



4th Performance Report of Elected Dutch Municipalities of BNG Bank Sustainability Bond of November 2017

December 2021

HET pon | telos

4th Performance Report of Elected Dutch Municipalities of BNG Bank Sustainability Bond of November 2017

December 2021

Sanne Paenen, MSc.

Fenna Bijster, MSc.

Ruben Smeets, MSc.

Drs. John Dagevos

Colophon

Commissioned by
Bart van Dooren, Head of Capital Markets & Investor Relations
bart.vandooren@bngbank.nl

Willem Littel, Senior Manager Capital Markets and Investor Relations
willem.littel@bngbank.nl

René Goorden, Sector Specialist Housing,

Author(s)

Sanne Paenen, MSc.
Fenna Bijster MSc.
Ruben Smeets, MSc.
Drs. John Dagevos

T +31 13 535 15 35

Publication number

205245

Date

december 2021



© 2021 Het PON & Telos

The copyright of this publication is held by Het PON & Telos. Reproduction of texts in whole or in part is permitted, provided the source is acknowledged. Reproduction and publication in any form other than this report is only permitted with the written permission of Het PON & Telos. Although this publication has been compiled with the greatest possible care, Het PON & Telos cannot accept any liability for any errors it may contain.

More information

www.hetpon-telos.nl

Executive summary

November 9, 2017, BNG Bank launched its fourth Sustainability Bond, a new EUR 750 million, 7-year benchmark. The Framework document for the BNG Bank Sustainability Bond 2017 was provided to BNG Bank by Het PON & Telos on 6 October 2017, describing the selection process of best-in-class Dutch municipalities eligible for the bond.

An important quality indicator of the bond is the 'Use of proceeds reporting (UPR)'. BNG Bank intends to include in the UPR a yearly impact report, during the period 2018–2024, based on updated data for the sustainability scores of all Dutch municipalities. The update will give insight in the changes in sustainability scores of the group of 110 Elected Municipalities compared to the total group of 352 municipalities of the Netherlands. BNG Bank asked Het PON & Telos to provide the yearly impact reports for this bond, based on its yearly National Monitor Sustainable Municipalities. This performance report is the third impact report of the 2017 Sustainability Bond, covering the years 2017-2021.

The end result is that the Elected Municipalities continued to outperform the other group of municipalities with 2.0 percentage points (54.1 vs 52.1). Scores over the period 2017-2021 improved for all three capitals in a similar way. Largest improvements occurred this year for the economic capital (4.2-4.8 percentage points), while those for the ecological and socio-cultural capitals were relatively small.

Table S.1 Sustainability scores of 110 elected municipalities and of the total group of 352 Dutch municipalities in 2021 compared to 2017

Sustainability capital	Elected 2017	Total 2017	Elected 2021	Total 2021	Elected: Difference 2017-2021	Total: Difference 2017-2021
Total	51.6	49.3	54.1	52.1	2.5	2.8
Socio-cultural	52.1	49.4	53.6	51.5	1.6	1.2
Ecologic	52.6	51.1	54.5	52.7	1.8	1.6
Economic	50.1	47.4	54.3	52.2	4.2	4.8 ¹

Among Elected Municipalities 99% had similar or higher sustainability scores in 2021 compared to 2017. Scores of municipalities are rather dynamic from year to year, although major differences and advantages among municipalities are of a structural nature. In the reporting period Elected Municipalities Voerendaal followed by Woudenberg improved the most. Reductions in sustainability score among Elected Municipalities were only detected in Oostzaan.

The highest reduction was found in Hilvarenbeek, Ameland, Amsterdam and Utrecht. Table 5.4 shows that Westland and Lansingerland noted the largest increase in CO2 emissions.

¹ The calculated differences can be 0.1 percentage point higher or lower due to rounding during the calculation. This is the case for all calculated differences in the report.

Index

1	Introduction	3
2	Description of activities	4
2.1	Update of database	4
2.2	Assessment of performance of Elected Sustainable Municipalities	5
3	Outcome of updating exercise and comparison of 2021 and 2017 results	6
3.1	General characteristics of Elected Municipalities for the BNG Bank Sustainability Bond 2017	6
3.2	General performance of Elected Municipalities compared to total group of Dutch Municipalities	7
3.3	Changes in stock scores of Elected and the total group of municipalities	8
4	Elected Municipalities showing largest improvement or reduction in sustainability score in 2017-2021 depending on city typology	10
4.1	Elected agricultural municipalities	10
4.2	Elected center municipalities	11
4.3	Elected green municipalities	11
4.4	Elected growth municipalities	12
4.5	Elected historic municipalities	13
4.6	Elected mid-sized municipalities	13
4.7	Elected New Town municipalities	14
4.8	Elected old industrial municipalities	15
4.9	Elected residential municipalities	15
4.10	Elected shrink municipalities	16
4.11	Elected small municipalities	17
4.12	Elected tourist municipalities	17
4.13	Elected work municipalities	18
4.14	Elected 100,000plus municipalities	19
4.15	Summary of score changes of Elected Municipalities and their typology	19
5	Overall outcome for Elected Municipalities including their CO2-emission scores in 2017-2021	21
5.1	General outcome of improving and regressing Elected Municipalities	21
5.2	CO2-emission score performance of Elected Municipalities	22
6	Discussion and overview of outcome of assessment period 2017-2021	24
	Annex A: Overview of the differences in total sustainability scores in 2017 and 2021 for all 110 Elected Municipalities	25
	Annex B: Overview of the changes in CO2-emissions in 2018-2019 for all Elected Municipalities	28

1 Introduction

At the request of BNG Bank Het PON & Telos has provided a Framework document to BNG Bank² on 6 October 2017 that describes the sustainability criteria and selection process of best-in-class Dutch municipalities eligible for a BNG Bank Sustainability Bond 2017. Het PON & Telos developed this framework on its National Monitor of Sustainable Municipalities 2017, which was produced for the first time in 2014 on behalf of the Dutch Ministry for Infrastructure and Environment. November 9, 2017, BNG Bank launched its fourth Sustainability Bond, a new EUR 750 million, 7-year benchmark³. An important quality indicator of the bond is the 'Use of proceeds reporting (UPR)'. BNG Bank intends to include in the UPR a yearly impact report, during the period 2018 – 2024, based on updated data for the sustainability scores of all then 352 Dutch municipalities. The update will give insight in the changes in sustainability scores of the group of 110 Elected Municipalities. Besides this impact report, other aspects are relevant for UPR, such as types of investment projects, governance aspects in relation to the sustainability performance of municipalities, etc. These other aspects are not included in this assessment by Het PON & Telos, because such data are not yet available in sufficient detail. BNG Bank has asked Het PON & Telos to provide the yearly updating of the Database over the years 2018-2024 and report on the annual changes in scores of the Elected Municipalities. This is the third of such reports on the 2017 bond covering the period 2017-2021. It describes how the performance is assessed, the general outcome of the comparison over the years 2017-2021, including the impact on CO2-emissions.

²

<https://www.bngbank.com/Documents/Investors/Sustainability%20Framework%202117.pdf>

³ <https://www.bngbank.com/funding/sustainability-bond>

2 Description of activities

2.1 Update of database

The main activity to be able to produce an impact report for 2021 on the municipalities elected for the BNG Bank sustainable municipalities bond of 2017 was to update data for the sustainability assessment of Dutch municipalities used in the National Monitor Sustainable Municipalities 2017. The monitor is basically designed on the basis of the UN and EU concept of sustainable development, which implies that three dimensions of development are considered of equal importance: socio-cultural, ecological and economic. Each of these three ‘capitals’ are subdivided into themes, called ‘stocks’, which are operationalized by measuring ‘indicators’. Indicator values are assessed against sustainability goals, as described in more detail in the National Monitor report. These sustainability goals have been designed independently from the later agreed UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) or Global Goals in 2015. A detailed analysis of the comparability and differences by Het PON & Telos, as described in the National Monitor of 2017⁴, has shown that these goals have a wide similarity. It should be born in mind that the UN SDGs are mainly developed for nation states and also include global commons such as oceans which are not relevant at the municipal level. Moreover, SDGs have more a political than a scientific frame. The latter was more at the basis of the Triple P (People, Prosperity and Planet) approach used in the UN Brundtland Commission report of 1987 and used by Het PON & Telos in its National Monitor.

The updating activities include:

1. Motivation of new sustainability stocks, indicators and goals for indicators to meet new scientific insights and practical developments.
2. Generating most recent data for the indicators used in the National Monitor Sustainable Municipalities from open public sources or by acquiring them.
3. Harmonization with national monitoring activities by third parties on theme specific issues such as climate, mobility, health, etc.
4. Adjustment to the outcome of municipality rearrangements, which are continuously resulting in larger municipalities and a lower total number of municipalities.

The National Monitor Sustainable Municipalities 2017 discerned 14 city types. These 14 types have been used for the Framework of the BNG Bank Sustainability Bond of 2017 and are the basis for the performance report at hand.

⁴ Bastiaan Zoeteman, John Dagevos, Rens Mulder, Corné Wentink, Naomi Hoven, Christien Visser, 2017, Nationale Monitor Duurzame Gemeenten 2017, Document number 17.170, Telos, Tilburg University, 29 September; <http://www.telos.nl/publicaties/publicatiesrapporten/default.aspx#folder=894859>

2.2 Assessment of performance of Elected Sustainable Municipalities

Based on the updated Database, sustainability performance of 115 Elected Municipalities in 2017 will be evaluated and discussed. The group of Elected Municipalities, described in the Framework of the BNG Bank Sustainability Bond of October 2017, has been selected by identifying the 15 best scoring municipalities for each of 14 types of cities, such as ‘agricultural’, ‘old industrial’, ‘shrinking’, etc. municipalities. The 115 Elected Municipalities have been selected out of the total number of 388 municipalities in the Netherlands in 2017. Since 2017, the number of municipalities decreased due to rearrangements among the municipalities. There are only 352 municipalities left in 2021. This influenced the selection of 115 municipalities for the bond of 2017 as well. The municipalities of Schinnen, Winsum, Strijen, Geldermalsen, and Zuidhorn are no longer independent entities. They are therefore no longer taken in consideration in this performance report. That means that the group of elected municipalities now consists of 110 municipalities.

Furthermore, the number of indicators was partially expanded due to new possibilities but also reduced due to lack of continued data collection, resulting in 137 indicators now compared to 140 last year and 109 in 2017. Such changes had to be included in the comparison between 2021 and 2017. Where needed new data for 2017 were separately collected and calculated. The reader is referred to Annex 1 of the National Monitor 2017 report and to the Sustainability bonds Method report 2021⁵, for the details of the amendments made in the calculation of the sustainability scores and how comparability between the years 2021 and 2017 was ascertained.

This assessment includes:

1. A comparison of sustainability scores of Elected Municipalities with the total group of Dutch municipalities for 2021 and 2017.
2. A comparison of sustainability scores for Elected Municipalities between 2021 and 2017, including:
 - a. overall scores
 - b. capital scores, and a selection of:
 - c. stock scores and where useful
 - d. indicator scores.
3. A list of Elected Municipalities, which show the largest improvement or reduction in overall score and an indication of the main causes for these results.

In the next chapters, the outcome of these activities is presented. Finally, the overall changes observed for reporting period 2017-2021 will be discussed.

⁵ www.hetpon-telos.nl/methodreport2021

3 Outcome of updating exercise and comparison of 2021 and 2017 results

In November 2021, Het PON & Telos has completed collecting the data for the Sustainability bond 2021. The major outcome is shown in table 3.1:

Table 3.1 Sustainability performance of the total group of Dutch municipalities in 2017-2021

Sustainability capital	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Total	49.34	50.10	50.94	51.42	52.14
Socio-cultural	49.45	50.26	51.02	51.54	51.51
Ecological	51.14	51.51	51.22	51.43	52.72
Economic	47.44	48.53	50.57	51.29	52.20

Last year the average overall sustainability score improved from 51.24 till 52.14%. The ecological capital improved most the past year from 51.41 till 52.72. The socio-cultural capital decreased from 51.54 to 51.51% and the economic capital increased from 51.29 till 52.20. These data show that the economic recession, still visible in early years, is clearly over. Due to the corona crisis the improvement is smaller than in past years.

3.1 General characteristics of Elected Municipalities for the BNG Bank Sustainability Bond 2017

The group of Elected Municipalities represents the sum of highest scoring municipalities in each of the 14 types of municipalities considered. They are therefore not a representative sample of the total group of Dutch municipalities. This is illustrated in table 3.2, using municipality size as criterion.

Table 3.2 Distribution of municipality sizes in the Netherlands and in the group of Elected

Municipality size (number of inhabitants)	Total number of municipalities in the Netherlands	Total number of municipalities in elected group
Less than 50,000	264 (75%)	79 (71.8%)
50,000-100,000	56 (15.9%)	16 (14.5%)
More than 100,000	32 (9.1%)	15 (13.6%)

As table 3.2 shows, the size distribution of the elected group of municipalities differs from the average distribution in the country. The small municipalities are underrepresented and the large municipalities are overrepresented in de elected group. In case the outcome for the elected group is compared with the total group of municipalities this has to be taken into account.

3.2 General performance of Elected Municipalities compared to total group of Dutch Municipalities

BNG Bank has chosen to allocate the proceeds of the Sustainability Bond to the best performing municipalities in their class as instrument for several reasons.

These include:

- Highlighting the importance of sustainable development to municipalities,
- Enabling investors that want to see their capital used for investments in municipalities that have experience in improving sustainability, and
- Increasing awareness of successful strategies used in high scoring municipalities, etc.

It would be welcome, against this background, if the comparison between performance of the group of Elected Municipalities and the total group of Dutch municipalities would show that the Elected Municipalities outperform the others over the years. Yet, it may not be as simple as that. Best performing municipalities may not have as much opportunities left for further improvement as low performing municipalities, which can more easily improve their performance.

Table 3.3 Sustainability performance of Elected Municipalities and of the total group of Dutch municipalities in 2017 compared to 2021 (percentage points)

Sustainability capital	Elected 2017	Total 2017	Elected 2021	Total 2021	Elected: Difference 2017-2021	Total: Difference 2017-2021
Total	51.6	49.3	54.1	52.1	2.5	2.8
Socio-cultural	52.1	49.4	53.6	51.5	1.6	1.2
Ecological	52.6	51.1	54.5	52.7	1.8	1.6
Economic	50.1	47.4	54.3	52.2	4.2	4.8

Table 3.3 gives a summary of the overall differences between 2017 and 2021 for the total group of Dutch municipalities and the group of Elected Municipalities. The end result is that the Elected Municipalities continued to outperform the other group of municipalities with 2.0 percentage points (54.1 vs 52.1). Scores over the period 2017-2021 improved for all three capitals in a similar way. Largest improvements occurred this year for the economic capital (4.2-4.8 percentage points), while those for the ecological and socio-cultural capitals were relatively small.

In the next paragraph, the more detailed stock scores are considered.

3.3 Changes in stock scores of Elected and the total group of municipalities

A closer look at the level of stocks, see table 3.4, shows that differences between the years show a similar pattern in both groups of municipalities.

Table 3.4 Differences in sustainability scores (%points) of stocks between 2017 and 2021 for the group of elected Municipalities and all Dutch municipalities

Sustainability stock	Difference 2017-2021 of 110 Elected Municipalities	Difference 2017-2021 of all 352 municipalities
Socio-cultural		
Arts & culture	-0.81	-0.11
Economic participation	11.95	12.89
Education	0.10	0.12
Health	-0.21	0.15
Housing	3.50	3.20
Lifestyle and Health	-0.53	1.88
Political Participation	5.95	6.38
Residential environment	-2.72	-2.19
Safety	3.24	3.30
Social participation	-4.92	-4.95
Ecological		
Air	3.37	3.01
Annoyance and External safety	-0.51	-0.38
Energy	6.50	6.64
Nature & landscape	0.00	0.00
Soil	-0.35	-1.34
Resources & waste	3.44	3.20
Water	0.27	-0.07
Economic		
Competitiveness	5.67	6.39
Infrastructure & mobility	5.99	5.80
Knowledge	4.62	5.45
Labor	6.92	7.25
Spatial location conditions	-2.04	-1.09

Socio-cultural stocks

Among socio-cultural stocks, differences between both groups of municipalities were small. Most striking is the improvement in 'Economic Participation', 'housing', 'safety' and 'Political Participation' in the both groups of municipalities. The decline of 'Health' and 'Health and Lifestyle' in the elected group is not what can be expected in a thriving time.

Ecological stocks

Also here, the group of Elected Municipalities shows a similar pattern as the total group of municipalities, with biggest improvements over the period 2017-2021 for the stocks of 'Energy' and 'Resources and Waste'. These are the two priorities of the national government: climate change and circular economy. The decline of 'Soil' in both groups is a point of interest.

Economic stocks

Also here, the group of Elected Municipalities shows a similar pattern as the total group of municipalities, with biggest improvements over the period 2017-2021 for the stock of 'labor'.

4 Elected Municipalities showing largest improvement or reduction in sustainability score in 2017-2021 depending on city typology

In this chapter, a closer examination of the improvements or reductions in total sustainability score of individual Elected Municipalities will be discussed. The assessment will be presented for each of the 14 types of municipalities that are discerned in the Framework for the BNG Bank Sustainability Bond of 2017: agricultural-, center-, green-, growth-, historic-, old industrial-, mid-sized-, New Town-, shrink-, small, residential, tourist, work- and 100,000plus municipalities. The list of best-in-class municipalities in each type of municipalities will be presented as described in the framework document. The scores for 2017 have in this assessment been corrected for additional indicators used in 2021 to make them comparable with the 2021 data. The results are therefore sometimes differing from those given in the 2017 Framework document.

4.1 Elected agricultural municipalities

Table 4.1 presents the 15 best-in-class municipalities of the agricultural type, their reconstructed 2017 scores and the 2021 scores for total sustainability. All municipalities perform better over the last 4 years. Overall, the score of the group of elected agricultural municipalities improved 2.7 percentage points since 2017.

Table 4.1 Improvements and reductions in total sustainability scores of elected agricultural municipalities over 2017-2021

Agricultural municipality	Sustainability score 2017	Sustainability score 2021	Difference
Dinkelland	53.8	58.3	4.5
Aalten	50.7	54.9	4.2
Montfoort	49.6	53.4	3.8
Dalfsen	54.1	57.2	3.1
Eijsden-Margraten	50.1	53.2	3.1
Bronckhorst	53.3	56.4	3.1
Voorst	53.1	56.1	3.0
Oudewater	48.9	51.7	2.8
Wierden	52.7	55.2	2.5
Bunnik	51.4	53.8	2.4
Olst-Wijhe	51.5	53.4	1.9
Midden-Delfland	55.9	57.7	1.8
Boekel	50.3	52.1	1.8

Renswoude	51.4	52.8	1.4
Zoeterwoude	52.6	53.3	0.7
Average	52.0	54.6	2.7

4.2 Elected center municipalities

As table 4.2 shows, all 15 elected municipalities improved their total sustainability score over the last years. Most improved are Huizen and Eindhoven.

Table 4.2 Improvements in total sustainability scores of elected center municipalities over 2017-2021

Center municipality	Sustainability score 2017	Sustainability score 2021	Difference
Huizen	50.6	54.7	4.1
Eindhoven	50.5	54.2	3.7
Castricum	52.5	55.7	3.2
Apeldoorn	51.8	54.9	3.1
Westland	48.8	51.7	2.9
Middelburg	48.8	51.4	2.6
Haarlem	50.1	52.7	2.6
Ede	51.2	53.7	2.5
Hilversum	50.7	53.2	2.5
Leiden	51.1	53.0	1.9
Delft	53.2	55.0	1.8
Groningen	53.0	54.8	1.8
Utrecht	53.3	55.0	1.7
Katwijk	52.2	53.7	1.5
Gooise Meren	52.2	53.3	1.1
Average	51.3	53.8	2.5

4.3 Elected green municipalities

Elected green municipalities improved on average 2.7 percentage points last four years. Heeze-Leende improved most with 4.6 percentage points, followed by Baarn.

Table 4.3 Improvements and reductions in total sustainability scores of elected green municipalities over 2017-2021

Green municipality	Sustainability score 2017	Sustainability score 2021	Difference
Heeze-Leende	52.9	57.5	4.6
Baarn	49.3	53.9	4.6
Leusden	52.8	57.3	4.5
Utrechtse Heuvelrug	50.1	54.5	4.4
Mook en Middelaar	52.4	56.4	4.0
Noordwijk	52.6	56.1	3.5
Bloemendaal	54.4	57.6	3.2
Laren	49.1	52.1	3.0
Bergen	51.3	53.8	2.5
Nunspeet	54.2	56.0	1.8
Rozendaal	51.7	53.4	1.7
Ermelo	53.9	55.4	1.5
Wassenaar	53.2	54.2	1.0
Waalre	54.9	55.7	0.8
Putten	52.9	53.0	0.1
Average	52.4	55.1	2.7

4.4 Elected growth municipalities

The elected growth municipalities showed an improvement of 2.1 percentage points over the last years. All municipalities improved their score, except from Kapelle which remained the same score. Highest improvement was found at Woudenberg.

Table 4.4 Improvements and reductions in total sustainability scores of elected growth municipalities over 2017-2021

Growth municipality	Sustainability score 2017	Sustainability score 2021	Difference
Woudenberg	51.1	56.1	5.0
Oegstgeest	53.6	56.8	3.2
Dalfsen	54.1	57.2	3.1
Wageningen	54.1	56.6	2.5
Bunnik	51.4	53.8	2.4
Scherpenzeel	49.7	52.1	2.4
Nijkerk	52.3	54.6	2.3
Voorschoten	53.5	55.7	2.2
Houten	54.1	56.3	2.2
Blaricum	53.5	55.5	2.0
Midden-Delfland	55.9	57.7	1.8
Renswoude	51.4	52.8	1.4

Kampen	52.4	53.7	1.3
Putten	52.9	53.0	0.1
Kapelle	51.0	51.0	0.0
Average	52.7	54.9	2.1

4.5 Elected historic municipalities

Schiermonnikoog improved their sustainability scores the most since 2017, with 3.3 percentage points. The average score shows an improvement of 2.3 percentage points, as presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 Improvements and reductions in total sustainability scores of elected historic municipalities over 2017-2021

Historic municipality	Sustainability score 2017	Sustainability score 2021	Difference
Schiermonnikoog	51.1	54.4	3.3
Eijsden-Margraten	50.1	53.2	3.1
Bronckhorst	53.3	56.4	3.1
Ameland	52.8	55.9	3.1
Oudewater	48.9	51.7	2.8
Lopik	50.9	53.7	2.8
Weesp	49.6	52.3	2.7
Middelburg	48.8	51.4	2.6
Staphorst	54.2	56.6	2.4
Delft	53.2	55.0	1.8
Utrecht	53.3	55.0	1.7
Kampen	52.4	53.7	1.3
Waterland	53.1	54.4	1.3
Vlieland	54.6	54.6	0.0
Average	51.9	54.2	2.3

4.6 Elected mid-sized municipalities

Table 4.6 shows that mid-sized municipalities improved their sustainability score on average with 2.1 percentage points the last four years. Krimpenwaard improved its score most.

Table 4.6 Improvements and reductions in total sustainability scores of elected mid-sized municipalities over 2017-2021

Mid-sized municipality	Sustainability score 2017	Sustainability score 2021	Difference
Krimpenerwaard	51.5	55.0	3.5
Veenendaal	48.2	51.5	3.3
Zeist	48.9	51.7	2.8
Meerijstad	49.4	52.2	2.8
Hilversum	50.7	53.2	2.5
Woerden	53.0	55.4	2.4
Stichtse Vecht	49.5	51.9	2.4
Pijnacker-Nootdorp	51.7	53.9	2.2
Lansingerland	48.9	50.7	1.8
Katwijk	52.2	53.7	1.5
Leidschendam-Voorburg	49.6	51.0	1.4
Kampen	52.4	53.7	1.3
Amstelveen	53.5	54.8	1.3
Gooise Meren	52.2	53.3	1.1
Barneveld	52.9	53.4	0.5
Average	51.0	53.0	2.1

4.7 Elected New Town municipalities

Elected New Town municipalities improved their score on average with 2.4 percentage points (see table 4.7). Woudenberg was on top of the list of improvement.

Table 4.7 Improvements and reductions in total sustainability scores of elected New Town municipalities over 2017-2021

New Town municipality	Sustainability score 2017	Sustainability score 2021	Difference
Woudenberg	51.1	56.1	5.0
Teylingen	52.1	56.0	3.9
Best	49.7	53.6	3.9
Oegstgeest	53.6	56.8	3.2
Nuenen, Gerwen en Nederwetten	52.5	55.2	2.7
Uitgeest	47.3	49.9	2.6
Langedijk	51.3	53.8	2.5
Nijkerk	52.3	54.6	2.3
Wijk bij Duurstede	51.8	54.0	2.2
Houten	54.1	56.3	2.2
Midden-Delfland	55.9	57.7	1.8

Boekel	50.3	52.1	1.8
Renswoude	51.4	52.8	1.4
Heumen	53.6	54.7	1.1
Oostzaan	51.6	51.0	-0.6
Average	51.9	54.3	2.4

4.8 Elected old industrial municipalities

Elected old industrial municipalities scored on average 2.4 percentage points higher over the reporting period, as shown in Table 4.8. Voerendaal has improved the most in the last four years.

Table 4.8 Improvements and reductions in total sustainability scores of elected old industrial municipalities over 2017-2021

Old industrial municipality	Sustainability score 2017	Sustainability score 2021	Difference
Voerendaal	47.7	53.0	5.3
Best	49.7	53.6	3.9
Hatterm	51.3	55.1	3.8
Bladel	51.8	55.5	3.7
Culemborg	51.1	54.6	3.5
Nuenen, Gerwen en Nederwetten	52.5	55.2	2.7
Weesp	49.6	52.3	2.7
Hellendoorn	52.2	54.8	2.6
Wierden	52.7	55.2	2.5
Rijssen-Holten	52.4	54.3	1.9
Haaksbergen	54.0	55.8	1.8
Reusel-De Mierden	53.2	54.2	1.0
Waalre	54.9	55.7	0.8
Putten	52.9	53.0	0.1
Oostzaan	51.6	51.0	-0.6
Average	51.8	54.2	2.4

4.9 Elected residential municipalities

Residential municipalities are a well performing elected group of municipalities when comparing the scores in 2017 with those of 2021, resulting in an average increased score of 2.3 percentage points (Table 4.9).

Table 4.9 Improvements and reductions in total sustainability scores of elected old industrial municipalities over 2017-2021

Residential municipality	Sustainability score 2017	Sustainability score 2021	Difference
Bloemendaal	54.4	57.6	3.2
Castricum	52.5	55.7	3.2
Buren	49.6	52.8	3.2
Eijsden-Margraten	50.1	53.2	3.1
Sint-Michielsgestel	52.2	55.2	3.0
Uitgeest	47.3	49.9	2.6
Langedijk	51.3	53.8	2.5
Wierden	52.7	55.2	2.5
Voorschoten	53.5	55.7	2.2
Wijk bij Duurstede	51.8	54.0	2.2
Rozendaal	51.7	53.4	1.7
Waterland	53.1	54.4	1.3
Heumen	53.6	54.7	1.1
Waalre	54.9	55.7	0.8
Average	52.1	54.4	2.3

4.10 Elected shrink municipalities

As far as elected shrink municipalities are concerned, it is found that they improved 3.0 percentage points on average the last four years (see Table 4.10). Vlieland is the only one who does not show an improvement.

Table 4.10 Improvements and reductions in total sustainability scores of elected shrink municipalities over 2017-2021

Shrink municipality	Sustainability score 2017	Sustainability score 2021	Difference
Voerendaal	47.7	53.0	5.3
Mook en Middelaar	52.4	56.4	4.0
Valkenburg aan de Geul	48.8	52.7	3.9
Berkelland	51.6	55.5	3.9
Grave	49.9	53.5	3.6
Gulpen-Wittem	47.5	50.7	3.2
Bronckhorst	53.3	56.4	3.1
Leudal	48.4	51.2	2.8
Bergen	51.3	53.8	2.5
Meerssen	49	50.8	1.8
Dantumadiel	50	51.8	1.8
Vlieland	54.6	54.6	0.0
Average	50.4	53.4	3.0

4.11 Elected small municipalities

The group of small municipalities has improved its score in 2021 by 2.7 percentage points compared to 2017. Woudenberg is here on top of the list of improvement.

Table 4.11 Improvements and reductions in total sustainability scores of elected old industrial municipalities over 2017-2021

Small municipality	Sustainability score 2017	Sustainability score 2021	Difference
Woudenberg	51.1	56.1	5.0
Hattem	51.3	55.1	3.8
Montfoort	49.6	53.4	3.8
Bloemendaal	54.4	57.6	3.2
Oegstgeest	53.6	56.8	3.2
Dalfsen	54.1	57.2	3.1
Voorst	53.1	56.1	3.0
Veere	52.4	55.1	2.7
Wageningen	54.1	56.6	2.5
Bunnik	51.4	53.8	2.4
Blaricum	53.5	55.5	2.0
Midden-Delfland	55.9	57.7	1.8
Rozendaal	51.7	53.4	1.7
Vught	53.2	54.9	1.7
Kapelle	51.0	51.0	0.0
Average	52.7	55.4	2.7

4.12 Elected tourist municipalities

The sustainability score of the elected tourist type of municipalities has improved on average 2.4 percentage point, Oostzaan has decreased by 0.6 percentage point as can be seen in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12 Improvements and reductions in total sustainability scores of elected tourist municipalities over 2017-2021

Tourist municipality	Sustainability score 2017	Sustainability score 2021	Difference
Voerendaal	47.7	53.0	5.3
Mook en Middelaar	52.4	56.4	4.0
Noordwijk	52.6	56.1	3.5
Schiermonnikoog	51.1	54.4	3.3
Bloemendaal	54.4	57.6	3.2

Eijsden-Margraten	50.1	53.2	3.1
Ameland	52.8	55.9	3.1
Veere	52.4	55.1	2.7
Bergen	51.3	53.8	2.5
Hilvarenbeek	53.8	56.0	2.2
Terschelling	52.7	54.7	2.0
Waterland	53.1	54.4	1.3
Wassenaar	53.2	54.2	1.0
Vlieland	54.6	54.6	0.0
Oostzaan	51.6	51.0	-0.6
Average	52.3	54.7	2.4

4.13 Elected work municipalities

Elected work municipalities performed on average well the past years (plus 2.4 percentage point), as illustrated in table 4.13. All municipalities improved its scores. Best improved its score the most (3.9 percentage points)

Table 4.13 Improvements and reductions in total sustainability scores of elected work municipalities over 2017-2021

Work municipality	Sustainability score 2017	Sustainability score 2021	Difference
Best	49.7	53.6	3.9
Amersfoort	51.5	55.1	3.6
Noordwijk	52.6	56.1	3.5
Apeldoorn	51.8	54.9	3.1
Westland	48.8	51.7	2.9
Zeist	48.9	51.7	2.8
Wageningen	54.1	56.6	2.5
Goes	50.5	52.8	2.3
Son en Breugel	50.8	52.8	2.0
Leiden	51.1	53.0	1.9
Utrecht	53.3	55.0	1.7
Ermelo	53.9	55.4	1.5
Amstelveen	53.5	54.8	1.3
Barneveld	52.9	53.4	0.5
Average	51.7	54.1	2.4

4.14 Elected 100,000plus municipalities

The, for Dutch dimensions, relative large elected 100,000plus cities show on average a high improvement (2.5 percentage points) in score from 2017 to 2021. Center- and work type of municipalities often show a similar development as the 100,000plus cities. One large municipalities showed a smaller improvement in sustainability score since 2017; Amsterdam. Zwolle improved most.

Table 4.14 Improvements and reductions in total sustainability scores of elected 100,000plus over 2017-2021

100,000plus municipality	Sustainability score 2017	Sustainability score 2021	Difference
Zwolle	52.2	56.4	4.2
Eindhoven	50.5	54.2	3.7
Amersfoort	51.5	55.1	3.6
Apeldoorn	51.8	54.9	3.1
Westland	48.8	51.7	2.9
Nijmegen	52.2	55.0	2.8
Haarlem	50.1	52.7	2.6
Arnhem	50.2	52.8	2.6
Ede	51.2	53.7	2.5
Leiden	51.1	53.0	1.9
Delft	53.2	55.0	1.8
Groningen	53.0	54.8	1.8
Utrecht	53.3	55.0	1.7
Breda	51.0	52.1	1.1
Amsterdam	50.3	51.1	0.8
Average	51.4	53.8	2.5

4.15 Summary of score changes of Elected Municipalities and their typology

Table 4.15 gives an overview of the average performance of the 14 groups of municipalities. Highest improvements in percentage points were found in shrink municipalities. Highest sustainability scores were measured in small municipalities (55.4 percentage points) and lowest in mid-sized municipalities (53.0 percentage points).

Table 4.15 Changes in total sustainability scores of 14 types of elected municipalities over 2017-2021

Type of municipality	Sustainability score 2017	Sustainability score 2021	Difference
Small municipalities	52.7	55.4	2.7
Mid-sized municipalities	51.0	53.0	2.1
100.000plus municipality	51.4	53.8	2.5
Agricultural municipality	52.0	54.6	2.7
Center municipality	51.3	53.8	2.5
Former industrial municipality	51.8	54.2	2.4
Green municipality	52.4	55.1	2.7
Growth municipalities	52.7	54.9	2.1
Historic municipalities	51.9	54.2	2.3
New Town municipality	51.9	54.3	2.4
Residential municipalities	52.1	54.4	2.3
Shrink municipality	50.4	53.4	3.0
Touristic municipalities	52.3	54.7	2.4
Work municipality	51.7	54.1	2.4

5 Overall outcome for Elected Municipalities including their CO2-emission scores in 2017–2021

This chapter presents a final overview of the performance of the Elected Municipalities, independent from their typology. The green bonds were started by the World Bank to help promote the transition to a low carbon economy, in order to slow down further climate change. Considering this background, this chapter includes a description of the performance of the Elected Municipalities in relation to CO2-emissions. Although they are included as indicator in the ecological capital, this aspect will be highlighted as an element of special interest, being often the key factor for green bond and sustainability bond investors.

5.1 General outcome of improving and regressing Elected Municipalities

Among Elected Municipalities 99% had similar or higher sustainability scores in 2021 compared to 2017 (see also Annex A).

Tables 5.1 and 5.2 show Elected Municipalities which changed their sustainability score most or least favorably. The best performing municipality in this respect among Elected Municipalities is Voerendaal followed by Woudenberg.

Table 5.1 Ten Elected Municipalities improving sustainability score most in the period 2017–2021

Elected municipality	Typology 2017	Total score 2017	Total score 2021	Difference
Voerendaal	Small, Agricultural, Former industrial, Residential, Shrink, Tourist	47.7	53.0	5.3
Woudenberg	Small, Growth, New town	51.1	56.1	5.0
Baarn	Small, Green	49.3	53.9	4.6
Heeze-Leende	Small, Green	52.9	57.5	4.6
Leusden	Small, Green	52.8	57.3	4.5
Dinkelland	Small, Agricultural	53.8	58.3	4.5
Utrechtse Heuvelrug	Small, Green	50.1	54.5	4.4
Zwolle	Large, Centre, Growth, New town, Work	52.2	56.4	4.2
Aalten	Small, Agricultural	50.7	54.9	4.2
Huizen	Small, Centre, Residential	50.6	54.7	4.1

Table 5.2 Ten Elected Municipalities with largest declining sustainability score in the period 2017-2021

Municipality	Typology 2017	Total score 2017	Total score 2021	Difference
Oostzaan	Small, Former industrial, New town, Tourist	51.6	51.0	-0.6
Kapelle	Small, Growth	51.0	51.0	0.0
Vlieland	Small, Historic, Shrink, Tourist	54.6	54.6	0.0
Putten	Small, Former industrial, Green, Growth	52.9	53.0	0.1
Barneveld	Medium, Green, Growth, New town, Work	52.9	53.4	0.5
Zoeterwoude	Small, Agricultural	52.6	53.3	0.7
Waalre	Small, Former industrial, Green, Residential	54.9	55.7	0.8
Amsterdam	Large, Centre, Growth, Historic, Tourist, Work	50.3	51.1	0.8
Reusel-De Mierden	Small, Former industrial, Residential	53.2	54.2	1.0
Wassenaar	Small, Green, Tourist	53.2	54.2	1.0

Reductions in sustainability score among Elected Municipalities were only detected in Oostzaan.

5.2 CO₂-emission score performance of Elected Municipalities

Finally, the outcome of the CO₂-emission assessment of Elected Municipalities will be discussed. This is one of the key transitions to which national governments have committed themselves in the framework of the UN Climate Change Convention and particularly since the 2015 Paris Agreement. But also individual municipalities have similar commitments, e.g. in the framework of the Covenant of Mayors to combat climate change. In the Netherlands the Association of Dutch Municipalities (VNG) has signed an agreement in 2013 with the national government and other parties to substantially reduce CO₂-emissions the coming years. In 2019, the climate agreement has been signed by the national government to ascertain that the ambitious goals are being reached.

Data on CO₂ emissions are available for each municipality via the web-portal of the Dutch Emissions Authority. They calculate the CO₂ emissions every five years, including the most recent two years. At this moment, data are available for 1990-2015 in a five-year interval, supplemented with the two most recent years in their database (2018 and 2019). In this impact report, the reduction over the two most recent years has been used. This impact report uses a different approach than

applied in the other impact reports for earlier bonds by showing the direct emission data instead of calculated sustainability score for CO2 emissions, to give a more detailed picture.

A closer look at the CO2 reductions shows that the group of Elected Municipalities realized a reduction in CO2 emissions; the CO2 emissions decreased with 4% from 2018-2019. The outcome of this analysis is shown in table 5.3.

Table 5.3 CO2 reductions in different time periods of the Elected Municipalities and the total group of municipalities

Considered group of municipalities	1990-2019	2010-2019	2018-2019
Elected (110)	-19.1%	-22.8%	-4.0%
Others	6.8%	-10.2%	-2.8%
Total (352)	0.7%	-12.8%	-3.1%

The highest reduction was found in Hilvarenbeek, Ameland, Amsterdam and Utrecht. Table 5.4 shows that Westland and Lansingerland noted the largest increase in CO2 emissions. CO2 emission changes for all municipalities over the last year are given in Annex B.

Table 5.4 Ten Elected Municipalities with most and least reduction in CO2-emissions over 2017-2018

Elected Municipality	Emission change over measuring years 2018-2019	Elected municipality	Emission change over measuring years 2018-2019
Hilvarenbeek	-13.2	Westland	6.9
Ameland	-11.9	Lansingerland	6.6
Amsterdam	-9.8	Pijnacker-Nootdorp	5.2
Utrecht (gemeente)	-7.4	Zoeterwoude	4.1
Montfoort	-7.0	Midden-Delfland	2.7
Meerijstad	-6.7	Putten	0.8
Reusel-De Mierden	-6.3	Kapelle	0.7
Middelburg (Z.)	-6.2	Woerden	0.4
Groningen (gemeente)	-5.9	Katwijk	0.3
Nunspeet	-5.7	Leiden	0.1

6 Discussion and overview of outcome of assessment period 2017-2021

The end result is that the Elected Municipalities continued to outperform the other group of municipalities with 2.0 percentage points (54.1 vs 52.1). Scores over the period 2017-2021 improved for all three capitals in a similar way. Largest improvements occurred this year for the economic capital (4.2-4.8 percentage points), while those for the ecological and socio-cultural capitals were relatively small.

Among Elected Municipalities 99% had similar or higher sustainability scores in 2021 compared to 2017.

Scores of municipalities are rather dynamic from year to year, although major differences and advantages among municipalities are of a structural nature. In the reporting period Elected Municipalities Voerendaal followed by Woudenberg improved the most. Reductions in sustainability score among Elected Municipalities were only detected in Oostzaan.

The highest reduction was found in Hilvarenbeek, Ameland, Amsterdam and Utrecht. Table 5.4 shows that Westland and Lansingerland noted the largest increase in CO2 emissions.

It is not always the best scoring municipality in a certain class that shows the biggest improvement of its score in the next year. The advantage of a high score on sustainability may turn into a (temporary) disadvantage under certain circumstances. Yet, the differences in position on a scoring list and the magnitude of improvement or fallback from year to year provide relevant incentives for municipalities to better understand their position, learn from each other, reduce vulnerabilities and develop new approaches to existing and new challenges. Impact reporting of Sustainability Bonds stimulates elected and other municipalities to invest proceeds from the bonds and other resources in most effective operational and innovative structural activities to improve sustainability.

Annex A: Overview of the differences in total sustainability scores in 2017 and 2021 for all 110 Elected Municipalities

Municipality	Total sustainability score 2017	Total sustainability score 2021	Difference 2017-2021
Voerendaal	47.7	53.0	5.3
Woudenberg	51.1	56.1	5.0
Baarn	49.3	53.9	4.6
Heeze-Leende	52.9	57.5	4.6
Leusden	52.8	57.3	4.5
Dinkelland	53.8	58.3	4.5
Utrechtse Heuvelrug	50.1	54.5	4.4
Zwolle	52.2	56.4	4.2
Aalten	50.7	54.9	4.2
Huizen	50.6	54.7	4.1
Mook en Middelaar	52.4	56.4	4.0
Valkenburg aan de Geul	48.8	52.7	3.9
Best	49.7	53.6	3.9
Teylingen	52.1	56.0	3.9
Berkelland	51.6	55.5	3.9
Hatterm	51.3	55.1	3.8
Montfoort	49.6	53.4	3.8
Eindhoven	50.5	54.2	3.7
Bladel	51.8	55.5	3.7
Amersfoort	51.5	55.1	3.6
Grave	49.9	53.5	3.6
Culemborg	51.1	54.6	3.5
Noordwijk	52.6	56.1	3.5
Krimpenerwaard	51.5	55.0	3.5
Schiermonnikoog	51.1	54.4	3.3
Veenendaal	48.2	51.5	3.3
Bloemendaal	54.4	57.6	3.2
Castricum	52.5	55.7	3.2
Gulpen-Wittem	47.5	50.7	3.2
Buren	49.6	52.8	3.2
Oegstgeest	53.6	56.8	3.2
Ameland	52.8	55.9	3.1
Dalfsen	54.1	57.2	3.1
Apeldoorn	51.8	54.9	3.1
Bronckhorst	53.3	56.4	3.1
Eijsden-Margraten	50.1	53.2	3.1

Voorst	53.1	56.1	3.0
Laren (NH.)	49.1	52.1	3.0
Sint-Michielsgestel	52.2	55.2	3.0
Westland	48.8	51.7	2.9
Lopik	50.9	53.7	2.8
Zeist	48.9	51.7	2.8
Oudewater	48.9	51.7	2.8
Leudal	48.4	51.2	2.8
Meerijstad	49.4	52.2	2.8
Nijmegen	52.2	55.0	2.8
Veere	52.4	55.1	2.7
Nuenen, Gerwen en Nederwetten	52.5	55.2	2.7
Weesp	49.6	52.3	2.7
Haarlem	50.1	52.7	2.6
Uitgeest	47.3	49.9	2.6
Middelburg (Z.)	48.8	51.4	2.6
Hellendoorn	52.2	54.8	2.6
Arnhem	50.2	52.8	2.6
Wierden	52.7	55.2	2.5
Ede	51.2	53.7	2.5
Wageningen	54.1	56.6	2.5
Bergen (NH.)	51.3	53.8	2.5
Hilversum	50.7	53.2	2.5
Langedijk	51.3	53.8	2.5
Staphorst	54.2	56.6	2.4
Scherpenzeel	49.7	52.1	2.4
Bunnik	51.4	53.8	2.4
Woerden	53.0	55.4	2.4
Stichtse Vecht	49.5	51.9	2.4
Nijkerk	52.3	54.6	2.3
Goes	50.5	52.8	2.3
Wijk bij Duurstede	51.8	54.0	2.2
Voorschoten	53.5	55.7	2.2
Hilvarenbeek	53.8	56.0	2.2
Houten	54.1	56.3	2.2
Pijnacker-Nootdorp	51.7	53.9	2.2
Terschelling	52.7	54.7	2.0
Blaricum	53.5	55.5	2.0
Son en Breugel	50.8	52.8	2.0
Leiden	51.1	53.0	1.9
Rijssen-Holten	52.4	54.3	1.9
Olst-Wijhe	51.5	53.4	1.9

Boekel	50.3	52.1	1.8
Lansingerland	48.9	50.7	1.8
Midden-Delfland	55.9	57.7	1.8
Groningen (gemeente)	53.0	54.8	1.8
Haaksbergen	54.0	55.8	1.8
Nunspeet	54.2	56.0	1.8
Delft	53.2	55.0	1.8
Meerssen	49.0	50.8	1.8
Dantumadiel	50.0	51.8	1.8
Utrecht (gemeente)	53.3	55.0	1.7
Rozendaal	51.7	53.4	1.7
Vught	53.2	54.9	1.7
Ermelo	53.9	55.4	1.5
Katwijk	52.2	53.7	1.5
Renswoude	51.4	52.8	1.4
Leidschendam- Voorburg	49.6	51.0	1.4
Kampen	52.4	53.7	1.3
Amstelveen	53.5	54.8	1.3
Waterland	53.1	54.4	1.3
Heumen	53.6	54.7	1.1
Breda	51.0	52.1	1.1
Gooise Meren	52.2	53.3	1.1
Wassenaar	53.2	54.2	1.0
Reusel-De Mierden	53.2	54.2	1.0
Amsterdam	50.3	51.1	0.8
Waalre	54.9	55.7	0.8
Zoeterwoude	52.6	53.3	0.7
Barneveld	52.9	53.4	0.5
Putten	52.9	53.0	0.1
Vlieland	54.6	54.6	0.0
Kapelle	51.0	51.0	0.0
Oostzaan	51.6	51.0	-0.6

Annex B: Overview of the changes in CO2-emissions in 2018-2019 for all Elected Municipalities

Elected municipality	Typology	% Difference 2018-2019
Hilvarenbeek	Small, Tourist	-13.2
Ameland	Small, Historic, Tourist	-11.9
Amsterdam	Large, Centre, Growth, Historic, Tourist, Work	-9.8
Utrecht (gemeente)	Large, Centre, Growth, Historic, Tourist, Work	-7.4
Montfoort	Small, Agricultural	-7.0
Meerijstad	Medium, Work	-6.7
Reusel-De Mierden	Small, Former industrial, Residential	-6.3
Middelburg (Z.)	Small, Centre, Historic, Tourist	-6.2
Groningen (gemeente)	Large, Centre, Growth, Tourist, Work	-5.9
Nunspeet	Small, Green	-5.7
Scherpenzeel	Small, Growth	-5.6
Hattem	Small, Former industrial	-5.6
Barneveld	Medium, Green, Growth, New town, Work	-5.3
Bladel	Small, Former industrial, Growth	-5.2
Schiermonnikoog	Small, Historic, Residential, Tourist	-5.1
Delft	Large, Centre, Growth, Historic	-4.9
Boekel	Small, Agricultural, Growth, New town	-4.9
Lopik	Small, Agricultural, Historic	-4.4
Olst-Wijhe	Small, Agricultural	-4.2
Haaksbergen	Small, Former industrial	-4.2
Renswoude	Small, Agricultural, Growth, New town	-4.0
Oudewater	Small, Agricultural, Historic	-3.9
Ede	Large, Centre, Green, Growth, New town	-3.8
Best	Small, Former industrial, New town, Work	-3.6
Veere	Small, Tourist	-3.5
Leudal	Small, Centre, Shrink, Tourist	-3.5
Berkelland	Small, Agricultural, Shrink	-3.4
Veenendaal	Medium, Former industrial, New town	-3.4
Buren	Small, Agricultural, Residential	-3.3
Wijk bij Duurstede	Small, New town, Residential	-3.3
Rijssen-Holten	Small, Former industrial	-3.3
Aalten	Small, Agricultural	-3.3
Nuenen, Gerwen en Nederwetten	Small, Former industrial, New town	-3.3
Hellendoorn	Small, Former industrial	-3.2

Nijmegen	Large, Centre, Growth, Tourist, Work	-3.2
Mook en Middelaar	Small, Green, Residential, Shrink, Tourist	-3.2
Dantumadiel	Small, Agricultural, Residential, Shrink	-3.1
Woudenberg	Small, Growth, New town	-3.1
Dalfsen	Small, Agricultural, Growth	-3.1
Grave	Small, Residential, Shrink	-3.0
Heeze-Leende	Small, Green	-3.0
Heumen	Small, New town, Residential	-2.9
Dinkelland	Small, Agricultural	-2.9
Krimpenerwaard	Medium, Agricultural	-2.8
Wierden	Small, Agricultural, Former industrial, Residential	-2.8
Voorschoten	Small, Growth, Residential	-2.7
Waterland	Small, Historic, Residential, Tourist	-2.7
Bloemendaal	Small, Green, Residential, Tourist	-2.7
Bronckhorst	Small, Agricultural, Historic, Shrink	-2.7
Weesp	Small, Former industrial, Growth, Historic	-2.7
Sint-Michielsgestel	Small, Residential	-2.7
Rozendaal	Small, Green, Residential	-2.7
Wageningen	Small, Growth, Work	-2.7
Huizen	Small, Centre, Residential	-2.6
Amersfoort	Large, Growth, New town, Work	-2.6
Haarlem	Large, Centre, Growth, Historic	-2.5
Terschelling	Small, Tourist	-2.5
Eijsden-Margraten	Small, Agricultural, Historic, Residential, Tourist	-2.5
Stichtse Vecht	Medium	-2.4
Voorst	Small, Agricultural	-2.4
Arnhem	Large, Centre, Green, Growth, Tourist, Work	-2.4
Bergen (NH.)	Small, Green, Shrink, Tourist	-2.4
Baarn	Small, Green	-2.4
Zwolle	Large, Centre, Growth, New town, Work	-2.4
Zeist	Medium, Green, Work	-2.4
Hilversum	Medium, Centre, Green, Growth, Work	-2.4
Voerendaal	Small, Agricultural, Former industrial, Residential, Shrink, Tourist	-2.3
Eindhoven	Large, Centre, Former industrial, Growth, Work	-2.2
Blaricum	Small, Growth	-2.2
Utrechtse Heuvelrug	Small, Green	-2.2
Valkenburg aan de Geul	Small, Shrink, Tourist	-2.2
Leusden	Small, Green	-2.1
Castricum	Small, Centre, Residential	-2.1

Oegstgeest	Small, Growth, New town	-2.1
Wassenaar	Small, Green, Tourist	-2.1
Goes	Small, Work	-2.1
Waalre	Small, Former industrial, Green, Residential	-2.0
Staphorst	Small, Agricultural, Historic	-1.9
Laren (NH.)	Small, Green	-1.9
Meerssen	Small, Former industrial, Residential, Shrink, Tourist	-1.9
Vught	Small	-1.9
Bunnik	Small, Agricultural, Growth	-1.8
Gulpen-Wittem	Small, Agricultural, Historic, Residential, Shrink, Tourist	-1.8
Culemborg	Small, Former industrial, New town	-1.8
Gooise Meren	Medium, Centre	-1.8
Oostzaan	Small, Former industrial, New town, Tourist	-1.8
Leidschendam-Voorburg	Medium	-1.6
Noordwijk	Small, Green, Tourist, Work	-1.6
Vlieland	Small, Historic, Shrink, Tourist	-1.6
Teylingen	Small, New town	-1.4
Apeldoorn	Large, Centre, Green, Work	-1.4
Amstelveen	Medium, Growth, Tourist, Work	-1.4
Nijkerk	Small, Growth, New town	-1.3
Langedijk	Small, Growth, New town, Residential	-1.3
Houten	Small, Growth, New town	-1.1
Ermelo	Small, Green, Work	-0.9
Breda	Large, Centre, Growth, Work	-0.8
Uitgeest	Small, Growth, New town, Residential	-0.5
Son en Breugel	Small, Growth, Work	-0.2
Kampen	Medium, Growth, Historic	-0.1
Leiden	Large, Centre, Growth, Historic, Work	0.1
Katwijk	Medium, Centre, Growth	0.3
Woerden	Medium, Agricultural, Growth, New town	0.4
Kapelle	Small, Growth	0.7
Putten	Small, Former industrial, Green, Growth	0.8
Midden-Delfland	Small, Agricultural, Growth, New town	2.7
Zoeterwoude	Small, Agricultural	4.1
Pijnacker-Nootdorp	Medium, Growth, New town, Residential	5.2
Lansingerland	Medium, Growth, New town	6.6
Westland	Large, Centre, Growth, New town, Work	6.9

(Source: www.emissieregistratie.nl)

HET **pon | telos**

About Het PON & Telos

Improving social decision-making

Het PON & Telos is a social knowledge organisation at the heart of society. We consider it our mission to improve social decision-making. We do this by linking scientific knowledge to practical knowledge. In this process every voice counts! We collect, investigate, analyse, and interpret opinions and facts using stimulating approaches and innovative methods. In doing so, we are always focused on sustainable development: the harmonious connection between social, environmental and economic objectives. In this way we contribute to the quality of society at large, now and in the future.

With a multidisciplinary and creative team of nearly 30 research consultants, we work mainly for local and regional authorities in the Netherlands, but also for corporate bodies, banks, care and welfare institutions, funds, and social organisations. We work closely with civic organisations and other knowledge institutions and are an official partner of Tilburg University. We use our knowledge and insights to advise initiators, policy-makers and managers. This enables them to make informed choices and give a positive impulse to the society of tomorrow.

Stationsstraat 20c
5038 ED Tilburg
+31 (0)13 535 15 35
info@hetpon-telos.nl
hetpon-telos.nl