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EVALUATION OF THE GREEN ZONE IN THE EU

Abstract

The purpose of this publication is to evaluate the EU countries as part of the Green zone using relevant data from Eurostat and re-create an index according to the collected data.

In order to reach the aim of the publication, the steps below played an important role:

* Collection of data from Eurostat: we picked the data related to ecological field, which helped us observe how green were the EU countries, which are going to be listed later in the publication.
* The data were processed and ranked, which constituted the new index. This re-created index is then compared to the result of the Global green economy index 2018.
* The Source URL for the publication about the backgrounds:

<https://miau.my-x.hu/miau/quilt/reconstruction_of_ggei_2018.xlsx> and the URL used for modelling:

<https://miau.my-x.hu/myx-free/coco/beker_std.php>

Fig. Nr1

The first set of collected data was the Global green economy index 2018, expressed as percentiles representing an aggregate result from the four main dimensions of the GGEI: leadership & climate change; efficiency sectors; markets & investment; and

environment.

Fig Nr2

Market share of the largest generator in the electricity market - as a percentage of the total generation

The dataset is based on the principle “the more/the less” for the GGEI value. The more is the share, the less ecological is the country, therefore, the less green it appears on the index. The values are expressed in percentage.

Fig Nr 3

Fig Nr 4

Fig Nr 3 and 4:

The dataset is based on the principle “the more/the less” for the GGEI value. The more are heating or cooling days, the less ecological is the country, therefore, the less green it appears on the index. The values are expressed in days.

Fig Nr 5

The dataset is based on the principle “the more/the better” for the GGEI value. The more are the people covered by the covenant, the more ecological is the country, therefore, the greener it appears on the index. The values are expressed in million persons.

Fig Nr 6

The dataset is based on the principle “the more/the less” for the GGEI value. The more is the amount of CO2 emission, the less ecological is the country, therefore, the less green it appears on the index. The values are expressed in gram per kilometre.

Fig Nr7

With the collected data from Eurostat, we re-created the green economy index. Which was then compared to the first.

Fig Nr8 Chart comparison: GGEI 2018 vs estimated GGEI

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| GGEI 2018 | estimated GGEI | difference | Countries |
| 647 | 569 | 78 | Austria |
| 573 | 572.5 | 0.5 | Belgium |
| 402 | 401.6 | 0.4 | Bulgaria |
| 491 | 490.5 | 0.5 | Croatia |
| 451 | 450.6 | 0.4 | Cyprus |
| 477 | 516.5 | -39.5 | Czech Republic |
| 680 | 679.4 | 0.6 | Denmark |
| 466 | 465.6 | 0.4 | Estonia |
| 699 | 698.3 | 0.7 | Finland |
| 640 | 639.4 | 0.6 | France |
| 689 | 688.3 | 0.7 | Germany |
| 548 | 547.5 | 0.5 | Greece |
| 541 | 540.5 | 0.5 | Hungary |
| 599 | 629.9 | -30.9 | Ireland |
| 560 | 559.5 | 0.5 | Italy |
| 463 | 462.1 | 0.9 | Latvia |
| 515 | 514.5 | 0.5 | Lithuania |
| 523 | 522.5 | 0.5 | Luxembourg |
| 516 | 515.5 | 0.5 | Malta |
| 410 | 409.6 | 0.4 | Poland |
| 540 | 543.5 | -3.5 | Portugal |
| 479 | 478.5 | 0.5 | Romania |
| 452 | 418.6 | 33.4 | Slovak Republic |
| 505 | 504.5 | 0.5 | Slovenia |
| 541 | 540.5 | 0.5 | Spain |
| 760 | 759.3 | 0.7 | Sweden |
| 622 | 670.9 | -48.9 | United Kingdom |

Fig Nr9 Table comparison: GGEI 2018 vs estimated GGE



Fig Nr10 Raw data



Fig Nr11: Ranked data with visual effects



Fig Nr12 Model

Modelling URL: <https://miau.my-x.hu/myx-free/coco/beker_std.php>

Conclusion

The Global Green Economy Index had been reconstructed and the new result is close to the first. The picked years influenced, moreover, it can be said that there has not been much of progression or regression in the transition of EU countries to a green economy.

- could also be interpreted the figures Nr.8-12 too (just 1-2 sentences for each figure)?  
- could be interpreted the counties having differences concerning the estimetad and the official calculated GGEI values (like AT&CZ+SK and IRL+UK)?  
- any ideas, why even these countries could not be modelled with quasi zero estimation error?  
-- what can be the reason that the differences for SK and CZ have quasi the same volume but not the same sign?  
-- why have IRL and UK the same sign (in case of the differences) and AT can be seen as a kind of balance through the different sign of the difference?  
- summa summarum: what kind of special informationare are not available in the model about the above listed countries (with differences between estimations and facts)?