

# **BACELOR THESIS**

**PINAR ÖZER**  
**International Studies BA**

**Kaposvár**  
**2022**



**Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences**

**Kaposvár Campus**

**International Studies BA**

**ASSESSMENT OF TURKEY'S HARMONISATION PROCESS TO THE EU  
ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES**

**Internal supervisor:** Diána, Koponicsné Györke  
Associate professor

**Co-supervisor:** Birce Azizli  
PhD student

**Author:** Pnar Özer  
K1NN8T  
Full time

**Institute/Department:** Institute of regional  
Development and Sustainable  
Economy  
Department of Rural and Spatial  
Development

**Kaposvár  
2022**

## TABLE OF CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION .....	5
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
3. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF EU ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES .....	8
3.1. 1945-1970 Period .....	8
3.2. Period After 1970 .....	8
3.2.1. Single European Act.....	9
3.2.2. Treaty of Maastricht (Treaty on European Union).....	10
3.2.3. Treaty of Amsterdam.....	10
3.2.4. Lisbon Strategy .....	10
3.2.5. Europe 2020 Strategy .....	11
3.3. Environmental Action Programs.....	12
3.3.1. First Environmental Action Program (1973-1976) .....	12
3.3.2. Second Environmental Action Program (1977-1981).....	13
3.3.3. Third Environmental Action Program (1982-1987).....	13
3.3.4. Fourth Environmental Action Program (1987-1992).....	14
3.3.5. Fifth Environmental Action Program (1993-2000).....	14
3.3.6. Sixth Environmental Action Program (2001-2010) .....	15
3.3.7. Seventh Environmental Action Program (2013-2020) .....	15
4. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES IN TURKEY .....	18
4.1. First Five-Year Development Plan (1963-1967) .....	18
4.2. Second Five-Year Development Plan (1968- 1972).....	18
4.3. Third Five-Year Development Plan (1973-1977) .....	19
4.4. Fourth Five-Year Development Plan (1979-1983).....	20
4.5. Fifth Five-Year Development Plan (1985-1989) .....	21
4.6. Sixth Five-Year Development Plan (1990 -1994).....	22
4.7. Seventh Five-Year Development Plan (1996-2000) .....	23
4.8. Eighth Five-Year Development Plan (2001-2005) .....	24
4.9. Ninth Five-Year Development Plan (2007-2013) .....	25
4.10. Tenth Five-Year Development Plan (2014-2018) .....	26
5. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES IN THE FRAMEWORK OF ECONOMIC INDICATORS.....	28
5.1. Comparison of Public Sector Environmental Expenditures and Investments .....	28

5.2.	Comparison of Environmental Investments and Expenditures in the Private Sector	33
6.	FINAL REMARKS .....	36
	REFERENCES .....	37

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The relationship of man with the natural environment, which started about thousands of years ago, has changed with the industrial revolution since the 18th century, and has turned into an uncontrolled destruction with the increasing consumption, production, population and the volume of economic activities. In these days of transition to the information society, the human-environment relationship has entered a new era and planned and environmentally sensitive policies have begun to be adopted (Bürgin, 2021a)

This awareness has begun to take place in the policies of countries and unions, starting at the individual level and increasing. Moreover, these policies were effective in the relations of countries with each other, and the consumption habits of individuals were evaluated within this framework and production was expected to keep up with these policies. These policies, which are expressed as environmental policies, have developed over time and tried to draw the limits of the destruction of a livable environment by production and consumption.

Environmental policy can be defined as the determination of a country's preferences and targets on the environment, while forming the whole of the measures and adopted principles for the solution of environmental problems (Bobat, 2017)

Looking at the environmental policy of the European Union; It is seen that it aims to remove, reduce and prevent pollution, to ensure sustainable development, to ensure that natural resources are used in a way that does not harm the ecological balance, to prevent environmental damage at its source, and to ensure the integration of environmental protection with other sectoral policies (energy, transportation, etc.) (Bürgin, 2021b)

This short thesis tries to explore the current situations and current problems related to the evaluation of Turkey's adaptation process to EU environmental policies.

Turkey's environmental policy, on the other hand, has displayed a constantly changing trend since the 1970s. In many sources, considering that Turkey's environmental priorities fall behind the development goal or the necessity of postponing it, the stages of this change trend have been tried to be discussed within the framework of development plans. If we summarize these studies as follows;

In the first part of the thesis, the historical development of EU environmental policies is discussed in two parts as the 1945-1970 period and the post-1970 period. The purpose of this distinction is the transformation of environmental policies in both the EU and Turkey after 1970.

In the second part of the thesis, the historical development of Turkey's environmental policies is discussed within the framework of the development plans that started with the transition to the planned period. While examining, the compatibility of the EU with the processes it went through was tried to be evaluated separately in each development plan period. Thus, while making an examination specific to Turkey, the harmonization of EU environmental policies expressed in the previous section will be tried to be revealed.

The last part of the thesis consists of the evaluation of environmental policies within the framework of economic indicators. In this section, Turkey will be compared with France,

Germany, Belgium, three of the founding countries of the EU, and Croatia, Bulgaria and Romania, the last three countries to join the Union, in terms of environmental protection expenditures and investments of the public and private sectors.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Environmental policies, which have started to take a significant place among the priorities of the countries, have increased the importance of scientifically examining the political, economic and social framework of the environment. By making researches on the subject in the literature, both the country's policies and the relationship of these country's policies with other countries or unions have been tried to be revealed. The summary literature of these studies is as follows;

While Turkey has made substantial strides in environmental policy alignment with the EU, overall environmental acquis transposition has not been sufficiently advanced. It was highlighted that specific consideration should be given to problems with industrial pollution, waste management, water quality, and air quality. (Sözen vd., 2008)

Despite Turkey's progress in the use of economic and financial instruments in the field of EU environmental policy, it remains limited, and the fact that the taxes collected in this framework are not used with the priority of protecting the environment does not lead to sufficient progress. indicated that it was effective (Unalan, 2009)

EU's environmental conditions in Turkey. successfully only to be implemented cannot be by law Besides, a strong institutional administrative capacity, local authority and subordinate that the structure is necessary stated (Unalan, 2009)

Turkey's harmonization with the EU encountered in the process legal problem regulations not in realization enforcing laws, other environmental policies with policies in harmonization and institutional capacity emerge in empowerment stated out (Blokhuys vd., 2010).

Turkey's environment policies according to the EU. Insufficient, this situation will cause some problems, for the environment in the investments to be made substantial amount of economic and financial need that, despite Turkey's change that you can overcome they have stated (Blokhuys vd., 2010)

The importance of local governments will be applied by citing the sources for the policies that express the needs they implement. It was stated that the issues of access to resources, project preparation and implementation should be given importance, therefore they would support economic development and implementation of environmental policies with grant programs. (Kentel & Alp, 2013a)

EU accession requirements and free market between the economy remaining Turkey's consistent policies sign of failure has done. In this context policies to be created in line with their own dynamics to be shaped as stated that it should (Kentel & Alp, 2013b)

It has been stated that environmental awareness, which has developed at the global level, has increased in Turkey, and that a system that will ensure the protection of this environment in a tax context should be designed and taxes should be re-regulated when necessary. In the membership negotiations against the EU, it was stated that it is important in terms of fulfilling its obligations as well as protecting the environmental regulations.(Alkaya & Demirer, 2015a).

### **3. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF EU ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES**

After the Second World War, the idea of a United Europe, which can be expressed as both the conditions of the period and the necessity, developed over the years and took the form of the 27-member European Union known today. In this development process, not only economic unity was tried to be achieved, but also a social change process was experienced.

The Union has tried to take measures and implement policies that have developed over the years in order for individuals to live in a better environment and to leave a better environment for future generations. These measures and policies, which will be examined in this part of the study, will be examined in two parts as the Second World War-1970 period and the post-1970 period.

#### **3.1.1945-1970 Period**

In order to repair the destruction in Europe after the war, the socio-economic infrastructure of the union was built on full employment and social security state, institutions such as the IMF, GATT, the World Bank and instruments such as the Bretton Woods international monetary system, liberal relations at the international level, and the national level after the war. It is planned to carry out economic measures that will enable the people to live in a stable and safe way (Bürgin, 2021b)

With the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), which coincided with the implementation of the Marshall Plan covering the years 1948-1951, a rapid development process was entered in the member countries. The 10-year period after the war can be expressed as the period in which the economic development of Europe was emphasized in order to heal the wounds of the war.

In 1957, the Treaty of Rome, which established the European Economic Community, was signed and it was aimed to improve living and working conditions and to ensure harmony between member states in this regard (Blokhuys vd., 2010). In the 1960s, which is expressed as the Golden Age, it is seen that important steps were taken towards social development, especially in education, health and working conditions.

While the EU had a structure based on economic growth, stability and social cohesion from 1945 until the mid-1970s, the oil shocks experienced throughout the world in the 1970s caused a decrease in the level of welfare, social policies, growth and employment that had risen until this time. This has led to a re-evaluation of policies on these issues.

After the development of the European Internal Market, environmental protection objectives and principles, which started with the directive on classification and labeling of hazardous chemicals in 1967, were included as a separate chapter in the agreement establishing the EU in 1987 (Algan, 2005)

#### **3.2.Period After 1970**



The environmental policies of the European Economic Community between 1957 and 1972 are defined as a series of trivial measures. The European Economic Community's focus on the common market and economic growth targets as a priority is expressed as the biggest reason for the absence of a clear statement on the environment in the 1958 Rome Treaty (Syed vd., 2020)

A group called the "Roman Club", which emerged in Western Europe in the 1970s, consisting of senior executives of the Italian Fiat automobile group, expressed their concerns about the environmental problems that economic growth would bring, and another group called the "Greens" from the excessive destruction of the environment. The new policy demands they put forward as a result of their concerns constituted the first steps of exhibiting new stances on the environment (Buffagni vd., 2007)

In the first declaration of the European Community Commission on the environment in 1971, it was suggested to the Council to prepare a comprehensive environmental protection activity based on Articles 100 and 235 of the European Economic Community agreement. In addition to this declaration, a second declaration was published in 1972 and these two declarations influenced the decisions taken at the European Summit held in Paris in 1972 (Brack vd., 2017)

Another important conference on the environment in these years, the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, held in Stockholm in 1972, is considered a major turning point in the development of the European Union's environmental policy. After the conference, European Environmental Policy started by pointing out the concerns of society and science about the "Limits to Growth" published by the "Club of Rome" in 1973 (Rodrigues vd., 2021)

Along with all these developments, at the summit held in Paris in 1972, environmental policies were discussed at the level of governments for the first time within the European Community. In this context, the first step of preparing an environmental action plan has been taken in order to determine the community environmental policy. At this summit, the aim of the community environmental policy was determined to improve the quality of the living environment and living conditions.

### **3.2.1. Single European Act**

With the Single European Act, which was signed in 1986 and entered into force in 1987, fundamental changes were made in the Treaty of Rome, which officially started the European Union single market and European Political Cooperation. With these radical changes, a new process related to environmental policy has started. VI in the name of the environment. a VII to the third part of the EEC agreement in sub-title. title has been added. The following are a some of the environmental topics:

- Conservation, protection and upgrading of environmental policy,

- Working for the protection of people's health,
- It aims to ensure the careful and rational use of natural resources.

Environmental activities of the Group within this scope:

- Taking action as a preventive measure,
- Taking precautions by giving priority to the source of damage to the environment,
- It was founded on the principles of "Polluter Pays.

### **3.2.2. Treaty of Maastricht (Treaty on European Union)**

With the Maastricht Treaty, which was signed in 1992 and entered into force in 1993, the European Community was renamed the European Union, adding new dimensions to the European Communities and a new legal structure was organized (Alkaya & Demirer, 2015b)

The fact that the sustainability concept first gained prominence in environmental policies is another significant issue that needs to be addressed in the Maastricht Treaty on the environment. In this regard, Article 2, which outlines the fundamental principles of the Union, states that it is the responsibility of society to "balance economic development activities, sustainable, non-inflationary and ecologically friendly growth, a high degree of integrity of economic performances." enhancing the standard of living and improving it through extensive social protection.(Unalan & Cowell, 2009b)

### **3.2.3. Treaty of Amsterdam**

In the Amsterdam Agreement, which was signed by the European Union member states in 1997 and entered into force in 1999, important issues were emphasized, although no major changes were made on the environmental policies that had been determined before. Thus, in the second paragraph of the 1st article, it is stated that the environment is protected at a high level within the framework of sustainable development and that its quality is increased. At this point, it is extremely important to position the environment in this way for the concept of sustainable development (Rodrigues vd., 2021)

In 2000, the Council of the European Union published a series of structural reforms, the Lisbon Strategy, aimed at increasing economic growth and employment for economic and social innovation. This 10-year strategy aims to make Europe "the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world" (Blokhuys vd., 2010)

### **3.2.4. Lisbon Strategy**

The Lisbon strategy was built on the idea that innovation and technological development are the engine of economic change, and stated that global competitiveness can be achieved by making a difference in the fields of R&D and information technologies. In addition, a social model based on the creation of an "active welfare state by investing in people" has been adopted, based on the fact that the focus of the Union's policies is human (Giarola vd., 2021a).

A year later, these goals were given an environmental and sustainable development dimension by the European Council in Gothenburg. With this achievement, the Lisbon Strategy has gathered the European Union in a single target point aimed at bringing economic, social and environmental innovation. Environmental priorities within the scope of sustainable development strategies agreed by the Gothenburg European Council:

- Increasing the electricity produced from renewable resources to 22% by 2010,
- To prioritize environmentally friendly infrastructure investments by separating the link between GDP and growth in transportation and shifting transportation towards other transportation methods,
- Combating rising traffic volumes, congestion, noise and pollution,
- Unbundling the link between resource use and growth-related waste,
- Informing citizens about safety and food quality, use of chemicals, infectious diseases, antibiotic resistance,
- Significant reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 2005 (Example: Kyoto Targets),
- Indicated as stopping the loss of biodiversity by 2010 (Syed vd., 2020).

In the interim evaluation made in 2005 after the implementation of the Lisbon Strategy, it was concluded that the foreseen targets, especially employment and social security, could not be achieved. Based on the Lisbon Strategy of the European Commission, a new strategy called "EU 2020" has been put forward to replace the existing strategy with a new and more advanced perspective (Yıldız, 2021).

### **3.2.5. Europe 2020 Strategy**

The Europe 2020 Strategy has been designed as a new roadmap for the 10-year process planning, in order to clear the EU from the negative effects of the economic crisis, and to realize its goals related to economic growth, employment and environment, taking into account the failures in the Lisbon Strategy.

The strategy consists of three pillars identified as smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.

- **Smart Growth:** It aims to transform the European Union into an economy based on knowledge and innovation, to improve the quality of education within the union, to strengthen research studies and to transform innovative ideas into products and services that create economic growth and employment (Elvan, 2018).

- **Sustainable Growth:** It is defined as laying the foundations of a more environmentally friendly and more competitive economy that uses resources more efficiently. It aims to position the EU at a point that prevents environmental degradation, protects biodiversity and prevents waste of resources in a low-carbon and resource-constrained world (Alkaya & Demirer, 2015b).

- **Inclusive Growth:** It aims to transform the European Union into a high-employment economy that has achieved social and regional harmony. Within the scope of the Europe 2020 Strategy, the objectives of the European Union for the protection of the environment and the fight against climate change are:

- **Reducing greenhouse gas emissions** by at least 20% compared to 1990 levels (it is also stated that this rate can be increased to 30% if other developed and developing countries also take initiatives in this direction); increasing the share of renewable energy in the European Union's total energy consumption to 20%; and increasing energy efficiency by at least 20%. The European Commission has set these goals, but it hasn't specified any specific measures for enhancing the corporate environment.

### **3.3.Environmental Action Programs**

The European Union has built its environmental policy for a long time focused on solving the problems within the community. However, later on, it realized the need to act jointly and harmoniously at the regional and international level, as well as the global nature of pollution, and developed more comprehensive policies.

Environmental Action Programs are studies that are generally regarded as Council pronouncements and that are not legally enforceable but show specific political intents. The initial steps of these programs were adopted during the summit held in Paris in 1972. The initiatives seek to reduce pollution and incorporate environmental concerns into every activity.

#### **3.3.1. First Environmental Action Program (1973-1976)**

The actions to be taken are explained in the first action program, which determines the aims and principles of environmental policies. The main purpose of the program is to “harmonize and coordinate national environmental policies as much as possible” (Dura and Atik, 2014: 437). The program is shaped around the followings are:

- Prevention of pollution at its source,
- Considering the environmental dimension at the earliest stage in all technical planning and decision-making processes,

- The exploitation of natural resources or nature, which causes great harm to the ecological balance, should be avoided,
- Supporting scientific and technological research within the scope of protecting and improving the environment and combating pollution,
- The cost of the problem that has arisen is covered by the polluter,
- An activity in a country within the Union does not cause environmental destruction in another country,
- Shaping the environmental policies developed within the Union by taking into account the situations of developing countries,
- Increasing initiatives aimed at promoting global environmental research and policy as defined by the long-term European Environmental Policy,
- Protection of the environment is important for the whole union and for the success of environmental policy everyone at all levels should be supported and continuous and detailed training should be given on the subject.
- Different levels should be determined for each category of pollution and priorities should be determined,
- The main perspective of environmental policy should not be limited to some countries. Within the framework of long-term partnership understanding, national programs in this field should be coordinated and national policies should be blended in unity.

Today, while some of the aims and principles of this program remain valid, some of them have lost their validity. One of the greatest contributions of the First Program of Action was the development of the Union's approach to environmental protection.

### **3.3.2. Second Environmental Action Program (1977-1981)**

The Second Program of Action is the continuation and extension of the First Programme. It is foreseen that the Commission will continue to prepare the environmental legislation during the five-year period it will be in force, and it has signed many new drafts and decisions in this period.

The Second Action Programme, in which the activities in the first program were handled more concretely, focused on environmental finance by focusing on environmental policies and employment relations. “Environmental Impact Assessment” (EIA) came to the fore here for the first time

### **3.3.3. Third Environmental Action Program (1982-1987)**

The third program has been approached from a different angle than the first two. Rather of focusing on individual difficulties, the curriculum has emphasized a more general knowledge. Recognizing that environmental policy is a structural component of the community's overall socio-economic structure, it has indicated that it prioritizes prevention over treatment.(Giarola vd., 2021b) The following items are also included in the program:

- The environmental dimension is integrated with other projects.
- Procedure for assessing environmental effect, environmental protection in the Mediterranean Region,
- Transportation-related noise pollution
- Cross-border pollution, hazardous chemicals, and waste management are all issues that must be addressed.
- Promoting the development of clean technology
- Protection of environmentally sensitive sites that are important to the community
- Priority is devoted to environmental collaboration with underdeveloped countries (Tukker vd., 2013).

Furthermore, environmental policy must address the following issues:

- Creating job opportunities by promoting less polluting and resource-intensive sectors
- Nuclear energy is characterized as lowering dependence on coal and oil, assuring energy efficiency, and supporting less polluting energy sources by using non-recyclable waste sparingly and creating less polluting alternatives(Tukker vd., 2013).

#### **3.3.4. Fourth Environmental Action Program (1987-1992)**

The program, which was developed in accordance with the goals outlined in the Single European Act, took a more comprehensive approach to the issues and concentrated on preventive strategies to safeguard resources and the environment. The year 1987 was designated as the European Environment Year, according to the program's content.

There are 22 articles devoted to pollution prevention. These goods are identical to the ones mentioned in the preceding episode in terms of content. Apart from the introductory and conclusion sections, it has been divided into seven sections in total. These:

- Policy Directions in General,
- Approach to Pollution Prevention and Control,
- Actions in Specific Industries,
- Environmental Resource Management,
- Research,
- Taking Action on a Global Scale
- The European Year of the Environment is underway.

#### **3.3.5. Fifth Environmental Action Program (1993-2000)**

In the first section of the program, which establishes the concepts of the European Union Environmental Policy, the relationship between sustainable development and the environment is discussed. The Maastricht Treaty's concept of sustainability was added to the concept of development, making it a more holistic term. The Treaty of Amsterdam later enshrined this comprehensive state.

- Changes in the Climate,
- Acidification and pollution of the air
- Consumption of natural resources and biodiversity
- Pollution and the depletion of water supplies are two issues that need to be addressed.
- The state of the urban environment is deteriorating,
- Coastal zone degradation,
- Waste product

Because of the EU's efforts to align its policies with the idea of environmental protection, it is now necessary to take the environment into account in all research and initiatives (Yıldız, 2021).

### **3.3.6. Sixth Environmental Action Program (2001-2010)**

The "Environment 2010: Our Future, Our Choice" Sixth Environment Action Programme is centered on four primary goals.

- Climate Change,
- Nature and Biodiversity,
- Environment and Health and Quality of Life,
- Natural Resources and Wastes are some of these topics.

When we look at the topics covered in the program, such as sustainable development, strengthening the market economy, including free market regulatory rules, addressing environmental problems holistically, raising environmental awareness, and increasing participation, we can see that it is largely in line with the 5th Programme.

Improving current legislation, working closely with the market, integrating environmental requirements into other policies, considering environmental issues in land use planning and administrative decisions, and empowering people as private citizens and assisting them in changing their behavior are the five priority issues identified. The EU's conversation with candidate nations, as well as the necessity to mobilize NGOs in this framework, are also covered (Coll-Mayor vd., 2007).

### **3.3.7. Seventh Environmental Action Program (2013-2020)**

The program highlights its major goals through 2020, as well as a long-term outlook on important concerns through 2050. Furthermore, it was predicated on the belief that Europeans'

economic success and prosperity are dependent on the health of their natural capital (Van Ittersum vd., 2008).

With the slogan "Living Better Within the Boundaries of the Planet," the program's scope has been narrowed down to nine priorities, which went into effect one year after its publication. These:

- The Union's natural capital must be conserved, preserved, and strengthened.
- Assisting the EU's transition to a resource-efficient, green, and competitive low-carbon economy
- Protection of Union citizens' health and well-being from environmental threats
- Improving the Union's Environmental Legislation's Implementation
- Gaining a better understanding of and experience with Union Environmental Legislation
- Ensuring that the essential investments in environmental and climate policies are made,
- Ensure that the environment is integrated with other policy areas and that policies are consistent.
- Strengthening the union's cities' long-term viability
- Improving the Union's efficiency in dealing with international environmental and climate challenges (Giarola vd., 2021a).

These nine horizontal priorities are divided into three categories: basic, facilitating, and supplementary. This classification is as follows:

#### **Main Objective:**

- Natural Capital is a term that refers to the value of
- Doing more with less in a resource-efficient economy
- People and the Environment: Taking care of the environment entails taking care of ourselves.

#### **Defining objectives as facilitators for the EU to attain its key goals:**

- Advanced Practices are beneficial to the environment, our health, and our finances.
- Incremental Knowledge: Making the best decisions possible based on the most recent data.
- Green incentives lead to green inventions, which means safe investments.
- Better Integration: Addressing several difficulties with a single strategy.
- Cities that are sustainable are those that work together to find common ground.
- Taking on International Challenges: "Living well within the constraints of our planet (Brack vd., 2017).



In addition to the program, the "Principles of Integrated Environmental Management," which are linked to other EU policy areas, are presented to member countries in a variety of ways. It is expected that efforts will be focused on speeding up the EU's transition to a rapidly developing green economy, with a "business world" that encourages the spread of environmentally friendly production models and the creation of long-term new job opportunities as a result of this environment (Yıldız, 2021).

#### **4. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES IN TURKEY**

Turkey embarked on a postwar restructuring drive in the early years of the Republican era, and as part of this endeavor, it divided its economic and political concerns into other issues, and limited its environmental measures to the context of public health.

Until the 1960s, Turkey, like the rest of the European Union and the rest of the world, had no substantial environmental rules. It is clear that an environmental policy enacted in response to rapid industrialization activities causing major environmental concerns has yet to be implemented, and instead of a comprehensive regulation, each law includes prohibitions and rules specific to its own fields of interest (Sözen vd., 2008).

Turkey established the State Planning Organization on September 30, 1960, in order to accelerate its economic and social development, and began to shape its development and industrialization efforts with a planning approach by publishing the first Five-Year Development Plan three years later, in 1963. Despite the fact that it was not a major part of the original plans, it incorporated the environmental issue in the understanding of development, in accordance with the environmental degradation caused by development over time and the norms of international agreements.

##### **4.1. First Five-Year Development Plan (1963-1967)**

The First Five-Year Development Plan, signed "to increase national savings, to direct investments for the benefit of society, with the necessary priorities, and to realize economic, social, and cultural development through democratic means," aims to raise people's living standards as much as possible. The environmental issue has not been discussed because there is no environmental awareness within the scope of this aim.

The signing of the Ankara Agreement, which established a partnership relationship with the EEC, on September 12, 1963, and the entrance into force of the Ankara Agreement on December 1, 1964, were the most significant events in Turkey-Community ties during this time (Konijnendijk vd., 2006).

##### **4.2. Second Five-Year Development Plan (1968- 1972)**

The Second Plan, like the first, was created using a regional planning strategy. This plan, which more concretely repeated the policies of the First Five-Year Development Plan to reduce interregional development disparities brought with it a population increase that would emerge over time, migration-induced crowding in metropolises, and the development of industry.

The environmental awareness that arose in Europe in the 1970s was not incorporated into the second development plan. The importance of the second plan in terms of the environment is not due to the precautions it takes, but rather to the more determined continuation of the policies that have caused the environmental issue to become significant.

When looking at the relationship with the Community, it's worth noting that the Additional Protocol containing the rules for the Customs Union was signed on November 23, 1970, and the commercial provisions of the Additional Protocol went into effect on September 1, 1971, with the "Temporary Agreement".

### **4.3.Third Five-Year Development Plan (1973-1977)**

Environmental issues were classified differently for industrialized and developing countries throughout the Third Five-Year Development Plan period. For years, developed countries have been dealing with environmental issues as a result of the intensity of industrial operations, excessive use of natural resources, and reckless attitude. On the other side, developing countries faced issues such as technological inadequacy, inability to properly utilize natural resources, low education and income levels, and the inability to form a healthy relationship with nature (ÜBYKP, 1973: 866). (Budak, 2000: 426).

In the 5th part of the plan, a section on Environmental Problems is included and it is stated that it is not possible to see the problem apart from the development problems of developing countries. In addition, it was stated that slowing down the development efforts by arguing these problems would not be valid. In some industrialization projects and dense urbanization areas, it is accepted that the pollution of air, water and coasts is seen in a narrow sense, and it is accepted that this does not apply to the whole country, but that there are problems such as erosion and environmental health, which are based on the inadequate and insufficient use of natural resources, or the lack of income and education. (ÜBYKP, 1973: 866).

Principles and actions to be taken have been defined within the context of this understanding. It was declared that no application that would deviate Turkey from its development aim of industrialization would be accepted in the work and legal rules to be carried out at the international level regarding the solution of problems (ÜBYKP, 1973: 867).

Although it has been resolved to take some steps to identify environmental issues, monitor worldwide research, make arrangements based on principles, and educate the public, the third factor that sticks out is what can be done without jeopardizing Turkey's growth objective.

While Turkey is developing its environmental policies as part of its own development efforts under the Plan, it has also begun to develop the EU's environmental protection approach as part of the EU's First Environmental Action Program. From this perspective, it may be claimed that some of the initiatives in the plan, though not all, follow a procedure that is compatible with community policies.

Another major consideration is the state of relations between Turkey and the EU at this time. This level is critical for determining how policies are shaped whether Turkey attempts to comply with or defers EU directives.

During this time, Turkey and the European Community reached an agreement on enlargement on May 21, 1973. The I. Enlargement Agreement (Supplementary Protocol) was signed in Ankara on June 30, 1973. Turkey completed its responsibility under the Additional Protocol on January 1, 1976, by harmonizing the second customs reduction and consolidated liberation list, and the III. Financial Protocol was signed in Brussels on May 12, 1977. (EU, 2016: 1).

#### **4.4.Fourth Five-Year Development Plan (1979-1983)**

Environmental issues are addressed in the Fourth Plan's fourth chapter, which is titled "Regional Development and Settlement." In this first article, the importance of solving environmental problems, which is accepted as the main policy in the third plan, without isolating them from industrialization and development, was emphasized once more, and it was stated that public awareness on the subject was formed and the problems were defined during the 1973-1977 period.

It has been noted that the pollution seen in Turkey is similar to that seen in sophisticated civilizations; in addition, the traditional sections of the country have water and sewerage problems, poor housing conditions in shantytowns, and soil and forest erosion. Water pollution, marine pollution, air pollution, and soil erosion were discovered, and it was said that despite the existence of legal laws to prevent water pollution, they could not be implemented.(Elvan, 2018)

The primary policies of the fourth plan were outlined in the third portion of the second section of the plan, under the subject of economic and social aims and policies. Environmental issues are once again addressed in the ninth section of the plan, titled "Urbanization and Municipalities." First, the underlying premise of environmental problems was expressed in this context as solving them in tandem with the process of societal change.(Tukker vd., 2013)

A regional environmental policy was mentioned, stating that the problem would be solved in the prevention phase before it arose, and that the most appropriate solutions for the socio-economic and ecological structure would be chosen by weighing alternative solutions in the approaches to resolving existing environmental issues. (Giarola vd., 2021a)

It has been stated that the activities of foundations, associations, and other similar voluntary organizations working on environmental issues will be supported in accordance with the plan, that the environment will be evaluated in terms of tourism, that environmental areas suitable for public use will be created, particularly in large cities, and that legal, scientific, and technological developments will be followed in the international arena, and that the environment will be evaluated in terms of tourism.(Yıldız, 2021)

The community embraced the Second Environmental Action Program during the fourth plan period. When we look at the program, which is a continuation of the First Environmental Action Program, we can see that policies that are beneficial to the union are being tried out on issues like preventing problems before they arise, different measures for different types of pollution, and scientific and technological developments. In this regard, the fourth plan, in comparison to the previous plans, appears to be more aligned with the programs that govern EU environmental policy.

In terms of ties with the Community, the most significant event during the Fourth Development Plan period was the decision to suspend the Turkey-EEC Agreement on January 22, 1982, at the request of the European Parliament, the Council, and the Commission. Because the following plan overlaps with the fourth plan's implementation phase, it will be easier to see whether this decision has any impact on the development plan's formulation.

Finally, another significant development occurred during the Fourth Development Plan time. Article 56 of the 1982 constitution, titled "Health Services and Environmental Protection," declares, "Everyone has the right to live in a healthy and balanced environment." The state and residents have a responsibility to improve the environment, safeguard environmental health, and avoid pollution. In a constitutional context, the text of the text has become legally binding. (Pierson, 1996)

#### **4.5.Fifth Five-Year Development Plan (1985-1989)**

The seventeenth element of the Fifth Plan's fourth section is devoted to environmental ideas and policies. Apart from this section, the conservation of resources and the environment has been mentioned in deciding the key policies in the energy sector, and it has been claimed that worldwide studies that do not allow pollution should be followed as well. The policies relating to tourism will be assessed in the context of maintaining ecological balance, keeping the environment clean and healthy, and beautifying it, according to the statement. Environmental impact is taken into account in public institution investment projects, as well as the compilation of "Environmental Impact Assessment" reports, according to their reports.(Konijnendijk vd., 2006)

The plan also included a strategy for identifying the root causes of environmental issues. Environmental difficulties in Turkey are defined as "environmental pollution produced by urbanization, erosion, and natural disasters, as well as environmental challenges created by rapid industrialization and modernization in agriculture" under this perspective. The main approach in this context is not to remove existing pollution, but to use, protect, and develop resources in the most efficient way possible so that future generations can benefit.

It will be emphasized that water quality evaluation and rational regulation in the use of water resources will be prioritized, that industries will take necessary measures in places where water pollution is excessive, that industrial wastes will be inspected, that drinking water regulations will be enacted, and that relevant universities and institutions will be supported by prioritizing research and development activities that should be continued in the fiefdom. Proclaimed (Bürgin, 2021b).

The implementation of the Community's Third Environmental Action Plan corresponds with the implementation of the Fifth Development Plan. Priority community issues such as the "Environmental Impact Assessment Procedure" included in the Third Environmental Action Plan, reducing reliance on nuclear energy, coal, and oil, ensuring energy efficiency and encouraging less polluting energy sources, and waste management are all addressed in the Fifth Development Plan in accordance with the community.

In this context, it is reasonable to conclude that the decision to suspend the Turkey-EEC Agreement, which coincides with the Fourth Development Plan, had no impact on Turkey's alignment with community policies and did not depart from Turkey's goal of full EU membership. Taking measures in development plans that are in harmony with the community in the context of the environment is a tangible example of this.

The process of restarting Turkey-EEC relations, which had been frozen since September 12, 1980, began on September 16, 1986, according to the development of relations with the Community during this era. Articles 98 of the ECSC Treaty and Article 205 of the EURATOM Treaty were used to make separate applications to become full members. In its "Opinion" (Avis) on Turkey's application for full membership on December 18, 1989, the European Commission stated that the Community cannot accept a new member before the completion of its internal market (1992), and that before Turkey's accession, economic, social, and political issues must be resolved (Brack vd., 2017).

#### **4.6.Sixth Five-Year Development Plan (1990 -1994)**

Environment and settlement is the fourth heading of the Sixth Five-Year Plan's fourth chapter. Environmental issues, settlement-urbanization, housing, and drinking water-sewage were all included as sub-titles in this title.

Within the plan, environmental protection in tourism investments, reorganization of forest lands taking environmental factors into account, legal regulations to eliminate environmental problems resulting from mining activities, compliance of industrial organizations with environmental policies, production of vehicles that minimize environmental problems in automotive, taking legal measures regarding toxic exhaust gases.

"To assure the management of natural resources in a way that will allow for ongoing economic development while maintaining human health and ecological balance, and to leave a natural, physical, and social environment that is decent for future generations," according to the plan's basic principles. The key aspect in this remark is that environmental issues have been included to the term "to allow for ongoing economic development." As a result, the environment's importance has fallen behind development as a priority (Alkaya & Demirer, 2015a).

While the Community included the concept of "sustainability" in its environmental policies in the Maastricht Treaty, which was accepted in 1992 and entered into force in 1993, and the 5th Environment Action Plan, which also entered into force in 1993, Turkey took a leading role by mentioning it in the Sixth Five-Year Development Plan.

Environmental dimensions will be considered in all economic policies, environmental degradation will be predicted and necessary precautions will be taken before pollution occurs, applicable technologies and country conditions will be taken into account together when determining environmental standards, environmental data will be collected by directing from a center, controls related to chemicals polluting the environment, provinces will be considered Within the scope of the plan, it is claimed that an environmental risk assessment based on environmental risks will be conducted, that R&D activities for renewable energy would be

directed, and that studies for harmonization with EC environmental policies will be continued (Alkaya & Demirer, 2015b).

Turkey's Sixth Five-Year Development Plan was designed in accordance with the principles of prevention ahead of time and prevention at source, which are evident throughout the Action Plans and reflected in the Single European Act. More importantly, it has been stated unequivocally that Turkey will maintain its environmental regulations in accordance with those of the European Union.

Regarding the current phase of Turkey-EU ties, the European Commission drafted a "Collaboration Package" on June 6, 1990, encompassing steps to commence and accelerate cooperation with Turkey in all disciplines, and submitted it to the European Council for approval on July 30, 1994. As stated in the Ankara Agreement reached between Turkey and the EC in 1963 (Chalmers & Lodge, 2003), the Union has identified the criteria that would enable its execution.

#### **4.7. Seventh Five-Year Development Plan (1996-2000)**

While the "Protection and Development of the Environment" is the fifth element of the third part of the Seventh Development Plan, the idea of environment is contained in three sub-titles: current condition, purpose, principles and policies, legal and institutional structures.

While the "Protection and Development of the Environment" is the fifth element of the third part of the Seventh Development Plan, the idea of environment is contained in three sub-titles: current condition, purpose, principles and policies, legal and institutional structures.

Despite the importance of the sustainable development approach in the Sixth Plan, it was stated that it was insufficient in practice, that the Ministry of Environment, which determined environmental policies, was insufficient, that legal legislation was deficient, that funds created for environmental purposes were not used in accordance with the purpose, and that there were general inadequacies (Pierson, 1996).

In terms of purpose, principles, and policies, the basic principle is to ensure the management of natural resources in a way that allows for continuous economic development while protecting human health and natural balance, and to leave a natural, physical, and social environment that is decent for future generations, in accordance with the sustainable development approach. Furthermore, the measures to be done in order to avoid the previously indicated deficiencies were stressed (Pierson, 1996).

"Regulations should be made in accordance with the principle of sustainable development in the articles of the Constitution directly or indirectly related to the environment," it was stated in the sub-title of Legal and Institutional Arrangements, and it was stated that the Environmental Law No. 2872 would be revised according to current conditions (Montforts vd., 1999).

With a sectoral approach to the environment, emphasis will be placed on training qualified personnel in these areas, cooperation programs will be developed between sectors to reduce environmental risk factors, irrigation systems will be carried out in accordance with

environmental conditions, the importance of environmentally friendly products in the international market, and environmental protection issues will be taken as a basis in industry (Pierson, 1996).

Environmental expressions include the need to protect consumers from environmental hazards, minimizing environmental impacts through energy efficiency, the importance of environmental impact assessment in investments, and taking into account environmental impacts in sectors such as agriculture and tourism. The formulation of a National Environmental Strategy for successful environmental management is a critical step that should be highlighted in the Seventh Plan (Montforts vd., 1999).

Within the framework of "Required Regulations for Harmonization of Turkish Legislation with EC Legislation," it is stated that environmental preservation shall be regarded as a basis. Furthermore, the plan clearly states that environmental standards should be updated on a regular basis in accordance with international standards, particularly EU standards, and that policies and decisions taken to address environmental issues will be in accordance with EU norms and international standards (Montforts vd., 1999)

The Seventh Five-Year Development Plan, in general, and the Fifth Environment Action Program and the Amsterdam Treaty, in particular, are deemed to comply with the Environmental Action Programs. Its attitude to environmental issues is extremely compatible, especially in terms of sustainable development. As mentioned in the plan, the community's environmental rules will be attempted to be followed without impeding the country's growth.

In terms of Turkey-EU ties during the Seventh Plan period, the "Transition Period" ended on January 1, 1996, and the "Final Period" began the full membership process on January 1, 1997. Turkey's name was not listed among the candidate nations in the decision on the EU's Fifth Enlargement at the Luxembourg European Council Summit Meeting on December 12-13, 1997. The document named "European Strategy for Turkey" was announced for the development of relations on March 3, 1998. Turkey was given candidacy status at the Helsinki European Council Summit Meeting on December 11-12, 1999, after the first "Progress Report," which will be published every year thereafter, was released on November 4, 1998. On July 4, 2000, the Prime Ministry formed the General Secretariat for the European Union.

#### **4.8.Eighth Five-Year Development Plan (2001-2005)**

The title "Environment" appears in the thirteenth portion of the eighth chapter, as well as the fifteenth article of the fourth part of the plan's key objectives and methods. In the broadest sense, progress has been made in legislation and institutional structure to address environmental issues, the National Environmental Strategy and Action Plan (UCEP) has been established, and social sensitivity to a clean environment has increased (Montforts vd., 1999).

Despite these positive developments, a development that will allow continuous and economic development while protecting human health and natural balance, ensuring natural resource



management, and leaving a healthier natural, physical, and social environment for future generations has not been achieved, and the integration of environmental policies into economic and social policies has not been achieved, in accordance with the sustainable development approach. It was also mentioned that it was unavailable.

While it is stated that the industry should produce in harmony with the environment, imports do not harm the environment, environmental pollution should be addressed within the framework of regional plans, and environmental quality should be considered within the scope of regional development projects such as GAP (Southeastern Anatolia Project) and DOKAP (Eastern Black Sea Project), has been completed. Because environmental issues are a significant cost element, a sustainable development strategy that causes the least amount of environmental damage has been stressed repeatedly.

The implementation of the UEP (National Environmental Strategy Action Plan) activities appears to be used as a starting point in the planning phase of the environmental element of the Eighth Plan. It was claimed in this context that UEP would be upgraded and incorporated into a legislative framework, with the coordination of key institutions and organizations mentioned. It was said that the intended success in the implementation process of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulation could not be accomplished, and that regulations would be established to improve the process (Chalmers & Lodge, 2003).

It has been reported that 98 percent of the 174 EU legislations under the environmental acquis title have been studied, and that environmental laws should be made within the limits of harmonization with the EU, regional aims and policies. The Eighth Development Plan incorporated the priorities of action programs such as sustainable development, which were previously specified in the Sixth Environment Action Program. In this regard, it is possible to declare that it is a plan that is in line with EU policies.

During the Eighth Plan Period, there were a number of significant changes in Turkey-EU ties. At the European Council Summit in Copenhagen, it was stated that if Turkey decided to meet the Copenhagen political criteria, negotiations would begin immediately, with the establishment of the "EU Harmonization Commission" in the Turkish Grand National Assembly and the start of full membership negotiations with the EU. Make a few of your own

#### **4.9.Ninth Five-Year Development Plan (2007-2013)**

. The environmental heading was first included in the Axis of Economic and Social Development, Enhancing Competitiveness, in the plan published with the vision of "a Turkey that grows steadily, shares its income more equitably, has global competitive power, transforms into an information society, and has completed the harmonization process for EU membership." It's under the heading of "Environmental Protection and Urban Infrastructure Development." As with earlier plans, the plan addressed policies related to environmental challenges and solutions alongside sustainable growth.

The need to establish standards for the use and circulation of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) and biotechnology products was emphasized in the plan, which stated that rapid population growth and industrialization threaten the sustainability of natural resources, the

production process, and environmental protection. Other important aspects of the plan include observing the needs of future generations, ensuring that everyone benefits equally from resources, protecting our country's biological diversity and genetic resources and converting them into economic value, developing environmentally friendly systems, improving waste management, and conducting education and public information activities aimed at raising environmental awareness. are the topics (Konijnendijk vd., 2006).

The Ninth Plan is in line with the main headings of Natural Capital, Resource Efficient Economy, Healthy Environment and People, Increasing Information, Safe Investments, and Advanced Practices specified in the basic and facilitating targets of the Seventh Action Programme, according to this framework.

Another step toward harmonization with the EU may be considered to be the observation of the country's conditions and the effectiveness of the public administration in updating the legal provisions that govern environmental standards and management. Furthermore, the plan's successful use of instruments that take into account the polluter-pays and user-pays principles is considered as a strategy that is compatible with both the general action programs' principles and EU environmental legislation (Coll-Mayor vd., 2007).

The preparation of a National Action Plan, in which policies and measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions will be revealed with the participation of relevant parties within the context of our country's circumstances, and the fulfillment of UN Framework Convention on Climate Change obligations are indicators that the plan is also prepared in accordance with international developments (Buffagni vd., 2007)

The commencement of substantive negotiations on the environment chapter on December 21, 2009, will be an important factor in Turkey-EU ties in the years ahead. Apart from the environmental chapter, taxation, free movement of money, commercial and industrial policies, and food security were among the subjects for discussion.

#### **4.10. Tenth Five-Year Development Plan (2014-2018)**

Under the heading of Livable Spaces, Sustainable Environment, under the heading of the Plan's Goals and Policies in the second section, the environmental issue is dealt with within the framework of objectives and policies aimed at increasing the social and economic benefits of environmentally sensitive approaches, and increasing the quality of life of people in cities and rural areas in a sustainable manner. taken. The tenth plan continues to deal with environmental issues and the search for answers within the context of sustainable development.

In this context, it is stated that the concept of "green growth," which aims to protect the environment while also increasing competitiveness in production sectors through clean production and eco-efficiency, has gained importance as a result of international developments in order to achieve sustainable development goals. Turkey, it has been noted, contributes to the international solution of environmental problems, with an understanding

that takes into account the country's reality, and within the framework of the principles of "shared but differentiated duties" and "relative capacities"(Tukker vd., 2013)

Turkey will alleviate environmental pressures by adopting policies that prioritize pollution avoidance, biological diversity protection, and sustainable use of natural resources, according to the plan. In this context, it has been noted that environmental protection or prioritization measures are included in practically all sub-headings of the plan, such as tourism, infrastructure, energy, logistics and transportation, and industry.

One of the most significant characteristics of livable spaces, according to the report, is the conservation of environmental quality and the adoption of a development and spatial development approach that does not jeopardize future generations' welfare and happiness. This method also demonstrates the final version of the policies Turkey has created throughout time to address environmental issues (Kentel & Alp, 2013b)

When it comes to the above-mentioned priorities and policies, the Tenth Development Plan incorporates both the priorities of the Ninth Development Plan and the Eighth Action Plan: safe investments, resource-efficient economies, and natural capital.

In the plan's content, two major elements stand out. The first is the lack of any direct reference to the EU, in contrast to previous environmental plans. The second is the framework's constant references to and parallels with the Ninth Development Plan. During the plan period, there was no significant change in Turkey-EU ties.

## 5. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES IN THE FRAMEWORK OF ECONOMIC INDICATORS

In addition the evolution of environmental policies in the EU and Turkey through Environmental Action Plans and Five-Year Development Plans, the amount of resources committed for the implementation of these written documents demonstrates the sensitivity of countries on this problem.

Three of the EU's founding countries, France, Germany, and Belgium, as well as the EU's most recent three members, Romania, Bulgaria, and Croatia, were chosen as research participants. The total expenditures of 28 EU member nations are also included in this part, which gives a comparison of Turkey with these countries. Between 2001 and 2013, the ratio of environmental protection expenditures per capita and GDP in these nations was only looked at in terms of public, although environmental protection and investment expenditures were looked at in both public and private sectors.

The term "investigation" is included in the definition of environmental protection, which encompasses any operations that have a direct impact on the reduction, prevention, or elimination of pollution or environmental deterioration. Environmental expenditure data in this framework comprises current expenditures and various investments from a variety of sectors.

Manufacturing, agriculture, fisheries, forestry, mining and quarrying, electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning production and distribution; water collection, treatment, and supply are examples of private sector expenditures and investments, while public expenditures and investments refer to net transfers between central, regional, and local governments.

While expenditures aimed at directly preventing, reducing, or eliminating pollution or the inconveniences caused by production processes or the consumption of goods and services are included in environmental protection expenditures, activities that are environmentally beneficial but aimed at meeting technical needs, health, or safety requirements are excluded.

Investment expenditures, on the other hand, refer to expenditures made within a year to purchase machinery, equipment, and land for environmental protection or for own account production.

### 5.1. Comparison of Public Sector Environmental Expenditures and Investments

**Table 1: 2001-2013 Public Expenditures on Environmental Protection (Million Euros)**

TIME/ COUNTRY	EU-28	BELGIUM	FRANCE	GERMANY	BULGARIA	CROATIA	ROMANIA	TURKEY
2001	62.789,1	1.474,22	8.301,8	9.170	70,05	15,09	58,11	171,33

	3		9					
<b>2002</b>	62.856,7 5	1.552,95	8.929,8 9	8.930	59,29	34,52	94,99	256,04
<b>2003</b>	62.270,6 5	1.415,81	8.673,9 1	8.760	54,73	-	69,38	1.018,3 5
<b>2004</b>	65.586,0 6	1.717,71	8.891,0 7	8.420	68,91	-	134,19	1.246,2 9
<b>2005</b>	74.258,6 5	1.599,69	9.650,2 8	8.140	86,88	23,96	186	1.545,7 3
<b>2006</b>	81.154,7 7	1.812,25	9.827,1 6	8.220	104,49	31,04	527,94	1.701,7 9
<b>2007</b>	83.932,0 2	1.831,75	10.355, 52	8.020	161,03	154,79	716,81	2.022,4 5
<b>2008</b>	84.133,5 7	1.954,97	11.023, 96	8.070	209,11	10,13	804,94	2.063,9 8
<b>2009</b>	88.446,7 3	2.066,46	11.398, 01	8.110	223,73	11,05	699,08	2.208,2 8
<b>2010</b>	86.427,5 7	2.152,98	11.570, 35	8.270	183,66	33,09	1.012,88	2.490,6 7
<b>2011</b>	86.510,9 2	2.589,55	11.646, 07	-	231,41	142,76	1.254,95	-
<b>2012</b>	87.495,3 4	2.355,53	12.065, 35	-	293,43	113,68	787,85	2.625,1 4
<b>2013</b>	87.346,4 5	-	-	-	425,21	139,5	647,62	-

Source: (Eurostat, 2016).(Unalan & Cowell, 2009a)

Table 1 shows the public spending for environmental protection from 2001 to 2013. Turkey is the only country in the table where expenditures have consistently increased over time. While France's environmental protection expenditures account for roughly 13% of the EU's total environmental expenditures, the newly joined countries' public spending in this area are quite low.

Turkey's expenditure surged about fourfold between 2002 and 2003, particularly between 2001 and 2005, which coincides with the implementation of the Eighth Development Plan. This rise has been consistent across time, with no decreases even during times of crisis. When compared to the other EU countries in the example, it can be seen that it has spent more in recent years than Belgium, although there are significant expenditure differences with France and Germany. The new members of the Union, on the other hand, could not even come close to matching Turkey's 2003 expenditure. Croatia spent even less money in 2013 than Turkey

did in 2001. As a result, Turkey, with the exception of France and Germany, clearly spends more on environmental protection.

**Table 2: 2001-2013 Share of Public Expenditures on Environmental Protection in GDP (%)**

TIME/ COUNTRY	EU-28	BELGIUM	FRANCE	GERMANY	BULGARIA	CROATIA	ROMANIA	TURKEY
2001	0,65	0,57	0,56	0,44	0,45	0,06	0,13	0,08
2002	0,63	0,58	0,58	0,42	0,35	0,12	0,2	0,11
2003	0,61	0,51	0,55	0,41	0,3	-	0,13	0,38
2004	0,62	0,59	0,54	0,38	0,34	-	0,22	0,4
2005	0,67	0,53	0,56	0,37	0,37	0,07	0,23	0,4
2006	0,69	0,57	0,55	0,36	0,39	0,08	0,54	0,41
2007	0,67	0,55	0,55	0,33	0,52	0,36	0,57	0,43
2008	0,67	0,56	0,57	0,33	0,59	0,02	0,58	0,41
2009	0,75	0,61	0,6	0,34	0,64	0,02	0,59	0,5
2010	0,7	0,61	0,6	0,33	0,51	0,07	0,81	0,45
2011	0,68	0,7	0,58	-	0,6	0,32	0,95	-
2012	0,68	0,63	0,59	-	0,73	0,26	0,6	0,43
2013	0,67	-	-	-	1,06	0,32	0,46	-

Source: (Eurostat, 2016).

Table 2 displays the percentage of GDP spent on environmental preservation by the government. When we look at the year 2010, the EU average is 0.7 percent, and several of the nations in the sample do not fall within this range. It can be seen that countries with significant environmental protection expenditures, such as France and Germany, have a lower share of GDP than the EU average, and even Germany falls behind Turkey and Romania. Romania had the highest ratio among the aforementioned countries, and it was also higher than the EU average.

**Table 3: 2001-2013 Public Expenditures on Environmental Protection (EUR per)**

TIME/ COUNTRY	EU-28	BELGIUM	FRANCE	GERMANY	BULGARIA	CROATIA	ROMANIA	TURKEY
------------------	-------	---------	--------	---------	----------	---------	---------	--------

<b>2001</b>	128,63	143,64	136,14	111,48	8,6	3,51	2,59	2,52
<b>2002</b>	128,52	150,63	145,38	108,32	7,51	8,02	4,35	3,72
<b>2003</b>	126,87	136,72	140,21	106,13	6,98	-	3,21	14,6
<b>2004</b>	133,11	165,22	142,73	102,02	8,83	-	6,24	17,63
<b>2005</b>	150,09	153,14	153,73	98,67	11,19	5,56	8,7	21,59
<b>2006</b>	163,41	172,41	155,42	99,71	13,54	7,2	24,84	23,47
<b>2007</b>	168,4	173,06	162,71	97,43	21,26	35,89	33,92	29,02
<b>2008</b>	168,13	183,28	172,23	98,15	27,82	2,35	39,01	29,24
<b>2009</b>	176,12	192,17	177,12	98,9	29,96	2,56	34,2	30,88
<b>2010</b>	171,69	198,62	178,94	101,1	24,75	7,69	49,91	34,33
<b>2011</b>	171,32	235,4	179,23	-	31,4	33,28	62,13	-
<b>2012</b>	172,88	212,31	184,8	-	40,05	26,59	39,2	35,13
<b>2013</b>	172,23	-	-	-	58,37	32,73	32,35	-

Source: (Eurostat, 2016).

In Table 3, which shows public spending per capita for environmental protection, Belgium and France were higher than the EU average in 2010, but Germany, Bulgaria, and Romania had an erratic path with big increases and declines, and had a consistent upward trend since 2001. Turkey's GDP is significantly lower than the EU average.

**Table 4: 2001-2013 Public Expenditures on Environmental Protection (EUR per Capita)**

<b>TIME/ COUNTRY</b>	<b>EU- 28</b>	<b>BELGIU M</b>	<b>FRAN CE</b>	<b>GERMAN Y</b>	<b>BULGAR IA</b>	<b>CROTI A</b>	<b>ROMAN IA</b>	<b>TURK EY</b>
<b>2001</b>	128,63	143,64	136,14	111,48	8,6	3,51	2,59	2,52
<b>2002</b>	128,52	150,63	145,38	108,32	7,51	8,02	4,35	3,72
<b>2003</b>	126,87	136,72	140,21	106,13	6,98	-	3,21	14,6
<b>2004</b>	133,11	165,22	142,73	102,02	8,83	-	6,24	17,63
<b>2005</b>	150,09	153,14	153,73	98,67	11,19	5,56	8,7	21,59
<b>2006</b>	163,41	172,41	155,42	99,71	13,54	7,2	24,84	23,47

	1							
<b>2007</b>	168,4	173,06	162,71	97,43	21,26	35,89	33,92	29,02
<b>2008</b>	168,13	183,28	172,23	98,15	27,82	2,35	39,01	29,24
<b>2009</b>	176,12	192,17	177,12	98,9	29,96	2,56	34,2	30,88
<b>2010</b>	171,69	198,62	178,94	101,1	24,75	7,69	49,91	34,33
<b>2011</b>	171,32	235,4	179,23	-	31,4	33,28	62,13	-
<b>2012</b>	172,88	212,31	184,8	-	40,05	26,59	39,2	35,13
<b>2013</b>	172,23	-	-	-	58,37	32,73	32,35	-

Source: (Eurostat, 2016).

While Belgium and France were above the EU average for environmental protection spending per person in 2010, Table 3 shows that Germany, Bulgaria, Romania, and Croatia followed an erratic trajectory with significant increases and declines and have been on an upward trend since 2001. Turkey falls far short of the EU norm.

**Table 5: 2001-2013 Total Environmental Investments of the Public - Million Euros**

<b>TIME/ COUNTRY</b>	<b>EU-28</b>	<b>BELGIUM</b>	<b>FRANCE</b>	<b>GERMANY</b>	<b>BULGARIA</b>	<b>CROATIA</b>	<b>ROMANIA</b>	<b>TURKEY</b>
<b>2001</b>	13.031,49	528,34	1.701,45	2.730	24,43	7,43	13,31	24,77
<b>2002</b>	13.007,98	518,06	1.695,07	2.650	32,33	12,11	13,69	142,42
<b>2003</b>	13.442,26	482,3	1.802,21	2.550	26,41	18,99	18,43	347,99
<b>2004</b>	14.571,7	436,35	1.906,47	2.390	33,4	3,71	71,32	357,26
<b>2005</b>	15.622,85	274	2.382,63	2.140	44,36	23,95	82,38	480,41
<b>2006</b>	16.605,93	399,1	1.105,27	2.100	50,65	20,32	128,11	524,27



<b>2007</b>	17.024,04	288,4	1.172,79	2.010	74,3	149,71	389,13	524,27
<b>2008</b>	17.289,44	284,1	1.290,27	2.020	108,43	1,82	444,11	465,26
<b>2009</b>	16.959,85	276,9	1.345,43	2.040	105,65	3,03	358,07	351,96
<b>2010</b>	16.148,81	121,1	1.357,99	1.880	73,14	23,55	436,88	427,05
<b>2011</b>	16.955,84	145,2	1.571,23	-	73,46	115,43	594,98	-
<b>2012</b>	15.701,15	223,4	1.685,69	-	72,37	10,21	283,3	522,1
<b>2013</b>	16.437,05	-	-	-	193,76	135,96	139,7	-

Source: (Eurostat, 2016).

Table 4 shows the overall environmental investments in public spending. As of 2012, Turkey had made more environmental investments than the three most recent members of the union—Croatia, Bulgaria, and Romania—as well as Belgium, one of the original members of the union. 3.3% of the EU's investments are in this sector, which is where Turkey is investing. A significant increase in the aforementioned investments is seen over the course of the Eighth Five-Year Development Plan.

When we consider public spending in Turkey generally, we may observe that various outcomes are evident for each variable that is examined. In terms of numbers, Turkey has lower expenditure levels than the last three members of the Union, is below the average for the EU in terms of the proportion of expenditures to GDP, has higher expenditure ratios than a powerful member of the Union like Germany, and has lower expenditure per capita than the Union average. even if it appears to be trending upward. It may be claimed that it has followed a decent track in terms of environmental investments when compared to both the EU as a whole and finally to the three countries that entered the Union.

## 5.2. Comparison of Environmental Investments and Expenditures in the Private Sector

**Table 6: 2001-2013 Private Sector Environmental Protection Expenditures (Million Euros)**

<b>TIME/ COUNTRY</b>	<b>BELGIUM</b>	<b>FRANCE</b>	<b>GERMANY</b>	<b>BULGARIA</b>	<b>CROATIA</b>	<b>ROMANIA</b>	<b>TURKEY</b>
<b>2001</b>	2.353,16	11.480,43	11.300	247,6	68,6	387,43	-

<b>2002</b>	2.535,85	11.932,98	10.800	183,86	103,22	628,87	-
<b>2003</b>	2.617,95	12.217,94	10.620	238,85	123,29	379,79	-
<b>2004</b>	2.506,45	12.827,4	10.710	267,2	255,85	609,86	-
<b>2005</b>	2.015,39	13.463,88	10.160	181,33	265,85	529,18	-
<b>2006</b>	1.180,99	14.513,53	10.230	365,47	339,13	697,94	-
<b>2007</b>	1.247,2	14.961,42	11.320	341,63	387,22	822,73	438,22
<b>2008</b>	1.596,67	15.398,62	11.960	434,38	429,63	1.226,45	455,87
<b>2009</b>	914,77	15.717,45	11.770	313,19	414,52	926,81	537,49
<b>2010</b>	1.382,64	15.989,75	12.560	333,69	418,52	1.075,48	676,34
<b>2011</b>	1.516,06	16.527,02	-	296,66	402,19	1.130,06	-
<b>2012</b>	1.700,16	17.585,25	-	313,48	267,31	1.581,97	-
<b>2013</b>	-	-	-	385,6	267,2	1.782,09	-

Source: (Eurostat, 2016).

Spending in the private sector paints a different picture than that of public scrutiny. When we examine the private sector environmental protection expenditures listed in Table 5, we can observe that they are significantly larger than the governmental expenditures in France, Germany, Romania, and Croatia. Turkey was unable to demonstrate its successful performance in public spending in private sector expenditures, while Bulgaria and Belgium took a more erratic path. While Turkey is the country among those analyzed where information on private sector environmental protection expenditures is least known, Eurostat has labeled the 2012 data as confidential.

The figure also shows that after the global financial crisis in 2009, expenditures fell in all nations except Turkey and France. While France and Germany spend more than other nations, Turkey spends more than Bulgaria and Croatia, but Romania only spends nearly half as much as those two.

**Table 7: 2001-2013 Private Sector Total Environmental Investments (Million Euros)**

<b>TIME/ COUNTRY</b>	<b>BELGIUM</b>	<b>FRANCE</b>	<b>GERMANY</b>	<b>BULGARIA</b>	<b>CROATIA</b>	<b>ROMANIA</b>	<b>TURKEY</b>
2001	469,93	2.083,07	1.580	130,69	47,77	181,25	-
2002	256,66	1.957,22	1.650	80,73	57,21	239,99	-
2003	261,97	1.751,96	1.430	113,84	61,53	190,4	-
2004	174,05	1.879,16	1.580	132,64	139,58	242,88	-

2005	230,33	2.252	1.410	92,05	149,34	225,41	-
2006	189,57	2.857,09	1.760	228,81	195,79	319,42	-
2007	199,8	2.650,89	2.780	186,28	218,39	398,76	138,42
2008	354,06	2.982,54	3.490	204,19	290,55	421,03	136,31
2009	246,24	2.856,45	3.070	149,73	258,88	418,2	56,57
2010	356,04	2.716,06	3.320	176,58	270,89	437,66	71,6
2011	390,21	2.633,89	-	127,68	230,13	330,36	-
2012	357,66	2.854,62	-	113,42	115,45	527,71	-
2013	-	-	-	144,06	113,74	648,23	-

Source: (Eurostat, 2016).

Table 6, which includes private sector environmental investments, shows that all countries' expenditures have decreased slightly since the global financial crisis in 2009. This decrease is significantly greater in Turkey than in other countries. Another notable factor in Turkey is that data on investments is less abundant than in other countries. Turkey, which has a much lower population than other countries, has very low investment levels when compared to the EU.

In comparison to 2010, Turkey's investment in this field was around 2.1% and 2.6% of Germany and France, the Union's strongest countries, respectively, while Bulgaria, Croatia, and Romania, the Union's last three members, were 40.3%, 26.2%, and 16.2%, respectively. Germany and France stand out among the countries studied for investing the most in the private sector.

When we combine public and private sector expenditures, we see that the state is responsible for the majority of environmental protection spending in Turkey. While expenditures by both the state and the private sector are high in countries such as France and Germany, private sector expenditures in Romania and Croatia, the Union's most recent members, are higher than public expenditures.

In terms of investments, Turkey's public investments are higher than those of the Union's previous three members, but Turkey falls short in private sector investments. While the majority of environmental investments in the EU are made by the private sector, the majority of environmental investments in Turkey are made by the public sector.

As a result, it is clear that the examined EU countries' environmental investments and expenditures are primarily private rather than public. In Turkey, public investments and expenditures are higher than those of the private sector. In terms of public investments and expenditures, Turkey has done well, especially when compared to the union's previous three members. However, the private sector has not been as successful in terms of investments and expenditures.

## 6. FINAL REMARKS

The EU process, which began in the 1970s with the "Roman Club" and continued with the First Environment Action Plan, began to be integrated with Turkey's Third Five-Year Development Plan. It has been discovered that the majority of the policies targeted for implementation in each plan period following the third plan are compatible with EU policies. According to the Union, it has taken pioneering steps with the concept of sustainability included in the Sixth Plan.

All of Turkey's environmental planning has been done with the goal of providing development rather than protecting the environment. This situation, which is clearly stated in the development plans, differs from the EU's approach to environmental protection in this regard. Despite this distinction, almost all of Turkey's environmental policy has been shaped by EU programs and policies.

More serious steps were taken in the approach to environmental problems with the Eighth Development Plan. These steps were reflected in the plan's policies as well as environmental investments and expenditures. The majority of investments and expenditures are public, and it has shown a positive development in this regard when compared to the EU. In contrast, private sector investments and expenditures lagged far behind the EU.

Although Turkey, as a developing country, prioritizes development, sees the environment as a complementary component of development, includes policies that are difficult to implement or require large resource transfers, and some priorities conflict with each other, the country remains steadfastly loyal to the EU while developing its environmental policies. In practice, he was unable to replicate his success.

Another reason Turkey has not been able to successfully implement every policy it has determined is that environmental investments and expenditures are largely made by the public. This approach, which necessitates a significant amount of resource transfer, is considered as a result of failing to account for the environmental cost to the private sector when prioritizing development.

In order for Turkey to achieve the success it has had in legislation for EU harmonization, the EU should develop policies within the framework of its general policies that are in line with its own internal dynamics. These priorities should be supplemented with holistic policies that include private sector investments and expenditures that do not impede sustainable development. Otherwise, it does not appear possible to achieve short-term success in the environment.

## REFERENCES

- Algan, N. (2005). Turkey's sustainable development policies in the EU accession process. *European Energy and Environmental Law Review*, 14(4).
- Alkaya, E., & Demirer, G. N. (2015a). Sectoral assessment of the Turkish textile industry for the diffusion of sustainable production approach. *The Journal of The Textile Institute*, 106(11), 1212-1225.
- Alkaya, E., & Demirer, G. N. (2015b). Sectoral assessment of the Turkish textile industry for the diffusion of sustainable production approach. *The Journal of The Textile Institute*, 106(11), 1212-1225.
- Blokhuis, H. J., Veissier, I., Miele, M., & Jones, B. (2010). The Welfare Quality® project and beyond: Safeguarding farm animal well-being. *Acta Agriculturae Scand Section A*, 60(3), 129-140.
- Bobat, A. (2017). Environmental impact assessment of hydropower projects In Turkey: Applications and Problems. *Fresen. Environ. Bull*, 26, 1192-1200.
- Brack, W., Dulio, V., Ågerstrand, M., Allan, I., Altenburger, R., Brinkmann, M., Bunke, D., Burgess, R. M., Cousins, I., & Escher, B. I. (2017). Towards the review of the European Union Water Framework Directive: Recommendations for more efficient assessment and management of chemical contamination in European surface water resources. *Science of the Total Environment*, 576, 720-737.
- Buffagni, A., Erba, S., & Furse, M. T. (2007). A simple procedure to harmonize class boundaries of assessment systems at the pan-European scale. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 10(7-8), 709-724.
- Bürgin, A. (2021a). The European Commission's role in EU–Turkey relations. İçinde *EU-Turkey Relations* (ss. 219-240). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Bürgin, A. (2021b). The European Commission's role in EU–Turkey relations. İçinde *EU-Turkey Relations* (ss. 219-240). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Chalmers, D., & Lodge, M. (2003). The open method of co-ordination and the European welfare state. *The Welfare State Reader*, 2, 289-308.
- Coll-Mayor, D., Paget, M., & Lightner, E. (2007). Future intelligent power grids: Analysis of the vision in the European Union and the United States. *Energy Policy*, 35(4), 2453-2465.
- Elvan, O. D. (2018). Analysis of environmental impact assessment practices and legislation in Turkey. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 84, 1-6.
- Giarola, S., Mittal, S., Vielle, M., Perdana, S., Campagnolo, L., Delpiazzi, E., Bui, H., Kraavi, A. A., Kolpakov, A., & Sognaes, I. (2021a). Challenges in the harmonisation of global integrated assessment models: A comprehensive methodology to reduce model response heterogeneity. *Science of the Total Environment*, 783, 146861.
- Giarola, S., Mittal, S., Vielle, M., Perdana, S., Campagnolo, L., Delpiazzi, E., Bui, H., Kraavi, A. A., Kolpakov, A., & Sognaes, I. (2021b). Challenges in the harmonisation

- of global integrated assessment models: A comprehensive methodology to reduce model response heterogeneity. *Science of the Total Environment*, 783, 146861.
- Kentel, E., & Alp, E. (2013a). Hydropower in Turkey: Economical, social and environmental aspects and legal challenges. *Environmental science & policy*, 31, 34-43.
- Kentel, E., & Alp, E. (2013b). Hydropower in Turkey: Economical, social and environmental aspects and legal challenges. *Environmental science & policy*, 31, 34-43.
- Konijnendijk, C. C., Ricard, R. M., Kenney, A., & Randrup, T. B. (2006). Defining urban forestry—A comparative perspective of North America and Europe. *Urban forestry & urban greening*, 4(3-4), 93-103.
- Montforts, M. H., Kalf, D. F., van Vlaardingen, P. L., & Linders, J. B. (1999). The exposure assessment for veterinary medicinal products. *Science of the total environment*, 225(1-2), 119-133.
- Pierson, P. (1996). The path to European integration: A historical institutionalist analysis. *Comparative political studies*, 29(2), 123-163.
- Rodrigues, V., Russo, M., Sorte, S., Reis, J., Oliveira, K., Dionísio, A. L., Monteiro, A., & Lopes, M. (2021). Harmonizing sustainability assessment in seaports: A common framework for reporting environmental performance indicators. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 202, 105514.
- Sözen, S., Teksoy, S., & Papapetrou, M. (2008). Assessment of institutional and policy conditions in Turkey: Implications for the implementation of autonomous desalination systems. *Desalination*, 220(1-3), 441-454.
- Syed, T., Choudhury, E., & Islam, S. (2020). An Assessment of Scale-Sensitivity in Policy Design and Implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive Within the Context of the Danube Basin. *Water Alternatives*, 13(3), 634-658.
- Tukker, A., De Koning, A., Wood, R., Hawkins, T., Lutter, S., Acosta, J., Rueda Cantuche, J. M., Bouwmeester, M., Oosterhaven, J., & Drosdowski, T. (2013). EXIOPOL—development and illustrative analyses of a detailed global MR EE SUT/IOT. *Economic Systems Research*, 25(1), 50-70.
- Unalan, D. (2009). An analytical framework for policy transfer in the EU context. *Policy & Politics*, 37(3), 439-452.
- Unalan, D., & Cowell, R. (2009a). Adoption of the EU SEA Directive in Turkey. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 29(4), 243-251.
- Unalan, D., & Cowell, R. J. (2009b). Europeanization, strategic environmental assessment and the impacts on environmental governance. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 19(1), 32-43.
- Van Ittersum, M. K., Ewert, F., Heckeley, T., Wery, J., Olsson, J. A., Andersen, E., Bezlepina, I., Brouwer, F., Donatelli, M., & Flichman, G. (2008). Integrated assessment of agricultural systems—A component-based framework for the European Union (SEAMLESS). *Agricultural systems*, 96(1-3), 150-165.
- Yıldız, T. D. (2021). How can the effects of EIA procedures and legislation foreseen for the mining operation activities to mining change positively in Turkey? *Resources Policy*, 72, 102018.



## STATEMENT

Undersigned Pinar Özer, student of the Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Kaposvar Campus, International Studies BA full time study program I confirm, that the submitted thesis is my own work, in the course of the preparation I handled the used literature in a correct way, by observing the legal and ethical rules. I agree that the one-page summary of my Final Thesis will be posted on the University's website and that the digital version of my work (in pdf format) will be available at the Department / Institute leading the topic and in the University's central register, in full compliance with legal and ethical rules..

The dissertation contains state or service secrets:                    yes    no\*

Kaposvár, 2nd November 2022.

---

Signature of the student

## STATEMENT

As the supervisor of the final thesis's author I states that I have read the final version of the final thesis, I informed the student about the requirements, legal and ethical rules of the correct management of literary sources.

I recommend / do not recommend the Final Thesis for defence in the final exam \*.

The dissertation contains state or service secrets:                    yes    no\*

Kaposvár, 2nd November 2022.

---

Internal supervisor

**\* Please underline the appropriate one!**