and 9% large
- Northern Italy (63%), 21% Centre, and 16% South and Islands
RQ1: reasons to not renew EMAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal difficulties within the organization</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.293**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of the EMS maintenance</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of exposure due low public awareness of EMAS</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>-.364**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of permanent bureaucratic and administrative simplifications</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of improvement in relationships with the competent authorities</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management choice</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of economic savings</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of improvement environmental performance</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). - PA: PA – Private: Private-owned organizations

Scale: 1 not important - 6 very important
Research Findings: reasons for dropping out

General reasons to drop out:
- Dropping out mainly relate to small-sized organizations
- costs are the most significant (as confirmed in literature)

Differences among PA and private:
- PA internal difficulties: employees’ motivation and competence
- Private: Lack of exposure due to low public awareness of EMAS
### RQ2: possible enabling measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of costs to obtain EMAS registration</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAS registration as a requirement by the supply chain (customers / suppliers)</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>-0.282**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater importance of EMAS in public tenders (GPP) compared to ISO 14001</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater importance in public funding (vs. ISO 14001)</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater importance in obtaining public funding</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing permanent bureaucratic and administrative simplifications (eg. Longer or Simplified Permits)</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial facilities (fees, charges and rates for inspections reduction)</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing tax benefits for the long term</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>-0.424**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of inspections by the competent authorities</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>-0.292**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater commitment / investment by the government in the promotion of EMAS knowledge to citizens/consumers</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.210*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Scale: 1 not important - 6 very important
General findings enabling measures

• Roughly 60% of the sample would register again if enabling measures were implemented (Internal reasons = negative approach; Low public awareness = positive approach)

• More bureaucratic and administrative simplifications for small-sized organizations (Findings consistent with previous investigations)

• EMAS is not considered as a tool to improve commercial relationships
Research Findings: enabling measures

General findings enabling measures

Differences among PA and private

• PA: funding opportunities from other public institutions (reducing budgetary constraints)

• Private: tax reductions

• EMAS as an incentive-based certification
Research Findings: final thoughts

- decision not to renew EMAS is strongly linked to the size of the organizations
- success of EMAS is strictly connected with the incentives provided by European Member States

is if EMAS is just an incentives-based instrument
- if yes
  - European decision-makers should question if a robust intervention to allow greater regulatory relief for EMAS is needed (e.g. better access to public tenders)
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