







Q

Home ► All Journals ► Environment and Sustainability ► Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning ► List of Issues ► Volume 22, Issue 2 ► Environmental policy implementation duri

Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning > Volume 22, 2020 - <u>Issue 2</u>

 $\begin{array}{ccc} \textbf{1,655} & \textbf{15} & \textbf{0} \\ \textbf{Views} & \textbf{CrossRef citations to date} & \textbf{Altmetric} \end{array}$

Articles

Environmental policy implementation during the economic crisis: an analysis of European member state 'leader-laggard' dynamics

Michail Melidis

Dec 2017, Accepted 07 Dec 2019, Published online: 29 Jan 2020

Cite this article

Attps://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2020.1719051

Sample our



Full Article

Figures & data

References

66 Citations

Metrics

Reprints & Permissions

Read this article

Share

ABSTRACT

The long-standing debate on environmental policy 'leaders' and 'laggards' lends itself to a new analysis following with the advent of the 2008 economic crisis. This paper, therefore, asks the question to what extent do European Union (EU) member states have the capacity and willingness to implement EU environmental policy amid austerity, budget cuts, and rising costs over the period 2008–2014. Building upon previous studies, 26 interviews with European, Greek and United Kingdom participants and records of environmental infringements, the paper provides a contemporary picture of the environmental policy 'leader-laggard' dynamic in Europe. The findings demonstrate that the impact of the economic crisis seems contestable and varies amongst member states, while the reduction in environmental infringements appears to have a link with the decrease in economic activity. Although environmental policy 'leaders' maintain patterns of strong implementation, the improved implementation

performance of some 'laggards' reflects a shift in their implementation patterns amid a period of intense political and economic controversies.

KEYWORDS:

Economic crisis	EU environmental policy	leaders and laggards	implementation performance	
policy outputs an	d outcomes			
policy outputs an	d outcomes			

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Michail Melidis is an Associate Lecturer at the University of Exeter. His work and research interests are focused on the analysis and implementation of environmental policies in EU, Greece, and the UK.

Duncan Russel is a Professor of Environmental Policy at the University of Exeter. His work research among other things, evidence-policy interactions, how institutional processes affect environmental policy outputs and policy coordination for the environment in the UK and Europe.

ORCID

Michail Melidis http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0042-4001

Duncan J. Russel http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3843-7892

Correction Statement

This article has been republished with minor changes. These changes do not impact the academic content of the article.

Notes

- 1 The UK in many studies is regarded both leader and in-betweener interchangeably.
- 2 The former as a small country which exercised leadership in certain stages of EU policy making, the latter as a larger state that provided leadership throughout all decision-making stages. Both of them introduced environmental policy innovations and exhibited high levels of ambitions and standards in different timings. In addition to this, another factor is the six-month rotating Council Presidency that permits Member states to hold the grip and wield great influence to the EU (Liefferink & Wurzel, 2017, p. 956).
- 3 Environmental infringements relate to the violation of Community environmental law. The EU Commission may take legal action and initiate a formal infringement procedure (of several stages each ending with a formal decision as laid out in the EU treaties) if an EU country fails to transpose the provisions of directives and implement EU law. Similarly, it may refer the issue to the Court of Justice which in some cases (of persistent non-compliance) results in the imposition of financial penalties. A telling example is the referral of Greece by the Commission to the European Court of Justice over poor waste water treatment presenting a risk to public health (26/02/2015) (IP/15/4491).
- 4 For more information please see the Annual Reports of the European Commission on monitoring the application of EU law, the infringements cases, court documents and rulings here: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/legal/law/press_en.htm.
- 5 The Pilot Scheme was gradually introduced from 2008 to 2012 as an informal mechanism to dispute settling by which the EU Commission aims to settle violations of EU law preceding the initiation of the formal infringement proceedings.

Additional information

Funding

This work was supported by State Scholarships Foundation.



People also read

Recommended articles

Cited by 15

Information for Open access

Authors Overview

R&D professionals Open journals

Editors Open Select

Librarians **Dove Medical Press**

Societies F1000Research

Opportunities Help and information

Reprints and e-prints Help and contact

Advertising solutions Newsroom

Accelerated publication All journals

Corporate access solutions **Books**

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email



Sign me up



Accessibility







Taylor & Francis Group an **informa** business

Registered in England & Wales No. 01072954 5 Howick Place | London | SW1P 1WG