



Documentation Regional development instruments

derived from DIAMONT Database www.diamont-database.eu



This project has received
European Regional
Development Funding
through the INTERREG III B
Community Initiative



Federal Ministry for the
Environment, Nature Conservation
and Nuclear Safety



Bavarian State
Ministry of the
Environment,
Public Health
and Consumer
Protection

Interreg III B

General Data	
Name of instrument:	Decentralised technical infrastructure (water, waste water, energy)
Country / region:	DE
Spatial level:	local
Type:	Economic instruments
Subtype:	Access fees / supply fees
Description:	In rural areas, central systems of technical infrastructure such as water provision, waste water treatment, energy and broadband communication are cost-consuming for the municipal as well as for the individual budget (high ratio length/user) and increase the land take for the development of new residential and commercial areas. In regions undergoing demographic changes, these centralised systems are increasingly operating far below capacity and are even becoming dysfunctional. Decentralised, cost-effective solutions are available (on-site biological wastewater treatment, small-scale hydropower, biomass, photovoltaic, and wind energy, broadband access via small-scale radio distributors) and their installation can reduce financial and environmental burdens.
General objectives:	Reducing infrastructure costs for municipal and individual budget. Reducing land take for technical infrastructure. Reducing environmental burdens.
General Objectives keywords:	municipal infrastructure costs ; municipal funds ; access fees ;
Responsible:	Public service providers
Stakeholder Involved:	Local authority/Municipal council
Stakeholder Involved:	Private individuals
Stakeholder Involved:	Planners
Stakeholder Involved:	Entrepreneurs/businessmen
Reference:	http://www.staedtetag.de/imperia/md/content/schwerpunkte/fachinfos/10.pdf http://www-1.tu-cottbus.de/BTU/Fak2/Stadttec/uploads/Abschlussbericht_Infrastrukturfolgekosten.pdf http://www.businessportal24.com/de/Dezentrale_Loesungen_Vormarsch_66790.html
General assessment of strength and weakness:	Strength: Instrument to address increasing infrastructure costs for municipal budgets and individuals particularly in times of demographic change.

	Weakness: Existing centralised structures display a high level of persistence, also among political stakeholders and therefore the change to decentralised structures is difficult to facilitate.
Metadata:	Date of entry: 31.01.2007 Contact: Ifuplan, Schleißheimer Str. 156, 80797 München
Implementation	
Legal status:	not-mandatory for responsible body, BUT mandatory for end-user
Extension:	rarely (< 25%)
Type of monitoring:	none
Preconditions for implementation:	Appropriateness and applicability of technical solutions. Disperse distribution of network users (for densely settled areas, centralised solutions (e.g. district heating etc.) are probably more effective).
Best practise example (1):	Decentralised Urban Infrastructure System DEUS 21-Project "Am Römerweg", Municipality of Knittlingen, DE
Example Abstract (1):	Best-practice example of a newly developed residential area. New houses are connected with two water pipes, one connecting to the municipal drinking water network, one for purified rain water collected on-site. This water can be used for all purposes that do not require drinking water quality such as house cleaning, washing, garden care, toilet etc. Waste water is collected on-site and further used for biomass energy generation and then treated on-site, residues can further be used as manure for agriculture. As rainfall is first collected and used for household purposes, a centralised system for waste-water-treatment can be calculated for smaller amounts and is therefore substantially cheaper. http://www.bauforum.at/ireds-13245.html
General comment:	According to §78 Para. 2 German Federal Law on Telecommunication, every citizen is entitled to be provided with an access line to the telecommunication network free of charge (once activated, the usual fees for telecommunication of course apply). Similar legislation exists for gas and electricity. In the sense of this instrument, legislation would have to be modified to charge users of networks the provision costs with network infrastructure, e.g. to small hamlets etc. To increase acceptance of this instrument, the advantages of reducing costs for the overall network and particularly for users in dense urban areas need to be communicated.
Assessment	
Relevance	
Status:	strong indirect relevance
Ranking:	2
Remark:	-
Acceptance	
Status:	municipal administration. Local economy, environmental NGOs, municipal residents, superordinate administrations
Ranking:	5
Implementation	
Status:	Instrument is implemented insofar as the length of infrastructure from property boundary to private house has to be financed by the house owner. Infrastructure on public space is still covered by municipal budgets or the entire user group of networks such as telecommunication, gas and electricity.
Ranking:	2

Remark:	-
Feasibility	
Status:	Legislation, Know-how, Political will
Ranking:	3
Remark:	As for budget, this instrument is rather budget-generating than budget-consuming
Effectiveness	
Status:	Direction of effect, type of effect, perpetuity
Ranking:	3
Remark:	Acceptability could be difficult as the provision of public infrastructure is considered to be self-evident by the population.